

PROCEEDINGS SIXTH PLENARY ASSEMBLY
JERUSALEM 1975

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



360.3
W

WORLD
JEWISH
CONGRESS

JERUSALEM 1975

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Blaustein Library

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

Sixth Plenary Assembly
Jerusalem, February 3-10, 1975

PROCEEDINGS



WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS
GENEVA

360.3

W

CONTENTS

OPENING SESSION

Addresses of Welcome:

Dr. Nahum Goldmann, President, World Jewish Congress	1
Professor Ephraim Katzir, President of the State of Israel	2
Mr. Itzhak Korn, Chairman, Israel Branch, World Jewish Congress	6
Presidential Address by Dr. Nahum Goldmann	8

SECOND SESSION

Message from the Rishon Lezion	28
Symposium: A World of Change	
Introduction by Dr. Joachim Prinz, Chairman, Governing Council, World Jewish Congress	28
Addresses by The Rt. Hon. Lord Chalfont, former Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom	29
Professor Raymond Vernon, Director, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University	37
Mr. Abba Eban, MK, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel	44
Discussion	54

THIRD SESSION

Approval of Rules of Procedure	59
Election of Credentials Committee	60
Appointment of Nominations Committee	60
Election of Presidium	60
General Debate: World Jewry in a Changing World – The External Front	
Introduction by Mr. Philip M. Klutznick (USA)	62
Discussion	71

FOURTH SESSION

General Debate: World Jewry in a Changing World (continued) – The Internal Front	
Introduction by Dr. Arthur Hertzberg, President, American Jewish Congress	79
Discussion	85

FIFTH SESSION

General Debate: World Jewry in a Changing World

(continued) – Regional Aspects

Introductory Presentations by Mr. Jacques Torczyner,

Chairman, American Section, World Jewish

Congress 96

Mr. Sydney M. Harris, QC, National President,

Canadian Jewish Congress 102

Dr. Benno Milnitzky, President, Jewish

Confederation of Brazil 109

Dr. Schneier Levenberg, Chairman, International

Affairs Commission, World Jewish Congress;

Vice-President, Board of Deputies of British Jews 112

Chief Rabbi Dr. David Moses Rosen, President,

Federation of Jewish Communities of Rumania 117

Discussion 121

SIXTH SESSION

General Debate: World Jewry in a Changing World

(continued) – Jewish Youth

Introduction by Mr. Mordechai Bar-On, Head, Youth

and Hechalutz Department, World Zionist

Organization 129

Dr. Paúl Warszawski, Assistant Director, Buenos

Aires Office, World Jewish Congress 134

Discussion 139

SEVENTH SESSION

General Debate: World Jewry in a Changing World

(concluded) – Israel and the Middle East

Addresses by Mr. Yitzhak Rabin, Prime Minister

of the State of Israel 150

Mr. Pinhas Sapir, Chairman of the Executive,

World Zionist Organization 159

Messages from Jews in the Soviet Union 169

EIGHTH SESSION

The World Jewish Congress in a Changing World

Introduction by Dr. Gerhart M. Riegner,

Secretary-General, World Jewish Congress 171

Discussion 184

NINTH SESSION

The World Jewish Congress in a Changing World

<i>Discussion (concluded)</i>	192
<i>Report of the Credentials Committee</i>	202

TENTH SESSION

Address by Mr. Menachem Begin, MK, Joint Chairman,

<i>Likud Party of Israel</i>	204
--	-----

ELEVENTH SESSION

Presentation and Adoption of Proposals concerning

Structural and Constitutional Changes

Report by Mr. Monroe Abbey, QC, Chairman,

<i>Committee on Organization</i>	214
--	-----

<i>Discussion</i>	222
-----------------------------	-----

Formal Admission of the Board of Deputies of British Jews

Addresses by Dr. Stephen J. Roth, Executive Director,

<i>European Branch, World Jewish Congress</i>	224
---	-----

Mr. Jacob Halévy, Chairman, British Section,

<i>World Jewish Congress</i>	226
--	-----

The Rt. Hon. Lord Fisher of Camden, President,

<i>Board of Deputies of British Jews</i>	227
--	-----

TWELFTH SESSION

Symposium: Jerusalem and the Jewish People

Introduction by The Rt. Hon. Lord Janner of Leicester

<i>(Great Britain)</i>	232
----------------------------------	-----

<i>Welcome by Mr. Teddy Kollek, Mayor of Jerusalem</i>	233
--	-----

<i>Addresses by Professor Shemaryahu Talmon (Jerusalem)</i>	235
---	-----

Professor André Neher (Jerusalem; formerly

<i>Strasbourg)</i>	242
------------------------------	-----

<i>Rabbi Dr. Joachim Prinz (Orange, New Jersey)</i>	247
---	-----

<i>Adoption of Declaration on Jerusalem</i>	250
---	-----

THIRTEENTH SESSION

<i>Elections</i>	252
----------------------------	-----

FOURTEENTH SESSION

<i>Report of the Workshop on the Problems of Small Communities</i>	265
<i>Report of the Workshop on the Aims of Jewish Education</i>	267
<i>Report of the Workshop on Jewish Aspects of International Law</i>	273
<i>Report of the Workshop on Intellectuals in the Community</i>	274
<i>Report of the Workshop on Anti-Semitism and Anti-Zionism</i>	277
<i>Report of the Workshop on Israel and the Diaspora</i>	281
<i>Report of the Workshop on the Third World</i>	284

FIFTEENTH SESSION

<i>Report and Resolution of the Cultural Commission</i>	288
<i>Report and Resolutions of the Commission on Soviet and Eastern European Jewry</i>	290
<i>Address by Mrs. Beate Klarsfeld</i>	301
<i>Proposal on Israel-Diaspora Relations</i>	305
<i>Report and Resolutions of the Commission on Israel and the Middle East</i>	306
<i>Report and Resolutions of the General Political Commission</i>	310
<i>Report and Resolution of the Commission on the Social Gap in Israel</i>	325
<i>Resolution on the Composition of the General Council and the Governing Board</i>	328

CLOSING SESSION

<i>Address by Mr. Gideon Hausner, Minister without Portfolio, Government of Israel</i>	330
<i>Eulogies of the Deceased</i>	338
<i>Closing Remarks by the President</i>	342

APPENDIX I.

<i>Rules of Procedure for the Sixth Plenary Assembly</i>	<i>353</i>
--	------------

APPENDIX II.

<i>Resolutions and Decisions of the Sixth Plenary Assembly</i>	
<i>Political Resolutions</i>	<i>363</i>
<i>Cultural Resolution</i>	<i>377</i>
<i>Revised WJC Constitution and Organizational</i>	
<i>Resolutions</i>	<i>379</i>
<i>Elections</i>	<i>393</i>

APPENDIX III.

<i>Composition of the Assembly</i>	<i>395</i>
--	------------

INDEX	425
------------------------	------------

OPENING SESSION

Monday, February 3, 1975
(evening)

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

It is with particular satisfaction that I open the Sixth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, the first Plenary Assembly to be held in Israel.

I am most pleased to extend a cordial welcome to the president of the State of Israel, Professor Ephraim Katzir, who fills his position with grace and distinction and who will address us in a few minutes. I also have the great pleasure of welcoming the prime minister of Israel, Mr. Yitzhak Rabin, who will address this Assembly on Wednesday evening.

I am also happy to welcome Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Yigal Allon; Knesset Speaker Israel Yeshayahu; Ministers Haim Bar-Lev, Yosef Burg, Gideon Hausner, Moshe Kol, Yehoshua Rabinovitz, Itzhak Raphael, Shlomo Rosen, Victor Shemtov, and Aharon Yadlin; Justice Haim Cohn; State Comptroller Itzhak Nebenzahl; and the mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Teddy Kollek.

I have the honor to greet the ambassadors of Finland, Panama, Sweden, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Norway, Haiti, Canada, Denmark, France, Guatemala, Bolivia, Switzerland, Chile, South Africa, Costa Rica, Ecuador, and El Salvador; the chargé d'affaires of the United States of America; the ministers plenipotentiary of Greece and Turkey; and the diplomatic representatives of the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Italy, and the United Kingdom.

I greet the hundreds of delegates who have come from forty-five countries in all corners of the world — and there may be delegates from some other countries who have not yet registered. I also greet the representatives of a score of associated international organizations, including very important worldwide movements which have recently joined the World Jewish Congress.

I extend a warm and fraternal welcome to the members of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization and to the representatives of the Zionist movement. I view the large Zionist representation at this Assembly as an impressive demonstration of our mutual desire for close collaboration in the interests of the Jewish people.

I am happy to greet the representatives of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, whose adherence to the Congress will be formalized on Thursday. Their presence here represents a historic milestone in the relations between the World Jewish Congress and the Jewish community of Great Britain.

I hope I may be permitted to express my personal satisfaction at seeing so large a delegation from the United States, a testimony to the progress the World Jewish Congress has made in that country in the past five years.

It gives me equal satisfaction to welcome here the delegations from Eastern European countries — Rumania and Yugoslavia — who are among the most loyal members of the Congress family.

I greet the representatives of the Jewish community of Denmark, which joined the Congress only a few days ago.

I greet warmly all the fraternal delegates and observers of Jewish organizations who are here this evening. I would like to single out in particular the important delegation of the B'nai B'rith, an organization with which we enjoy most friendly relations, which we hope to intensify in the months ahead.

It also gives me pleasure to welcome the representatives of the Conseil Représentatif des Institutions Juives de France (CRIF), with which our French Section equally enjoys most friendly relations.

Last, but certainly not least, I express my great pleasure at the presence at this Assembly of more than forty youth delegates from various parts of the world. This is the first time in the history of the World Jewish Congress that such a large delegation of the younger generation is participating in our deliberations. We will give them every opportunity for the full expression of their views, and will listen with great attention to the voice of the upcoming generation. Their participation in this Assembly is a sure sign that the Congress may look forward confidently to the years ahead.

2. ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL, PROFESSOR EPHRAIM KATZIR

The Sixth Plenary Assembly is taking place at one of the fateful moments in Jewish history. During your sessions, you will be discussing

the situation of the Jewish people at the present time, as well as the specific problems of the Jewish communities throughout the world.

There are approximately 14,000,000 Jews in the world today. Thirty years after the Holocaust, in which 6,000,000 of our brethren perished, the Jewish people has still not managed to reach the 16,000,000 figure it had attained prior to the European Holocaust.

Ever since the establishment of the State of Israel, the eyes of every Jew have been turned, with apprehension and longing, to the spot where the visions of generations of Jews have become a reality and where a homeland is coming into being for a dispersed people fighting for the preservation of its specific identity. The doors of the State of Israel are wide open to every Jew wherever he may be. Thus, since its inception, the state has absorbed more than 1,500,000 Jews fleeing the Holocaust and persecution in Europe and the Arab countries, Jews from the prosperous countries, and, to our joy, also Jews from the Soviet Union. The State of Israel has become the sole Jewish center in the world in which our people is able to shape its own destiny and its life in the political, economic, social, and cultural spheres. It is the only place on earth where the Jew can defend his life and his liberty by means of his own trained army and where the creative power of our people can express itself spiritually as well as in action.

Support for Israel has become for many Jews in the Diaspora the outstanding sign of their Jewishness, and they freely give of their energy, their time, and their money for the benefit of the Jewish state. But just as the State of Israel is a vital necessity for Jewish survival in the Diaspora, so is the faithful support of the Jewish people in the Diaspora necessary for Israel. It is helped not a little by the Diaspora in developing its economy and in setting up its social and educational institutions. The Jews of the Diaspora play a primary role in immigration and absorption efforts as well as in creating a favorable public opinion for Israel in the world.

The mutual attraction between the Jews of the Diaspora and the State of Israel was proved anew in the Yom-Kippur War, in which the Jewish people evinced a marvellous spirit of sacrifice and extended to Israel — fighting for its survival — every material, political, and moral help. Thus was added a glorious new page to the history of our people.

The fact that for the first time in the history of the World Jewish Congress you are holding your Assembly in Jerusalem, the eternal capital of the Jewish people, shows that your hearts beat as one with the heart of the nation.

The modern world in which we live has impressive scientific and technological achievements to its credit. These achievements have led

to an unprecedented development in agriculture, industry, transportation, and communications. They have enabled man to penetrate the secrets of the atom as well as those of outer space. However, science has at the same time put into the hands of man destructive forces of tremendous power.

Only a few days ago we commemorated the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, symbol of the planned and organized mass murder of 3,000,000 Jews — an act of annihilation without precedent in the annals of mankind. In this horrible and vile deed the Nazis made use of many scientific and technological resources in order to improve the efficiency of their murderous work. It was proof once again of the satanic depths to which men and nations can sink in our day, when they turn their backs on the sacred moral principles that the Jewish people has bequeathed to mankind.

Anti-Semitism in a new guise is threatening the Jewish people once again. Our enemies, while they are ready to accept the existence of Jews as individuals, are not prepared to recognize the right to collective Jewish existence as it is shaped and defined by the Jews themselves. The Arab terrorist organizations that do not recoil from the murder of innocent men, women, and children in order to further their declared aim — the destruction of the State of Israel — state at the same time that they are willing to accept individual Jews living in a so-called Palestinian democratic, secular state. Even among the most enlightened nations of the world voices are raised dissociating themselves from the State of Israel and from the need for the existence of organized Jewish communities preserving their own religion, tradition, language, and customs.

The world has not learned from the past; it has not only remained indifferent and accepted the acts of terrorism and murder within and outside the borders of Israel; it has given a standing ovation at the headquarters of the United Nations to the chief of the terrorist organizations. Moreover, representatives of the Arab countries and their sympathizers have managed to edge Israel out of Unesco, an organization established for the purpose of encouraging and promoting cooperation among nations in the cultural, educational, and scientific fields.

Once more the civilized world is capitulating before the brutal strength of those who wield the weapon of oil. The Arab countries, which for the present hold the key to the greatest part of the world's energy resources, threaten Israel directly and indirectly by purchasing arms aimed against Israel, by boycotting companies that trade with Israel, and by exerting pressure on the countries of the Third World with a view to their severing all relations with the Jewish state.

For the present, the Arab leaders declare that their intention is to harm only the State of Israel. It seems, however, that if their blackmail is not finally resisted, they may end up by destroying Western democracy. The persecution of the Jews in Germany in the thirties, which in the end led to the Second World War and the Holocaust, is a bitter lesson still fresh in our memory.

Great challenges, both external and internal, confront Israel and the Jewish people in this situation. From the outside world, the Jewish people will go on claiming its right everywhere to preserve and develop Jewish religious and educational values and its language and culture. We shall not cease to demand full equality of rights for Jews in all their countries of residence and we shall insist on their right to come to Israel and help in building it. These demands are first and foremost directed to the leaders of the Soviet Union, who at present permit only a limited number of Jews to emigrate, and we fervently hope that they will open the doors of their country for all those wishing to come to Israel. We want to believe that the day is not distant when the Jews of Syria and other Arab countries will also be allowed to come out and join their brethren in Israel.

On the internal front the greatest task confronting us today is that of deepening Jewish awareness in all our people by the expansion and strengthening of Jewish education, both religious and secular. We must enable the young generation to acquire a thorough knowledge of the history of our people, from the time it came to the Promised Land up to the present. It is incumbent upon us to see to it that the study of the Bible and of the other masterpieces of our ancient and modern literature becomes more widespread. It is our duty to widen and deepen the knowledge of the Hebrew language and its culture, and an understanding of the Jewish philosophy of life. Jewish education must extend to all levels, from elementary school through high school and university. But Jewish education will not achieve its aims if Jewish values are not fostered and the traditions and festivals of Israel are not kept in every Jewish home.

Despite the progress made in Jewish education in recent years, one cannot ignore the fact that there is still a large number of Jewish children in the Diaspora who do not receive any Jewish education at all. There are entire Jewish communities that lack Jewish educational institutions worthy of the name.

A wider and more profound Jewish education can help more effectively to stem the growing tide of intermarriage threatening entire Jewish communities. To strengthen the infrastructure of Jewish education, an infrastructure comprising Jewish studies in an academic framework, in rabbinical colleges and teachers' seminaries as well as

in Jewish schools of all kinds — this is a task which the large Jewish communities must undertake. It is also incumbent upon them — with the active cooperation of the State of Israel — to help the smaller Jewish communities who are unable to face this challenge by themselves.

This educational task is an enormous one, requiring extensive collaboration between the State of Israel, with its great cultural resources, and the Jewish communal educational institutions in the Diaspora. Common educational programs must continue to be formulated; the training of teachers should be undertaken in common; a growing number of pupils, students, and teachers should be enabled to sojourn, to learn, and to complete their studies in Israel.

To our great regret there are still many Jews in the Diaspora who take no part in Jewish life and remain aloof from Judaism and Zionism. It is the duty of the World Jewish Congress to bring them nearer to Judaism and to the Jewish people.

In the world of many changes in which we live, the Jewish people has a heavy responsibility which it has been shouldering throughout the ages: as the "chosen people," to give expression in its way of life to the moral values, the integrity, and the social and national justice which are enshrined in its spiritual heritage.

Tremendous forces lie hidden within the Jewish people. If we can, by common endeavor, bring about a deepened Jewish awareness; if we are able to strengthen the affinity of our brethren in the Diaspora with the culture of Israel and the State of Israel — then it will be within our power to ensure the development and the prosperity of the Jewish people in Israel and in the countries of the Dispersion.

3. ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE ISRAEL BRANCH OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS, MR. ITZHAK KORN

It is truly a great occasion today to see you, representatives of the Jewish people, gathering in Jerusalem, so that we can demonstrate to the whole world and to ourselves the common destiny shared by the State of Israel and the Jewish Diaspora. It is of special historic significance that our meeting here is taking place at a time of trial both for us and for you.

Let us admit without hesitation that the feeling of deep isolation has not passed, when we have seen almost the entire world rise and cheer the oppressor who has resolved to bring about the destruction of the Third Commonwealth. This image is preserved deep within our memory,

as it has befallen the Jewish people twice in this century : once forty years ago on the eve of the Holocaust, and when it repeated itself a few weeks ago at the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Yet despite that occurrence in New York and despite the continuous struggle in which we find ourselves, I can faithfully promise all of you that our spirit has not faltered and that we have not lost faith in our strength. The Jewish nation is one well acquainted with strife, a nation which has already been tested, in times like these and in times worse than these.

We are a people which has the ability to rise above itself, especially in moments of trial. We are a people which, under a thin layer of doubt and confusion, possesses a tremendous wealth of spiritual fortitude and a belief in the righteousness of its cause. Let no one doubt it — we are destined to overcome this hour of trial and to emerge from it ten times as hardened and as strong.

And yet, especially in these stormy times, we are in greater need than ever of our one and only ally, who has no match for generosity and dedication in the history of the nations. This ally is the Jewish people of the Diaspora. Without it, where would we be ?

It is fitting that all of us remember the simple truth that despite all the spirit of sacrifice and courage, there will be no rebirth for us here if we do not take advantage of the Jewish strength which is dispersed throughout the world. Jewish strength, which has many facets — *aliya*, material help, influence on policymakers and public-opinion shapers — is the prime guarantee for our existence here. If this Jewish strength should weaken, a basic component in the defenses of the Jewish state would be weakened, too.

And on the other hand, if, God forbid, the State of Israel should be struck off the map — as our enemies aspire — it would have a somber significance for the fate of the Jewish people. Although it is possible that here and there small, scattered, and isolated pockets of Jews might remain, the existence of the Jewish people as a people would be placed in doubt. For this is the essence and the fundament : the State of Israel and the Jewish people depend on each other's existence like Siamese twins. The one cannot hope to survive without the other.

Faced with this situation, we are witnessing a frightening phenomenon : assimilation, acculturation, and intermarriage mercilessly decimate the Jewish people. Entire Jewish communities have vanished from the face of the earth and thousands have been lost to us — not by the sword and not in pogroms, but rather in times of abundance and plenty, under progressive, democratic governments. It would seem that the Jewish people does not know how to make good use of the liberty

bestowed on it and the possibilities suddenly opened before it when the gates of the ghetto crumbled. It is an irony of fate that when the limitations and restrictions have been lifted from the Jewish people and when its progress is no longer hampered, it then follows a slow but sure process of assimilation and acculturation. We are therefore liable to lose in the second holocaust of this century – the holocaust of assimilation and acculturation – those saved from the first.

This state of assimilation and acculturation among the Jewish people is amazing and perhaps very serious, but it is by no means hopeless. We can still save souls from perdition. We can still make good what has been neglected ever since the state was established, when – despite the warning we sounded – Jewish education in the Diaspora was given a low place on the scale of our national priorities. But if we do not give new dimensions, new depth, and new energy to Jewish education in the Diaspora – which is the only dam in the way of the flood of assimilation – then the Jewish people will probably lose a considerable proportion of its children as early as the coming century.

It therefore follows that the main task of this Assembly is to see to it that ways are found of removing the dangers which threaten our people. In the name of the Israel Branch of the World Jewish Congress and in my own name, I thus wish for all of us that the Assembly will meet the fateful and historic needs of this hour and this generation.

4. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS BY DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: THE JEWISH PEOPLE AMONG THE NATIONS

As I make this presidential address at the beginning of my last period as your president, I am conscious of my first such address, in 1932, at the opening of the first preliminary conference which led, in 1936, to the formal establishment of the World Jewish Congress. Between these two addresses forty-three years have passed, which comprise the most tragic and heroic, the most decisive period in Jewish history, so rich both in tragedies and in achievements.

The main initiator of the preparatory conference was Stephen Wise and it is only fitting that in these first minutes of the Sixth Plenary Assembly we should mention this wonderful figure. It was he who made me interested in *galut* Jewish affairs, and we called the first conference primarily under the impact of the fear of Hitler's coming to power. Without foreseeing all the horrible consequences of the Nazi period, which culminated in the Holocaust, some of us felt – consciously or unconsciously – that a tremendous threat to Jewish survival was being planned by a people outstanding for organization. The 1932 conference was meant in the first place to prepare the Jewish people against this menace. Unfortunately the majority did not take this

warning seriously enough, as has happened very often in Jewish history, with incalculable consequences. I refer to this in the beginning, because my presidential address of tonight will also sound a new warning, and so the cycle of my public activity stretches from one warning to another, which is only in conformity with the basic character of Jewish history.

The four decades between the Geneva conference and this Assembly are dominated and determined by the two great events in Jewish life which shaped our psychology and the policies of our generation and probably of several generations to come. It may seem inappropriate or even unwise to connect in one breath the terrible events of the Holocaust and the glorious emergence of Israel. This connection, however, is not only justified by the facts — both happened in the same period — but it has a deep inner reality. It is doubtful whether there would be a Jewish state today without the tragedy of the Holocaust that preceded it. Having closely followed developments at the United Nations, I doubt whether the two-thirds majority in favor of the partition of Palestine and the creation of a Jewish state would have materialized were it not for the impact of the Nazi genocide, which made the majority of the peoples, both of the East and the West, feel that they owed an act of compensation to the Jewish people and led them to realize that the creation of the Jewish state was the only way to prevent a similar tragedy in the future.

I say this so that the people in Israel and the Jewish people everywhere should be aware that we paid for the establishment of Israel not only with the lives of the thousands of heroic young men who fell in the four wars which Israel had to fight, but also with the lives of 6,000,000 Jews. This only increases tremendously our responsibility toward Israel and our moral obligation to stand by it, come what may, and secure its future survival.

In this address I intend to analyze the consequences of these two central events which shape our attitude, our life, and our policy, today and tomorrow. One personal remark before I start. I will speak out very frankly; I shall be critical in many respects, both of the policy of the Diaspora and of Israel in a general way. But I do not intend to discuss the concrete problems of Israel, which are not within the jurisdiction of an Assembly of the World Jewish Congress. The Congress is constitutionally based on the premise of full solidarity with Israel which, as a sovereign state, has the right to determine its own policy. Every Jew, in my opinion, is entitled to express his views about Israel's policies, but when it comes to the final conclusion he has the duty to stand by Israel, even if he is not in accord with its policies. In addition, the World Jewish Congress, by its structure, cannot adopt a unified

position on any of Israel's internal or external political problems, because fortunately all Israeli parties are represented in the Congress, so that it is *a priori* impossible to reach a unified conclusion on any of the controversial problems involved.

Let me start with the Holocaust and its consequences. What it has done factually to the Jewish people need not be told again. It annihilated a third of our people, that third which represented the most creative Jewish communities in the Diaspora during the last centuries, those which carried the full inheritance of history and civilization in their hearts and without whose continued existence our survival would have been in doubt, were it not that, fortunately, Israel emerged, able not only to substitute for the exterminated communities but even to strengthen our existence.

Externally, the consequences of the Holocaust were, in a way, beneficial to our position in the world. The non-Jewish nations, who had not done anything substantial to avert the tragedy — primarily for lack of foresight, for which they paid by the loss of many more millions of their own sons — had for years after the Holocaust a feeling of responsibility, of guilt, and of bad conscience, of which, as a people, we were the beneficiaries. As a result of the Second World War, non-Jews felt that they had to treat the Jewish people with kid gloves; it became shameful to be anti-Semitic; people were reluctant to criticize Israel even if they did not agree with its policy, and they felt a special obligation to support Israel, as a kind of compensation for the tragedy that the Jews had suffered. The Jewish communities in the Diaspora made great progress in this period in every respect — economically, politically, culturally, intellectually. More than ever before we got the support of many non-Jewish groups and personalities, not only for Israel but for whatever demand we had with regard to Jewish problems in the Diaspora. The best illustration of this situation is, on the one hand, the vote at the United Nations favoring partition of Palestine and the establishment of a Jewish state, and, on the other, the support for the right of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, which went so far as to delay the signature of vital legislation in the US Congress. And even when we had to deal with the tragic position of Jews in some Arab countries or other Jewish issues, it was easier than ever before to get non-Jewish support. We were somehow in a privileged position and were treated more gently and more positively than in any previous period.

We have used this position to the full. We gained in wealth; we greatly increased our political influence, especially in the USA; we became a very important creative element in the literary and artistic life of many countries of the world. The number of leading Jewish writers in American literature in the last decade and our outstanding partici-

pation in modern art are among the manifestations of this creative activity of our people, facilitated by the attitude of the non-Jewish world that I have described. It seems to me that this period is drawing to an end, and I shall deal with this in the second part of my address, when I shall consider — after diagnosing and analyzing the situation — what should be our reaction to it.

No less important or maybe even more so than the external ones were the internal consequences of the Holocaust. I have always maintained that the internal front of a people is more decisive in the long run than the external one, and this axiom is more valid for our people than for any other in history. For thousands of years we lived without any real power, either economic, military, or political. The miracle of our survival can be explained only by the strength of our internal front, by our faith, by our refusal to give up hope, by our rejection of the dictates of the majorities among whom we lived, by our solidarity, by our attachment to Israel and to the values of our ancient religion and civilization. The inner impact of the horrifying experience of the Holocaust was thus even more decisive than the external consequences.

The first effect was that a feeling of bad conscience and guilt was generated within the surviving Jewish communities. As I mentioned, some of the World Jewish Congress founders had tried to warn the communities against the Nazi menace, but their warnings went largely unheeded. For instance, when we proclaimed a boycott of Nazi Germany, most of the influential Jews or Jewish organizations, especially in the USA, were reluctant or refused to accept it, out of fear of damaging the normal trade relations between their countries and Nazi Germany. This blindness was due to inherent Jewish optimism, which is a wonderful quality explaining in part our survival, but for which we have also had to pay — since people pay not only for their vices but also for their virtues. After the war, when we became fully aware of the annihilation of 6,000,000 Jews, the survivors of our generation asked themselves why they had been privileged to survive when millions of their relatives and friends had been exterminated, and why they had failed to see the danger in time. The traumatic obsession by the horror of the Holocaust is not fully digested even today, more than thirty years after the end of the Second World War. In the first years, many subconsciously refused to digest it, a classic case of collective psychological suppression. This, by the way, applies to Jews and non-Jews alike, and the great interest shown lately in books on Nazism and Hitler is not, as some fear, an indication of the revival of Nazism, but rather — after having gained the necessary distance to look at the matter objectively — an attempt to explain this unbelievable phenomenon of a great cultural and creative people like the Germans

accepting the Hitler dictatorship for more than a decade. As for ourselves, it is indicative that there is no book, no work of art, which has given a lasting poetic or artistic expression to the tragedy of the Holocaust.

Our trauma and obsession with this unforeseen and unforeseeable tragedy expresses itself in an oversensitivity to any kind of criticism of the Jewish people or of Israel. Quite understandably, during the centuries of the Diaspora, we have become over-alert to anti-Semitism; we are inclined to see in every gesture of non-Jews which we dislike, individually or collectively, an expression of anti-Jewishness, often when this is not so. This understandable and legitimate sensitivity was deepened by the experience of the Holocaust, coupled with distrust of the non-Jewish world which, for whatever reasons, had not really tried to save European Jewry from annihilation. This distrust, for instance, explains Israel's lack of confidence in any international guarantees proposed for its future.

A second psychological result of the Holocaust is our reaction to the significant change in the situation of the Jewish people, which, after having been powerless for 2000 years, finds itself in the post-Holocaust period in a situation of influence and power. "Power corrupts," as Lord Acton said, and it is a very dangerous element; it is essential to implement ideas and to conduct policies, but — like essential drugs which may save a patient if used in the proper dose, or kill him if the doses are too large — power must be used with moderation. Without any transition or preparation, the Jewish people is moving into a position of real power, not only in Israel (its military strength, its ability to win wars against large majorities) but also in the Diaspora, where many Jewish communities, like the American one, exert political influence and power as never before. In principle this is naturally a most welcome development, but we must learn to use it with moderation. Nothing is more difficult in this tense century in which we live than to shape the proper behavior of minorities. They should try not to be too conspicuous and not to overestimate the generosity and the tolerance of the majorities, not to provoke them to negative reactions, and they must learn to display a quality of tact, something difficult indeed in politics. Except in Israel, the Jewish people lives everywhere as a minority, and one should be objective enough to realize that, as a people, we are given to exaggeration, to extreme notions. I have often said that what I personally consider the wisest motto in history, the inscription on the temple of Delphi, "Everything with measure," seems to be meant for all peoples except ours. Our tendency to overestimate our power, to exaggerate its use, to rely too much on the benevolence of our friends, is characteristic of many aspects of our policy today and, in many cases, needs substantial correction.

A third consequence of the Nazi period is our tendency to concentrate more and more on the external front. Having witnessed and experienced what enemies can do to us, we began to feel that the only real danger to Jewish survival is from the outside. Disregarding the fact that, for the reasons I have outlined, anti-Semitism in the post-Second World War decades has lessened and cannot be compared with what we had to endure in the Nazi period or under earlier anti-Jewish regimes such as those of czarist Russia, Rumania, or Poland, we have tended to devote our major efforts to fighting anti-Semitism, very often building up unimportant symptoms into grave dangers, often fighting windmills. As the world is today, there is no real danger of a new holocaust, of pogroms, of a denial of rights for the Jewish people, although this obviously may change. But, devoting most of our collective effort to external enemies, imagined or real, we have neglected our internal front, which, more than at any previous time in Jewish history, is today decisive. Seen from the outside, Jewish life seems more flourishing than ever in the past: we are a wealthy and influential people, we are well organized, we are conscious of our strength and display great solidarity with Israel, which, despite all the difficulties, is respected and even feared in the world. It might seem therefore that the building of Jewish life is in wonderful shape. But when one looks beyond the beautiful facade into the background, into those anonymous forces and elements that mold the destiny of a people in the long run, then the picture changes radically. This is not the place to go into details, since Jewish life in the various parts of the world will be reviewed and analyzed at length during this Assembly. If I merely mention such phenomena as the proportion of mixed marriages; the fact that a large part of the young generation is indifferent to and disinterested in Jewish life; the lack of real Jewish education for our youth; the absence from Jewish life of the Jewish intellectuals — and at no time have we had such a rich number of intellectuals as today — then one begins to realize in what danger we live and where the real threat lies.

It is only natural that we concentrate on the external front, not only because of the dramatic remembrance of the Holocaust but because it is easier to protest, to organize meetings, to picket — and it gives an immediate satisfaction as an outlet for worries and anxieties — than to deal seriously with the slow, long-term work of strengthening the internal front.

Now let me analyze the impact of the glorious event of our generation, the creation of the State of Israel. Like every event in history, it has had both positive and negative effects. There is nothing in history which is only good; one has to pay for everything, peoples more than individuals. The positive, great, and deep effect of the emergence of Israel — unexpected and surprising for the vast majority of the people

and therefore all the more impressive — is too well-known and experienced by each of us daily to require a detailed description. It has created a new pride in every Jew to be a Jew, it has given a new *raison d'être* for Jewish life. Zionists or non-Zionists, most Jews realize that Israel is the natural center of Jewish life, and that the future of the Jewish people — despite the fact that over 80% do not live there — depends primarily on Israel's future. The only chance to replace the bastions of Jewish life destroyed in the Nazi period, which will not be rebuilt in Europe, lies in the new life and creativity of Israel, which may not only substitute for the loss but create even stronger foundations for our future. Israel is what Toynbee regarded as the essential element for the survival of a people: a great new challenge; and there is nothing which in the long run can appeal to the best part of our youth and induce it to remain Jewish more than the challenge of Israel — in the most effective way by living there, or in a lesser degree by being linked to its creativity, to the new society and culture that are emerging in Israel.

But even here — and I understand our sensitivity to anything critical or negative said about Israel — we should not overlook the less positive aspects. Not only has the hope of the Zionist movement that the creation of the Jewish homeland would solve the Jewish problem not been fulfilled, but on the contrary Jewish life has been made much more complicated and difficult by the emergence of the State of Israel. When I say this, it is not meant as any denigration or argument against the validity of the Zionist idea. First of all, time has been much too short for the hope to be fulfilled of solving the Jewish problem. Secondly, as long as less than a fifth of the people is concentrated in its own homeland, there is no chance for this fulfillment. And thirdly, it should have been clear from the beginning that the Jewish people would have to pay a price for the creation of the Jewish state, not only by monetary donations and political support, but by a radical change of its whole structure after 2000 years of Diaspora, and that it would take at least one generation but probably more to adapt world Jewry to such a fundamental change.

In particular two major problems were created by the existence of a sovereign Jewish state as part of Jewish life as a whole: one external, and I refer to what is called double loyalty, and one internal, the relationship between Israel and the Diaspora. I shall deal with both in all frankness. I know that many of us do not like to discuss the first issue, especially in public. There is a natural tendency among all peoples to ignore delicate and difficult problems, to close one's eyes, believing that they then disappear. In fact, this attitude makes it even more difficult to find a solution. It is unrealistic to deny the potential existence of the issue of double loyalty. Israel cannot survive and can

certainly not assure the survival of our people as its center and main source of inspiration, unless the Jewish people in its totality lives and acts in full solidarity with Israel. In normal times this should not constitute a problem. To help Israel financially, to support it politically, to participate in its cultural, scientific, and artistic achievements, should be an obvious right of every Jew and each Jewish community. In times of crisis, however — primarily political ones, when Israel's policies are rejected by many countries of which Jews are citizens — this problem of double loyalty is bound to crop up. Some indications have occurred even in the last few years. The fact that Israel's policies are fought and contradicted by the Soviet Union, which fully supports the Arabs, naturally makes the attachment of Soviet Jews to Israel more difficult. Likewise, the position of South African Jews was affected when the policy of apartheid — which fortunately is undergoing a process of radical change — was in full swing, and the foreign policy of Israel, originated by Golda Meir — and I say this in praise — supported the aspirations of the African people.

This problem, by the way, exists for other peoples too, but in a much smaller degree: other peoples have diasporas, like the Germans, the Italians and the Irish. The German minority in the times of rabid German nationalism had to face very seriously the issue of double loyalty, just as the Japanese in America when Japan declared war on the US. But in these other cases the problem is not crucial, because these diasporas, though having a certain loyalty to their countries of origin, will probably not survive very long as minorities, nor does the existence of the mother countries depend on the survival of the diasporas. For us it is a question of life and death. A Jewish state will not survive if Diaspora Jewry separates itself from it, morally, politically, and intellectually.

The solution of the problem is first of all to admit its existence and to fight for the recognition of such double loyalties. The notion of one loyalty for a people or an individual is the most antidemocratic notion one can think of; it is a typical consequence of the Nazi theory of the state — seen in the *Tausendjähriges Reich* — as the one entity that can claim the total and exclusive loyalty of its citizens. Under the Nazi regime, nobody had a right to be loyal to his family, to his church, or to his class if it was in any contradiction to his overriding loyalty to the Reich. But to deny the right of people to have many loyalties would make life poor and sterile, and is a complete denial of democracy and freedom. If I have to pay for my equality of rights as a citizen by the negation of my ties with my people, my history, my religion, my specific past, then I am neither free nor equal. One may go further and say the richer human life becomes, the more varied its civilization, the more loyalties it develops. Naturally, conflicts between loyalties may

develop, even in private life: if parents are separated and hostile to one another, the children may be torn between father and mother; there may be conflicts in loyalty to friends who are antagonistic to one another. And the same applies in a larger measure to collective groups. The only answer can be that, if these loyalties develop into a serious conflict — let us say in case of a war between Israel and another country of which Jews are citizens — then everyone must determine his priorities and choose between the conflicting loyalties.

The conclusion of this analysis is twofold. The first refers to the Diaspora and its obligation to fight publicly for the right to be loyal to Israel. We may have to do so together with other minorities who have similar problems of double loyalty, although less serious than ours. In our case, and in view of our tragic history, we may argue that more than any other people we have the moral right to be loyal to our tradition, which includes, as an essential part, Eretz Israel. It is the least compensation the non-Jewish world owes us after centuries of persecution and discrimination — not only to have enabled or facilitated the establishment of the state, but to recognize the need for Jewish solidarity and loyalty to Israel. I am optimistic enough to believe that, if properly explained, this problem will be fully understood by decent non-Jews, and even if difficulties should develop, we must be ready and courageous enough to face them.

The second conclusion concerns Israel. It is a sovereign state, and as long as other states in the world are sovereign — I am, by the way, convinced that this will not be for long, as the period of sovereign states is coming to an end — Israel has to be sovereign too. On the other hand, it has to consider the impact of its policies on Jewish communities in the world, whose solidarity it rightly demands. Therefore one of the major considerations of Israel's policies should be to avoid possible conflicts and accusations of double loyalty, to keep out of international disputes as far as possible if they do not vitally affect Israel's existence, and thus to make it possible for Jews in all parts of the world and under all kinds of regimes to remain attached and loyal to Israel. This is one of the reasons why I have often suggested, since the beginning of Israel's existence, a policy of neutrality for Israel, which for a certain time was adopted and formulated as nonidentification, but which, primarily because of the conflict with the Arab world, was unfortunately not maintained.

I now come to the second major issue resulting from the emergence of the State of Israel, the internal problem, which is lately becoming quite real, of the relationship between Israel and the Diaspora. For many years we were not really aware of it. Israel and the Diaspora were too fully occupied with the urgent task of securing Israel's survival, enabling it to develop economically, politically, and culturally, and as

this was done in a spirit of full mutual solidarity, the issue was not apparent or urgent. But with time, it has become more and more real, linked partly with the previous problem. It is a unique problem, because there is no other people in the world of which only a small minority — less than 20% — lives in its own state and the vast majority outside it, while at the same time the unity of the two parts of the people and full solidarity between them is a condition for the survival of both. How to create a state we could learn from other peoples — we are not the first or the only ones to have done so. We could learn how to build up an army, how to create a government, democratic institutions, an administration, and so on. But how to solve this problem we cannot learn from other peoples, who do not know it, or from the Jewish past — not even from periods when a similar situation prevailed and the majority lived outside Eretz Israel, which, by the way, was not then a sovereign state. In those ancient periods, the problem was much easier, because of the great bond of the Jewish religion, which dominated Jewish life both in Israel and the Diaspora and created the natural framework for Jewish unity and solidarity. Today, the Jewish religion no longer fulfils this task for the majority of the people, and the problem, particularly with the emergence of the sovereign Jewish state, becomes more important. As long as the Jewish communities of the world are ready to support Israel blindly, without expressing doubts about any of its policies, without criticizing or disagreeing, the issue may be pushed into the background. But the more Israel's position becomes difficult externally, the more Jewish communities have to face the policies of their own governments, unfriendly or antagonistic to Israel, the more this problem becomes urgent. It will take the best resources and the major constructive talents of political thinkers and historians to create a framework that will embrace the whole people, the sovereign state on the one hand, the Jewish communities in the Diaspora on the other.

We will try to discuss the relationship between Israel and the Diaspora in detail in one of the workshops of this Assembly. I would like to formulate only the basis for an approach to it, namely three principles: 1) the unity of the whole people and the equality of all parts of it; 2) the recognition of the sovereignty of Israel by the Jews of the Diaspora, leaving to the state and its institutions the right and privilege to reach binding decisions on its policies; 3) the recognition by Israel of the autonomy of the Diaspora, not trying to dominate its internal policies and allowing it to voice its views on Israel's policies. As a result of these principles, an institution should be created — without any juridical or binding status — which would enable Israel and the Diaspora to meet in an organized and permanent fashion, to discuss their problems, to exchange information and advice, to evaluate the

impact of Israel's policy on the position of Jewish communities in the Diaspora and vice versa, and to try to reach a common line of action on a purely voluntary consensus. Such a solution, I think, could be made understandable to the non-Jewish world, which might accuse Jewish communities of double loyalty if any legal or political rights were given by Israel to Diaspora Jewry; but this Israel should never do as long as it is a sovereign state, nor would the communities demand it.

May I now, after having analyzed the impact of the two decisive events of our Jewish generation on our present and future, review our position in the world. On the basis of outside, short-term, and superficial criteria, it would seem to be a very good one. The Jewish people of today is economically wealthy, influential, culturally very creative, with an unusually high degree of learning; it is well organized (at least on a territorial basis), committed to solidarity with Israel, ready to take care of endangered Jewish communities, and has also developed strong instruments to fight outside enemies or dangers. But from a long-range point of view, judged against the major new tendencies that are developing in the outside world — on which, as a people dispersed in so many countries, we depend — there appear on the horizon forces and trends that may weaken or even destroy this favorable situation.

The first of these is the fact that, as far as the outside world is concerned, the Jewish people since the nineteenth century has been dependent primarily on the democratic world. The democratic countries granted us equality of rights; they primarily helped us to implement the Zionist idea of a Jewish state; they are the natural address which we approach whenever there is a menace to a single Jewish community; they are — or at least have been — the natural friends of Israel; and the leader among them, the United States of America, fortunately a superpower, is committed in friendship to Israel. I personally have always had doubts as to the wisdom of this unilateral orientation of Jewish world policies, tied up solely with the democratic nations.

The second element in this chain of events — which could not escape anyone looking objectively at the development of the world since the Second World War — is the emergence of two new world powers or groups of countries, for the time being weaker than the democracies but getting stronger from year to year and able, if necessary, to compete with them. One is the bloc of Communist states, the other the group of so-called Third World countries which are, behind the scenes, supported by another new and potentially very important factor in world politics, the People's Republic of China. The clearest manifestation of this changing power structure can be watched yearly at the General Assembly of the United Nations. For the purpose of our

analysis it is unimportant to determine what real power the UN wields; as a barometer of world politics, it is still the most reliable instrument. And here the rapidity of the change in the power structure is frightening. Ten years ago, the democratic world, led by the US, was all-powerful in the United Nations and could obtain a clear majority on every issue and the two-thirds vote necessary for the most essential ones. Today it is nearly impossible, except in certain cases, for the democratic bloc to get a simple majority. The vote on the acceptance of China some years ago and — of even greater interest to us — the reception granted to Arafat at last year's Assembly, are an indication, unexpected to most of us, of this far-reaching change, which is of the utmost importance for us. The Communist bloc is on the other side of the barricades with regard to Israel, antagonistic and often even hostile, and on a number of issues the Jewish world is engaged in an open, violent fight with the Soviet Union. As for the Third World bloc, it knows nothing of the Jewish problem, as most of its member states are "*judenrein*"; they cannot understand the complications and implications of Jewish history and are inclined more and more, on very important issues, especially those concerning Israel, to vote with the Communist world and the Arab countries.

A third factor, which I have already mentioned, is the lessening or disappearance of the feeling of guilt and responsibility of the democratic countries for the Holocaust, and therefore a change in their attitude to Jewish communities and to Israel. There is much less hesitation to criticize Israel, to oppose it, to attack it; egoistic considerations of self-interest are beginning to override the remnants of moral criteria related to Jewish suffering during the Second World War. The attitude of most democratic countries in the critical days of the Yom-Kippur War was ample manifestation of this new trend.

In addition to this general weakening of our position, which may become further accentuated with time, two large parts of our people are threatened by external factors influencing their position. The first are the 3,000,000 Jews in the Soviet Union, whose survival is threatened not so much by potential anti-Semitism — although it certainly exists — but by the danger of erosion and assimilation, by the inability to lead a Jewish life and be identified with the Jewish people, the impossibility to strengthen its emotional relation with Israel. This situation concerns at least 20% of our people, with the danger of losing them not by pogroms or extermination but what is called in Hebrew "death by a kiss," enforced assimilation. A second group menaced by external factors comprises the 1,000,000 Jews in Latin America, again not so much threatened by anti-Semitism or direct menaces to the Jewish position, but in danger of becoming the victims

of a prerevolutionary situation which — as our experience in centuries of Diaspora life proves — tends to make us, as the weakest minority, the primary object.

To all this must be added — as a result of the general deterioration, but greatly strengthened by the open hostility of the powerful Arab world — the political isolation of Israel and the danger, if this continues, not only to Israel's position but, because of our solidarity with the state, to the totality of the Jewish people.

Let me now, after having tried to give a diagnosis of our situation, deal with a possible therapy and speak about the conclusions which, if we face the dangers and do not try to escape them, we have to draw. Again I will discuss first our foreign policy. I can indicate the solutions only on general lines and must leave it to further discussions, both in plenary meetings and in the workshops and commissions, to debate them in greater detail. We have, first of all, to reconsider and if possible to improve our relations with the Communist bloc and with the Third World, particularly because, next to the survival of the State of Israel, the future of the 3,000,000 or more Jews living in the Communist world is the major issue we have to solve.

This is one of the most delicate and controversial questions, on which there are differences of opinion and in which the World Jewish Congress has, for many years, played a specific role. For a long while, although aware of the situation, the policy of the WJC was one of great caution, often of silence and of trying to get improvements by confidential contacts with Communist governments. I know very well that the World Jewish Congress and I personally were severely criticized for this policy in the past, the wrongness of which was supposedly proven by the fact that, once the Jewish communities, particularly in the US, began an open fight — primarily on emigration — they got American politicians in the Senate and the House of Representatives to support them and even succeeded in imposing on the Soviet Union a change in their policy of restricting emigration — though how real and lasting this change is, remains still to be seen. To this I only want to say that our caution and refrainment from public demonstrations on the issue were enforced upon us in the past by the then much more brutal form of the Soviet regime, especially in Stalin's days. To illustrate this, let me mention that for years I was the chairman of an informal committee — formed with the participation of the Israel government and Jewish organizations, chiefly the WJC, B'nai B'rith, and some others — to deal with the Russian Jewish problem. For years we tried to obtain the release of hundreds or thousands of Zionists who had been imprisoned or sent to camps in Siberia by the Soviets. I had many talks with Soviet diplomats, who vehemently denied that any Zionist was detained because of his Zionist convictions or activity. When I declared

that we knew that many of them were in camps or prisons, the Soviets always challenged me to give them their names in order to check on my statement, but — although I had many of these names in my pocket while talking to the diplomats — I never dared reveal them, because one could not be sure whether the people would not be shot the same day or later by the Stalinist authorities. As I would not take such a responsibility and could not provide the names, it was easy for the Russian representatives to deny the accusation. The same occurred in general during the days of Stalin, when, with few exceptions, no Jews in Russia or abroad dared make a public issue of the problem. Nevertheless we tried to publicize the plight of Russian Jewry. For example, Martin Buber and I convoked the first public conference on this problem, in Paris in 1960, with the participation of very important non-Jewish personalities and declarations of sympathy from Eleanor Roosevelt, Justice Douglas, Bertrand Russell, Albert Schweitzer, and others.

But even then we were prudent in our handling of the issue on public platforms, for the reasons I mentioned. Only when the Soviet regime became more liberal and the danger of being arrested or shot overnight no longer prevailed — beginning with the regime of Khrushchev and continuing in a larger measure today — a group of activists in Russia, admirable in their courage and daring, began to speak out and to clamor especially for the right of emigration. When we saw them acting without being liquidated — in the worst case they were imprisoned or sent to camps for a number of years — Jewish organizations outside understood the signal and began to make a great public issue of the problem. In this public raising of the question — which was all to the good — we made, in my opinion, two mistakes.

The first was that very often we overdid it and exaggerated. Acts like those of the Jewish Defense League, the molestation of individual Soviet diplomats, the attempts to disturb concerts and artistic performances by Soviet artists — even Soviet Jewish artists — the identification of Soviet anti-Semitism with Nazism, were unjustified and could only boomerang. As a matter of fact, they brought about a strengthening of potential anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, particularly among the intelligentsia and the leadership, and induced many of them — as I know from personal contact with Soviet diplomats who even tried to understand the Jewish problem — to claim that the real enemies of the USSR today are neither the capitalists nor the USA, but the Jewish people and Israel. The pro-Arab position of the Soviet Union, its breaking off of relations with Israel — in which it was followed by all Communists states with the exception of Rumania — have strengthened these tendencies. As long as the policy of détente prevails and the Soviet Union is very attentive to public opinion in the democratic

world, one can hope that the increased potential anti-Semitism in Russia will not become a real one; it could break out, in very dangerous forms, if, God forbid, détente should fail for one reason or another and a new period of cold war should start, which is not likely for the moment, but not impossible.

The second error in our policies in this respect was the almost exclusive concentration on the issue of emigration. When I explained, a few years ago, that the Soviet Jewish problem has two aspects — the 100,000 or so who want to go to Israel and the millions who will remain in Russia and must be assured of facilities to live as Jews — I was attacked by many who even tried to punish me for this then non-conformist view. Concerning emigration, I hope that we have gained a real victory, but we will have to wait and see. The Soviets have played a very skillful game and one cannot know whether the promises which they are supposed to have made but which publicly they deny will be kept, nor can we foresee how large a proportion of Soviet emigrants are ready to come to Israel. In the meantime it has become obvious for all and is no longer a controversial issue that, with the same emphasis that we put on the struggle for the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate, we must fight for their right to live as Jews, particularly as they are formally and constitutionally recognized as a minority in the USSR. We are going to discuss the problem in depth at one of our commissions. I only want here to express the hope that it will be possible to obtain facilities for Jews in the Soviet Union to preserve their Jewish identity, both religiously and culturally, and even to establish certain ties with world Jewry. Those who deny this hope fail to realize that it may mean giving up or writing off millions of Jews, which would be a historical crime. It will require great efforts and patience to succeed, but — just as a decade ago, when I and others expressed the hope that the day would come when tens of thousands of Jews would be allowed to leave the Soviet Union and were accused of lack of realism — I now believe that there is a similar chance — if the policy of détente continues — to convince the USSR that it is in the interest of their image in the Jewish and non-Jewish world to allow the second largest Jewish community of the Diaspora to maintain its Jewish identity. In order to achieve this, it is essential that we realize the significance of this aspect of the problem, which is no less important than the issue of free emigration, and make of it a public issue, in the conviction that we cannot abandon Russian Jewry and have to secure for as many of them as possible the right to remain a creative part of the Jewish people.

The denunciation of the Soviet-American trade agreement by the Soviets, due in a large degree though not exclusively to the Jackson amendment, naturally alters the situation as regards emigration. It is too early to know or to predict what the consequences will be.

Personally I do not think that this denunciation means the end of the policy of détente or indicates a change in the basic desire of the Soviet Union to improve relations with the US — in which the USSR is deeply interested, as a means of benefiting both from American know-how and from American investments in order to develop the Soviet Union, primarily Siberia.

I hope it is not wishful thinking when I contend that emigration will go on more or less as during the last year. I believe Russia wants to show the world that it was not only because of American pressure that it allowed emigration and, more decisive perhaps, because the Soviet government would prefer that those whom they call “activists,” those who insist on emigrating, should leave the country, which would reduce the tension surrounding this problem in their opinion.

On the other hand, the denunciation of the trade agreement indicates that Russia is less amenable to American pressure or American public opinion. This means that future public action to induce the Soviet Union to continue or even increase Jewish emigration must be even more cautious than in the past, since any exaggerated attacks might provoke the USSR to stop emigration completely.

One more remark in this connection. There can be no greater error or shortsightedness in Jewish policies than to believe, as some do, that détente is contrary to our interests, and to desire a renewal of the cold war. Quite apart from our interest as members of humanity — which would be threatened with the end of our civilization in case of a new confrontation — détente is the only chance for peace in the Middle East — as peace is impossible without Russian cooperation — and for the future of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union, since détente must bring about a liberalization, however slow, in the USSR.

The number-one problem of Jewish foreign policy is, naturally, to secure the survival and the future of Israel. As I stated at the beginning, I shall not discuss concrete problems of Israeli policies, on which the World Jewish Congress as such has never taken any position. But it is our right and our duty, vis-à-vis the Jewish people and Israel, to warn that we are facing a very serious period. The honeymoon between Israel and the non-Jewish world — the majority of which voted for the Jewish state and reacted to it with sympathy and often with admiration, well deserved by the dynamism and achievements of Israel — has come to an end. My position since the creation of the state — that time unfortunately is working against Israel and in favor of the Arabs — has proven to be true, and because of the oil crisis the tempo of this development has become unforeseeably quick. Very great difficulties stand in the way of obtaining the acceptance of Israel by the Arab world, which is a condition sine qua non for peace and the future of

Israel. The way the Jewish people has stood by Israel since its emergence is a record of justified pride. But the real test is still to come. In the past, when we supported Israel to the full, we did so in an atmosphere of world sympathy for Israel, of respect and admiration for it and in conformity with the policies of at least most of the democratic countries. With the fortunate exception, for the time being, of the US, all this has changed radically. We may have to face open conflicts with the Middle East policies of many countries in the near future and must be prepared for it. Even those who may have doubts about the wisdom or the efficiency of Israel's foreign policy — which, by the way, is beginning to change too — must be conscious of our absolute obligation to stand by Israel in case of need. The courageous position of British Jewry in the days when we fought the anti-Zionist policy of Great Britain could serve as a model and example for us. The real test of our solidarity with Israel comes when we support it against the views of the states in which we live. It is natural that we should try to avoid such conflicts, and I hope that they will not become too sharp or too long-lasting. But we have to be prepared for the worst and committed to stand by Israel, whatever the political sacrifices we may have to take upon ourselves.

Before closing this outline of our foreign policy in the light of the deteriorating situation, I must make one general remark, which I hope will not be misunderstood. The discussion which has gone on among Jewish groups since the Holocaust, as to whether Jewish policies should be aggressive or prudent, radical or moderate, is, logically analyzed, meaningless. It is mostly the outcome of the psychology of the people involved: some feel happier in giving extreme expression to their passionate sentiments; others, cooler, more responsible and cautious, prefer to do the contrary. The choice of means is a problem for the foreign policy of all peoples. For the Jewish people, with its unique history of dispersion as a minority among other nations, it is a much more central, decisive, and complex question. Jews have survived throughout 2000 years in the Diaspora because they knew how to create a synthesis between stubbornness and meekness, knowing when to resist, even at the risk of annihilation, and when to remain passive, trying to escape. The most tragic and dramatic illustration of this fascinating problem in Jewish history may be the controversy on the attitude of the Jews in the Nazi-occupied territories. The insulting accusation — if not always made openly, at least felt by many in Israel and the Diaspora — is that the victims allowed themselves to be led like sheep to the slaughter. This is an unjustified and immoral accusation. First of all, it is factually not generally true, in view of the many heroic instances of resistance, the most dramatic one being the uprising of the Warsaw ghetto. But even if the majority did not resist, the great

historical and philosophical question remains, as to whether passive heroism is not sometimes even greater than active heroism. I shall not go into it now but recall a memorial speech for the ghetto fighters, in which I said that it is very hard to decide who was more heroic: the Jew in a concentration camp who went to the gas chamber with full faith in his religion and in the future of his people; or the young Israeli soldier going into battle with a song. From a historical point of view, the Diaspora gave us ample examples of both attitudes. When Jews were forced to deny their religion, there were many who did it, but that heroic minority which secured the survival of our people — and it was always a minority, as is well known — went to be burned in the days of the Inquisition or committed collective suicide during the period of the Crusades. In most cases they knew that resistance was hopeless and would result in the annihilation of even the remnant that might have a chance of surviving. Even during the Hitler regime, I doubt whether the survival of thousands of Jews would have been possible if all of them had openly resisted the Nazi policies. To know when to remain stubborn and sacrifice oneself, on what other occasions to run away, to yield, to escape, to remain alive in order to maintain the existence of the people — this was one of the great achievements of the national genius for survival that characterizes the Jewish people and explains the miracle of our existence.

The same problem exists today, under quite different circumstances. Since we have a Jewish state and are equal citizens in the Diaspora, the conditions are much more favorable. We are not threatened by Inquisition or pogroms, and therefore our stubbornness, when necessary, has to be less dramatic and our flexibility and readiness to yield can be more restrained. But the problem itself remains, and in many cases of Jewish policies of our generation — which I cannot discuss here in detail — overdoing our stubbornness, aggressivity, and radicalism was harmful, while in others our readiness to make concessions or to indulge in undignified policies was no less, or even more, damaging.

Now, coming to the end of this lengthy address, let me discuss the conclusions to be drawn from the circumstances on our internal front. We have, first of all, the obligation to fight for our right to be Jews. It may seem superfluous to stress it in this period, when Jews enjoy equality of rights and have acquired a large measure of influence. The problem nevertheless exists because of the character of our times. We live in a century which is by nature brutal and tense; we are witnessing the largest revolution in the history of mankind, embracing all peoples of the world — the hundreds of millions who were passive for centuries and suffered to be ruled by others, the fight of classes and social conflicts, and simultaneously the conflicts of power politics between the great nations of the world, while at the same time the arms that

have been developed may destroy victors and vanquished alike. In such a period, majorities are not inclined to be very gentle, tolerant, or understanding of the right of minorities to be different. I have often said that the difference between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Jewish history is that, while in the nineteenth we had to fight for the right to be equal, in the twentieth we must fight for the right to be different though legally equal.

A second conclusion must be that we have to concentrate more and more on internal issues: take care of our young generation; try to bring back the numerous Jewish intellectuals into Jewish life; establish an all-embracing system of Jewish education with the stress on making Hebrew the second language of the Jewish people, as a condition for becoming partners and participants in the cultural and social creativity of Israel. We must see to it that *aliya* increases and that the present untenable proportion of less than 20% of the Jewish people in the state and 80% outside it is radically changed. We must induce the important and influential Jewish personalities who are unable or unwilling to join Jewish life through the existing processes, to play an active part.

To sum up this analysis, all this is based on psychological conditions. We must stop being too sure of ourselves; we must cease living in an unjustified peace of mind. The relatively happy period since the Second World War is coming to an end, and we are entering a new era in which we will have to fight more strenuously and against greater risks for the survival and security of Israel and for the continued existence of the Diaspora, for which Israel's survival is a condition. Nothing is more dangerous for any people, especially for ours, with its innate inclination to be overoptimistic — a characteristic which explains to a large degree our survival but for which we have paid, in the Nazi period and in other times, with the loss of large parts of the Jewish people — than to indulge in illusions, see things better than they are, escape from facts when they are tragic and uncomfortable. We must find the courage and coolness of mind to face the realities, both in the Diaspora and in Israel, where all Jewish problems become more dramatic and more focused.

I started this address by referring to my first presidential address, forty-three years ago, which was a warning, asking the Jewish people to see the danger on the horizon of our lives. It is deplorable but inevitable that this, my last presidential address, must also sound such a warning. Fifty years ago the Nazi regime was not unavoidable and — having witnessed its ascent — I am convinced that it was due largely to the failure and the weakness of democratic forces in Germany and outside that Hitler came to power. Nothing is unavoidable in history — other-

wise man should throw up his hands in despair and meekly await a destiny decided upon by God or by the course of history. Human dignity is possible only if human beings believe in their capability to change trends, to influence events, and to avert tragedies. The warning of today is not of brutal anti-Semitism, certainly not of the physical extermination of the Jews. It is meant to alert the Jewish people to be prepared for a new period of danger which, though not as dramatic as the past one, may endanger in the long run the greatest achievements of Jewish history and of Israel, and destroy the Jewish identity of one of the potentially most wonderful young generations.

I hope that the coming leadership will heed the warning and learn from the errors and the sins of past generations, especially the adult generation of today. And may I conclude by expressing the hope that the new leadership which the World Jewish Congress will have to develop in the near future will not again have to address a warning to the Jewish people thirty or forty years from now, but that, after the heroic epic of its history and so many sufferings and tragedies, our people will be allowed to live with its center in the Jewish state strong and flourishing and the identity of the major part of the coming generation secured. I hope and pray that we may enter a period in which our main effort can be concentrated not on defense and on overcoming dangers or difficulties, but on creativity and on developing the great eternal values which it was the glory and the *raison d'être* of the Jewish people to have created in the past.

SECOND SESSION

Tuesday, February 4, 1975
(morning)

In the chair : Dr. JOACHIM PRINZ

1. MESSAGE FROM THE RISHON LEZION

The following message, from Rabbi OVADIA YOSEF (*Sephardic Chief Rabbi of Israel*), was read :

I regret that for reasons of health it is impossible for me to take part in the Sixth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress. Please convey my heartfelt greetings and blessings to the delegate to the Assembly, which is taking place in the holy city of Jerusalem, the capital of Israel.

I pray that this Assembly may strengthen the Jewish identity and the Jewish roots of every Jew, wherever he may be. I wish you, delegates to the Assembly, that you may be vouchsafed inspiration, that all your decisions may be blessed from Heaven, and that you may be successful, individually and collectively, in whatever you undertake.

2. SYMPOSIUM: A WORLD OF CHANGE

Dr. JOACHIM PRINZ (*Chairman, Governing Council, World Jewish Congress*): The topic we have chosen for this morning's symposium may sound like a truism, for there has never been a world without change. Change is the very principle of historical development. Every year, indeed every day, marks change, however minute or imperceptible it may seem.

As we are assembled here as Jews and will be dealing with the Jewish people in a changing world, it is important for us to understand that we have never lived in isolation. Even the medieval ghetto and the life within it were subject to changes that came from the outside. The architecture of the medieval synagogues, the language of the Jewish people, the whole scheme of Jewish thought, and even the Jewish tunes and prayers were affected by changes in the surrounding world. To live as a Jew always — from antiquity to the twentieth century — meant an adjustment to the changes of the times and an urgent call to our people to attune to the changes as well as to preserve and maintain that

which to us remained beyond change. But preservation never meant fossilization, but new Jewish creativity.

The three men of great distinction whom we have invited to present their own interpretations of our world of change, to choose their own approaches, and to suggest their own solutions — if there be any — will, I am sure, stimulate each of us to examine not merely their theses but his own as well.

The Rt. Hon. LORD CHALFONT (*former Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom*): A great number of the assumptions on which we have conducted international relations since World War II and on which we have based much of our thinking about international affairs can now be seen to be false, or at least dubious. I want to suggest that we should perhaps look at them again, fundamentally, and ask ourselves whether we ought not to be thinking about a totally new concept and system of international security.

If you ask most political observers or politicians of international stature what they think of first when we use the phrase, “the changing world,” or “the changing balance of power,” I think they would say that the most obvious and far-reaching change that has taken place since the Second World War — and, indeed, still is taking place — is the change from what was called the bipolar system of world power to a multipolar system. That is to say, the move from the phase of world affairs, after World War II, in which the world was to a very large extent dominated by two great economic and military superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, to the emergence of a number of other centers of decision-making, based upon states or groups of states that themselves are — or show signs of becoming — superpowers, and therefore breaking up the balance of power between the two great superpowers in Washington and Moscow.

To some extent, this is true. I have never, however, wholeheartedly subscribed to the theory of the breakup of the bipolar system. It is true that the People’s Republic of China has emerged, and is still emerging, as a potential superpower of the 1980s. It is a country with a vast base in terms of population, in terms of economic and even industrial potential; it is certainly a military power of great significance now, and as it develops its military nuclear capability it will become even more significant. It is probably true to say that in the future no great political decision affecting the long-term structure of the world will be taken, or can be taken, without taking very serious account of the policies of the People’s Republic of China. There is also — or was — the emergence of the other great Far Eastern power, Japan, which began, in the course of the last decade or so, to emerge with an enormous economic potential. It has always had a great scientific and industrial base. It is

arguable that, to some extent, the progress of Japan has been affected by the world oil prices, but I suspect that that effect is a temporary one and that, within a measurable time, Japan will also emerge as an economic superpower. Whether Japan chooses to emerge as a military superpower will depend very much on outside events. There is very little doubt that, if one simply looks at Japan in terms of nuclear weapons potential, it is a country that from the point of view of its industrial, economic, and scientific base, could easily become a nuclear weapons power within a very short time of making the decision to do so.

Then there is the emergence of a third group, which also is passing through its difficulties of development, partly, again, having to do with the crisis in oil and in world primary products, but partly for internal reasons as well. I refer to the Western European Community, which, had it continued to develop from the beginnings enunciated in the Treaty of Rome, which we in Europe thought were going to be further developed when the Community was enlarged by the accession of Britain and two other Western European countries, would have marked the beginning of the development of yet another superpower. Certainly, Western Europe, with its population, its industrial base, and its scientific and technological expertise, could have emerged – and still can – as one of the world's great powers within a comparatively short time. It is, however, now in a time of crisis.

In the changing world, some of the most critical and crucial changes are those taking place in Western Europe. We have the crisis brought about by the decision of the United Kingdom to renegotiate the terms of its original entry into the European Community. Not only I, but many other politicians in Western Europe, would say that the withdrawal of Great Britain from the Western European Community might well mark the end of that Community as a potential great-power grouping in the world. If, however, the Community should remain at its present strength and its present membership – and indeed there is no reason why that membership should not increase slightly in coming years if the present crisis can be overcome – then I think it is also arguable that we shall see, in the 1980s, the emergence of the Western European Community as a great power in the world. It certainly has the potential to be a great economic and industrial power; it also has, if this is the way the world should develop, the potential to become a great military power. I hope that this is not the way in which the power structure of the world will develop; but nevertheless I fear that it might be the way, and I fear that the political pressures on the statesmen of Western Europe might be such that they will find it necessary – or at least think it expedient – to develop their military power alongside their economic and industrial power.

To some extent, then, it is true that the multipolar world is emerging, that we no longer have a situation in which all the great decisions about the world's political activities and political developments are made either in Washington or in Moscow or in coalition between the two. Having said that, however, and having admitted that it is certainly one of the aspects of the changing world of today, I want to register a very considerable reservation and say that I do not believe that the change has taken place or is taking place quite as quickly as many people might think, and certainly might have thought in the late 1960s. I believe that we are still, to a very great and very significant extent, conditioned in all that we do and think in international relations by the superpower condominium.

Of course, there are people who deny that such a condominium exists. It is denied very frequently and very vigorously in Washington and in Moscow. Indeed, when Dr. Kissinger had just been confirmed as United States secretary of state and was making his first speech at the United Nations in that capacity, he said: "We have not been asked to take part in any condominium, and if asked we should not do so." This was a good rhetorical phrase for the United Nations in New York, but I think that we must concern ourselves with realities rather than with rhetoric.

If we look at the world power structure as it is today, we do still find a very considerable degree of what the Chinese call superpower hegemony, that is to say, a condominium or a collaboration of the two great superpowers in an attempt to solve most of the world's political problems. I think that this has emerged in the series of negotiations and discussions between the superpowers that generally go under the heading of *détente*. This, I suggest, is one of the most important areas of change that we have to consider in the world today: whether there is such a thing as *détente* between the two great superpowers and the military and political blocs which surround them; whether it is likely to emerge into anything more than simply a continuing discussion; and what the implications are of the failure or success of *détente*.

By far the most important set of negotiations within that whole complex of relations between the two great powers is, in my view, the talks on strategic arms limitation (SALT). I think that these are especially significant negotiations, for a number of reasons. I would suggest two main reasons: first, it suggests a much closer community of interest between the superpowers than we have been accustomed to see in the past, and the emergence of that community of interest into something more solid would have enormously great significance for the rest of the world. But also it seems to me to reflect something which might be very dangerous for the rest of the world.

If you take a look at the details of the first SALT agreement, you will agree with me that this was not quite what it appeared to be on the surface. On the surface, it appeared to be a very significant arms-control agreement; and indeed I recall that at the time it was first published a number of international observers who ought to have known better referred to it as a great breakthrough in disarmament. It was certainly not that, and I think we should be very clear in our minds as to precisely what it was.

It was, in effect, two agreements: one on defensive nuclear weapons and one on offensive nuclear weapons. I am not proposing this morning to go into all the detailed, sometimes almost theological discussions about nuclear weapons, but simply to point out that the agreement on defensive nuclear weapons allowed both countries to deploy two ballistic missile defense sites, when in fact they did not have two ballistic missile defense sites at the time. The effect of this agreement, therefore, was to allow them to have more defensive missiles than they had when they signed the agreement. In the agreement on offensive missiles, precisely the same thing emerged. The arms-control agreement was in fact an agreement, not to reduce the number of nuclear weapons or even to stop increasing the number of nuclear weapons, but to limit, to some extent, the amount of increase both parties allowed each other. It furthermore allowed — and continues to allow — both sides to improve the capacity and the effectiveness of their nuclear delivery systems.

That agreement, certainly is not a measure of disarmament — it is scarcely even a measure of arms-control. It may be — and it probably is — an important development in the political relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States. But it has very considerable significance for the rest of the world, and not always the amiable, optimistic, advantageous significance that many people attribute to it.

A series of follow-up talks, SALT II, is currently taking place in Geneva. The Soviet Union, while these talks go on, is continuing to develop its nuclear delivery systems. Meanwhile, the United States is continuing with the improvement of *its* nuclear striking force. (Indeed, those of you who follow these things closely will have noticed that quite recently the United States secretary of defense announced a very significant change in American nuclear weapons policy: the change from targetting nuclear weapons on cities to targetting them on enemy missiles, what is called in the jargon “a counterforce strategy.”) Thus anybody who believes that SALT is likely to lead to any dramatic or spectacular agreement between the two superpowers which will lead to a reduction of their nuclear stockpiles, had better think again, because I do not believe that anything of the kind is likely to happen.

I said that this had a somewhat dangerous connotation for the rest of the world, and I would like to explain very briefly why I think it is dangerous — and why it might have repercussions quite soon. There is, of course, the fact that a nuclear arms race of this kind has its own built-in instability and dangers, apart from the intentions and the perceptions of the two parties who are conducting it. Its built-in instability could at any time lead to disaster. But that is not really my main point. My main point concerns just about the only single important measure of arms control that the United Nations has succeeded in achieving in the twenty-five years of its life: the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty of 1970.

I know that the treaty itself is regarded by many people as an imperfect treaty, and I agree. I had a great part in the formulation and negotiation of that treaty, I know how difficult the negotiations were, and I know how imperfect the final document was. But if we forget the treaty, the piece of paper, for a moment, and look at the strategy behind it, we find that there was something quite significant in the whole concept of the nonproliferation strategy: the desire to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons throughout the world, to prevent the creation and the emergence of more and more centers of nuclear decision-making, and therefore more and more possibilities of nuclear disaster by accident or miscalculation.

That strategy has to some extent held up over the four or five years since the treaty was signed, with one notable exception, which was the decision of India to test a nuclear device under the general rubric of peaceful development of nuclear energy. The point I want to make, however, is that the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, in order to be signed at all, had to contain a clause which called upon the nuclear powers to effect real measures of nuclear disarmament. This was the price which the nuclear powers were asked in 1970 to pay to the non-nuclear powers in exchange for their agreement not to spread nuclear weapons around the world. The nuclear powers undertook solemnly to engage in real measures of nuclear disarmament. They have not done so; in fact, quite the reverse has happened.

Since 1970 the French and the Chinese, and to a lesser extent the British, have continued a program of nuclear testing. It is true to say, of course, that neither the French nor the Chinese signed the treaty, so they are perfectly entitled to go on testing if they wish. It is true that there is no treaty or international agreement which would prevent Great Britain from testing a nuclear weapon underground. But the most significant fact is that the Soviet Union and the United States have continued to engage in an open arms race in which the stockpiles of nuclear warheads have continued to grow, almost daily, since the treaty was signed in 1970.

In May of this year, that treaty comes up for review, as it has to by its own provisions. I suspect that if, by the time the treaty comes up for review, the superpowers have not engaged in some measure of nuclear disarmament, then the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty will disintegrate, and the nuclear nonproliferation strategy will disintegrate. As I see absolutely no possibility of any agreement on nuclear disarmament, I conclude that it is quite likely in the coming years that the nonproliferation strategy will collapse and that the world will — or certainly may — become a world of many nuclear powers. This, I believe, would be an extremely dangerous development, because the more centers of nuclear decision-making there are in the world, the more danger there is that one day there will be a war by miscalculation or mischance or madness.

I have spent more time than I had really intended on the strategic arms limitation aspect of things, but only because I believe it to be perhaps the most important element in the changes that are taking place in the world today. There is a danger — at least this is how it seems to me, looking at things from Western Europe — that people have forgotten or have become overfamiliar with the dangers of the nuclear weapon. In the 1960s the nuclear weapon was regarded as the great menace to world peace and indeed to the survival of civilization. Since then, we have had a number of other more or less fashionable causes to embrace: the ecological crisis, the crises about world population, about food, about energy — all these things have emerged, and they are real changes that have to be taken into account. But they seem to have caused people to forget what seems to me to be a central fact: that whatever threats there may be to our well-being, to our prosperity, to our stability, to our political institutions, the one single threat that still exists to our *survival* is the nuclear weapon; and unless it can be controlled, we may find that all our arguments about ecological conservation and world population and food are almost entirely academic.

I just want to mention, before I leave the question of the condominium, two other aspects of détente which are being discussed between the two great powers: the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the discussions on what are called mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe. I believe that they have as little chance of resulting in any kind of effective agreement as the strategic arms limitation talks. It seems to me that the gap between the Soviet Union and the West, both in their concepts of what constitutes cooperation and what constitutes balanced forces, is still so great that I would be extremely surprised if these two sets of discussions resulted in any success in the near future.

So, my first proposition to you in this analysis of the world of change is that, to some extent, things have not changed at all: in one very notable area, we are still in a world in which the two great power blocs — the Soviet and the American — are still in competition, although there is now a measure of community of interest in their approach to world affairs; and that this is still the confrontation that most of us must take into account whenever we consider the development of any particular local or international conflict that might be emerging.

I want also to mention the vast change that is taking place as a result of the new climate surrounding primary products, particularly oil and energy. A very simple realization, which has been clear to many people for years, is now becoming universally clear: that the belief of the industrialized West that it could forever support high and increasing standards of living based on cheap commodities from the developing world, whether it be food or oil or any other primary products, has been finally and irreversibly exploded. Those days have gone, and the developing countries of the world — whether they are oil-producing or food-producing — have realized that they hold in their hands a political weapon of enormous power. And having recognized the power of that weapon, they are very unlikely to relinquish it again. That, I think, is a single change of profound significance for all of us.

There is, however, another change, of a more immediate kind, which may result from this development, and that is the pressures that might be exerted upon certain governments to resort to the use of force in order to ensure their supplies of certain essential commodities. A classic possibility — although by no means the only one — would be another outbreak of open war between Israel and some of the Arab countries, followed — as it was in 1973 — by an embargo on oil supplies from Arab oil-producing countries to certain Western countries whose foreign policies are associated with support of Israel. If that happened, I think — and one has to choose one's words very carefully here — that there would at least be pressures upon certain governments to use whatever resources and whatever methods were available to them to ensure continuing supply of energy and raw materials. In that case, I believe that we would find ourselves in a situation of extreme peril, because it is very unlikely that that kind of situation could be contained. It would almost certainly escalate into something that might very rapidly become uncontrollable. It is all very well for the shah of Iran to say that he would not take part in any such embargo of oil supplies to Western countries and that certain oil producers in Latin America would be equally reluctant to do so. That is one statement of the case, and I have heard others; but I think that the scenario I have described is one that we should certainly take account of.

The possibility I have described is one of the most cogent reasons for my belief, which I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, that some of the assumptions on which we have conducted our international affairs and developed our international thinking since the Second World War are now being very seriously challenged. We have, I believe, tended too readily to accept the attractive idea that the world is progressing to a sort of world order based upon the belief that one day force and the threat of force would be eliminated from world affairs altogether. The whole concept of the United Nations and the Charter of the United Nations is based upon the idea of general and complete disarmament, that is, that civilized governments would always have as their aim the reduction or even abolition of national military establishments and the placing of the affairs of the world under some kind of benevolent world authority in which all disputes would be settled peacefully and any which arose would be immediately brought under control by the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations.

In my view, our experience and our experiment with that kind of international system in the last quarter of a century has failed. The United Nations, in its political activities, has shown itself — with one or two isolated exceptions — powerless to deal with any major international dispute. The reasons are many, and I have no time or inclination to discuss them all at this moment. Furthermore, in the one single aim which is identified more than any other with the United Nations — disarmament — it has also failed. In twenty-five years of hard work in the UN General Assembly, in the UN Political Committee, in the UN Disarmament Conference in Geneva, there has not been one single international measure of disarmament. There have been measures of arms control, and there have been what are called partial measures of disarmament; but there has not been one single internationally agreed measure of disarmament.

I believe that we must now admit the possibility that we have to look for a different system of international order. One possibility is a system based upon the realities of power, on the realization that, whatever we may wish the world to be, it is — and is likely to remain for a very long time — a world in which power matters and in which the intelligent handling and manipulation of power is far more important and far more urgent than the pursuit of idealistic dreams about the brotherhood of man, the abolition of violence, and general and complete disarmament. I would still dearly love to see a world in which all our disputes were settled peacefully; I would dearly love to see a world in which nation-states did not use organized violence in the pursuit of their national aims; but they do so, and I believe we must realize that. How we evolve a new system is going to be an enormous

challenge for the statesmen of the world in the next ten, fifteen, or twenty years.

In this connection I think it is most interesting to consider the changes in the character and style of leadership which have taken place in the world over recent years and the changes that might take place in the future. In the kind of time-frame that we are talking about, we have seen the disappearance from the world of leaders in the United States and Western Europe and the emergence of new leaders. I suggest that if you look closely at the new leaders who have arisen, you will find that they are people of a much more pragmatic kind. We hear far less now of "new frontiers" and the brotherhood of man and the emergence of a new world order than we used to hear before. Our new leaders seem to be pragmatic, and they seem to recognize — for good or for ill — the realities of power.

There are two changes that will have to take place in the leadership of the world before too long. One of those is in the People's Republic of China, where Mao Tse-tung, in spite of all appearances to the contrary, is not immortal. He will have to disappear one day, and I suggest that when he does we may see a convulsion in that part of the world which will have its effects everywhere else in the world where people think and practice politics. There is another, perhaps lesser, change which will also have to take place soon, and that is in Yugoslavia. When the present leader of the Yugoslav people leaves the scene, I suspect that there will be some very considerable convulsions in the political situation in Western Europe.

Those, then, are the ideas which I wanted to place before you as my contribution to the analysis of change in the political and strategic field. They have necessarily been rather synoptic and schematic, because each one of these things could have been the subject of a long dissertation and discussion on its own. I would make one last comment, which may or may not seem to you to be relevant: in less than ten years from now, we shall be entering upon the year 1984. But that of course is the subject of another discussion.

Professor RAYMOND VERNON (*Director, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, Cambridge (Massachusetts)*): As I listened to Lord Chalfont, my principal reaction was one of admiration for him and admiration for the Program Committee. The view that he has given you of the world, though having its somber overtones, struck me as an exceedingly thoughtful one. And as for the Program Committee, with a flash of intuition which approached inspiration they in some way or another divined that the view that I would provide you, of another blind man stroking an elephant, would be considerably different; that it would sometimes suggest the existence of the same elephant, sometimes suggest the possibility that we were stroking different beasts.

The mood we all share is the mood of something having ended and something else having begun, something a bit frightening, a bit uncertain. And that mood, I suggest, is justified. A great many things have been ending. A great many new developments — some of a disconcerting sort — have just begun to unfold. But for the moment, like Lord Chalfont, I would like to stress with you some of the enduring elements of the change — some of the elements that have been going on in the past, have been creating some of the difficulties of our world, and seem likely to continue in the future. One of these elements is trite, platitudinous. It is something we live with every day and therefore have become accustomed to. This is the fundamental shrinkage in international space. We all know about it. We get on planes and jump across oceans with an insouciance, an easiness which, though new to the human race, seems familiar. The effects are not just effects of cost or of time. They are effects which are deeply psychic. For the first time in human history, in all of the principal countries of the world our kids look at the things they eat and wear and dress in with basically similar eyes. The notion that pizza or ice cream or plastic pails, or lately even tempura, should be internationally acceptable commodities, would have been incredible to the man of fifteen or twenty years ago, and its psychic implications, I suggest, have not yet begun to work themselves through. Certainly their institutional implications are decades from us.

It is not only at this trivial level, of course, that we have been developing uniformity. In industry, again, almost for the first time, engineers and businessmen are capable of talking to each other using common language, common norms, common objectives. Synthetic fertilizers have the same formula, with small differences, in every country. We use common technologies. Our businessmen engage in a kind of global sourcing which would have seemed H.G. Wellsian in character if it had been mentioned fifteen years ago. In the United States the toy manufacturer in New York who thought that the end of the world was Hazelton, Pennsylvania, now thinks of Hong Kong as a familiar source. And it is not alone in industry, not alone among the consumers, that this homogenization has been occurring. The bonesetters of Mount Hermon who fix your skiers after they've made their mistakes develop their techniques from the Swiss physicians in Davos, and maintain a constant correspondence with bonesetters in Aspen.

In psychological terms, this globalization of horizons has also moved into the field of ideas and propaganda. I have been fascinated by the speed, for example, with which the political Left of the world have linked their causes. As you pick up, for example, standard leftist propaganda in Europe, Chile, Israel, and Vietnam, they are all linked as if they were a common phenomenon.

The measurable aspects of this development of global horizons can be seen in very tangible ways. For a period of about twenty years international trade has been going up at a rate which is nearly twice as rapid as the trade within countries. Our whole concept of the importance of the interchange of goods has taken on new dimensions.

In the field of international investment the same phenomenon is obviously visible. Investment across borders has been growing faster than investment within countries. But more important, cross-border movements of people and of ideas have grown at breathtaking rates. The other day I stumbled onto rather a curious statistic: by now, European countries, when they issue patents, when they issue these legal monopolies that sovereigns are capable of granting in their own countries, find themselves issuing over 70% of their patents to foreigners – to people not members of their own country. In the last twenty years or so, Americans and Japanese have been the largest growing element in these monopoly grants by sovereigns. The same phenomenon is happening everywhere else. In the United States today, the American are issuing about 30% of their monopolies to foreigners, and the Japanese are just beginning on the same process.

One of the implications of this that is critical for the situation of Israel is that the efficient institution – in terms of ideas and in terms of economic activity, not in terms of the use of force – today tends more and more to be multinational in scope and large in size. I would not for a moment suggest the inevitable, inexorable takeover of the world economy by 200 corporations, which is the current myth of a number of writers. But I would suggest a more sober and, I think, restrained and realistic concept: that in the world of business and of ideas the multinational organization has begun to acquire strengths which previously did not exist. Indeed, one of my colleagues tells me that if you analyze the marriages of the children of the eminent physicists of the world, the propensity of the children of physicists to marry other physicists' children is greater than the propensity to marry people of their own nationality – which says something for social contact. And in the field of politics and ideas, entities like the World Jewish Congress, or the Pan-Arab Movement, develop a significance relative to the nation-state which, prior perhaps to the period of the great strength of the Roman Catholic Church, had no parallels.

But there is a fundamental paradox that is involved. In many ways, the nation-state has become a much more critical entity in terms of the people who live in it. Over the past seventy years the nation-state has become much more a service state. By the only legitimate political process that we know that involves consent of the governed, people have been demanding more and more of their states, more and more in the way of exceedingly complex, subtle, sometimes contradictory,

goals. They want the avoidance of unemployment. They want the avoidance of inflation. Some of them want income equalization. Some of them simply want more income. So that you have this curious paradox — just at the very time when the critical institutions for doing things in the economic field become international, the nation-states are called upon to perform. And they find that many of the institutions they require lie outside their grasp. This is true with respect to bringing the necessary technology in, sending the necessary goods out, controlling the necessary prices, and so on.

That paradox remains. It is a bone stuck in the throat of the human race. For the moment there are no answers to the paradox. Both of the tendencies that I have described — the tendency toward internationalization of the critical institutions and the tendency to set more difficult national tasks — both of these grow stronger. The European Economic Community can be thought of in a certain respect as an effort to respond. But the European Economic Community is stuck on dead center. It is even retrogressing at the moment. A few years ago some of my colleagues in the economics profession had the idea that variable exchange rates would provide a way out of the dilemma. If you let nations alter their exchange rates, they could have all of the advantages of international economic discourse and all of the advantages of national economic freedom. That was always a self-generated illusion of the economics profession, and I think it will pass, along with the other ideas.

Meanwhile, inside most states, according to a number of fairly good analyses, there has been a steady decline in what you might call loyalty and identification — secular decline in identification with party and with class. The degree to which people no longer automatically give their loyalty to a label has become evident. The idea of a worker's class, or an employers' class, with continuity and a common interest, has declined. And according to a variety of very carefully done studies there has also been a decline in the belief of people that the key institutions of their nation-states are presumptively benign. There is much more skepticism about the political-industrial, the military-political, the military-industrial complexes — the elements of power and the central institutions of our society. And I suggest that one of the reasons why politicians and statesmen have become more pragmatic is because they sense that the background out of which they operate is a background in which they cannot command loyalty automatically. A statesman of the early 1960s, thinking out of his own life period, was entitled to talk in large ideas, given his experience. But the statesmen of 1975 knows in his bones that the paradoxical aspects of his position prevent him from doing anything otherwise than in small, pragmatic steps.

Let me turn from these large trends to a short-range problem, a problem, however, so large, so explosive, so delicate, that it may make long-range projection a little academic. This is the problem — within the next three or four years — of transferring 200,000,000,000 or 300,000,000,000 dollars of financial assets from the oil-importing countries to the oil-exporting countries. There are all kinds of projections about the correct figure. I observed with amusement the other day that Secretary Simon had heaved a great sigh of relief to discover that his previous prediction of 600,000,000,000 or 1,000,000,000,000 dollars had turned out to be wrong: it would only be 200,000,000,000 or 300,000,000,000 dollars that had to be transferred — so we needn't worry.

The notion of transferring 200,000,000,000 or 300,000,000,000 dollars of financial assets presents a problem without precedent to the financial institutions of this world. Observe that I am not talking about the oil price. Lord Chalfont and I have a basically different view of the future in this respect, which we probably will not be able to discuss adequately. I approach his view with respect, but also with disagreement. My projection is that the oil price will not prove to be the problem. I anticipate — with all the usual caveats involved in projection and the realization that one can be thoroughly wrong — that in the last half of the 1970s our problems will not be problems of shortage and high prices in the field of commodities, but the opposite. Notwithstanding that expectation, there still remains the problem of the transfer of 200,000,000,000 or 300,000,000,000 dollars, which is a separate problem, almost irrespective of the projection of the oil price.

Technically, anyone can transfer such a sum. Anyone who has read the thoughtful piece in last month's issue of *Foreign Affairs* in which four scholars got together and devised the necessary institutions, can see at once that the technical problems are of no great significance. But as he reads what the institutions entail, his political sense says that they are nonnegotiable. The oil importers know that they confront a group of powers that have used the "oil weapon"; and therefore they anticipate that these powers are capable of using something which for the moment we shall call the "money weapon." Therefore the oil importers will discreetly be demanding a variety of restraints on the prospective use of the money. And the oil exporters — be it said in fairness to their position — will be saying: It is our money and we don't see why we should be inhibited in its use any more than any other users of money are inhibited. This is where the area of political impasse exists. The effects that the use of a small part of 200,000,000,000 or 300,000,000,000 dollars can have in political terms upon exchange rates, upon asset values, upon monetary structure, are potentially cataclysmic. So far the measures that have been taken, such as the

25,000,000,000-dollar Kissinger Safety Net and the slight increase in International Monetary Fund facilities for lending, have been laudable, but they have also been trivial. This is no reflection on the technicians who have worked on it, who have been positively inspired. It is the political setting in which they have sought to pursue their objectives.

Here is the critical point in terms of our discussion today. Whatever the outcome, the industrial companies will be scrambling. They will be scrambling not for oil, in my scenario, but rather for the right to sell goods. And this will create — one must not exaggerate it, but one must not minimize it either — a significant source of influence on the part of the holders of the money. The holders of the 200,000,000,000 or 300,000,000,000 dollars, provided they are discreet and restrained, will also be able, for some time to come, to use these assets for the extension of the blacklist concept, for vote-buying, for grants with political purposes attached. We have come to the end of one era and to the beginning of another, which is bleak.

But there is another point to be made. I also project — again with a recognition of the basic danger of projection — that the unfolding of the oil crisis and its aftermath will probably not strengthen the political cohesiveness of the less developed countries, but may significantly weaken it. Up to today, of course, the less developed countries in international gatherings have exhibited quite remarkable unity. That unity has been based on the basic psychic need of seeing the big industrialized countries heartily punched in the nose for once. That is a terribly important factor explaining part of the reaction of less developed countries.

There is a second, much more pragmatic factor involved, and this is a hope — which I think is a very short-range one — of mutual support in their efforts to extract high prices for a variety of products, such as copper, aluminum, bananas — a variety of products for which there is an expectation that mutual support could strengthen world markets. And finally, of course, there is the simple pragmatic hope of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and others, that the Middle East countries would provide aid, perhaps concessionary oil; and that hope has been realized in a small way.

But the strains of this relationship are overwhelming. And the first strain obviously is the fact that in the years just ahead, as India tries desperately to increase her per capita income by 1% a year, the per capita income of Abu Dhabi will rise to 50,000 dollars. The oil-exporting countries will, in the absence of some major changes in social structure, be engaged in a relatively high degree of conspicuous consumption — to use Thorstein Veblen's old phrase — and the obvious gap in the well-being of these countries will become painful to behold.

The bridging of that gap might conceivably be possible if you could picture the existence of some common ideology binding the countries together. At the present moment there is none. And even if there were revolutions in some of the more conservative oil-exporting countries, it seems highly improbable that the Boumediennes or Kadhafis or Sadats could find a common ideological point of view.

Finally — and this is of course a critical point that we all understand — nobody has ever managed to be in a position of aid-giver or aid-receiver on a long-term basis and on a large scale without desperate strains developing in the relationship. Two outstanding cases today are the United States and the Soviet Union, both of which have sought to achieve political objectives through aid-giving, without much success. And the aid-giving weapon in the hands of the oil-exporting countries, I suggest, will be used even less subtly.

In the end I anticipate that the oil exporters will find themselves obliged to develop links with the industrial world at a faster rate than the links forged with the less developed world. They will generate that need out of a variety of forces. One, of course, is the problem of investing their assets.

The development of links will have to be accelerated when there is a slump in the oil market and in other raw materials. Because then, as history tells us, and as industrial organization analysis repeatedly reaffirms, the large producer has to have his own captive customers. We must remember that the Middle East is planning to put in place — and in some cases is putting in place — something on the order of 50-100,000,000,000 dollars' worth of capital-intensive plants which require high rates of production, demanding guaranteed access to markets and captive customers. The moment that these plants are perceived of as selling on an uncertain market, the need for enduring linkages will be great. My anticipation over the long run, therefore, is the interdependence of the oil-exporting countries and the importing countries, deriving from a common perception of interest.

My final point has to do with the relationship of the United States to Europe. The relations of the United States and Europe have gone through a series of shifts, not so much in reality as in perception. In general the perception across the Atlantic recently has been one of relative strain. At times, the Americans have regarded themselves as the material lords of the universe. At times they have regarded themselves as a giant with declining strength. And at those very periods, European perception of the United States has generally been in accord on these shifts in mood.

Meanwhile, the underlying realities have barely changed at all. In the field of technology, in the field of raw materials, in the field of

just plain mass size, the Americans and the Europeans, while shifting a little bit in their relative proportions, have not shifted all that much. And the effect of the oil prices has been bitter from a European point of view. Bitter in the sense that it has reestablished the fundamental point that the Lord accidentally gave the Americans a vast land mass and a very large market. That is a source of strength which the United States should take no particular credit for having achieved, it being largely accidental in historical terms. But it does lead to a relative invulnerability. The Americans, relatively speaking, feel nothing like the degree of vulnerability that the individual states of Europe feel, either with respect to raw materials or with respect to the monetary and financial situation. Europe has begun to realize this once again.

The response in Europe could surprise us. And yet, oddly enough, I am not sure in which direction it will go. One possibility is resignation to the fact that if the Europeans cannot get together in this crisis they will not be able to get together in any crisis. So Britain will go off with its North Sea oil, and Germany will go off with its strong currency, and France will go off with its pride, and Italy will go off with a sense of "anything can happen but that's what we can expect in this world." And we shall have a fractionalization of Europe once again, with the Americans once again being dominant — not because they deserve to be dominant, but because everybody else is smaller.

There is another possibility — the possibility that there may be a dramatic recovery in the esprit de corps, in the strength, in the psychological support for a European movement. I anticipate either of these extreme solutions and I do not think the middle is nearly as probable. I doubt that the present Europe can stumble on in its present form for very much longer. And with this cluster of complex crisscrosses and strands, I leave to you for the afternoon the much more difficult task of asking: What does this mean for the Jews and for Israel?

Mr. ABBA EBAN, MK (*former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel*): It is not easy to follow Lord Chalfont and Professor Vernon. I am reminded of the only conversation I ever had with the late Sam Goldwyn. I sat with him for nearly half an hour waiting vainly for him to produce a characteristic aphorism, all to no avail. His discourse flowed on disappointingly without any eccentricity, until the situation was saved at the last moment when some of his MGM executives put their heads around the door. It was then that the great man said: "Boys, I want a movie that begins with a couple of earthquakes and works its way up to a climax."

Now, that is what happens when you begin a symposium with Chalfont and Vernon. I doubt if I can improve on the volcanic

eruptions of authority that we have heard so far. It is consoling to believe that somebody thought that I could. Like Daniel in the lions' den, my problem is not how I got into this situation but how in Heaven's name I propose to get myself out of it.

I think it is not necessary to reflect on the nature of change. Change is essential to man — irresistible. Change is life itself. But change — rampant, unguided, unrestrained, accelerated change which overwhelms man's physical defenses and swamps his decisional processes — is the enemy of his peace. And let us admit that the change in the past decade has intensified all our predicaments and solved none of them. There is now more danger to human life, more ecological peril, more racism, more contrast between the rich and the poor, more irrationality, and less self-confidence in contemporary culture. All of us, including Israel, therefore face our problems in a world context less congenial to harmony and reason than a decade ago. I want to illustrate this by referring to one of the unexpected changes to which some allusion has already been made: the failure of the idea of world community, which was to be the most dynamic and transforming idea in twentieth-century life.

This is the first era of global history. The currents of action and creativity flow across the planet without any limits of parochialism; many of the world's most acute problems are capable only of planetary solutions. On the other hand, at the very time when the world can least afford to live without a unitary framework of relations, we find international institutions at their lowest point of effectiveness and of repute. In other words, the instruments are ineffective just when the task for which they were designed has become most relevant.

The truth is that it proved unexpectedly difficult to establish any sense of community at any level beyond what is still the crucial and decisive level of the nation-state.

Social history describes the expansion of the sense of community into widening circles — from family to tribe, from tribe to village, from village to city, from city to nation-state. In each case the transition was complex and many were very skeptical whether the new focus of authority would command allegiance.

At every stage in the widening area of community, the old loyalties endured together with the new. Men continued to be loyal to family and city even while becoming loyal to nation-state. Yet in each case the smaller unit of community had to renounce something of its jurisdiction. The incentives for broadening the scope of community have never changed. The incentives were positive and negative — a vision and a danger. The vision is of a larger scope for society, escaping from provincialism into wider forms of organization. The danger is a threat

to security: the smaller unit could not ensure its security; it therefore had to seek the shelter of a larger agglomeration.

I hope I am not too cynical if I say that the danger, rather than the vision, forced men out of parochialism into wider loyalties. My experience teaches me that men and nations do behave wisely, once they have exhausted all the other possibilities. But if the incentive of danger was sufficient to bring about previous transitions, to broaden communities, why is it not decisive in persuading our generation that the nation-state, with all its deep roots in men's consciousness, cannot be the final recourse for the solution of predicaments which are now supranational?

It is not very difficult to define what the predicaments are. There is the universal effect of regional conflict. No arms dispute can ever exist in confinement. Each of them sends out repercussions far and wide into the world. This was not always so. People talk of World War I. It was not a world war at all. It had an element of regionality, leaving large areas of Asia and Africa untouched. Ours is the first period in which nothing can occur in human action or conflict without affecting the rest of the world.

This is also the first generation of universal cultural experience. Cultural history until our age was very regional in its effects. This is even true, for example, of the most intense eruption of intellectual and spiritual energy, which occurred in the sixth and seventh centuries before the present era. Buddha, Confucius, Zoroaster, some of the Hebrew Prophets, the Greek philosophers and poets — all expressed their visions within that brief spasm of time. And yet they all lived, created, and died without ever having heard of each other. There was no cross-fertilization of their concepts and intuitions; it is therefore quite reasonable to study them separately. Today, on the other hand — for good or for ill — ideas and cultural forms become universal from the very moment of their expression.

The same sense of universal fate emerges from a study of political and social relations. There are predicaments which can only be solved, if at all, on a supranational plane: for example, the dangers of nuclear war and the pressure of population on resources, with the consequent peril of famine. I think it is far more likely that man will suffer disaster through famine and population increase than through nuclear war. This is something that goes on inexorably. Since our meeting began this morning, the world's population has increased by something like 15,000. If we had begun on time the statistics would have been even graver.

There are the perils of environmental pollution, the exhaustion of basic resources which sustain human life, violence and tension through

a drastic inequality of standards between advanced and developing countries. Equality is the keynote of our generation's life. Men are no longer prepared to put up with traditional situations of inequality, either as individuals within society or as nations within the universal family. Disparities which were once accepted with docility could now disrupt any chance of social or international peace.

Therefore, in the world of today a unitary framework of international relations would seem to correspond to the authentic mutuality of human fate. The trouble is that international institutions are the very places where there is less internationalism than anywhere else. Every year the heads of sovereign governments, in their parliaments and assemblies, survey the state of their own nations. But there is no authority which surveys the state of the entire human family in its full breadth and complexity. What would a president of the world, responsible for the total human destiny, have to report if he had to face a universal parliament in 1975? He would have to report that 60% of the earth's land surface is arid or semiarid and is only capable of supporting 5% of the world's population; that the inhabitants of the earth number more than 3,000,000,000 and at the present rate of increase will number 6,000,000,000 at the end of the twentieth century. It took centuries to double the world's population. It now only takes about thirty-five years to double it again. The president of the world would have to report that more than half of the world's present population suffers from varying degrees of malnutrition; that the increase in food production is not keeping pace with the population growth; that the expectation of life, which is about 71 in some developed countries, is as low as 33 in parts of Asia and Africa. (If I may be pardoned a word of egotism, I noticed in the last United Nations survey that life expectancy is highest in Sweden and then, believe it or not, in Israel. Astonishing in view of our tensions, our climate, and our telephone system.)

The State of the World message would have to go on to declare that there are 500,000,000 people suffering from water-borne diseases for which remedies or preventive techniques exist. It would have to add that in this golden age of scientific originality, some 750,000,000 adults are totally illiterate. That includes 80% of the population of Africa and 60 to 65% of the population of Asia. The world report would note with satisfaction that some 98% of the human race now live under their own sovereign flags. For the first time in history, then, the nations of the human family are equal in political and juridical terms. But in economic and cultural opportunity the disparities between them are wide and are growing wider. The report would have to say that the most advanced countries are 3000% more prosperous than the least advanced, that the rich are getting richer and that the poor are not catching up. Therefore

there is disillusion, even on the morrow of the celebration of national freedom. In the first flush of their independence, new nations are exalted by the flags, the stamps, the coins, the constitutions, and the parliament — all the emblems of their new dignity. But in the cold morning after the celebration of independence, the old backwardness, the old squalor, the old exploitation, and the old disease linger on. The flags are not enough. Men awaken to find that they can be free in every institutional sense and yet lose the essence of their freedom in the throes of starvation and want. There is more freedom and yet more bitterness than ever before.

The president of the world would have to end this cheerful account by confessing that there is no diminution of the arms race and little progress in evolving agreed forms of peacekeeping, even in disputes in which major powers are not involved.

But with all this dark counsel, the State of the World message would not be composed entirely of gloomy warnings. It would also include a testimony to the healing power of science. It would tell not only of dangers but of new opportunities to fertilize soil, to harness water, to irrigate deserts, to diffuse the fruits of knowledge, and to draw all men closer together in accessibility. It would portray towering feats of imagination and courage which have sent man beyond his earthly confinement into extraplanetary vistas. It would include a new awareness of universal interests and an unexampled mingling of experiences across the frontiers of states.

But the summing-up would have to be sober. The City of Man is a city with a few wealthy suburbs, chiefly in the north and the north-west, with vast areas of undernourishment and illiteracy, with no effective police or organs of government. Yet governments are so preoccupied with provincial crises of limited effect that the affairs of the human nation receive only marginal attention. The United Nations' specialized agencies propose to bring a universal vision to bear on the hopes of all mankind, but they never discuss them at a level of authority capable of launching cooperative and decisive action. They are also now disrupted by political rancors. Summit meetings are frequent but they still take a microscopic view of a few problems. They never take a panoramic view of the total human scene. The heads of government never come together to discuss the destiny of the planet, the population explosion, the development of resources, the structure of an evolving world community. They meet very often — indeed, the intensity of encounter is one of the main features of diplomatic experience today. It is a far cry from the conditions reflected by a memorandum from Thomas Jefferson to his secretary of state which is worth repeating verbatim:

We have not heard from our ambassador in France for three years. If we do not hear from him this year, let us send him a letter.

This splendid utterance reflects a leisure age in which currents of international conflict and interest moved much more slowly than today.

In theory, the frequency and intensity of diplomatic contact today ought to bring about broader currents of international understanding. It does not always do so.

It is here that the debility of international institutions becomes paradoxical. In theory the United Nations is supposed to represent a planetary spirit. In its Charter it seeks to present a vision of man in his organic unity. It does not escape into a vague universalism by ignoring the claims of nationality. The proliferation of nation-states goes hand in hand with a search for wider forms of integration — the European Community, the Organization of American States, the Organization of African Unity. The United Nations Charter strikes a balance between national identity and universal solidarity. It recognizes that the nation-state is still the main source of distinctive culture. In some respects, all nations are like all others, but those qualities which a nation holds particularly to itself, its particular memories and dreams, may well be its chief gift to the universal human legacy. The United Nations system, then, is theoretically viable; but in practice it has not generated a spirit of universalism. It has thus contributed to the contemporary mood of disillusion. Anyone who comes into contact with youth can discern this new melancholy. There is no general sense of moving into a future.

There has also been a breakdown of the instruments which were meant to express universalism in the field of diplomacy. Let me speak about the effects of world change on diplomatic method. The central fact is that the fashion of multilateralism has lost its glamour. It was believed on the morrow of the Second World War that a particular methodology of international dialogue had some special quality and power. It all goes back originally some decades before, to Woodrow Wilson: "Open covenants openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private understandings, but diplomacy shall proceed always in the public view." And again: "The great things remaining to be done can only be done with the whole world as a stage and in cooperation with the universal forces of mankind."

Now we must admit that all this was heavily oversold. I am speaking first of the idea that international relations would flourish if they were always open, dramatic, histrionic. (Notice Wilson's metaphor, "with the whole world as a stage.") Moreover, it was to be universal. A universal participation in all international problems was deemed likely to advance the prospects of a remedy. I suggest that any serious student of contem-

porary diplomatic history must now say that the multilateral, open, universal approach is an illusion. What Woodrow Wilson saw as its virtues are really its defects. When diplomacy is open, it is not congenial to compromise. With television cameras focused upon them, representatives of states are less likely to show flexibility than to illustrate their rigorous, heroic, and virile orthodoxy. If diplomacy is dramatic and histrionic, it is more likely to evoke passion than reason. Seated on a stage with the whole world as their audience, parties to a conflict are involved, not in seeking the agreement of each other, but in winning multilateral disapproval for each other's policies. Thus the United Nations has become not an instrument for solving conflicts, but an arena for waging them. Yet our liberal mythology has held that international discourse would be noble, honorable, and permeated with integrity to the degree that it was open and universal, whereas the traditional diplomacy, with its compactness, its reticence, and its restraint, must somehow be regarded as conspiratorial, sinister, and dangerous.

The question is whether there are any criteria for the applicability of the multilateral as distinct from the traditional techniques: I think we should acknowledge the inappropriateness of the multilateral technique to issues of bilateral conflict. Publicity and histrionics are counter-productive; they are hostile to compromise. Another of Woodrow Wilson's sacred animals, universality, is also open to challenge. I refer to the idea that everybody has got to be involved in everything. If you are discussing the Middle East, you cannot do without Burundi and Guyana. If you are discussing the Caribbean, you must have the Maldive Islands. In every dispute, however non-African, the decisive voting power of Africa must decide the issue. The justification used to be that disinterested parties are likely to be cooler and more responsible than those more directly involved. Experience shows that the "disinterested" participant is likely to be something of a burden and also prone to irresponsibility. Responsibility is more likely to come from those whose interests would be affected — those who would have to suffer or sacrifice if something were to go wrong.

The exaggerated recourse to multilateralism is one of the features of twentieth-century life. There has been nothing like it in history. Secretary Kissinger said that the United States appoints 560 delegates to intergovernmental conferences every year. I don't believe that the Israeli contribution to all of this international junketing is proportionally very much less. The sheer volume of encounter is bewildering. It has not, however, generated a spirit of universalism. There are very few statesmen who take a supranational view of world problems. It may be that some of the secretaries-general of the United Nations, some of the directors-general of the specialized agencies, have managed to

transcend their national identity into a kind of planetary patriotism. There have been certain statesmen, usually of small countries, who have tried to play a dual role: as the spokesmen of their particular national interests, but also as representatives of the broader human cause. But as a general proposition, we must deduce that a world community has not yet come into existence. The only real community is the scientific community, whose intellectual solidarities transcend the frontiers of states. A physicist in one country often feels a greater human solidarity with a colleague doing similar research in another country than with those of his own countrymen who do not live within the special mysteries of his discipline.

So far I have spoken of the failure of the multilateral technique in the resolution of conflicts, and here I join forces with Lord Chalfont's verdict. I fear, however, that we must also diagnose the failure in the effort to develop planetary habits outside the political realm. There were those who said that it might be difficult to transcend national sentiments and prejudices in regional disputes, but that the sense of community would assert itself in other domains, such as the war against famine, the control of the sea's resources, the environment, restraint of the population explosion, and the closing of the development gap. This hope has been put to the test at the Caracas Conference on the Law of the Sea, the Bucharest World Population Conference, the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment, the World Food Conference in Rome. Even in these domains we have not found an effective sense of world community.

None of the assemblies that I have mentioned can be described as successful or fruitful. The same is true of the effort to find an international response to terrorism. There have been verbose international debates without any effective conclusions about the limits of permissive violence. In fact, the change here has been negative: there has been a certain retreat from previously accepted norms. Some people assert that nations engaged in war or in national struggle have never recoiled from any means which might serve their ends. That is not true. In the past there was respect for certain immunities, even in armed conflict, and even in revolt. It is only in our age that these have been eroded. There used to be the immunity of children from deliberate attack. Now they are deliberate targets. There used to be a recognized immunity of those not involved in conflict. We now find that those outside the conflict are usually its most frequent victims. There used to be immunity of innocent maritime passage, with its modern corollary, immunity of vulnerable civil aviation. Today the modern hijacking movements have used the vulnerability of air travelers as a deliberate weapon of pressure and extortion. For many centuries there was respect for the immunity of diplomatic agents. A diplomat, after all, places himself outside the

protection of his own nation and comes defenseless into the mercy of a foreign state; therefore, the herald, the diplomat, the messenger, was always endowed with an immunity close to sanctity. In fact, in ancient Hebrew the word for *messenger* and the word for *angel* are the same word — which should not lead us to attribute angelic qualities to all diplomats.

Yet the need for a planetary approach becomes more intense in the measure that we have to face new themes unknown to traditional diplomacy. What were the classical themes of diplomacy in the past? Boundaries, spheres of influence, balance of power, honor, national prestige. In the second half of the twentieth century the primary themes are less elegant and more prosaic: energy, primary resources, the conflict between sovereign rights and international responsibilities, the spread of inflation to the point at which it becomes recalcitrant to anything except an international solution.

Today, a foreign minister or ambassador who says he does not understand economics is really saying: I do not understand international relations. After all, the proximate and likely causes of international conflict do not always affect boundary problems or political relations. The issue today is that geological or geographical accident has placed primary resources in countries which cannot fully use them and which are in a position to exert pressure or extortion on those who cannot live without them. The question is whether the countries in which these resources happen to be situated are entitled by the extreme application of the law of sovereignty to deny them to nations which would die without them. This is now the major international theme. It is potentially a more likely cause of future armed conflict than any other. Yet there is little hint of it in the textbooks on diplomacy written even one decade ago. Thus, while the methods of diplomacy have remained constant, they now must be applied to new and changing themes. This demands a fundamental recycling of training amongst leaders who operate in the field of international affairs.

First, there should be an annual world review such as that to which I have referred. It would be much more useful than the appalling routine of "general debate" in the United Nations General Assembly, in which most delegates repeat their utterances, not of the previous year, which might still be remembered, but of the year before that. I refer to the endless cyclical repetition of which the saving grace is that the world has stopped listening. Not even the television stations or the patient *New York Times* any longer takes any notice. Instead of the general debate, there should be a review of the planetary problems which transcend local disputes.

Second, there is need of a scientific study of those beginnings which do show some promise of concrete and successful supranationalism. My

own belief is that the most promising example so far is the European Community, with all its imperfections, of which we heard much in the previous two papers. This is still the only relatively successful approach to supranational decision processes. It has given birth to a twentieth-century concept of a frontier which does not have to divide states into sealed compartments. Within this community frontier, the dividing characteristics are limited to the definition of juridical responsibility and cultural identity. In all other respects the frontier provides for human accessibility, the freedom of movement for men and goods and ideas.

They key to the evolution of multilateralism lies in modesty and in gradualism. The European enterprise began with coal and steel. My European friends will forgive me if I am too rhapsodic about their achievements, but in relationship to our own situation in the Middle East, the degree of sacrifice of sovereignty to regional patriotism that has been achieved in Europe is almost beyond our dreams. You begin with the concrete measures; only at a later stage do you pursue the ambitious formula for a common political attitude.

The trouble is, there has never been any United Nations leadership which attached much importance to the nonpolitical possibilities of international cooperation. If Europe succeeds on the bread-and-butter issues of a common agricultural policy, joint industrial planning, and the creation of community institutions, its political role will be assured. I suggest a shift in the emphasis of international agencies from a vain obsession with geographical conflicts which are much better left to classical diplomatic methods, towards the planetary issues which transcend political conflict.

I also urge a deeper realization that the failure to develop the community idea beyond the level of the nation-state has its roots in educational systems. All educational systems are intensely ethnocentric. Few of them inculcate a general human philosophy. The planet Earth is not a subject of discussion in the schools of most states. Yet there is no real contradiction between internationalism and nationhood. Here I would endorse the statement of Alfred North Whitehead:

The differences between the nations and races of mankind are required to preserve the conditions under which higher development is possible. Men require of their neighbors something sufficiently akin to be understood, something sufficiently different to provoke attention, and something great enough to command admiration.

The point is that a double loyalty, to one's own nation and to the broader human cause, cannot flourish at the higher levels of diplomatic discourse unless it takes root in the world's educational systems.

There is, of course, a Jewish context to this problem. I think any objective historian, if there is such a creature, would have to admit that

in the struggle of nations between the impulse of particularity and the impulse of universalism, there is really only one successful reconciliation of that conflict: the Jewish people is the most intensely particularist and the most intensely universal of all nations that have had an international career.

To develop a sense of world community is a vocation worthy of the world's political and academic movements. The truth is well stated in the words of Teilhard de Chardin:

Everything that makes for war now makes for peace. Pressed against one another by the increase in their numbers and relationships, forced together by the growth of a common travail, the men of the future will in some sort form a single consciousness.

Mankind has a long history and an uncertain future. The "single consciousness" is the central purpose of modern statecraft. If we cannot yet touch it with our hands, let us not lose it from our vision, for I agree with the two previous speakers' diagnosis of pragmatism as one of the major qualities of international and national leadership today. I am not certain if I noticed in their voices a tone of approval. If so I would like to put in a word of controversy. I believe that excessive pragmatism in leadership has been an empirical failure. Modern national and international leaders, in their preoccupation with pragmatism, have lost a rhapsodic sense. The contempt for general ideas, what has been called the contempt for phrases, should be looked at with skepticism. After all, there was a nation in this place which threw a few phrases into the air, and the effects continue to reverberate, to agitate, to stir, sometimes to enrage. I believe that the eclipse of idealism, the discredit of general ideas, has been fatal to national and world leadership. Excessive realism is totally unrealistic.

Dr. PRINZ: I want to thank the three speakers, who have certainly expressed a great many new and exciting ideas. If my watch is correct, there is time for what is called in America a rebuttal, that is, a critical exchange of views among the speakers.

LORD CHALFONT: Although we dealt with certain different aspects and there were obvious differences of emphasis, one of the things that struck me about our presentations this morning was the fact that all three of them were characterized by a tentative and rather provisional approach to the future; for in most of the fields that we have been talking about, it is much too early yet to say which direction will be taken.

I think that there is really no difference between Professor Vernon and me on the question of oil prices in the future. I agree with him that our problem in the late 1970s and 1980s will not be high oil prices. What I think may be the problem — and I think he agrees with me

here — is the extent to which primary products, including oil, may be used as instruments of economic competition and even economic blackmail.

I would also like to make it very clear that I am by no means pessimistic about the development of Western Europe: I believe that the present crisis of confidence through which Europe is passing — which is due in part but not entirely to the attitude of the government of my own country — will be resolved. Nor am I pessimistic about the possibility that Europe will emerge as a significant world power and, if wisely led, have an effect on the solution of some of the world's more intractable problems.

As far as Mr. Eban's presentation is concerned, I find myself in almost total agreement with everything he said. I would assure him at once that when I spoke of the emergence of pragmatism among world leaders I was simply noting the phenomenon and not approving it. Excessive expediency and excessive pragmatism, as Mr. Eban rightly pointed out, may be characteristic of modern leadership, but I would regard that as a demonstration of the indifferent quality of modern leadership, and I would suggest that perhaps many of our problems are due to the inability of the political structure of today's world to come up with a leader of any real intellectual or moral stature at all.

I agree with Mr. Eban too about the failure of multinational institutions and the multilateral approach to world problems, and especially the apparent failure of the civilized world to deal with the new phenomenon of international terrorism. In addition to the introduction of the economic weapon, terrorism may be the most significant new instrument of international conflict that has emerged in this century, and I think that it requires a great deal more study than we have given it, a great deal more international cooperation in the collection of intelligence about international terrorist organizations, and a great deal more international discussion about how these operations can be dealt with.

I do not wish, then, to rebut anything my two colleagues have said this morning. On the contrary, it seems to me that all three of our presentations, each in its own way, conveyed a general sense of pessimism, an almost apocalyptic feeling about the nature of the changing world.

I would close by remarking that 200 years ago Immanuel Kant said that perpetual peace and happiness was bound to come to mankind one day, either as the creation of man's moral aspirations or as a matter of sheer physical necessity. It seems to me that this physical necessity is with us now. If we are going to do something about peace and prosperity in the long run, we have to work out some kind of world community,

some kind of international security system, that will accept the realities of power in the world, even if perhaps it falls short of man's highest moral aspirations.

Mr. EBAN: It seems that the three gladiators who were thrown into the arena absolutely refuse to wrestle with each other; instead they celebrate a harmony which probably the organizers find uncongenial. I do not want to rebut anything either, but to elaborate on a few ideas.

My point about leadership is that it is not enough to say that the only obligation of leadership is decision. Leadership has two obligations: inspiration and decision. It must satisfy each of these two tests; if it cannot inspire, then it will not be able to decide. I believe that the self-imposed, rather puritanical inhibition against going beyond the immediate horizon does have a detrimental effect even on the solution of concrete problems.

My conclusion on the problems of multilateralism was that you cannot jump from nation-state to world community unless you also go through the intervening stage of regional community, and that is the significance of the European Community. Looking at the discussions that originated the United Nations I found to my surprise that, whereas Roosevelt and Stalin were full of universalism and all the fallacies of Woodrow Wilson, Churchill, of all people, spoke of the necessity to advance by the creation of regional institutions in which multilateralism would be practiced, which might eventually enable the regional institutions to meet on some broader federal plane.

Finally, a word about oil. I agree that it is not necessary to anticipate an armed conflict over oil prices and that reciprocal interests will create a certain stabilization. The interest of the oil-producers to sell is not much less than the interest of the oil-purchasers to buy. The trouble is that the producers are more conscious of their power than the purchasers are of theirs; the oil would be useless if the markets were destroyed. I would only add that we ought not — from any socially progressive point of view — to regard an increase in oil prices as a reactionary thing. It was unrealistic and unprogressive to believe that the owners of this vital resource would continue to accept the disparity between what they got for their product and what the oil companies got out of it — a disparity much too wide to be sustained in any idealistic terms. The resistance should not be to the principle of price increase but to the drastic, extreme, and arbitrary nature of the increase.

Professor VERNON: I want to share my colleagues' discomfiture at our inability to pick a good roaring fight. I would, however, like to try to clarify one point which may have emerged confusingly from our three presentations — a point on which I suspect we are in a greater

degree of agreement than has so far been suggested. It concerns the whole question of whether multinational structures are weak or strong. Sometimes we have said one, sometimes the other, and yet we all seem to be agreeing with each other.

Multinational gatherings of nation-states in the past few years have been, by and large, extraordinarily discouraging, and this for a variety of reasons. One reason may well be the publicity accorded to them; another derives from the extent to which elected political leaders can be influenced by the objectives and immediate concerns of the populations of their respective countries — objectives which are for the most part rather grubby, or at least are perceived in that way by their leaders.

When we consider multinational institutions we get a different story. The Food Conference in Rome was a gathering of nation-states in their usual grubby mood, stumbling over day-to-day problems. However, the multinational institutions concerned with the food situation of the world are of another sort. Institutions like the International Institute for Rice Research and a variety of others rush around the face of the earth carrying new strains of wheat, cotton, or corn, moved by factors that have little to do with the particularistic objectives of nation-states.

Another example is deep-sea exploitation. The Caracas Conference was a disaster; it was as grubby as it could possibly be in terms of any broad perception of the needs of the globe. Meanwhile a variety of technicians, multinational enterprises, and other people, moved by completely different considerations, push along trying to figure out how to extract copper or manganese or cobalt from the ocean depths. I am not suggesting for a moment that what they are doing is necessarily desirable or adequate. I am simply suggesting that they are there, advancing with increasing vigor, concerned not with the politics of the situation but with its technology.

I would add one final point. Beneath their coordinating entities — beneath their prime ministers' offices — nation-states have subdivisions with delegated sovereignty. One observes the increasing tendency of these subdivisions, as technicians, as functional workers, to be involved internationally in a plot against their own governments. The ministries involved in weather-reporting around the world, for example, are constantly engaged in a question of: How can I get out from under the control of my foreign office so that we weather fellows can get together? The same can be said of the American and the Russian scientists who are devoted to a life of counting penguins in Antarctica. This dimension of nation-state action is also growing; and I would suggest that national leaders at the coordinating level — frustrated at constantly having their jobs subverted, belittled, and sidetracked by this tremendous potent force of technology and communication that

leads men to make contacts anyway — could conceivably, as a second-best course, as a fallback position, be brought around to finding the international common denominator for coordinating activity among nation-states. I would not put high bets on it, but I would not dismiss it as a possibility either.

THIRD SESSION

Tuesday, February 4, 1975
(afternoon)

In the chair: The Rt. Hon. LORD FISHER OF CAMDEN

1. APPROVAL OF RULES OF PROCEDURE

Dr. GERHART M. RIEGNER (*Secretary-General, World Jewish Congress*) presented for approval the rules of procedure that had been proposed by the Executive Committee, as provided for in the Constitution, and had been distributed to the delegates. On behalf of the Governing Council – which had been authorized by the Executive Committee to make such changes in these rules as it might deem appropriate – Dr. Riegner also submitted two proposed modifications:

1) that Article 8 (1) be amended to read

The Presidium shall consist of (a) the officers, (b) the chairmen of the principal commissions as defined in Article 34, (c) the chairman of the Nominations Committee, and (d) forty other persons elected by the Plenary Assembly,

thus adding the chairman of the Nominations Committee to the ex officio members originally provided for, and, in the light of the experience of the Brussels Assembly, increasing the number of other members from thirty to forty;

2) that, for this Plenary Assembly, Article 34 should read

The principal commissions of the Plenary Assembly are:

- (1) the Commission on Israel and the Middle East;
- (2) the Commission on Soviet and Eastern European Jewry;
- (3) the General Political Commission;
- (4) the Cultural Commission.

Dr. Riegner explained that an Organization Commission was not necessary for this Plenary Assembly, as a Committee on Organization had for the past three years been working on the preparation of organizational changes that would be submitted to the Assembly on Thursday evening.

The amended rules of procedure were approved. [See Appendix I.]

2. ELECTION OF CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

On behalf of the officers of the Congress, Dr. RIEGNER proposed the following composition of the Credentials Committee :

Mr. Donald Silk, Chairman (*Great Britain*)
Mr. Shabetai Ben-Dov (*Israel*)
Mrs. Mathilda Guez (*Israel*)
Mrs. Rachel Honigbaum (*France*)
Mrs. Norma U. Levitt (*USA*)
Mr. Andrew Linden (*Youth Delegate, Great Britain*)
Dr. Anton Pick (*Austria*)
Mr. Maurice Wagner (*Rhodesia*)

The proposal was adopted.

3. APPOINTMENT OF NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

Dr. RIEGNER then submitted the Governing Council's proposal that the Nominations Committee consist of:

Mr. Jacques Torczyner, Chairman (*USA*)
Rabbi Yehuda Elinson (*Israel*)
Miss Sonja Francuski (*Youth Delegate, Yugoslavia*)
Mr. Bernard Harkavy (*USA*)
Mr. Fernando Jeno (*Mexico*)
Dr. Lavoslav Kadelburg (*Yugoslavia*)
Mr. Jacob Katzman (*USA*)
Mr. Itzhak Korn (*Israel*)
Dr. Benno Milnitzky (*Brazil*)
Mr. Jean Nordmann (*Switzerland*)
Mr. Jacques Orfus (*France*)
Ing. Chaim Rajchemberg (*Argentina*)
Mr. Sidney L. Shipton (*Great Britain*)
Mr. Kalman Sultanik (*World Confederation of United Zionists*)

The proposal was adopted.

4. ELECTION OF PRESIDIUM

Dr. RIEGNER explained that the Presidium would establish a Steering Committee from among its members. If the Steering Committee should find itself unable to reach a unanimous decision on any issue, that issue would be brought before the full Presidium.

In accordance with the rules of procedure, the ex officio members of the Presidium were :

Officers present at this Assembly

Dr. Nahum Goldmann
Dr. Isaac Goldenberg
Dr. Israel Goldstein
Mr. Itzhak Korn
Dr. Schneier Levenberg
Dr. Joachim Prinz
Dr. Gerhart M. Riegner
Mr. Pinhas Sapir

Chairmen of the principal commissions of this Assembly

Dr. Eliezer Burla
Mrs. Raya Jaglom
Rabbi Joseph Karasick
Mrs. Rose E. Matzkin

Chairman of the Nominations Committee

Mr. Jacques Torczyner

Dr. Riegner submitted the Governing Council's slate for the forty other members of the Presidium, based on the nominations received from the various delegations, as follows:

Mr. Shneur Zalman Abramov, MK (*Israel*)
Mr. Zvi Bernstein (*Israel*)
Mr. Hersh Cynowicz (*India*)
Mr. Arie L. Dulzin (*World Zionist Organization*)
Mr. Habib Elghanayan (*Iran*)
Mr. Ron Finkel (*World Union of Jewish Students*)
The Rt. Hon. Lord Fisher of Camden (*Great Britain*)
Me Alexis Goldschmidt (*Belgium*)
Mr. Stefan Grayek (*World Federation of Jewish Fighters, Partisans, and Camp Inmates*)
Mr. Jacob Halévy (*Great Britain*)
Mr. Sydney M. Harris (*Canada*)
Dr. Arthur Hertzberg (*USA*)
Mrs. Pnina Herzog (*International Council of Jewish Women*)
Rabbi Richard G. Hirsch (*World Union for Progressive Judaism*)
Mr. Nathan Jacobson (*Australia*)
The Hon. Greville E. Janner, MP (*Great Britain*)
Mr. Fernando Jeno (*Mexico*)
Dr. Lavoslav Kadelburg (*Yugoslavia*)
Mr. Jacob Katzman (*USA*)
Rabbi Wolfe Kelman (*USA*)
Rabbi Mordecai Kirshblum (*World Zionist Organization*)
Mr. Philip M. Klutznick (*USA*)
Me David Lambert (*France*)

Professor Perry Meyer (*Canada*)
Dr. Benno Milnitzky (*Brazil*)
Mr. Samuel Norich (*Youth Delegate, USA*)
Mr. Jacques Orfus (*France*)
Ing. Chaim Rajchemberg (*Argentina*)
Ing. Anselm Reiss (*Israel*)
Dr. Nehemias Resnizky (*Argentina*)
Chief Rabbi Dr. David Moses Rosen (*Rumania*)
Mr. Julius Rosettenstein (*South Africa, Observer*)
Mr. Avraham Schenker (*World Zionist Organization*)
Mr. Ezra Z. Shapiro (*World Zionist Organization*)
Mr. Joseph Shofman (*Israel*)
Mr. Gil Sinay (*Chile*)
Mr. Hilel Storch (*Sweden*)
Mr. Leon Tamman (*World Sephardi Federation*)
Mr. Izak Warszawski (Varsat) (*France*)
Mr. Izaak Zadoks (*Netherlands*)

The slate proposed by the Governing Council was elected.

Finally, the delegates approved the proposed agenda for the Assembly.

Mr. URI GORDON (*Israel*), conveying the unanimous decision of a meeting of the youth delegates to the Assembly, requested the Presidium to establish, in addition to the four commissions already named, a commission on Jewish youth.

It was agreed that the matter would be considered by the Presidium.

5. GENERAL DEBATE: WORLD JEWRY IN A CHANGING WORLD

I. THE EXTERNAL FRONT

A. INTRODUCTION

Mr. PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK (*USA*): The subject assigned to me for this afternoon was simple until this morning, when it was completely covered, as far as the world is concerned, by three excellent exponents of their particular views, each extraordinarily talented in his field. Consequently, my remarks have had to be changed somewhat. Another caveat is in order. I will limit myself to a few areas. There is room for differences of opinion, both in my choice of areas and what I will say about them. The merit of the World Jewish Congress is that it encourages expression of one's beliefs. It is important, it seems to me, that we try to understand not only the world in which we live but how it affects the Jewish people and particularly the State of Israel. I look

upon this discussion as an opportunity for a serious consideration of matters in which we all have a deep interest, and I hope that what I say in a few areas will stimulate some thought to bring us closer to the truth and the hope that we seek.

This morning we heard three experts talk about world changes that are well described by the metaphor that Nahum Goldmann used last night — the end of the honeymoon. We tend to get a little moody about these things; it seems to me, however, that we should instead be grateful that we are facing up to the realities of life, so that from an appreciation of the realities we can move to achievement.

The aspects I would like to discuss from a Jewish point of view are : the current condition of international multilateral institutions such as the United Nations and the specialized agencies; energy, raw materials, and the world economy; détente — where it stands and what it means; the crucial position of the United States and its reflection on the Middle East and Israel; and, finally, what do these developments mean to world Jewry and the State of Israel ?

We heard today the condemnation that multilateralism has been a failure. I do not regard that as a serious charge against anything. One of the greatest fundraisers in America once said to me: "How do you define a successful campaign ? It's simple : you have a hundred failures and it adds up to a success." That is the history of life — the very process of building something invites failure. Of course, a sure way to avoid failure is to sit back and not try to do anything at all. When President Wilson, to whom reference was made this morning, suggested the concept of open covenants openly arrived at, he did not say that that was the only way to conduct world diplomacy, nor did he guarantee that he would be successful. As for Mr. Churchill's suggestion that the way toward universalism is regionalism, I would remind Mr. Eban that that is precisely what is provided for in the Charter of the United Nations; it was under the aegis of the UN Charter that the first universal approaches to encourage the European Common Market were made in the early 1960s. The fact that there is no regional economic commission in the Middle East is not due to any failure of the principle, but to the tragic inability of the Israelis and their neighbors to sit together.

Indeed there have been failures, and one might say that it takes a bit of gall for me to stand here and defend the United Nations system. I served on eight or nine delegations on behalf of my country; I know that the high point of the United Nations as far as our people is concerned was in November 1947 and that the low point in the life of the United Nations was in November 1974, when Arafat stood on what might have been our holy sanctuary in violation of every political concept on which the United Nations system was built. The question is

whether, because of that moment of infamy, it is in the interest of the Jewish people to turn its back on the concepts that created the United Nations or to fight all the more to preserve them now that they have been established.

I think it appropriate to remind ourselves of the aims set out in the preamble to the UN Charter :

We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

And for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

Have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

Let those who do not believe in these aims abandon ship. We who cherish these hopes must stand firm and fight until we win out. Let us follow the example of the State of Israel, which — although frequently harassed within the United Nations — has announced with dignity that it will not leave. In the absence of a viable alternative to the UN, it is one thing to vigorously and persistently oppose the transgressions that occur in the UN system, but it is quite another to proclaim departure.

Mr. Eban brilliantly described the Jewish people as intense particularists and, at the same time, intense universalists. We Jews, who gave birth to many of the ideals that have motivated the United Nations, do not leave the arena that looks to the future; and the future is for those who believe in regionalism — without, as Mr. Eban said, ignoring the legitimacy of statehood — and in the struggle for peace throughout the world. For in the world in which we live, if there is not peace for all of us, there may be peace for none of us.

I was especially intrigued this morning with Mr. Eban's hypothetical report on the present state of the world, in which he did a thoroughly remarkable job. Actually, there *is* such an annual report, dealing with the state of the world's economy. As economists will tell you, it is one of the finest works available, and — of particular importance as far as I am concerned — it was created and perpetuated by a Jew, Jacob Mosak.

We have heard references to the automatic majority at the United Nations. We of the West enjoyed a political majority for a long time, in which we could count on the almost automatic participation of the

Latin American countries. In 1960 Khrushchev demanded a troika to manage the UN, because the East was being left out of the decision-making process. At about the same time, my then chief, Governor Stevenson, predicted the new majority that has since emerged; and that new majority was as inevitable in 1960 as another new majority is inevitable before 1980. As Professor Vernon indicated, there is a wide gap within the so-called Third World between the wealthy oil-producing countries and others such as India, Bangladesh, and Pakistan. Both the haves and the have-nots in the Third World are becoming increasingly aware of the differences dividing them, and a Fourth World is growing in its consciousness. There is no such thing as a permanent political majority in an international organization. Our job is to make certain that the majorities that emerge in the next few years are majorities that are more conducive to our ideals — not the least of which is peace in the Middle East — than the majorities that we condemn now.

While some of the votes of the old Western majority may have been questionable, it was consistent in its support of the institutions and the economic and social development of the underprivileged nations and peoples and the advancement of human rights and dignity. It was only a rare departure from the high moral purposes of the United Nations that took place. The current abuse of the UN system opens the door to the disappearance of the system itself — a system in which 85 to 90% of the resources are spent in the very areas that Mr. Eban and Professor Vernon referred to as essential — from the World Health Organization to the World Meteorological Organization to the International Labor Organization, not to mention the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. There are ports in Israel today that were made possible by a World Bank loan that was negotiated in the late 1950s and, God willing, there will be more ports, because specialized agencies will facilitate the building of the transportation systems. Israel, with its coastline, has a great interest in developments concerning the ocean bed, and — because Israel is so important to us — these developments should be of tremendous importance to us too.

As this morning's speakers noted, the era of cheap and abundant energy has ended among all oil-importing nations. In the industrialized world, great emphasis has been put on the danger of another oil embargo. Embargo, however, was never the real problem: the problem is prices that are arbitrarily fixed by OPEC in such a way as to make the industrial West unable to cope without incurring huge and irreplaceable deficits or else finding a recycling program with all of its uncertainties. At eleven dollars and twenty-five cents or more per barrel there isn't a Western economy that does not face national bankruptcy, save Canada, which is nearly self-sufficient now that it has stopped sending oil to the United States; the Federal Republic of Germany,

which can afford it; and the United States, which currently needs only one third of its energy from outside. In the US, there is talk about taxing oil at three dollars a barrel, which would mean at least a 3% increase in the cost-of-living index. And this at a time when the country, whose economy has already been taxed by 30,000,000,000 dollars in OPEC increases, is fighting a recession. Of course, the situation is proportionately worse in other countries, and direct or implied threats of action by force are already being heard. A competent observer recently suggested that over a period of time even a 400% increase in oil prices could be absorbed; I hope that there is enough sanity left in the West and in OPEC to find a formulation which gives OPEC even more than fair prices over a period of time but simultaneously avoids either the strangulation of the industrial West or confrontation of a more serious character.

The economic cost which eats at the vitals of Western industrialized economies is but one aspect of the problem. The purchases of military hardware and nuclear capacity already contracted for suggest a search for empire that may be far more serious than the economic implications. A friend and distinguished historian recently said to me that the trouble with all of us is that we are looking at the energy problem as an economic fact of life, when it should be looked at in historical terms. Defending his discipline, he said that only historians can appreciate that yesterday's ragamuffins of the Middle East may be tomorrow's emperors of the world. He reminded me of Spain and what had happened to her in her glory at the hands of a little island of less than 4,000,000 people, and he asked why it could not happen to the West.

The Foreign Policy Association of the United States each year selects seven or eight important subjects that call for great decisions and presents them in a publication entitled *Great Decisions*. Obviously, for 1975 one of the subjects is the oil states of the Persian Gulf. I would like to cite three quotations in this publication which give the flavor of the growing mood:

"Fantastic. Imagine it — the great of the world come to kowtow to the Arabs," murmured an American banker as he surveyed the guests arriving at a Saudi Arabian embassy reception in Washington last year.

And the second:

An American economist in Kuwait sees "a definite shift of power taking place." The center of financial gravity is moving from London and Paris to Riyadh and the Gulf.

And finally, one of the more reasonable and well-informed leaders of the Middle East, Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani, the petroleum minister of Saudi Arabia, is quoted as saying:

"Raw materials are not the main source of power; technology is. However, the shortage in energy has reduced to some extent the power of the industrial nations, and is creating a new relationship...."

One of the leading Sovietologists in the United States recently came back from a month in the Soviet Union, where he had had discussions with the people involved in foreign policy. He reported that, while there was some concern about the possibility of a blowup in the Middle East because of Israel and her neighbors, this was only a short-range concern. The long-range concern was the Persian Gulf and the shah of Iran. His Imperial Majesty, Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, is referred to in the *Great Decisions* publications in the following manner:

He regards himself as spiritual heir to Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes, the founders of ancient Persia's imperial glory 2500 years ago. The 55-year-old shah envisions a new age of glory. He has set himself the task of building modern Iran into a major industrial power — "the Japan of western Asia" — before its oil wells run dry.

Can it be done? Can the shah make his dream of a great civilization come true in his lifetime, while the oil wealth to pay for it lasts? If he fails, comments one foreign resident, this place could go back to being a desert.

It might also be remembered that on a recent visit to the United States, the shah was asked by reporters if Iran had ambitions of becoming the strongest power in the Gulf region, and his answer was: "It is not an ambition. It is inevitable."

The significant danger for us, then, is not price but the fact that increasingly the Middle East is becoming an arsenal in a number of places, and arsenals have a way of emerging into a different form: they become shooting material.

These are disturbing thoughts. But the fact that we face them and discuss them openly provides some assurance that these things will not happen if we move courageously and intelligently toward solutions.

For several years now, the word "détente" has had an overwhelming influence on many events — in the Middle East, the United States, the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, and Western Europe. Professor Theodore Draper has said that what we call détente is just a continuation of the "limited adversary relationship" between the United States and the Soviet Union, which used to be called "containment" or "cold war." This view has been strengthened in the last few weeks by the developments surrounding the US Foreign Trade Act, with its Jackson-Vanik amendment, its limit of 300,000,000 dollars a year in credits, and its subsequent rejection by the USSR.

But there is still a difference between consistently referring to the relationship as cold war or consistently calling it détente. I support Dr. Goldmann's favored approach: it is psychological if nothing more.

And this difference counts when you have people who are convinced — as one of our undersecretaries of state, Eugene Rostow, once put it — that Soviet political policy is more and more obviously fixed in a mood of muscular imperialism, and others who feel that the muscles are not being flexed and that perhaps minds are being opened. Nothing is possible when there is a fence so high that it blocks out light altogether.

While I am convinced that SALT I and SALT II are everything Lord Chalfont said they are, I am also convinced that there is a determination in Washington and Moscow to convert détente into something more than another expression of the cold war. Meetings like the SALT series and the discussions at Vladivostok will produce at least a call for another meeting, and as long as the discussions go on there is hope.

In any event, the test of détente is not going to be disarmament. Certainly, here in the Middle East, where military matters are approached gingerly and with extra caution, there is appreciation for the delay and the difficulties of finding a way of reducing enormous armaments and the frightening overkill that exists in the arsenals of both the Soviet Union and the United States.

The greatest immediate test of serious détente in its initial stages could well be the Middle East, as we saw in October 1973. Therefore we, who are so concerned with this critical area of the world, must also be very deeply concerned that the discussions continue, in the hope that the principle of counterbalancing forces will lead to peace.

One of my country's earliest authorities on the Soviet Union was the late Charles E. Bohlen. He concluded his last book, published in 1973, with the following thought:

I do not think we can look forward to a tranquil world so long as the Soviet Union operates in its present form. The only hope, and this is a thoroughly thin one, is that at some point the Soviet Union will begin to act like a *country* instead of a *cause*.

There is much to this. Much of the best academic thinking in the United States points to détente as neither easy nor soon realized. There is a respectable school which holds that détente is really possible only with a more open Soviet society. Yet, the Soviet Union looks to the United States for economic help and investment now.

The key fact is that in spite of setbacks, these superpowers are intent on continuing the discussions and the explorations. So long as this is true — even though the obstacles are many — small countries and even large ones may expect to live in an alternating atmosphere of hope and despair as the events of détente unfold. There must not be any discounting of the continued consequences of détente, which started only a short time back. Nor must there be any slumbering in the belief

that détente has really arrived. It is now clear that détente means different things to the United States, the Soviet Union, and the rest of the world. Yet, its impact can be conclusive and incalculable to those who underestimate what is in the wings or who fail to remain alert to the possibilities for either good or ill.

Since the birth of the State of Israel, the Jews of Israel and the rest of the world have been properly concerned with what the United States might or might not do; the United States has played and continues to play a crucial role. It has not always been easy for the leaders of the United States to do the things which the leaders of Israel wanted done and which most frequently the American Jewish community has tried to help get done. Yet the record to this point has been encouraging, in a succession of high-level decisions taken by American presidents since 1948. It is too early yet to evaluate the relative gravity or importance of any of these decisions. Only history will properly assess whether it took more courage for Harry Truman to recognize the State of Israel as promptly as he did, thus overruling some of his most trusted advisers; or more courage for President Eisenhower to fight for the United Nations at the risk of losing friends in the United States and later for Secretary Dulles to arrange for the offshore procurement policy to include Israel; or more courage for President Kennedy to undertake the first direct relationship in supplying major military instruments to Israel, such as the Hawk missiles in 1961; or for President Johnson to provide planes of the most sophisticated type in 1968; or for President Nixon to take the steps that he did before and during the Yom Kippur War; or now for President Ford to follow in that line that has had a gradual but certain rising curve. To this day, the American affection for the legitimate ambitions of the State of Israel has been bipartisan. It started when the Democrat Truman and the Republican Taft were in accord on the basic issue and it continues today, when Ford and Jackson are in accord on the basic issue.

But the question is: Can we look forward to an uninterrupted continuance? Many people tend to accept what happened yesterday as a guarantee of what will happen tomorrow. I would be less than truthful if I did not consider the effect of the present revolutionary changes in the world on the United States, and the influence that this may have on the American attitude toward the Middle East and especially Israel. For example, it is high time that we Jews began to understand that Henry Kissinger is the secretary of state of the United States, and not the delegate of the Jewish people. He has acted and will continue to act in the interests of the security of the country that he represents. The first duty of a responsible national government is the security of its people, and this is true no less of the government of my country than it is of Israel.

I was pleased to read the views of Prime Minister Rabin on the Jewish lobby in the United States. I am neither ashamed nor apologetic about the existence of various lobbies made up of Jewish people. This is an essential part of the process of democratic government in my country and in the other democracies of the world. But our lobby, or any other lobby, is most effective when the cause it supports is identical with what the vast majority of the people and the legislators conceive to be in the best interest of the United States of America. The American economy is at a low ebb, and the rising cost of energy is disturbing. Many Americans are weary of conflict and the expenditure of resources for either political, economic, or military foreign aid; there is danger of growing isolationist feeling. And we are faced with a difficult new problem: for the first time, one of the most effective, best-financed, and cleverest lobbies in America is the Arab lobby.

I am firmly convinced that there is enough love and affection in the United States for the State of Israel and everything it stands for, so that we can achieve our ends if we move reasonably quickly. But let us not take it for granted; let us not forget that today in America, Jews are excluded from discussions where business is being done with those billions of dollars to which reference was made this morning. Prominent Arabs from this part of the world who used to call on me when they came to my community are now so busy with the biggest bankers and the biggest interests in my city that at best they have time for a drink and a casual discussion, or maybe find it embarrassing even to see an old friend. There is a subtle change of which we must be aware, and it is related to all of the problems about which we have been talking.

This brings me to my concluding statement. The most important discussion that took place this morning, in my opinion, was the one that had to do with the pragmatic government versus the idealistic government. We must believe in Mr. Eban's formulation: if we live in a purely pragmatic world, we must lose. In 1950 Ben-Gurion appointed an International Housing Committee, which I was privileged to chair. I got a great architect, who in those days was an anti-Zionist, to join the committee. After a few days in Israel, he wrote me a letter in which he said: "Now I know what a Zionist is. If the thing is impossible and you still believe in it, you are a Zionist." And in fact this man became a great Zionist.

I participate in the work of the Council on Religion and International Affairs, which was founded over sixty years ago as the Carnegie Peace Foundation. We have a staff relationship with people who have been rather careful about some of the questions affecting the Middle East. One of these men — a profound Christian and editor of the council's publication — oftentimes said to me: "Phil, why do you have such a deep

and affectionate interest in Israel ?" I answered: "It's religious, it's peoplehood." But my explanation never got through to him. Recently, however, he took a long trip and he wrote about it. He was trained by the great power producers in international affairs, and he quotes Hans Morgenthau, who says that in terms of economic resources, influence, and geographic location, the Arab states far outweigh what Israel can offer. In these terms, there can be little question about the direction in which the United States should lean. But he concludes with the following paragraph:

It is always difficult to sense, to know, to delineate the ethos of a country or a culture, to grasp that spirit which guides and actuates opinions, attitudes, actions, customs, expectations. However informed and sensitive we may be, we are necessarily partial in our perceptions, but even a limited view should acknowledge the significant role Jewish history plays in the ethos of the West, in our own history. Like all significant history, the history of the Jews has had its ups and downs. But this I know; it is part of what I learned more fully as I traveled in Europe, part of what I felt intensely at the Wailing Wall of the Old City of Jerusalem: our own history, our own future as a nation, the United States, cannot be neatly separated from that of Israel in terms provided by traditional geopolitical analysis. Our concern for ourselves necessitates special concern for Israel and for its people. The matters to which I allude are imponderable, but they are not ephemeral. They are not normally included in the considerations of interest and power to which Hans Morgenthau referred, but they are real, and the way we evaluate them will tell us much about the state of our own America's national health.

There is a miracle aborning; there is the miracle of people recognizing that what happened once cannot happen again, and must not happen again — not because the people are small, but because it will destroy the very fabric of free countries. It will destroy the moral purpose of free countries, and it isn't true in international affairs that power, and power alone, is the answer to the question. Power may prove to be the most illusionary aspect; but moral purpose, to which we must allude and to which we must adhere, may prove finally to be the decisive factor.

B. DISCUSSION

Rabbi IRA EISENSTEIN (*USA*): My criticism is not of what Mr. Klutznick said, but rather of his treatment of the subject of this afternoon's discussion: it seemed to me that he continued this morning's session rather than advancing into the theme of "World Jewry in a changing world." Most of the illustrations that were cited centered upon the impact on the world in general and on Israel in particular; but I did not detect where world Jewry came into the picture. Mr. Klutznick's presentation was a dramatic illustration of the fact that it is often difficult for me to distinguish between debates at a World Zionist Congress and at a World Jewish Congress meeting. And

it is not always clear to me in these debates whether the Jewish people is part of Israel or whether Israel is part of the Jewish people.

Unless we ask ourselves: What is the Jewish people and how does the Jewish people express itself ?, we are going to continue in this confusion. I am not talking about internal questions, which will be discussed this evening, but about the Jewish people vis-à-vis the world. It seems to me that perhaps the only instrument through which such peoplehood can operate is an enlarged, enhanced, and more clearly delineated World Jewish Congress.

There are problems that we can deal with only as a world people concerned with any one of its parts as with the people as a whole. Every country from which we delegates come represents particular problems, but they do not seem to be the concern of the *klal*. If we take seriously the often-quoted statement that all Jews are responsible for one another, then we have to perfect the machinery through which we can carry out that rabbinic dictum.

I hope that nothing that I have said will be interpreted as in any way minimizing the centrality of Israel. Israel is a great focal point of all Jewish life. But let us at the same time make sufficient room for dealing with the problems that we in the *tfutsot* have, so that we can help one another as a world Jewry and not merely by one part trying to help another in an ad hoc philanthropic way.

If world Jewry really exists, then there has to be an instrument through which it functions. I would hope that the World Jewish Congress would become such an instrument.

Alderman MICHAEL M. FIDLER, JP (*Great Britain – Board of Deputies of British Jews*): Phil Klutznick gave a brilliant exposition of what the things are in a changing world, but I didn't find a great deal of where world Jewry fits into it. Surely, our concern as Jews must be with those Jewish communities – wherever they are throughout the world – which are not capable of fending for themselves. For example, the future of Soviet Jewry must be our basic concern even in this changing world. Of course I agree with Dr. Goldmann's view that we must work constantly for the human rights of those Jews who wish to stay in the Soviet Union, but I have not the slightest doubt that Jewish communities everywhere must give priority to the emigration to Israel of those Jews who see no future for themselves in the Soviet Union.

We must also be concerned for the Jews in the Iron Curtain countries of Eastern Europe, in Arab lands, and in Latin America, which is a matter of continued and growing concern. Even at this conference, within the last twenty-four hours, we got disturbing reports of the plight of the Jews in the Eritrean province of Ethiopia.

I realize that there are tremendous world problems in which we have a part to play as individuals, not as Jews. But our Jewish concern must surely lie in looking after those matters that vitally affect the security, the prosperity, the development of Jews in every way, shape, or form. We acknowledge the centrality of Israel in all our work, and Israel is doing a magnificent job; but we ourselves have our own roles to play with our particular governments.

Reference has been made here to regionalization. This process in Europe is presenting us with particularly Jewish problems, and one of the things we shall have to discuss during this Assembly is the question of *shechita* and how legislation in the European Economic Community will affect those of us who in our individual countries have not faced this problem before.

We have to create an even better Congress than existed before; we have to streamline the organization of the Congress; and — bearing in mind Dr. Goldmann's reference to the honeymoon between Israel and the world being ended — we have to strengthen our bonds and maximize our pressures on our own governments.

Since the question of a Palestinian entity is now being put on the world stage, one of the messages we must press home and get our governments to accept is the fact that the mandate given to Britain covered a Palestine which extended east of the Jordan as far as the Hejaz railway, and that today 80% of Palestine still is in Arab hands. There is a Jordan-Palestine and an Israel-Palestine.

The success of this Assembly will be measured by how well we coordinate our planning and carry out our efforts in our separate countries.

Maitre MICHEL DREYFUS-SCHMIDT (*France*): You all know the story of Mr. Levy in Colombia who, reading his newspaper, announces to his wife that there has been an earthquake 2000 miles away, whereupon his wife asks: "Is that good or bad for the Jews?" Well, that is what our discussion is about. This morning we spoke of the earthquake; this afternoon we are trying to find out whether it is good or bad for us. In addition to the changes we heard about this morning, one can also cite the control of multinational businesses over the economy of part of the world and the rise of nationalism.

Faced with these changes, we must decide what should be the attitude of world Jewry — the *gola* and Israel. Should world Jewry remain as it is, or should it change as well? Within the French delegation, in whose name I am addressing you, there are differing opinions

as to what the changes could be, and I do not intend at this time to put forward a decisive opinion. But I think that our debate now should deal with whether we should change, and if so how and why.

Mr. YEHUDA GOTHELF (*Israel*): Dr. Goldmann frequently warns us, but in my view he also misleads us. The theme with which we are dealing is "World Jewry in a changing world". What are the chief processes taking place in the twentieth century which are leaving their mark on the destiny of our people?

First of all, the world is locked in a convulsive struggle of revolution and counterrevolution, and the Jewish people is, as it were, caught between hammer and anvil. It would seem that the revolution, by reason of its universal character, should have brought deliverance also to our own people; history teaches us, however, that all social and ideological movements which began by being universal have drifted into national and even nationalistic channels. And even though the Jews pioneered these revolutions, they ended up by being their victims.

Along with the strengthening of international contacts and the formation of great blocs, a process of differentiation and national liberation has also set in. Multinational empires have broken up and many national states have been created. As nationalism crystallized in different states, so the possibilities of existence decreased for national minorities. In multinational empires such as the Austro-Hungarian Empire and others, a Jewish entity could exist, but not in the national states which rose on the ruins of these empires.

I fear that the national crystallization of the American people will equally not permit, in the long run, a special national existence for the Jewish community. American Jews speak in the name of a cultural pluralism. The truth is that the United States acknowledges only a religious pluralism, not a national one. The American melting pot will cause an American nation to crystallize which will not tolerate exceptions.

The great scientific and technological revolution, which is responsible for the creation of huge and sophisticated industrial enterprises, spells the doom of independent businesses of Jews as artisans, shopkeepers, etc. Jews are swallowed up in such enterprises and the dividing line between Jewish life and that of the majority population becomes blurred.

It is true that there are Jews who stand out by reason of their talents, and the considerable percentage of academics reflects once again the economic anomaly of the Diaspora. This anomaly suffices to nourish anti-Semitism, but it is not able to foster a specialized life and culture of the Jewish community in the Diaspora.

The twentieth century is marked by the socialist idea, just as liberalism prevailed in the last century. The Jews contributed much to the victory of liberalism and to its economic flowering, but in the end they became victims of the uncontrolled masses and were crushed by the bourgeoisies of the majority populations. I think that objectively speaking the progress in the Diaspora works to the disadvantage of the Jewish people, and that only in Israel is there hope of progress and Jewish interests being made to coincide.

In recent times attempts have been made to diminish the stature of Israel. It is said that Israel is not a safe haven, that it is not the ideal society that was envisaged. I would remind you that in the twentieth century there has been an escalation. In Kishinev tens were killed; in the Ukrainian slaughter, thousands; and in the Holocaust, millions. I appeal to the World Jewish Congress to put all its strength behind Israel.

Dr. ELIEZER BURLA (*Brazil*): Two months ago there was an international conference at Taormina in Italy which was attended by some well-known economists and political scientists. During an informal dinner an American senator said to a Brazilian friend of mine that he was afraid that the excessive Jewish pressure on the US Congress would lead to anti-Semitic campaign in the United States. I want to ask Mr. Klutznick whether the Jewish community in America is aware of this danger, because as you know, today on the shoulders of the American Jews rests a great responsibility for the Jewish destiny in the Diaspora.

Maître ALEXIS GOLDSCHMIDT (*Belgium*): Our purpose on this first day of our session is to define Jewish policy in a changing world. I must say that had we heard solely the statements made this morning I would feel extremely pessimistic. For they seemed to accept that the world would always be governed by material interests only. If that is so, however, I cannot see how Jewish policy could be anything but defensive. That is why my intervention has the exclusive objective of requesting that here, where we should define what we must do and what we can do, we should stress the spiritual and moral values which we have always espoused and which alone will make us heard.

It has been pointed out that we live in an era of violence. It is certainly not under this angle that we could make ourselves heard by the world and we know it. Our cause is just and we can defend it and perhaps for that reason we shall arrive at solutions to the problems of world Jewry and of the State of Israel.

Professor PERRY MEYER, QC (*Canada*): I had intended to talk about the Canadian scene and the very close collaboration between the Canadian Jewish Congress and the Canadian government in many areas

including the European Security Conference, Soviet Jewry, and others, but in view of the limitations on time I will refer to only one aspect of the Canadian scene as the jumping-off point for a more general comment. The situation in the Province of Quebec, with the separatist movement, the emphasis on French unilingualism, a majority of English-speaking Jews and also several thousand French-speaking Jews, reflects the general problem that Jews throughout the Diaspora face in their relations, particularly with non-Jewish intellectuals, students, and so-called liberals, because of the identification of Jewry as a whole with the criticisms levelled at the State of Israel.

The crux of the problem is the lack of success in getting across our message about the centrality of the land of Israel for Judaism and world Jewry. An article by the historian Barbara Tuchman in the current issue of *Newsweek* makes three points which we have not made sufficiently clear to our non-Jewish friends: that the elimination or weakening of Israel would exacerbate the international situation rather than restore the happy days of cheap oil and trouble-free relationships with the Arab states; that appeasement is futile and that the Jews, like any other group, have the right to lobby; and that anti-Semitism is not determined by what Jews do or fail to do but by the needs of a particular political-moral-social situation.

In a democratic climate I think we can be optimistic about the future of the Jewish people but it is up to us to do something about it and we must confess that the World Jewish Congress and other Jewish bodies have not done the best possible job in this respect. We should try to equal the public relations efforts of the Arabs though we do not have their financial resources.

Professor Dr. ISI FOIGHEL (*Denmark*): May I first express my pleasure that the Danish Jewish community has joined the World Jewish Congress and that for the first time a Danish delegate is participating as a full member at a WJC Assembly. Some of the participants in the debate have asserted that today's speakers did not sufficiently focus on the Jewish element in the changing world. However, the speakers discussed a very Jewish subject — the discrepancy between pragmatism and idealism. This conflict has always faced the Jewish people; in the years ahead the communities in the Western world will again have to choose between pragmatism and idealism. We will receive a number of Jewish refugees from countries where they cannot stay: for reasons of their own, they may prefer to go to our countries rather than to Israel. For the World Jewish Congress, where the principle of *aliya* has priority, this presents a moral dilemma. We should try to define the problem and how we should go about solving it.

Professor GIORGIO SACERDOTI (*Italy*): A significant change taking place in the world today is the drive of the Third World countries to displace the central hold that the Western world has traditionally had in shaping global attitudes. This is a point to be considered by the Congress.

We are now witnessing an attempt by the countries that represent 80% of the global population to change the patterns imposed on the world by the Western countries — mainly Europe and America — during the last fifty or 100 years.

These countries object that only a fraction of the world's population is benefiting from the world's wealth and natural resources. The traditional ideology of the West is being eroded as the problem of hundreds of millions of poor people calls for new approaches.

One of the difficulties is that Judaism has become associated mainly with traditionally Western attitudes. This is also a problem for the State of Israel, which is associated with the West while situated in the Middle East. The World Jewish Congress and Judaism in general must also concern themselves with prevalent world concerns which have not even been mentioned here — socialism, communism, national liberation, the fight against racial discrimination and apartheid, sovereignty over natural resources, nationalization, exploitation, imperialism.

We should not abandon the traditional values of Judaism, but I think we must take a fresh look at the direction in which the world is going today.

Mr. SALOMON GEIMANAS (*Argentina*): I have come to this Assembly from Argentina and would like to learn what our task is as Jews in a world that is changing. I do not think I have received a reply to this question.

Mr. SHERMAN TEICHMAN (*USA*): Speaking as a youth delegate and as a citizen of the United States, I wish to stress the need for independence of intellectual thought on matters affecting Jewish communities on the domestic level and also specifically on questions that affect Israel in a period of threat.

Whatever we do in financial terms is not sufficient. The 600,000,000 or 700,000,000 dollars that we raised as a world Jewish community, with the going price of the F-14, will buy us around 50 planes, or meet about 8% of Israel's defense needs.

We should have anticipated trends in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, and the necessity of dealing with the Palestinians and of recognizing them at a time when our intransigence actually facilitated the representation of the PLO and terrorism in international fora. We must expand what is usually thought of as Jewish concerns.

We should support, in our respective countries, the right to corporate disclosure and investigatory panels, alternative energy policies, the abolition of secrecy except in the most delicate negotiations, and other issues vital to an ethical national interest. If we fail in this moral effort, Israel's position in the world will suffer. I suggest that it is time in the United States and elsewhere for us to be represented on the highest boards on all policy-level decisions. We must learn to participate in planning alternative policies rather than merely react to crises.

Mr. MENACHEM SAVIDOR (*World Union of General Zionists*): We are engaging in a very good intellectual exercise but we are not providing the answers sought by our friends who came from abroad.

The Western world, which originally was based on the ethics of Israel and the aesthetics of the Greeks, has divorced itself from the basic tenets of Judaism. A powerful caste of technocrats has framed decisions in terms of GNP and consumer societies and these in turn create moral emptiness. With their magic words of constant growth, of consuming and waste, the technocrats have not foreseen the depletion of resources and the energy crisis that we are now witnessing.

Jerusalem, the place from which messages have been uttered for millennia, should proclaim a new message. We Jews should proclaim morals, tenets, precepts, and values to oppose the present trend, which is at the root of the world crisis.

Mr. KLUTZNICK: I am sorry that in the time we have had on this first day of our debate we have not supplied answers. As you can see from your program, the various questions that have been raised in the debate are scheduled for discussion at later sessions. So that there is complete understanding, I will guarantee that when we finish we will not have found all the answers either.

Our greatest need is to better develop the communication system between Israel and the Diaspora, and the proper place to start doing it is here. This too will be discussed later in the Assembly.

FOURTH SESSION

Tuesday, February 4, 1975
(evening)

In the chair : Dr. NEHEMIAS RESNIZKY

GENERAL DEBATE : WORLD JEWRY IN A CHANGING WORLD (continued)

II. THE INTERNAL FRONT

A. INTRODUCTION

Dr. ARTHUR HERTZBERG (*President, American Jewish Congress*) :
A discussion of the inner front of the Jewish people is not to describe in detail what may be the surface facts. They are well known. There is a large rate of intermarriage, at least in the free world — in the Western democracies — and, for that matter, in the Soviet Union. No matter what may be our arguments about the precise percentages, it is very substantially more than we can easily bear, either sociologically or emotionally. There is evaporation of inner content. There is, of course, the single greatest preservative factor of Jewish life today — the passion for Israel — and there is renewed fear for the political future of large parts of the Jewish world and a very substantial worry about Israel.

There is in almost every area of our life a kind of polarization, the polarization of some Jews who are moving toward their Jewish identity, and some Jews — perhaps many — who are moving away from it to all kinds of other involvements. And there remains the consciousness — not the memory — of the Holocaust, which we have not yet really come to terms with. At very least we know that this unparalleled event, even if we believe that it cannot be repeated, gives us a nervousness in our reaction to other events. That, too, is one of the hallmarks of our generation. But it is not about all this that I want to talk. We need not description, but rather diagnosis and prescription. What are the deepest needs of Jewish life at this moment ? Where is it heading ?

For such purpose, it does not matter whether one accepts the view of Gershom Scholem, that Jewish modernity is derived from its own inner tensions, from a renewed eruption in the seventeenth century of

messianic antinomianism, which has long existed in tension with the law in Judaism, or whether one asserts the more usual opinion that Jewish modernity comes more from without — from non-Jewish cultural influences — than from within. This debate does not matter here, because I am going to try to be reasonably pragmatic rather than historical or theoretical.

Jewish modernity is that journey which took all of us some part of the distance from the Belzer Yeshiva — which is 200 meters down the road from this hall in Jerusalem — to here, the Binyanei Ha'uma, to discuss the importance of the modern Jew. It is true that in each and every modern Jew there is something Janus-like (the Midrash calls it *du partzufin*) in which he faces forward to the lobby of the Hilton Hotel, and back to the Belzer Yeshiva. He stands in the Binyanei Ha'uma and asks himself: How did I get here — somewhere in the middle?

I do not intend to preach to Israel on this theme. I think modernity, as it really cuts, cuts most immediately in the Diaspora. Whatever one may say about Israeli culture — and I do not belong to that tribe which delights in discussing its problems — not to see the sins of the Jewish people is in itself a very good tradition. Whatever one may say about what is going on here, some good fundamental Zionist clichés are actually true: that the continuity of land and language are their own momentum and their own guarantee. It is about the Diaspora as a modern phenomenon, that Diaspora which is the real cause of our worry, that I want to speak.

In the last century we have constructed four theories of the Diaspora — four dominant notions as to how it was to be dealt with. One was that we were going to remake ourselves and remake the world so that the Jews and the world would become one, would overcome the distance between them, by assimilation or revolution. Do not underestimate in any one of the Jewish assimilationist movements the element of revolution, the drive to try to remake the world itself, so that it should be something new into which the Jew could fit. Whether it is Marxist revolution or, for that matter, Freudian revolution, we, the deepest of the historical peoples, often appear in modernity as attempting to start history over again — ours and theirs — so that the new men may start a new heaven and a new earth, which has no past and therefore has no exclusion of Jews.

This Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress will have a workshop on Jews and International Law, that is, how we Jews have helped and can help to create a structure of human rights in which decency can operate for all mankind. It is not accidental that in every country in the world in which we have had the opportunity, Jews have tried to remake the world, to cure its old ills, so that we might become a part of society as equals.

Another attempt to make the Diaspora fit, or to make it work, has been to isolate it or semi-isolate it by reasserting in the modern world its religious character, whether it was *tora im derekh eretz* (the Law and secular life) or the Hatam Sofer's famous outcry: *chadash asur min hatora* — that anything new had to be excluded. One way to make the Diaspora survive has thus been to assert, in a variety of ways, its unchanging religious character. And that too has had its positive results — its consequences for Jewish life to this very day.

A third theory of the Diaspora is the Herzl-Nordau view, of which Ben-Gurion was the last great paladin, which is that the "normal" Jewish state would end the Diaspora and that in reasonable time most Jews would come to Israel. The rest would quietly and descently assimilate out of Jewishness, and so there would be an end of this unique and scandalous phenomenon — the Jewish Diaspora — because the Jews would do the reasonable thing and fit themselves, by ingathering and assimilation, into the world. And this thesis too has had deep, and even positive, consequences for Jewish life.

The fourth theory was the Ahad Ha'amist — that here would be created a *merkaz ruchani*, a spiritual center, and that the modern culture created here would radiate out like a sun to its moons throughout the Diaspora. It would illumine and warm and sustain the various communities. Now, Ahad Ha'am had in mind a Diaspora of a hundred years ago, that was much less evaporated in the content of its Judaism, that knew lots more. He was thinking of Russian Jews of the first generation, not of Americans of the third and Argentinians of the second. He was thinking of a different century. But this too has had its positive and revitalized consequences.

Yet all four together have not created the Diaspora of their dreams. As a matter of fact, Jews in this century have not succeeded in so changing the world that there are no Jewish problems, or that there is such freedom for humanity that all Jews are now safe and linked and feel part of the general culture. It has not succeeded in isolating or taking the Jews out of the general culture so that this will preserve more than a minority. It has not succeeded — I say this in some pain as a Zionist who feels this pain on his own body, within his own heart — in convincing the bulk of world Jewry that massive end of the Diaspora through *aliya* is an immediate live option. We should have done it but we have not. Secular Hebrew culture is of substantial account in the *galut*. But the very fact that for the very best of us in most cases Hebrew is a second language is indicative of the fact that Ahad Ha'am has not totally succeeded.

What then do we have? We have a Diaspora that does not fit any ideological formula that has been laid down. We have been right in part,

and as a matter of fact, we have all been wrong. We have a nonideological Diaspora about which Jacob Klatzkin's description: *tireh ad shetistaev* — let this Diaspora hang around until somehow or other it vanishes — is also not true, because we are pledged to see to it that it does not happen.

And so, this Diaspora which is neither vanishing nor surviving, which is neither disappearing nor marching, is not in any rational sense making sense of itself. And we have been excellent doctors. We have given it excellent ideas. But it has not taken our prescription. This Diaspora is not out in Australia or Bogotá or New York. It is here seated in this Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, saying to itself: We are in the midst of moods of return and of flight and of quest, and what are we going to do with ourselves ?

I would like to suggest to you that about a century ago, political Zionism began as a movement not with ideological purity but rather with the idea that you could create a pragmatic coalition around a perception and an act. In a variety of garbs, Zionism said two things. It said 1) that we cannot solve our problems by living off the political movements of the world as a whole, and 2) that we have to act politically in our own name. Around that political act of building in our own name, we will create a pragmatic coalition of all those who, for whatever reason, will join with us. Thus, the Zionist ideologues who believed in the total transformation of the Jewish people into a modern nation-state, and semiassimilationists who were concerned about the impossible lives of Russian Jews under the czar, and sentimental traditionalists who "loved Zion," could work together in creating a new Jewish society in the Holy Land.

Culture and religion are, perhaps even more than politics, ideological concerns, and yet it is possible today to evoke a comparable coalition. It does not matter in which direction you may want to shape Jewish experience. There is a problem that is common to all of us, whatever may be the quality of our caring, in that the content of Jewish culture is radically evaporating before our eyes. What glosses you may want to put on the knowledge of a classic Jewish text, what state of belief or unbelief you may be in, is your own business — at least in this modern age. But that we no longer know these texts is, it seems to me, a tragedy for everybody. We have been able to say for a century that if a Jew has his rights injured, that is the public business of all kinds of Jews. We have created Jewish agencies out of the notion that it is the public business of world Jewry to act together in defense of our tangible woes, *but we have privatized our cultural situation*. We have said that Jewish culture, Jewish knowledge, is a private matter, that every ideological grouping may deal with it or not deal with it as it suits it.

Let me give you a very simple example out of our own American experience. If a Jew were to come to me in New York right now and say: I am not allowed to work in the civil service because I quit at 3:00 PM on Friday to observe Shabbat, we would spend any number of thousands of dollars to go to the Supreme Court of the United States to defend his right to observe Shabbat. If he were to come to me and say: There is no school in my neighborhood where I may teach my children what the Shabbat means, we would say to him: Why don't you go and organize one and pay for it?

We have in effect said that the *tsores* of the Jews are unideologically everybody's business. The culture of the Jew is your own business — however you may want to define it. And I submit that if we once perceive the lack of rights as the total business of the Jewish community, to be funded by everybody, to be worked out by everybody, we must now so perceive the evaporation of the knowledge of our tradition. We must now perceive assimilation — the enemy within — to be as grave a danger as the enemies without. And if for a century — if I may use classic Zionist terms — we have made *tsarat hayehudim* (the problems of the Jews) the public business of the Jewish community, we must now make *tsarat hayahadut* (the evaporation of our inner selves) the public business of the Jewish community.

A hundred years ago Zionism began in a certain ambivalence toward the political movements of the Western world. We were for socialism and we were for nationalism, but we felt that in their unsophisticated and often anti-Semitic recensions, these movements were also our enemies. In the cultural realm today, the very content of most of our lives, created out of what was fashionable in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, is now questionable not alone because we are Jews, but because for modern man as a whole, so many of these gods are the gods that failed. And so, we are modern men on a journey back to our own identities, as Jews in search of their own authenticity. We are one people, and what we are going to do here is to reassert it.

We have not yet reasserted in any Jewish forum of this consequence that we are accepting for ourselves the continuity of our inner selves as an overarching public task for the entire Jewish community in this generation. That assertion is the single most revolutionary thing that this Congress could do.

Let me make two very practical suggestions. One is that the fundamental need in the Jewish world is free Jewish education. It is a shocking paradox that, particularly in the last century, when modern states and societies have made secular education a public matter, when in Israel we keep worrying about adding another class or another year at the expense of society as a whole, the Jewish community has moved in the

contrary direction. Therefore we must ask of the Jewish communities all over the Jewish world that they do what was done in Jerusalem 2000 years ago — announce that every Jewish child is entitled to a Jewish education at the expense and responsibility of the community.

If this changes the balances of our major fund drives, so be it. It must be done, or our successors will sit here and talk sign language about half-remembered woes, without passion, without commitment, without roots, without a past, and therefore with too little future.

In the second place, it is scandalous — even on the simplest level of personal decency — that we have given to one segment of Jewish youth — those in Israel — the responsibility of giving several years of their lives to the service of the Jewish people as a whole, through their enlistment in Israel's armed forces, while the young Jews of the Diaspora give very little of themselves to the Jewish people. But our youth are not unidealistic. The American Peace Corps was chockablock with Jewish young people. I walk into Times Square in New York and run into those saffron robes and pseudo monks singing, and most of them are named Goldberg. There is a hunger in the Jewish world for service. Why do we imagine that our young people in the universities around the world are less dedicated than the children of the Mormons who give three years to the service of the church ? Why is it not conceivable that Jewish young people from California might serve a year leading a youth group in Ma'alot, or teaching arithmetic in a Jewish school in Bogotá ? In 1967 and again in 1973, more young people than we knew what to do with volunteered to help defend Israel without our even asking. This Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress must set into motion a powerful and sustained effort that will give every young Jew an opportunity for Jewish service, and in the process, an opportunity to confront the sources of his own being, his own belonging. Only in this way will we lend resonance to the struggle for political rights.

Finally, we must stop conferring about culture, and do something about it. Here, too, some beginnings have been made within the World Jewish Congress, notably in the annual *colloques* in France and in comparable efforts in a variety of countries, including the United States. It is nonetheless true that nowhere in the Jewish world are studies the central endeavor of important communities, as central as political rallies and fundraising, which are the staples of our lives. You can get 100,000 activists into downtown New York against Arafat. You can get every Soviet consulate all over the world sat in on whenever you want to — and blessed be those who perform such acts — but where are the activists to canvass every Jewish home throughout the *galut* and say: Where are your children ? And where is the central instrumentality which announces that as a central task for Jewish activism ? It's easy, it's dramatic, it's intelligible, and it is certainly of profound importance,

to deal with our tangible and searing *tsores*. But *eyn mayim ela tora* — there is only the water of the inner sap of our tradition, and we are beginning to be desiccated trees.

Theodor Herzl once said in a sentence which is often quoted, but generally not totally understood, that the return of the Jews to their homeland must be preceded by their return to their own identity: *Heimkehr ins Judentum*. It is a historical paradox that for more ferocious reasons than he could have imagined, Zionism was propelled more rapidly politically than culturally. The cultural task still remains.

I am well aware that the root of what I am reaching toward is not quite the pragmatic objectivity that I have been trying to pretend. Underneath this hunger for the tradition, this harangue at you that we must together recapture it, is certainly something of the sense of our own uniqueness. What licks around such talk, no matter how we disguise it, is something of the reassertion of our own chosenness. I know this. I think that to deny *bechirat yisrael* is essentially to “deny the root,” really to deny the essence of it all.

A wide variety of our present Jewish political and secular concerns all assert the simple sentence: I am here and the world must deal with my problems. The tasks that await us add up to directing our energies into something that says more formidably: I ought to be here because I am the bearer of value — transcendent value. To understand this is to understand ourselves again. We might then be able to bear our uniqueness, not as a burden or a wound, not as something to be cured or to be forgotten, but as a challenge.

B. DISCUSSION

Dr. JOSEPH P. STERNSTEIN (*USA*): We are all grateful to Dr. Goldmann, who last evening underscored the importance of the inner front, for it is the strength or weakness of the inner front that will determine our ability to react to the world about us.

There are allegations of a conflict among the young people at this Assembly, between so-called Zionist delegates and representatives of other youth organizations. We ought to pay careful attention to such reports. For those who choose to remain in the Diaspora, there are two options. One is an exclusive reliance on what life in the *gola* has to offer. The other option is that life in the *gola* will receive its maximum efflorescence through the primary strength of Israel.

There are also some Jews in the Diaspora who do not want to live as Jews and who resist every attempt to nurture them with Jewish ideals. I

sometimes question whether the great effort made to influence these persons is not wasted. I speak to those, therefore, who want to live as Jews.

We believe that the World Jewish Congress, if it is to have vitality, must make Israel its central concern, but this objective is giving rise to some difficulties. In the United States there are Jews who assert that, because of Israel, American Jewish life is being sacrificed. These persons allege that, because we have given so much money to Israel, the American Jewish educational system and American Jewish culture are being aborted. We must expose such an argument, which is superficial and harmful to Jewish life everywhere. In no way does the security and welfare of Israel imply any sacrifice of Jewish culture in the Diaspora. On the contrary, life in Israel has sustained the life of the *gola*.

Israel represents for us the creative laboratory of authentic Jewish living; the Diaspora derives its strength from Israel. We are one people with a heart of Israel.

Mr. DOV YOSEFI (*Israel*): I am expressing the views of the Labor supporters of the Land of Israel Movement. The solution to our problems is a Jewish renaissance. Israel must be strengthened in every respect, not just militarily and economically but equally in regard to its society, ethics, and morals. We must raise once again the banner of chalutzic Zionism, of a fighting and effectual Zionism, and of settlement in all of Eretz Israel.

One of the important functions of the World Jewish Congress is to explain that the Zionist movement is a Jewish liberation movement. If we want to succeed in our information campaign, we should speak in the language of Shimon Hanassi, who in the second century BCE said to Antiochus:

We have not conquered an alien land nor do we rule over alien possessions, but it is our forefathers' portion which fell unjustly into the hands of our enemies, and now our forefathers' portion has returned to its erstwhile owners.

Mrs. LILIANE WINN (*USA*): Article 2 of the Constitution of the World Jewish Congress proclaims that one of its principal purposes is to "assure the survival and to foster the unity of the Jewish people." While we realize that this all-encompassing statement covers Jews in every corner of the world — from the persecuted in the USSR and Arab lands, to the endangered in Latin America, and to the poor in the United States — I feel that all of our efforts to assure their survival will be of little avail if we do not focus on the internal threat to the survival and unity of the Jewish people here in Israel.

Israel's future is endangered by inequities within its social structure. Dr. Hertzberg spoke about the need for free Jewish education in the

Diaspora, and we all agree and applaud it. But how can we, known all over the Diaspora as the People of the Book, tolerate a situation in the land of our fathers which is producing a whole generation of untrained, unskilled, and insufficiently educated youth who exist in such frightening numbers that they pose a real danger to the very survival of the Jewish people itself. It is incumbent upon us to help the overburdened State of Israel complete the undertaking that it has been unable to finish. I request that this Assembly create a permanent Committee of Concern to study, inform, influence, and improve the quality of life in Israel. We must make a commitment and try to implement Dr. Hertzberg's suggestion that young Jews of the Diaspora volunteer for service in Israel to help promote education and improve social conditions.

Rabbi RICHARD G. HIRSCH (*World Union for Progressive Judaism*): The dangers for Jewish survival persist even under conditions of peace. What will happen to world Jewry when the most dangerous threat to our existence is neither Fascist and Communist anti-Semitism nor Arab and Third World anti-Zionism, but Jewish assimilation and Jewish indifference to the Jewish heritage? I submit that regardless of developments in the world, the Jewish people is in jeopardy. And we must ask ourselves whether we have created the necessary instruments for meeting the tests that will confront us on both the external and internal fronts.

In this context, it should be noted that the World Zionist Organization and the World Jewish Congress serve identical purposes and duplicate much of each other's work. I have been told that the reason for maintaining two separate organizations is that Jews from some countries are permitted to attend a Jewish congress but not a Zionist congress. Are we to persist in the diversion of energy and funds because of semantic problems in the gentile world? We should not tolerate artificial dichotomies between Jews and Zionists to be imposed upon us by outside political pressures or by internal cultural pressures. Since the Assembly of Notables in 1806, the world has tried to get us to limit our Jewishness in order to find us an acceptable niche in society. But every attempt, whether from without or from within, to separate the Jew from Judaism or *eretz yisrael* from *am yisrael* or Jews from Zionists, has failed and is doomed to fail in the future.

Mr. LEON TAMMAN (*World Sephardi Federation*): Listening to the speakers this evening, I ask myself: Are we talking of the internal front only in the Diaspora or also in Israel? I am leader of the World Sephardi Federation and the head of our delegation here; however, I am not addressing you as a Sephardi but as a Jew, as a Zionist.

We are faced with a problem that is even more grave than the enemy around us, and that is the social gap in Israel, which can be closed only

through education. It is not only an Israeli problem, or a Sephardi problem, but a problem that faces world Jewry at large. We must look into the needs of the people of the State of Israel, especially those underprivileged who have lived for the last twenty-six years under very poor conditions. We must harness our forces and do something about the problem as quickly as possible, before it gets out of control and results in a greater evil than even an invasion by the Arab forces.

Mrs. CHAIKA GROSMAN (*Israel*): The State of Israel was an answer to expulsions, pogroms, economic misery, and political repression; an answer to the Holocaust. But it was not that alone. The State of Israel is first and foremost a gathering place for Jews who aspire to a homeland of their own in order to be independent, and no longer an eternal minority. The State of Israel signifies the upright stance and the intact being of the Jew, as opposed to the lack of identity and the split personality.

Today, we do not lack power and we do not lack land, as we did in the ghetto. I reject the thesis that the entire world is a gallows for Israel and that there never will be anyone in the Middle East with whom peace negotiations can be held.

To proclaim that the whole country is ours, that we hold a historic title deed to the whole of Eretz Israel, that our right cancels all other rights — this, it seems to me, is an incentive for a state of continuous warfare. It might even confer on us the right to fight a battle to the death, after which there is nothing more. The last such battle was fought in the ghetto, not because we wanted to become heroes in Jewish history but because we were not allowed to make war in any other way. I hope and I trust that the Jewish people will do all in its power in order that that “last stand” shall not repeat itself.

We have established the Third Commonwealth so that it may survive, and it will survive on foundations which are not the pathetic ones of “all or nothing.” The might of Zionism has never been measured in terms of the territories we hold, but in terms of our attachment to the homeland and the roots we strike there. It is stated explicitly that there is a common right, or a right divided between the two peoples — the Jewish people, which is returning to its homeland, and the Arab people which dwells there. It is an illusion to believe that we shall be able to hold on to the whole of Eretz Israel, with everybody — the Arabs, the big powers, our enemies, and our friends — acquiescing.

I do not discount the important political support which Israel is receiving from Diaspora Jewry in general and from United States Jewry in particular. But it seems to me that this support can only be limited. Moreover, if we want world Jewry to support us, we must not ask it to

support us blindly. It is entitled to understand the rationale behind our demands and to know what kind of Israel we are aspiring to.

It is better that we should not be a pawn in the global game between the big powers; that there should be no return to the cold war; that immigration from the Soviet Union should be large-scale and independent of any trade agreement; that we should negotiate with our neighbors, either in stages or in the framework of an overall agreement in Geneva; that we should mobilize the Jewish people for an ingathering of the exiles, not as refugees.

Dr. HERTZBERG: I know that in a general debate one says what one feels like saying and that there is often very little relationship to anything that was said earlier. However, one or two things have been said — either in words or in the magnetism of the room — to which I want to respond.

It seems to me that this meeting of the World Jewish Congress should be free from the rhetoric in which one is implicitly or explicitly accused of polarizing if one talks about culture without taking loyalty oaths in every other phrase to the centrality of Israel, the importance of our total support of Israel, the importance of our total involvement in the problems of Russian and Syrian Jewry. I find that unbearable. I am a man of Zionism; I belong to the Zionist Executive. I do not believe that there is a tension between being totally devoted to our political causes, with Israel at the center, and being totally devoted to the survival of Jewish tradition, of the Jewish heritage, of Jewish culture, and of Jewish learning.

In our Jewish world of today, one is not ostracized for eating pork on Yom Kippur or for not giving one's children a Jewish education; but one can be "excommunicated" for not giving to the Magbit. I suggest that in a Jewish world one ought to be excommunicable both for not giving to the Magbit and for not providing one's children with a Jewish education, and that the causes are not mutually exclusive. And I for one am not going to sit here very much longer and allow speeches to be made which suggest that it is a matter of one or the other, and that those who speak of one are somehow diminishing the other.

Some people seem to think that we can save our children from intermarriage by screaming at the top of our voices that both generations must be together on all the battlefronts. We have been together at all the demonstrations. We have done marvelously well as a united people on all the battlefronts, but on the internal front *s'iz gantz shtark bitter*. If being mobilized could save our young for Judaism, we would have saved them long ago.

The Jewish people is one. Its *tsores* are one. Its joys are one. Its commitments are one. We ought to be able to draft people to teach as we draft them to give, as we draft them to fight.

Let there not grow in the Congress some nonsensical notion about two parties — the party that is talking about culture and is therefore downgrading Israel, and the party that is talking about Israel and therefore downgrading culture. To downgrade one in the name of the other is like talking about whether you love father or your mother better. And when you do that, you are slightly sick.

The Very Rev. Dr. ISAAC COHEN (*Ireland*): Everyone this evening has agreed that the *neshama* — the soul and spirit — of the Jewish people is our greatest strength and our surest protection for the survival of our people. Every young Jew has the right to be shown the way of Torah as his inheritance. He can reject his birthright if he so wishes, but he must know what his inheritance is. How much of the moral deterioration of certain aspects of Israeli society is due to the soul starvation of much of education in Israel? We must be concerned that the economic pressures in Israel should not force us to sacrifice the vital service provided by Jewish religious schools and the yeshivot at various levels of study.

There are voices calling for economy in education, asserting that Israel cannot afford both secular and religious schools. Let us not imagine that it is any more possible in Israel than in the *galut* to provide adequate religious education in special classes after general school. If we economize on our religious education we do so at our peril. Let us beware that we do not become in Israel the self-destructing missionaries of nihilism.

Dr. FEDERICO STEINHAUS (*Italy*): I completely agree with Rabbi Hertzberg's presentation, except for what he said about Jewish youth. Jewish youth has its own genuine Jewish creativity, which is quite different from the one we are used to. If some part of our youth does not accomplish its Jewish duty as we see it, this is mostly our own fault because we failed to show them the way or encourage them. When our youth works for Judaism with means we do not agree with, maybe we are wrong and they are right. Perhaps the older generation is less able than youth to adapt to the enormous and continuous changing of the world.

Mr. SAMUEL NORICH (*USA*): I am not speaking for the World Union of Jewish Students but for the independent youth delegates at this Assembly, of whom there are about forty from countries around the world. We are the children of *she'erit hapleta*, of the saving remnant, and this in a double sense: we are the children of the *she'erit hapleta* of the *sho'a* and of the ravages of assimilation and indifference. We who

have come here are not the best that there could have been. We are what is left. We try as best we can to embody in our actions our understanding of our past, and also the idiom of our own generation.

For lack of time, I will mention only briefly some of the new forms that our understanding of our Jewish past is taking in the community which I know best, the United States. We have a Jewish student press service which was begun in 1969 and now counts among its members more than fifty independent Jewish student publications. There is a vast network of independent Jewish student groups, organized by the students themselves, which reaches into every campus in the country. And most hopeful of all has been the growth of *chavurot* – communities in which Jewish students are trying to revive their past and make it live, under the guiding principle of *klal yisrael*. The *chavura* of which I am a member – Kibbutz Langdon, in Madison, Wisconsin – was established in 1971. Our members include *datiyim* and *chiloniyim*, Zionists and non-Zionists. We have had a Lubavitcher, we've had Yiddishists, we've had somebody who thinks he's a Bundist. And we live together, guided by the principle of *klal yisrael*.

I welcome Dr. Hertzberg's proposal to make Jewish learning the responsibility of the community as a whole and to establish a Jewish service corps whereby young Jews could devote a year or more, at a subsistence wage, to serving the Jewish people. Call on us and we will answer that call. The question is whether you have the unity, the vitality, the self-assurance, and the love to make that call.

As for the rumor that Dr. Sternstein heard, I can tell you that it was not correct. There are no anti-Zionists in the youth caucus at this Assembly. I invite each and every one of you to come and listen to the way we talk, and if one of you comes away with the impression that we are anti-Zionists, then none of us belongs here. But if you listen to us you will see that the unity of the Jewish people is our chief concern and the welfare of Israel at the head of our agenda.

Listen to our language and try to understand our idiom. We can still be your *hemshekh*.

Dr. EMMANUEL BULZ (*Luxembourg*): As the representative of a small Jewish community, I am happy to note that the special problems of small communities will be the theme of a workshop later this week.

From the dawn of our history the Jewish people has experienced changes in its environment and in the process has itself changed. What is unique in our time is the accelerated pace of the changes confronting us, coupled with our task of maintaining the permanent values of Judaism.

To cope with this problem and to meet the challenge, we should create a new infrastructure, which would not speak in terms of eco-

nomics or power, but of Jewish values, knowledge, culture, ethics, and perhaps mysticism.

On the practical level the World Jewish Congress must continue to serve as the powerful link that unites the Jewish people wherever it is found. In the realm of cultural activities, the Congress must not only publish but put literature at the disposal of our communities; it should also reinforce existing Jewish educational institutions and help us to create new ones.

If we Jews want to assure our continuity despite our isolation and despite the dangers that threaten us, we must be the bearers of Abraham's message and ideals.

Mr. DENIS DIAMOND (*South African Jewish Board of Deputies*): Dr. Hertzberg has stressed the need to inculcate the ideal of service to the Jewish people in Jewish youth. It is the more necessary to entrust our Jewish future to the younger men when we see today that the Jewish people seems to be torn apart, not by any conflict between Israel and the Diaspora but by friction and competition between the Zionist movement and the World Jewish Congress. The Zionist movement has been politicized and is no longer solely formulating the classic dream of the return of the Jewish people to their homeland. The World Jewish Congress, as a modern Jewish movement, naturally accepts the centrality of Israel. Our anguish at contemplating the impending quarrel between the Zionist organization and the Congress is great. The young see the Jewish people being kicked about like a football, and there is little wonder that they place so little trust in our future.

Mr. PERCY SASSOON GOURGEY, MBE (*Great Britain – British Section, World Jewish Congress*): We can always rely on Dr. Goldmann to inform us on the state of the Jewish world, and he does it very well. However, I think he can be too self-critical and cause us to lack confidence. I refer to the continuous harping, not only by Dr. Goldmann but by many others as well, on the so-called rights of the Palestinians – to such an extent that many of our youth unfortunately seem to think that we Jews are directly responsible for the sorry plight of the Palestinians. With reference to Mr. Norich's statement, while Jewish youth may be committed to Israel, I find that their feelings for the so-called rights of the Palestinians far outweigh their feelings for Israel. If young Jews could enlist in a Jewish peace corps, as proposed by Dr. Hertzberg, this would be meaningful for shaping their attitudes.

Dr. Hertzberg has said that the passion for Israel is perhaps the most potent force today for Jewish cohesion and identification. I submit that this commitment to Israel must be informed and not only emotional. It is very easy, during a crisis – as in the Six-Day War or the Yom-Kippur

War — to flock to the colors. It is, however, as important to work for Israel in the years between the wars, and for that you need knowledge of Israel's history. This is sadly lacking, and leads to a lack of self-confidence.

If there is no Palestinian Arab state today, it is because of a history of missed opportunities on the part of the Arabs. Let us recall that in 1922 Transjordan was created out of the greater part of the Palestine Mandate. Then again, in 1947, the United Nations offered the Palestinian Arabs a state of their own and they refused it, because it would have meant living alongside a Jewish state. Let us also remember that from 1948 to 1967 the West Bank was under Jordanian and Gaza under Egyptian rule. Why did they not create a Palestinian Arab state then ?

Mr. HENRY BULAWKO (*France*): As a survivor of Auschwitz, some of the language used in this Assembly is incomprehensible to me. I wonder whether those present here really have a concept of what the resistance and the Holocaust signified. One must not continuously invoke the specter of Auschwitz to blind us to reality. A few days ago in Paris Beate Klarsfeld declared: "Auschwitz was the negation; Israel is the negation of Auschwitz." This is the image of Israel we must strive for — not a false Massada cult.

We do not want to erect new ghettos or new bastions where we should wage new battles that are lost in advance. We want Israel to be a viable reality and we do not accept the myth of Greater Israel. After four wars Israel must finally win the great battle for peace that she is waging.

As to the centrality of Israel, I would think that this is recognized by all Jews, whether they are Zionists or not. It does not mean, however, that Israel would be a kind of Jewish pope. Jewry remains an entity composed of diverse communities, united in their diversity, and unanimous in their loyalty to Israel.

Mr. EZRA KOLET (*India*): In India, we are scattered Jewish communities in an ancient land. For 2000 years our people have lived in peace and honor among the Hindus and the other local populations. Never has there been an instance of anti-Jewish feeling or anti-Semitism. Nowhere in the world could the Jews have assimilated as easily as in India. In addition to our acceptance by the local populations, we had no rabbis for thousands of years and we were not in contact with the mainstream of Judaism elsewhere in the world. We succeeded in remaining Jews because we have kept within us the Jewish mystique and tradition. Even if brought up in a Roman Catholic institution the Jewish children see the Shabbat and the other ceremonies observed at home. Therein lies the secret.

Therefore, when we consider world Jewry in a changing world, let us be concerned not about the world that is changing but about the Jew who is changing. The basic teachings of the Torah provide the answer.

Dr. ARIEH LEON BAUMINGER (*Independent Zionist Movement*): Lord Chalfont has referred to the rising might of the People's Republic of China. How does he explain the fact that China, although it has virtually no Jews on its territory, has suddenly become more anti-Semitic than the Soviet Union and Egypt ? What would Lord Chalfont and Dr. Goldmann and the World Jewish Congress propose we do to change the views of the People's Republic of China ?

Maitre CHARLES HADDAD (*France*): I feel that the problems confronting Jewry on the internal front are far less difficult to overcome in Israel than in the Diaspora. In Israel, it would suffice to find a little money with which to enable the young Sephardi to enter university together with his Ashkenazi brother, and the Black Panthers would turn into the gentlest of lambs. But in the Diaspora, Jews in increasing numbers are being lost forever, through assimilation.

Of the 600,000 Jews in France half have come relatively recently from the other side of the Mediterranean. These newcomers were not invulnerable to the charms of French wine and French women, charms to which we should not be insensible but not to the point of abandoning Judaism. It happens, however, that today among the 300,000 North African Jews in France, three out of four weddings are mixed marriages.

We all know the remedies, but the problem is how to administer them. We have community centers, but they are empty; it is true that we must involve our intellectuals, but they are to be found in the leftist camp.

I would propose that the World Jewish Congress decide to establish a permanent commission composed of experts, intellectuals, and concerned parents, whose mandate should be to seek out approaches resulting in the prevention of de-Judaization and the maintenance of faithfulness to the Jewish heritage.

Rabbi DAVID HOLLANDER (*USA*): One does not have to intermarry to be assimilated. It is sufficient if one does not lead a Jewish way of life. Our goal in Jewish education is not the knowledge of Hebrew and of Jewish history — these are fringe benefits — but to live the way of life. In America, to cite an example, there are tens of thousands of Jews of the second and third generation of American who are practicing Judaism. Why don't we follow the model of their schools ? Here we have a proven method of Jewish education that lasts a lifetime, so why must we talk about experimentation ?

I also wish to refer to the favorable opinion expressed by the World Jewish Congress toward the recent Vatican *Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration "Nostra Aetate."* In the view of the organization I represent, Poale Agudath Israel of America, that attitude is most unsatisfactory. It is true that the Vatican declaration is addressed to Catholics, and that well-informed Jews may not be misled. But there are many Jews who have no foundation to resist the flattery that exists in that document. It talks about common prayer and common understanding of theological doctrines, and that is impossible between Jews and Christians. We will be very happy if the Church changes its attitude toward us. But when there is an invitation to dialogue we have to be very careful. There is only one kind of dialogue in which we can engage and that is on social problems.

FIFTH SESSION

Wednesday, February 5, 1975
(morning)

In the chair : Mr. ITZHAK KORN

GENERAL DEBATE: WORLD JEWRY IN A CHANGING WORLD (continued)

III. REGIONAL ASPECTS

A. INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS

Mr. JACQUES TORCZYNER (*Chairman, American Section, World Jewish Congress*): We met the last time in 1966, in Brussels. At that time, the president of the United States was Mr. Johnson, and we were just getting into trouble in Vietnam. In Israel, Eshkol was prime minister; there was an economic recession; and Ben-Gurion, Dayan, and Shimon Peres were in the political wilderness.

Today, in the United States, we have a president and a vice-president who were not elected by the people, but chosen. And we are at the beginning of what might be a real recession. In Israel we have a government headed by Mr. Rabin, and General Dayan is again in the political wilderness. In the United States, we have recovered, I believe, or we are recovering from the trauma of the Vietnam War. I hope that in Israel we are recovering from the trauma of the Yom-Kippur War.

I am speaking in my own name, not in the name of the seventeen organizations which form the WJC American Section and which range from Mapam to Poale Agudath Israel.

We have a variety of activities and are the only forum where all points of view can be expressed. We have organized colloquia and seminars for intellectuals at outstanding universities in the United States. Our executive director is Max Melamet, a man of knowledge and culture who guides our program with wisdom and enthusiasm.

It is not known exactly how many Jews there are in the United States. Some say 6,000,000, some optimists say 8,000,000, some pessi-

mists say 5,000,000. I believe that the Jews account for roughly 3% of the population. This does not mean, however, that the Jews share in the total income to the extent of 3% or that 3% of the university students or people in the liberal professions are Jews.

Few Jews in the United States live in small communities. They are to be found in the big cities, where as a rule they do not live in the city center, which frequently has been abandoned by whites, but in the golden ghetto of the suburbs.

There also has been a shift in their professions. Most Jews are in the liberal professions and the number of Jewish college graduates is disproportionately high.

Jews are active in all businesses and enterprises except a few of the most important ones. During the years of prosperity many Jewish businesses were sold to big conglomerates for highly-priced shares, whose value has since dropped considerably.

On the religious level, the Orthodox movement in the United States has gained strength in the last nine years because it had the wisdom many years ago to start a large network of Jewish day schools. Such schools are the only answer to the problem of Jewish education because nowhere else can Judaism and the Hebrew language be taught effectively and painlessly. They also have the help of the Israeli Orthodox establishment.

While on the subject of the Orthodox, I must mention the Lubavitcher movement, which has done certain things that years ago would have been thought impossible; for example, young Jews stopping people on Fifth Avenue and asking them, "Are you Jewish? Did you put on your *tefillen*?" And they really make an impact.

I would say that the Conservative movement is still very large, although its theological seminary does not have the influence it had some twenty-five years ago; I believe, however, that this will change under the new leadership of Professor Gerson Cohen. In the last few years, the difference between the Conservative and Reform movements has been blurred. In the Reform seminary in Cincinnati one finds many students wearing yarmulkes and observing kashrut. The services of the two movements have become more and more similar, and it is possible that one day the Conservative movement and the Reform movement in the United States will unite.

One of the most outstanding developments in the Reform movement has been the change in its attitude toward Zionism, particularly if we recall the anti-Zionism of the Reform rabbinate during the early years of the struggle for a Jewish state. The international Reform movement has joined the Zionist movement, and we hope that in the near future the Conservative movement will join too.

American Jewry is very active in fundraising, which has become centralized and dominated by the welfare funds. The real heads of the community welfare funds are not the lay leaders but the professional directors, whose power has grown and who guide the allocation committees' decisions as to which organizations should get money and how much should go to Israel. The role of the volunteer in fundraising in the United States has decreased, and the professional has taken over.

We have had two fantastic experiences in fundraising in recent years. In the Six-Day War, the American Jewish community was enthused; it rose as one man and contributed generously to the United Jewish Appeal and to the Israel Emergency Campaign. During the Yom-Kippur War, the atmosphere was quite different and the reaction much more profound. This was especially striking among young adults. I attended one or two of the big fundraising meetings and saw with what generosity young men and women contributed. In Los Angeles, a young doctor got up and said: "I sold my car and took a mortgage on my home, because I want to contribute. The survival of Israel is my survival as a Jew in the United States."

An interesting point is that nowadays 5% of the contributors give 85% of the money. This leads to terrible difficulties, because when one million-dollar giver stops his contribution you not only lose his one million, but you may have to find 1000 thousand-dollar contributors to replace him.

We have in the United States a new struggle between overseas and local needs. It is true that in every community the appeal is made on the basis of Israel. Yet it is also very important to support local institutions. There is also the new phenomenon of Jews — *noshrim* and *yordim* — from the Soviet Union — twelve families in Birmingham, ten families in Nashville, some 4000 Russian Jews in Forest Hills. You cannot tell the Jewish community in America not to support these new refugees, not to take them to its heart, not to see to it that their children get a Jewish education, not to see to it that they are absorbed into the American Jewish community. Before taking strong measures that would divide the community, we should understand that we must give the Russian refugee today the same welcome we gave the German refugee in the 1930s and to other refugees after the Second World War who did not come to Israel.

The fraternal movements in the United States continue their activities. But the largest and best organized in the country is the Zionist movement, the bulk of whose membership is the women's organizations — Hadassah (the largest), Pioneer Women, Mizrahi Women. The Zionist movement has a tremendous influence; while it does not

comprise the overwhelming majority of the Jewish community, whenever the chips are down Zionist ideas have conquered the community.

We have suffered a great loss in the United States. There is no longer a Jewish press. Only one Yiddish daily remains, with a very limited circulation. We do not have anything similar to the *Jewish Chronicle* in England. When I go to the White House and when I discuss certain Jewish problems, I am told that in their eyes the Jewish paper is the *New York Times*. We do not consider the *New York Times* a Jewish paper, even though it gives us a lot of coverage.

The welfare funds have taken over the Jewish newspapers in the local communities and exert an important editorial influence. There are wedding announcements, birth announcements, eulogies, and necrologies in these journals but we have hardly any Jewish papers with an independent editorial policy. One such paper is the *Detroit Jewish News*; a few others are the organs of organizations. There are two magazines of note: *Commentary*, with a circulation of 60,000; and *Midstream*, which has a much smaller circulation.

Another phenomenon is the lack of a central voice for American Jewry. The Jewish leadership in the United States rejoiced when the American Jewish Conference was dissolved but to me this was a grave mistake. We need the American Jewish Conference today more than ever. We do have the Presidents' Conference, which is very good, but it is obliged to agree on the lowest common denominator since it can decide only by consensus. We never have an opportunity really to discuss the issues that are before the Presidents' Conference. The group must listen to every minister of Israel who visits the United States, to every personality, sometimes to officials from the State Department, but it is not a forum where the American Jewish community can express itself on the issues of the day. Therefore I believe that we have to come back to a democratically elected central body of American Jewry. This is necessary if we want to have a future in the United States.

You have heard people talk about the Jewish lobby, about Jews in political life in the United States. It is true that there is a Jewish vote in the United States — the only ones who do not admit it are Jews. The others know that it is so. But Jews do not automatically vote for a Jewish candidate; they vote on issues of interest to them. The Jews of the United States are interested first and foremost in the future of Israel. They are interested in the future of Soviet Jewry. They are worried about quotas at universities and colleges. They are worried about their relations with the Blacks.

The Jewish vote in the United States is bipartisan. It is bad if one party believes that it has the Jewish vote in its pocket or that it has no chance to get the Jewish vote. In 1972 the Republicans received 40% of the Jewish vote, but I do not know what they would obtain today.

In recent years the numbers of Jews in Congress and in the Senate decreased, but this trend was arrested in the last elections. In the United Kingdom, which has 500,000 Jews, there were once forty-six Jewish members of Parliament. In America, with 6,000,000 Jews, we now have only seventeen Jewish congressmen and three Jewish senators.

The Jewish lobby has been described and has been referred to in the *New York Times* and the magazines. It was very effectively organized in support of the Jackson amendment. What encouraged me most in Washington was to see so many Jewish young men and women as assistants of senators and congressmen of both parties. While many of these young people may not have had any Jewish education and may remember their Judaism by attending a Seder at the home of their grandparents, they have become vitally interested in Israel and in the problems of American and world Jewry. They give their time and their energy to see to it that the political interests of Israel are protected in the United States.

The Jewish position in the United States is very strong, though not as strong as some people believe or as weak as others describe it. Dr. Goldmann mentioned in his speech the influence of the Jews in the arts and letters. I do not know how good it is that writers like Saul Bellow, Philip Roth, and Bernard Malamud are Jews; that composers like Bernstein, Copland, and Barber are Jews; that in the movies there are Jews. When you notice that the presidents of CBS, NBC, and ABC are Jewish, then you understand why the mass media in the United States are over-cautious on certain issues. When 200,000 Jews manifested in New York in a tremendous demonstration, Mr. Mehdi was across the street with twenty Arabs. But both the Jews and the Arabs each got one minute on the air. This is the kind of objectivity we get from the mass media in New York.

I believe that the period of Jews dominating the liberal movements in the United States is over. American Jews are becoming more conservative and more interested in themselves. Universities are offering more courses on Jewish history and more Jewish students are writing papers on Jewish problems. A survey by the WJC American Section of current Jewish research in America showed an amazing revival of interest in Yiddish, Hebrew, and Jewish studies in general.

I was interested to hear yesterday Mr. Philip Klutznick defend the United Nations. The majority of the Jews and of the American people are no longer willing to support the United Nations. The United

Nations is going the way of the League of Nations and I believe we may see the day when that beautiful building near the East River will become the Jewish community center of New York. Mr. Klutznick also mentioned the World Health Organization. But do you know that the World Health Organization last year was ready to kick out Israel? It was stopped by letters from Jewish doctors who are treating people in the Third World and who threatened that they would not go along with this.

What has changed the American Jewish community is the existence of the State of Israel. For the young people, the State of Israel has always been a reality; when they were born, the blue and white flag was among the other nations' flags in the skating rink at Rockefeller Center. Their identification with Israel often replaces their identification with Judaism, and sometimes this must be regretted.

There are many Jewish American students in Israel. We should show them what Israel is like but we must also show young Israelis what American Jewry is like. The older American generation will give money to the United Jewish Appeal, invest in Israel bonds, and plant trees for the Jewish National Fund. But *aliya* has decreased, because certain conditions in Israel have not encouraged Jews from the United States to come here. Before we have large numbers of Jews from the United States settling in Israel, Israelis must stop emigrating in large numbers to the United States.

For the past twenty-six years Israel has concentrated on fundraising, and I can understand why. But today this is alienating the young American Jews, who are more interested in cultural and political activities. There also has emerged over the last few years a more critical attitude among American Jewry toward Israel; and the Jewish community in America is entitled to be critical if necessary, just as the Israelis have a right to tell us how they feel without thereby dictating to us. Israel and the Jewish people are equal partners, which means mutual respect, mutual frankness, and mutual understanding. In this way, there is a possibility of better understanding and of clarifying differences.

The struggle on behalf of Soviet Jewry has also changed the American Jewish community. Many young people who were never interested in Israel have become interested in the plight of Soviet Jews. I believe that the American Jewish community will continue to fight for the support of public opinion; without large public demonstrations, without activism, the Jews will not be able to leave the USSR. We have a right to intervene wherever a Jew is threatened, has no right to emigrate, or no right to his own culture. This is not an internal matter. We permitted discrimination forty years ago but we will not permit it today. We must continue our struggle for Soviet Jewry.

But the American Jews also are interested in the Jews in Syria, in Morocco, in Latin America, in the entire world. The World Jewish Congress is the instrument to bring together all Jews, and to discuss with them not only the problems of Israel but the problems in their respective communities.

The year ahead, I believe, will be difficult from every point of view. The economic recession, the oil crisis, the future of Israel — all this will demand a great effort on our part. Dr. Goldmann referred in his speech to the example of British Jewry in the days of Bevin. When the test will come, the Jews of America, 6,000,000 strong, will march, demonstrate, and never permit injustice to be done to our cause, to the future of Israel.

American Jewry is an exceptional community as America is an exceptional country. We went through a great crisis in the United States in 1974, and we have come out of it stronger. The United States of America is today still the only hope for the free world, because it is the only country that will defend the free world when it is in danger. Not détente will bring about peace, but only a strong America ready to defend itself.

Mr. SYDNEY M. HARRIS, QC (*National President, Canadian Jewish Congress*): This Plenary Assembly meets at a time when we must arrive at broad principles. A knowledge of the Jewish world, of course, precludes that our proposals will be necessarily acceptable to all of the groups which make up the rich spectrum of our Jewish people. Nevertheless, I feel that we who are gathered here can in good conscience affirm these basics which govern our Canadian attitudes as being axiomatic for all of us.

First, we assert that the survival and security of the State of Israel is the most fundamental demand on the Jewish people.

Second, we propose that we reaffirm the unity of our peoplehood, a partnership between Israel and the Diaspora wherein we work on parallel, but not subservient, lines.

Third, we emphasise that we represent a proud Jewish community which cooperates with other such communities in giving effect to that partnership.

Fourth, we attest that the Diaspora strengthens its Jewish identity by every means at its disposal.

The Canadian Jewish Congress, which has existed since 1919 and represents the totality of the Canadian Jewish community, has an unshakable faith in those fundamental tenets. It is because of them that we have from its very founding been associated with the World Jewish Congress. Indeed, we are in microcosm what the World Jewish Congress

must become in macrocosm. Our people must have at its disposal this democratic, independent world body within whose framework we can grapple with the awesome problems which face us. Canadian Jewry believes in the World Jewish Congress not only because it serves the Jewish people but also because it respects the independence and traditions of the communities and organizations affiliated with it. We reject categorically those critics who have recently denied both the power and value of the World Jewish Congress.

We in Canada are the declared enemies of that disunity and confusion which unfortunately still plague some aspects of Jewish international life. We believe that there must be one international Jewish organization, namely the World Jewish Congress, through which we may function as the great Jewish family of the Diaspora in the international arena. It is for this reason we are gratified that the Board of Deputies of British Jews has decided to affiliate with the World Jewish Congress. We know that this was not an easy decision, given the history and the traditions of Anglo-Jewry. We congratulate the leadership of the Board of Deputies, and especially its current president, Lord Fisher of Camden, and his past and present colleagues, who have taken this historic step. We are delighted too to witness the reemergence of European Jewry within our councils. We believe that the Jewish communities of Western Europe are destined to make an increasingly important contribution to world Jewry.

At this critical juncture of Jewish history, we can perceive no valid reason or obstacle which cannot be overcome to bring about the affiliation of two most illustrious bodies to the World Jewish Congress. We look forward to and want to facilitate the early advent of the day when the B'nai B'rith and CRIF will be represented in the Congress family. We have found no abrogation of sovereignty involved in our affiliation. Rather, it has been a manifestation of our unity and solidarity with world Jewry. I need hardly add that Canadian Jewry is prepared to use its good offices to bring about this *shidukh*.

The World Jewish Congress may well look to CJC as a model. We have as delegates every recognized Jewish body, including the Canadian Zionist Federation, and B'nai B'rith, with whom we have enjoyed a forty-year association in community activities.

Ever since the Brussels Conference — indeed even before it — Canada has been concerned with the problem of Soviet Jewry. The saga of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union is so dramatic that we have not yet seized on its full implication. We must continue to press for the emigration of those Jews who wish to leave and to demand that the Soviet government desist from harassing and imprisoning those whose only “crime” is their desire to live as Jews in the State of Israel. Towards this end we have been most active.

There is every reason to believe that the mass demonstrations in Ottawa and throughout Canada in October 1970, when Kosygin visited Canada, when 12,000 Jews marched through the streets of Ottawa, when other tens of thousands were present at all public appearances, had a significant effect on the decision of the Soviet government to allow Jews to leave in somewhat increased numbers. The Canadian government has expressed its deep concern for Soviet Jewry to Soviet officials and continues to do so. Our prime minister, our secretary of state for External Affairs, and other members of our Federal government, have intervened time and again for our brethren in the USSR both in support of their right to leave and to return, and their right to live in freedom as Jews if they choose to stay in the USSR.

We are pleased to tell you that through our efforts the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which maintains a Russian language service, now includes considerable content of Jewish interest. We have concluded arrangements with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to broadcast regular religious services to the Soviet Union in both Hebrew and Yiddish and also to broadcast Yiddish programs of cultural interest to Jewish listeners in the USSR.

Canada is a participant in the European Conference on Security and Cooperation. Canadian foreign policy is a reflection of our internal condition, namely, concern and protection for human rights and fundamental freedoms for cultural and linguistic rights, but above all else, for the mobility of peoples. In our discussions with Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau and the then secretary of state for External Affairs, Mr. Mitchell Sharp, they both expressed the opinion that the West must exact humanitarian concessions from the Soviet government if détente is to have any meaning at all. Mr. Trudeau reaffirmed this view when he addressed our own Canadian Jewish Congress Plenary Assembly last June.

As our colleagues of the World Jewish Congress know, Canada adopted a forthright and militant stance at the European Security Conference, calling for the free flow of people and ideas and for uninterrupted communication between linguistic groups within the two blocs. Canada has gone even further, and has advocated untrammelled joinder of families and that ease of communication which will lead to relaxed relations between peoples. This, of course, was in direct opposition to the Soviet view that détente is between states rather than peoples. The Canadian government has made it clear, although it did not mention any specific ethnic group in Canada, that the fate of the Jewish community of the USSR would to a considerable extent be ameliorated by such policies and was a matter of real concern to Canada's citizens.

At this time the fate of détente is unclear. However, we in Canada will continue and indeed redouble our efforts to facilitate the flow of emigration from the USSR, to press the USSR to cease its barbaric harassment of the Jewish militants and to bring pressure on the government of the USSR to release those prisoners of conscience still in prison.

We maintain, in partnership with the Canadian Zionist Federation and the B'nai B'rith, a Canada-Israel Committee, whose program includes regular meetings with the prime minister, the secretary of state for External Affairs, the leader of the Official Opposition, other leading parliamentarians, senior members of the civil service, and important leaders in the nongovernmental sector. We are presently expanding these activities, especially since the impact of Arab propaganda after the October War has had an effect in Canada, even though we are in the unique position, as a Western state, of being an oil-producing country. We are, however, not members of OPEC.

We are giving attention to the situation which has arisen since the Rabat Conference, with its semilegitimization of the PLO in some areas of public opinion. We were disappointed — and we have told the government so — that Canada abstained on the substantive vote with regard to PLO observer status at the UN General Assembly. But we are confident that Canada will continue to maintain its close and friendly relationship with Israel and seek true and lasting peace through direct negotiations between the parties in conflict, leading to secure and recognized borders. I will file with the WJC Secretariat a letter from John G. Roberts, my member of Parliament at home, in which he explains Canadian policy in regard to the Middle East and to which are appended a number of formal statements and documents by important members of the government.

We all have lived for nearly three decades in a welter of crises and we remain a besieged people. We have succored the remnant of the Holocaust; we have mobilized our efforts for the establishment of the State of Israel; we have supported Israel throughout the atmosphere of crisis and war. We have done what could be done to rescue Jews in Arab countries, in which connection Canadian Jewry has played a not unimportant role, but one which cannot be further publicized at this time; we have reestablished and expanded Jewish communal institutions.

We have concerned ourselves with the anti-Semitism from the New Left, now stalking under the guise of anti-Zionism; we have battled neo-Nazism; we now are confronted with enormous pressures from the Arab world. We have concerned ourselves with all of these and with a host of other matters, all of which we have dealt with perforce as concurrent crises.

I would like to say a few words about our situation, unique for a Western country, namely, the Canadian policy of multiculturalism. To a considerable extent the Canadian Jewish Congress may be considered responsible for this policy, which stems from the position of the French language and culture in our Federal system.

In 1963 the Canadian government established a Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. The Canadian Jewish Congress reacted negatively and publicly because it appeared that only the cultural and linguistic needs of the English and the French were being taken into account, whereas one third of our country is of neither English nor French extraction.

When he announced a multicultural policy, our French Canadian prime minister emphasized that this would help to break down discriminatory attitudes and cultural jealousies. Mr. Trudeau added:

National unity, if it is to mean anything in a deeply personal sense, must be founded on confidence in one's own individual identity. Out of this can grow respect and a willingness to share our views, attitudes, and assumptions. The overall objective of the new multicultural program is to foster cultural freedom in Canadian society. This means first and foremost the promotion of a greater understanding among Canadians of the advantages of cultural diversity. The Jewish culture itself is one of the most interesting examples of a people who have taken the traditions of many different countries, weaving them into a fascinating fabric that is both strong and beautiful. However, there are many people in Canada who have yet to realize that within diversity lies a richness. In fact, cultural diversity is our greatest national resource — one which should be nurtured. That is the purpose of the new multicultural program. The Federal government will support Canadian cultural groups which show a desire and a capacity not only to exist, but to flourish and contribute to Canadian life.

Anticipated Jewish contributions seem to extend beyond Jewish community concerns. Speaking at a Canadian Jewish Congress luncheon in Toronto, the prime minister described the Jewish people as representing, in many ways, a microcosm of Canada, having an admirable record of community participation with great distinction.

In the words of the prime minister, Canada has two official languages, but no official culture. Consequently, the Federal government is now funding multicultural projects other than formal education (which is under the Provincial jurisdiction). These have included exhibits of Canadian Jewish history, Yiddish periodicals, Yiddish theater, and other Jewish cultural endeavors in Canada. Thus, we see that Canada is now embarked on a unique cultural experiment of encouraging folk cultures within the Canadian mosaic. The special unique nature of this Canadian experience is best seen in its relation to the United States experience with which it is totally at variance. The Canadian Jewish Congress, through its Religious Affairs Department, is engaged in a far-

reaching program to bring into focus the identification of the Jewish community as a faith community in its broadest sense, encompassing the entire gamut of shades and opinions within the Jewish community and our various denominational groups, without in any way interfering with the specific ideologies of any given group and without aiming at any kind of uniformity in religious thinking.

In spite of the many differences which exist within the Jewish community as far as the application of religion in daily life is concerned, there are many areas which are common to all, and it is in these areas that we strengthen the image of the Jewish community by developing the highest standards of religious observance; strengthening Jewish religious education; dealing with problems of intermarriage, conversion, and adoption; encouraging religious responses on campuses; training and supplying religious functionaries for smaller communities; and involving ourselves in a myriad of other areas on which there is much agreement in principle but usually little common action. We propose to establish in Canada a CJC National Synagogue Council as the representative spokesman for the religious community. In these endeavors to create a unified community, some success has already been obtained in that in our representation to government and Parliament we speak with one voice.

A major concern to us, as it is to the World Jewish Congress, is the development of a cordial relationship with Christian religious bodies, both Roman Catholic and Protestant.

We have been successful in developing such a relationship with the Roman Catholic community in Canada through the Canadian Catholic Conference, a national organization encompassing the senior hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Canada. In these meetings what concerned us most was social action, human rights issues, and cooperation on such problems as poverty and welfare programs.

We are part of the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations and are in a position to exchange views on recent developments such as the promulgation of Vatican guidelines on Jewish-Christian links.

Our contacts with the Protestant community have proceeded along similar lines. There was a problem in Canada with a publication of the United Church (a union of some nonconformist Christian denominations, to give a loose description) which was strongly anti-Israel. The matter has been handled on a national level and the situation, while improved considerably, is not yet wholly resolved.

We recently participated in the international discussions with the World Council of Churches at the meetings last month in London, and, no doubt, Dr. Riegner will be dealing at greater length with this matter.

A major concern of ours is the creation of a favorable climate within the Christian faith-community on matters affecting Israel.

The issue of Jerusalem, of course, has deep religious connotations. It will be of interest to note that the Canadian Catholic Conference, following a number of meetings between both our representatives, made a statement on Jerusalem which stresses the ties of the city of Jerusalem to the Jewish people and affirms the hope for a Jerusalem united.

We are told that this resolution has been discussed with and approved by high authorities of the Vatican (though unfortunately not yet expressly so by the highest authority there).

A Canadian Jewish Congress delegation recently met in Ottawa with the Catholic hierarchy concerning the Vatican guidelines. The prime minister, a Catholic himself, took the initiative in requesting our delegation to meet with him to discuss these guidelines. It is evident that Mr. Trudeau has a deep interest in this increasingly important aspect of our work.

I turn now to a different problem — one hardly unique to us. Can anyone doubt today that in a world of increasing tolerance, Jewish survival cannot be guaranteed unless we are able to provide a basic Jewish education for our children? Dr. Goldmann has said that we are not likely to see a period of anti-Semitism in Western countries which will impel Jews towards a negative identity. I agree, of course. On the contrary, there may be perceived an ever-widening humanistic and open society in Europe, in the United States, and in Canada which presents a profound challenge to Jewish survival. The by-product of this humanism is increased intermarriage and acculturation and a generation emerging with a scant sense of Jewish identity, let alone knowledge.

What hope other than biological survival in these circumstances can there be for a viable and creative Diaspora? Those of us with a deep religious faith will, of course, remain Jews. While it is true that there has been a modest renaissance in Jewishness amongst the young, we are nevertheless losing the battle. We do not have exact statistics, but consider for a moment estimates of the numbers of Jewish children attending day or afternoon schools. As of 1970, with a few exceptions — notably Iran and South Africa — the percentage was 50% or less. In South America it was only 28%; in Western Europe only 39%; and even in Canada and the United States, the highest estimate was only 50%.

The implication is catastrophic. Hundreds of thousands of Jewish children in both the advanced industrial countries and the developing countries must inevitably lose not only their identities as Jews, but also any consciousness, tradition, and heritage.

We must, therefore, seek a remedy and we suggest that the Diaspora enter into a great partnership with Israel; we must mobilize the Diaspora for survival — education is survival — in the same manner in which we mobilize material resources for Israel. Cooperation with Israel must not always and only be in an atmosphere of crisis and need. The day must come — and soon — when the greater portion of the monies we collect will be devoted to education, culture, and the maintenance of social services, rather than to satisfying the needs of economic existence and military exigencies.

Events since the October War have taught us the irrefutable lesson that Israel, without a strong and viable Diaspora, will remain in jeopardy. While Israel provides the cultural tools whereby there will be effected a Jewish renaissance in the Diaspora, the Diaspora provides the pragmatic means whereby Jewish life will be preserved in Israel and in the world. God forbid that history record that while Israel's survival was secured on the battlefields, the Diaspora died in empty classrooms.

I cannot refrain from expressing our joy at seeing Dr. Kadelburg and Chief Rabbi Rosen, who regularly grace our meetings. As a truly international organization, untrammelled by any partisan ideology, the World Jewish Congress is a powerful instrument both for Diaspora Jewry and for Israel, and under the inspired and inspiring leadership of Dr. Nahum Goldmann it has performed great services for the Jewish people.

I suggest, with some modesty, that world Jewry might well emulate our experience in Canada. We require a World Jewish Congress which includes and represents every major Jewish community, every major Jewish organization, and every shade of Jewish opinion. Such is the nature of our Canadian Jewish Congress. This must be one outcome of this historic Assembly — our first in Israel. If we leave here without achieving the total unity of Diaspora Jewry, we will be answerable to our conscience and to history.

We call on this Plenary Assembly to embark on twin programs for survival — a continued mobilization of resources for Israel and a new mobilization of resources for education. These are our two great goals: survival in Eretz Israel and survival as *am yisrael*.

Dr. BENNO MILNITZKY (*President, Jewish Confederation of Brazil*): Latin America is gigantic area, stretching from the Rio Grande, on the border between Mexico and the United States, down to Cape Horn. It is a common error to consider it as a unit from an economic, institutional, and social point of view. Latin American reality is not so simple. It is rather a complicated panorama of structures. Historical origins, though similar in certain aspects, are insufficient to create an overall continental concept. Another common mistake is to designate

Latin America as underdeveloped or developing; this is an outdated terminology, created by economic studies of some twenty or thirty years ago. Although this expression has been internationally adopted as if it had an indisputable certificate of truth, it is inadequate for Latin America. More erroneous still is to compare Latin America with other continents, Africa for instance. Not so long ago the people of Kenya said: "We had our land, then came the Europeans with the Bible in their hand; now we have the Bible and they have our land." This was not true for Latin America, nor are the various stages and processes of colonialism in other areas comparable with developments on our continent.

From the beginning, and during the centuries of their domination, Spain and Portugal set up what certain economists designated as a "factor of intrusion." With its native collaborators — a kind of low-class executives or better paid subordinates — this system simulated a seeming development in some areas of the continent, and in fact blocked the possibilities of the people.

Curiously enough, in the former classification which divided nations into rich and poor, many Latin American countries used to be considered rich, because of the natural resources which they have always possessed.

When the end of the Second World War brought about the technological revolution, none of the Latin American countries was ready to take advantage of it. Indeed, their backwardness and the complexity of the problems which the "intrusion factor" had left were accentuated by the disappearance of speculative foreign investments. In a great number of countries, domination passed to individual families or groups of families, which took over both the great areas of cultivation and the smaller agricultural properties and thus came to exercise political power. In other countries, such as Brazil, the great differences between the various geographical areas made a unifying policy imperative so that differences could be leveled out by a compulsory distribution of the gross national product.

This process of growth, against a background of imperialism and its effects, is slow, difficult, sometimes bloody, and can hardly take place in normal institutional circumstances. This explains the military regimes which came to power in Brazil, in Argentina before the return of Peron, in Chile, in Peru, and in Uruguay. The politicians had failed in the task of national upbuilding.

With the exception of Venezuela and Mexico, in all Latin American countries the first convulsive tremors of varying intensity can be felt as the populations seek the production of wealth and its just distribution.

The leanings of the various governments — whether it be to the left, to the right, or toward the establishment of a model of their own — depend on a number of elements which I shall not go into here.

Some 800,000 Jews live on this unquiet continent, the majority in its most agitated spot, Argentina, where in the view of the American State Department democracy reigns. This so-called democracy is pro-Arab, anti-Zionist, and anti-Jewish — and not only for utilitarian motives. The Arab oil tycoons applaud, support, and embrace, as is their custom, both fascists and leftists; they make no difference between the extremes, since both serve their ends.

The strongman regimes of Peru, Chile, and Brazil, despite undeniable restrictions, are not anti-Semitic; their character, however, affects the Jews, who can survive only in a free society. The nationalistic nature of these regimes also creates difficulties as regards pro-Israel activities; in particular, campaigns for *aliya* or fundraising for Israel are forbidden by law. To these factors must be added the vicious Arab propaganda, which finds an echo in most countries because of their dependence on oil supplies, the high rate of inflation, and their ambition to play a role on the world economic scene. It is thus understandable that old anti-Jewish propaganda such as the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* is being revived and certain neologisms have found their way into the propaganda idiom, such as “synarchy,” “sanhedrin,” and the like. The anti-Semites of the various countries exploit their governments’ thirst for petrodollars in order to reactivate their agitation, and the governments, although embarrassed, let themselves be pressured — as was demonstrated recently by their votes at the United Nations.

Under the colossal impact of these developments, the Jewish communities must face challenges of two kinds.

First, internally, because Jewish youth and a great part of the intellectuals are estranged from Jewish problems and, at the risk of grave frustrations, devote themselves to undefined and facile causes of dubious social justice; and because the Jewish leadership does not understand the course of events and fails to propose inspiring alternatives.

Second, externally, because Jewish communities have to overcome grave obstacles in order to give open and full expression to their Zionist identification and their loyalty to Israel. Furthermore, they are fighting an uneven battle against anti-Semitic publicity subsidized by huge capital which has been able to silence even democratic governments on the much more experienced and developed European continent.

Despite all this, and although with many deficiencies, Jewish education exists. Religious life among the younger generation has been

intensified by a few rabbis who do not hide in their synagogues. Despite the difficult circumstances, aid to Israel has been maintained, as have *aliya* and other Zionist activities.

I have not mentioned terrorism and have not spoken of tragedies, but have preferred to survey the great and menacing drama — the decomposition of Jewish life. I leave it to the culture, the intellect, and the imagination of the delegates to fill in the voids. It was my task to introduce the subject. In the brief time allotted to me, I cannot say more about the gigantic Latin American continent, which is so variegated. The workshops and commissions will be able to hear reports on particulars and will supply additional data. I have provided only the preliminary strokes for a vast picture, which must be painted without panic, of that great segment of the world where Judaism is in crisis — Latin America.

Dr. SCHNEIER LEVENBERG (*Chairman, International Affairs Commission, World Jewish Congress; Vice-President, Board of Deputies of British Jews*): My task is to give you a broad panorama of the situation in Western Europe. I shall not deal with the internal structure of the various Jewish communities, because I have done so at previous WJC gatherings and the material is available from the Congress offices.

Of the twenty-eight countries in Europe, eight have Communist regimes. I shall speak of the other twenty, loosely referred to as Western Europe. Nine of these, the members of the European Economic Community, have a total population of 260,000,000, including about 1,250,000 Jews. The seven countries belonging to the European Free Trading Area have 40,000,000 people with only 65,000 Jews. The other four countries — Greece, Turkey, Spain, and Malta — account together for a population of 80,000,000, including 45,000 Jews.

Thus, less than 1/2% of Western Europe's population of 380,000,000 are Jews — a tiny Jewish island in a gentile sea. Yet, figures can be misleading. The Jews, living mainly in major cities, constitute a significant element in London and Paris, for instance. They are also concentrated in certain branches of economic, social, political, and intellectual life. Therefore, qualitatively the Jews in Western Europe are much more important than their total number in the population might indicate.

Western Europe is in a phase of transition, although of course the situation varies from country to country. But at the moment the general trend in the large majority of these countries is a democratic one and Jews enjoy equal rights, both *de jure* and *de facto*.

The general economic situation in Western Europe may become worse before it gets better. Nevertheless, with regard to the oil crisis,

the mood prevailing in Europe today is more confident than it was at the end of 1973. During the Yom-Kippur War and immediately afterwards, there was real panic in Europe. There was fear of an economic collapse. There was fear of political dislocation. Today, I believe every country has contingency plans. Governments have realized that oil is a double-edged weapon, that not only the oil-producing Arab countries have all the say. There is more understanding of the problem, more confidence. The example of the Netherlands did not go unnoticed by other governments. As far as Great Britain and Norway are concerned, there is the prospect of the North Sea oil. To quote the British prime minister, Harold Wilson: "Another few years, and we in Britain will also be an oil-producing country." This shows quite a different situation from that prevailing during the Yom-Kippur War. During the autumn of 1973, 80% of the oil used in Britain came from the Middle East; today it is 70%; excluding Iran, it is only 54%.

The major problem facing Western Europe and its Jewish population is an economic problem — oil prices, inflation, unemployment. In the European Economic Community 3,500,000 are unemployed. There is industrial strife and living standards are declining. There is a danger of economic upheaval which may lead to political upheaval in certain countries, and we know that the Jews are always the first victims of economic or political upheaval.

The general climate in Europe is not good at the moment. There is a certain disillusionment and lack of purpose, which is reflected in literature, poetry, and the theater. There is also disillusionment with the Third World, which used to be the darling of the progressive circles in Western Europe. There is criticism of the United States but it is realized that without the American nuclear umbrella Europe is defenseless. The feelings about détente are very ambiguous: there is a strong desire for détente, along with a fear of it, and the Jews are a part of the general scene and are greatly influenced by these trends.

A few weeks ago, at an important political gathering, the German chancellor, Helmut Schmidt, in commenting on the European situation, said: "The increase in oil prices has led to a loss in real income in all the oil-importing countries. It has also led to large deficits in the balance of payments of most of the European states. This is a danger to world trade. This is a danger to our exports. The danger of unemployment and inflation is great."

This is the reason why there is a pessimistic mood in Europe at the moment. It was reflected in a recent Gallup poll, which put the following question to people in various countries: "Do you think that the year 1975 will be better or worse than the year 1974?" In Britain, 64% of those questioned said "worse" and the same answer was given by

60% in France, 55% in the Netherlands, and 50% in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Nonetheless, it would be a great mistake to underestimate the strength of Western Europe and, by the same token, the inner strength of European Jewry.

Aliya from Western Europe today is very small — something like 3000 in 1974. This is due to relative prosperity in Western Europe and difficulties in Israel. But the situation may change radically. We must warn Jews against illusions. As a Zionist I am not surprised at developments in Europe or elsewhere in the Diaspora. I believe that Jewish communities will continue in the Diaspora, but not without Israel. We need Zionists and Jewish vision to lead these Jewish communities. Paradoxically, Jewish life in Western Europe is governed today not so much by the economic situation — although this affects every individual — but by the situation in Israel and the Middle East. One reason for this is the bond of deep solidarity with Israel. Other reasons are more pragmatic and realistic.

Developments in Israel affect very strongly the position of Jewish communities. I am aware that people in Israel may question whether the support of Western Europe is important for Israel and, there, I would like to warn against any misconceptions. We have seen shifts of opinions in the past. I would recall the period 1955-1967, when France was the darling of Israel. Then, after 1967 and de Gaulle's speech, people dismissed France as unimportant. Today, following Sadat's visit to Paris and the French sale of arms to the Arabs, people begin to have second thoughts. There was also a time when people said that Britain is of no importance whatsoever as far as the Middle East is concerned. Today, after Harold Wilson's visit to Washington, and before his visit next week to Moscow, I suppose every sophisticated political leader would want to review his assessment of the situation.

We Jews are a people of ups and downs. I would warn against dismissing Europe as a factor in the Middle East. Europe is no less important for the superpowers than the Middle East, and the present exclusion of the United Kingdom and France from the Geneva Peace Conference should not be considered final. Moreover, we should remember that of the fifteen members of the United Nations Security Council today four are European countries — France and the United Kingdom, who are permanent members, and Italy and Sweden. We should remember that Israel has normal diplomatic relations with the large majority of non-Communist European countries.

There are other factors also to be taken into account: the friendly attitude of the Council of Europe toward Jewish problems, particularly the problem of Soviet Jewry; the representation of smaller European

countries on the United Nations Peacekeeping Forces in the Middle East; the fact that almost 30% of the United Nations budget is covered by Western European countries; that more than half of Israel's imports originate in the European Economic Community while 39% of Israel's exports go to the Common Market; and Israel's important trade relations with EFTA countries.

There is a great deal of ambiguity in the attitude of Western European countries toward Israel. The official policy is that Israel must have secure and recognized borders and that one must recognize the rights of the Palestinians. The reasons for this ambiguity are manifold: Western European countries want to wait for the results of the Kissinger mission before committing themselves; they are not at present involved in the Geneva Peace Conference; they find it convenient for their relations with Arab countries and with Israel to use ambiguous formulas, which they can ascribe to neutrality.

One should note, however, that there is a great discrepancy between governmental policy and public opinion, which is more pro-Israel. Jewish communities in many European countries are obliged to criticize their own governments. We know the example of British Jews during the struggle for the State of Israel; today, practically every Jewish community has to criticize the policy of its government. This is not an easy situation and Jews face difficult and complex problems. Up to now Jewish communities have acted with pride and dignity, feeling that their own interests are at stake in Israel. As a result of the Holocaust and the establishment of the state, there is a new Jewry more confident in itself, ready to take risks in defying its own government.

Turning to another subject, I would say that the Israeli people and the Israeli press are unduly obsessed with the question of information. A great debate is going on about whether Israel's information campaign is right or wrong. Obviously information is very important. But policies are still more important, and what influences governments and public opinion is whether Israeli policies or Arab policies advance peace and lead to relaxation of tensions or create a danger of war. However, the differing statements coming from Israeli leaders are extremely confusing, not only for general opinion but also for Jewish opinion.

We have heard talk here about *détente*. Everyone knows that the efforts in this direction will not bring about paradise or a new relationship between the superpowers. On the other hand, to dismiss *détente* is irresponsible both from the general and the Jewish points of view. From the general point of view because the absence of *détente* would increase the danger of war; from the Jewish point of view, it would damage the position of Jewish communities. We must welcome the endeavors to achieve *détente*, but without illusions.

When we urge *aliya* from the Soviet Union we should be aware that Soviet policy in this respect is governed by domestic considerations. Nevertheless, world public opinion has an impact. I would plead for moderation and avoidance of exaggeration. We should watch the situation very carefully, as we do not yet know what the European Security Conference may achieve.

A word about anti-Semitism. At the moment it is not a serious problem for Western European Jewry, but this could change in an economic and political crisis.

Western European Jewry is an example of unity in diversity. Of the two largest Jewish communities, the French has grown considerably through immigration during the last fifteen or twenty years; British Jewry, on the other hand, suffers from the lack of an influx of new blood. But the main problem is that of the small communities and their cultural and religious isolation; unless we bring them into the general stream of European Jewry some of the small communities will be endangered.

We need a round table of Jewish communities in Europe. We need a European Jewish Congress as a part of the World Jewish Congress which will deal not only with political issues but with cultural issues and the whole framework of Jewish problems.

Let me conclude with a reference to two great personalities. Some of you may remember that in 1938, following the infamous Crystal Night, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, speaking in London, said to the British public: "Today the Nazis are burning Jewish synagogues in Germany; tomorrow they will be burning Westminster Abbey, which is the main religious shrine of Christianity in the great city of London." These were prophetic words. No responsible person or statesman in Europe can say: I don't care about Israel; I don't care about the Jews; I care only about my own little corner. Wendell Wilkie, the former American presidential candidate, put it this way: "We all live in one world."

The other person to whom I would like to refer is Professor Harold Laski, who died twenty-five years ago. He was a great man, a leader of the New Left before people knew what the New Left was, and well known in Britain, the United States, Asia, and Africa. Today, at the London School of Economics and at other universities, the name of Laski is a great name.

Laski was a person who had a "Jewish fault" — he wanted to save the world; he was not interested in Jewish issues. But when events in Germany developed as they did, and when there came the fight for Jewish immigration and a Jewish state, he joined the struggle led by Weizmann, Ben-Gurion, Sharett, and others. I would like to read to

you a quotation from a speech by Professor Laski because I feel it is relevant to the European Jewish situation: "The lessons of history are unmistakable. The enemies of Jewry are the enemies of freedom. Whoever is silent about the fate of Israel and Jewry is a collaborator in his own servitude. Freedom is indivisible. Justice is indivisible." This, I think, is our message to our non-Jewish fellow citizens, to the world at large. The fate of Israel is the fate of the world.

Chief Rabbi Dr. DAVID MOSES ROSEN (*President, Federation of Jewish Communities of Rumania*): It falls to me, as head of the delegation of the most important Jewish community among the small countries of Eastern Europe — and in the absence of the other communities of those countries — to speak about our Weltanschauung and in particular about a very important matter for us: how it is possible to be Jews in a Communist country.

The order of proceedings of this Assembly is a logical one. Yesterday we began by discussing a changing, dynamic world, which is of course in accordance with our millennial outlook: "*Bekhol yom yihyu be'eynekha chadashim.*" The ancient Torah itself is in a permanent process of renewal. Yesterday we devoted ourselves to general world problems and higher politics — perhaps, however, too high and too much. Today we come to our own vineyard.

The world is indeed changing and has changed a great deal. One only has to compare the Rumanian delegation to the Montreux Plenary Assembly, twenty-seven years ago, with the one at this Assembly. Then we represented 450,000 Jews, survivors of the Holocaust. Our delegation was headed by people whose purpose was to interfere with Jewish expression in Rumania. We were beset by a big question: What is going to happen? In that year, 1948, I was chosen to be chief rabbi, and my close friends and family asked me: "What do you have in mind? What are you going to do?" I answered — and perhaps this is the definition of a changing world — "I shall take each day as it comes. I have no intention of engaging in higher politics. I intend to do all that is possible — and more than is possible — to maintain Jewishness."

Today we represent, *barukh hashem*, only 80,000 Jews: in the meantime 350,000 Jews have left Rumania for Israel. I can say with pride that our delegation here is, Jewishly speaking, of a much higher level than that of 1948. May I add that our delegation is not here in an observer capacity: I am by now a veteran in the World Jewish Congress, and I often report at meetings. We have also had the honor and pleasure of receiving guests from the Congress leadership in Rumania.

I think it worthwhile for me to give you a brief description of Jewish life in Rumania today, as an example of how to deal with the problem of a Jewish community in a Communist country.

Our federation groups seventy Jewish communities throughout the country. We have 150 synagogues, most of which function every day, morning and evening. We have education for our children and young people, and Hebrew courses for high-school and university students. Our communities have choirs that sing Yiddish and Hebrew songs. Our young people participate in our *oneg shabat* celebrations and our Seders.

What a pity that there were no television cameras, to show world Jewry what a Chanuka celebration in socialist Rumania looks like. When I say that about 20,000 Jews took part in the Chanuka festivities throughout the seventy Jewish communities across the country, I am being very careful not to exaggerate. Accompanied by youngsters, by choirs, I myself visited twenty-eight towns and villages in Moldavia and Transylvania, where entire communities turned out. In one of them, a *shtetl* of 160 Jews, we were told that Jews came to the celebrations who had never been inside a synagogue. I answered: "Even if it were only that -- *dayenu*."

We have the possibility to live a full religious and cultural life. Our periodical appears in three languages: Rumanian, Yiddish, and Hebrew. By the way, this is the only Hebrew newspaper to appear in all of Europe, East or West, and many of our friends here receive it regularly. This is not just any newspaper, but one that fulfils an important, even sacred, role: it reaches our youth and our intellectuals twice a month and allows them to identify as Jews. It provides them with some knowledge and news of world Jewry and Israel, and it provides world Jewry with news about us.

We also have an extensive social work program. Without going into details, I can say with pride that today in Rumania there is not a single Jew who suffers from hunger or cold or who has no clothes to put on his back. It is an organized assistance program, in which we are helped by the Joint Distribution Committee, and which allows the means to live in dignity to elderly and sick concentration camp survivors and those whose children have gone to Israel.

In 1948 the leaders of our delegation told us that we had no advantages to hope for by going to the Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress. Those were times when it was not wise to assert one's Jewishness. We were told: You are Rumanians and you have nothing in common with world Jewry.

Today, thank God, I can tell you that we openly identify ourselves as part and parcel of the Jewish people and that we are no longer a limb severed from the body of our people. And what we say in Jerusalem we also say in Bucharest. We can express our solidarity with and our love for *medinat yisrael*, and there is neither a Shabbat nor a *yom tov* when

we do not offer a prayer for *medinat yisrael* when opening the Holy Ark. And at the same time, with no contradiction, we can assert ourselves as loyal citizens of the country which allows us all these opportunities. Therefore the representative of the Federation of Jewish Communities, the chief rabbi, is a member of the Rumanian parliament, as a representative of the Jewish population.

How was all this possible ? I know you did not come here to study history, but to learn about the future. But I must tell you how all this was possible, because experience is the best teacher. Throughout this period we have sought, wherever possible, to justify our interests by citing the interests of the regime, and we have succeeded. We have never sought out what divides us, but only what unites us. And at the same time we have occasionally been able to convince our interlocutors, to win them over. There are silent Jews and there are Jews who shout. I think that neither extreme is good: silent Jews must be able to speak, but Jews who shout perhaps too loudly should lower their tone a bit. We Rumanian Jews neither shout nor remain silent, and we have been able to convince the leaders of our country – who are no less and perhaps more Communist than others – that the fact of Jews living their lives as Jews poses no danger to them but that it is in their interest that the Jews be a satisfied element. We have convinced them that the State of Israel is a factor in world peace and that ties with Israel are a good thing.

All this was not easy to obtain, and the early postwar years – which have been referred to here as the “honeymoon” years – were far from sweet for us. But even then we were able to convince the authorities that a Jew who wants to emigrate to Israel for religious, national, or family reasons is not a traitor.

I want to emphasize that during this entire period we maintained Jewishness and Judaism in Rumania and were therefore able to send hundreds of thousands of Jews to Israel. If we had not succeeded in maintaining their Jewishness, there would have been no one to come to Israel.

Now a word about the centrality of Israel. The Torah describes how, when the Jews in the desert pitched camp, the various tribes put up their tents in a circle, with the Tabernacle of the Congregation in the center. The picture repeats itself at this Assembly, where we see the tribes of Israel – Jews who have come from all over the world, speaking different languages and representing different traditions and cultures. We all proclaim our solidarity with the State of Israel and we all agree as to the centrality of Israel in world Jewry. However, this centrality entails not only rights but also obligations. Eretz Israel, our millennial dream, should not be a country like all other countries, but “a light

unto the nations.” And until it succeeds in becoming a light unto the nations it should at least be a light unto the Jews.

In this connection I am obliged to state from this platform that those in Israel who are responsible for the Diaspora communities are doing nothing to maintain Judaism in Rumania. Everything we are doing in this regard, we are doing ourselves. We complain that there are some countries that do not allow Judaism to be maintained; but here is a country that does allow it, where there are no barriers to contacts with world Jewry and Israel, yet we are receiving no help.

During these past twenty-seven years I have done something for *aliya*, and every wave of emigration has been a *simcha* for me — but also a *churban*. Each wave of *aliya* has destroyed institutions in our community and we have had to rebuild them over and over again. This is our fate and our mission.

I believe that *medinat yisrael* is not an end in itself, but a means toward the preservation of *am yisrael*: the Jewish people cannot exist without the State of Israel. But the teachings of the Torah are also important for those who consider the State of Israel as an end in itself, for if we do not maintain Judaism there will be no *olim*.

We have heard references here to the internal front and the external front. On the subject of the latter, I hope my friend Torczyner will forgive me when I say that one should not stand on the rostrum of the World Jewish Congress and speak against détente. Détente is our only hope. We have acquired an image that is too combative, which has lost us a great deal of sympathy.

The Jewish people has always been in the vanguard of the progressive forces in the world. Now, for the first time in our history, all the progressive forces are against us. We must ask ourselves whether we can exist in a world where our ties are with South Africa; we must ask ourselves whether this is not in total contradiction to the outlook of Judaism and to our 2000-year-old history. No sacrifice is too great for us to make for the State of Israel, but we have the right to ask Israel to uphold Judaism.

We hear about the crisis in American Jewry. But what is being done against assimilation ? Is Torah going forth from Zion, the word of the Lord from Jerusalem ? Judaism is Torah, and Torah must go forth from Zion so that Jews will come to Israel and not go to Belgium or Berlin. “Let my people go, that they may serve me.” You have forgotten the second part of that phrase: “that they may serve me,” that they may serve Judaism.

For years we hear nothing of what is happening to the millions of Jews in Eastern Europe, who will be there for decades to come and who

represent 25% of the Jewish people. If, during the course of our history, we Jews had not identified with our mission but only with a system, we would have disappeared long ago. We have been able to live under any system, to seek out the possibilities to remain Jews under every system.

For years I have been asking the World Jewish Congress to consider thoroughly the problem of how to approach the authorities on the question of Jewish life in a Communist country. Based on my own experience I say to you that the only approach — and this is not a paradox — is the religious one. In a Communist country, Jewish communal life can be organized only on a religious basis. The authorities in Rumania understand that in Judaism one cannot separate the religious from the national aspects. And this is the approach that we must adopt so that those millions of Jews rediscover Judaism and so that we can think in terms of *aliya* at a later date.

An old Jewish legend says that when the Messiah comes, the kings of the nations of the world will go forth across iron bridges to escort him with their chariots and armies, but that the Jews will go forth across a paper bridge. All the bridges will collapse except the paper one, the bridge of the people of the Book, the bridge of Torah, of our 2000-year-old culture.

B. DISCUSSION

Rabbi JOSEPH KARASICK (*USA*): As chairman of the Board of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, which speaks in the name of the thousands of Orthodox synagogues in America, I rise to disavow the statement published in the press to the effect that a certain Beth Din Harabani Ha'elyon (supreme rabbinical court) — which is neither a *beth din rabani*, nor *elyon* — has issued a *cherem* against the president of the World Jewish Congress, Dr. Nahum Goldmann.

We do not know this organ, do not recognize it, and do not know the persons who claim to speak for it. It has no validity and I ask the Plenary Assembly to treat it as utter nonsense and irresponsible.

Mr. HABIB ELGHANAYAN (*Iran*): The Jewish community of Iran is the oldest in the Diaspora. It antedates Cyrus the Great, founder of the Persian empire, who 2500 years ago encouraged our people to go and build the Second Temple in Jerusalem.

The favorable position enjoyed by the Jewish community in Iran — despite complications and difficulties of a political, social, and religious nature in a Muslim country — is in the tradition of the founder of the Persian empire and is proof of the shah's magnanimity, humane

principles, and wisdom. In the past half-century, notably during the Second World War, this tradition was further manifested by the hospitality and assistance extended to Jewish refugees by the Iranian government and people.

During this period Iran has progressed rapidly in the economic, cultural, and social spheres, and our community has benefited from this progress as well. Since the establishment of the State of Israel, close to half of our community has settled here, in the spiritual and cultural center of the Jewish people. Nearly all the 80,000 Jews in Iran today live in the big cities, two thirds of them in Tehran. They are to be found in the economic and industrial sectors and also in the professions. Their educational level is comparable with that of the most advanced Jewish communities in the Diaspora. To promote community organization and Jewish culture, we cooperate with world Jewish organizations such as the American Joint Distribution Committee, the Jewish Agency, the Alliance Israélite Universelle, ORT, Otzar Hatorah, and others.

The Iranian Jewish community, along with certain other religious minorities, is expressly recognized under the Iranian Constitution, and its religious rights and autonomy are safeguarded. In accordance with the principle of proportional representation, we have a Jewish member of parliament.

The links of the Jewish people with Iran are ancient and solid. The Books of Daniel, Ezra, and Esther were written in Persia and numerous talmudic schools were founded there. Iran, its inhabitants, and its kings have always been referred to with great respect in Jewish religious writings, which is not the case with certain other ancient civilizations. For many centuries Jewish religious books were an important means of acquainting Judaism as well as Christianity with the civilization of Iran.

The Hon. GREVILLE E. JANNER, QC, MP (*Great Britain – Board of Deputies of British Jews*): Our Board of Deputies is very happy to be joining the World Jewish Congress, because we know that no one is going to approach our government without consultation with our Jewish community, and without full agreement with that community. We feel that it is not the job of Diaspora Jewry to preach to Israel and its elected government what Israel should do within its own frontiers or what those frontiers are. That is not our job, because we do not live here. Our job is to cooperate, to help, to sustain, and to understand.

There is one voice which is absent from this Assembly – the voice of the Soviet Jews. Ever since I worked as a war crimes investigator in Germany as a youngster some years ago, I have been haunted by the voice

of the Jews of Auschwitz saying, Bomb the camp ! and those who had the power to do so, answering: No ! We know best what's good for you. And I believe that those who know best what is good for the Jews in the Soviet Union are the Jews who live there, many of whom are dying to get out and have been waiting and fighting and suffering. Their voices are not easy to hear, but last week I was able to record a telephone conversation I had with Vladimir Slepak in Moscow, who applied to leave in 1969 and has been in and out of prison and suffering. I asked him whether we should abandon such methods as the Jackson amendment, public demonstrations, and open diplomacy. Listen to his answer in his own voice :

[*Taped recording of Mr. Slepak's voice:*] "Oh no, no, no: the more the better." [*Mr. Janner:*] "You don't consider that there should now be a period of silent diplomacy ?" [*Mr. Slepak:*] "Oh no, not at all." [*Mr. Janner:*] "And is that the view of you all ? Do you all think that ?" [*Mr. Slepak:*] "Yes, of course."

Some of us here say that we should go back to silent diplomacy, because if we make too much noise, the Russians will not want to hear. But when we deal with any given country, it is the views of the Jews within that country that must form the policy of this Congress, or the Congress will fail. I beg you to listen to the voices of those who will remain in the Soviet Union unless they are freed.

We must have an activist policy, a vigorous battle against anti-Semitism in any country in which it is found. We must ally ourselves with Israel, and Israel must understand that the Jews of the *galut* also have voices. As a World Jewish Congress, as a family, as a community seeking unity, we must listen not only to the strong but to the weak.

Mr. GERALD Y. FALK, OBE, JP (*Australia*): I would like to refer to the region of Southeast Asia and the Far East. In my opinion it is the duty of the World Jewish Congress to see that the small, defenseless, and vulnerable Jewish communities scattered throughout this vast area covering almost one quarter of the globe are maintained and serviced so that they become viable and are brought out of isolation and into the world Jewish family.

As indicated in the excellent report of WJC activities prepared for this Assembly, the WJC and the Executive Council of Australian Jewry have already expressed interest and undertaken some action in the region. This area should now be considered as a regional area of the WJC, with a permanent chairman and a permanent director. As a beginning, a professional officer based in Australia should be installed without further delay. Facilities must be provided to bring information from the WJC and other sources to enrich their Jewish cultural life. New and frail Jewish communities in such remote places as Taipei, New

Caledonia, Guam, Rangoon, Bangkok, and Manila are in need of communication with each other and with world Jewry. I urge the incoming officers to bring reality to the Federation of Jewish Communities of Southeast Asia and the Far East that was decided on in December 1969. Only by vigorous support, including adequate funding, can we achieve a more complete union of the Jewish people in that area.

Rabbi JOSEPH KARASICK (USA): I wish to react to some statements which were made here both last night and today. First, with the signing of the agreement between the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organization, I hope that we have laid to rest once and for all the canard, the *bilbul*, that the World Jewish Congress, if not anti-Zionist, has become the haven for anti-Zionist organizations. There are those who perhaps are not happy with the Zionist Organization or parties; but in the world in which we live today, no responsible Jew can see his existence without the State of Israel.

However, I wish to take issue with those who maintain that our priority for Israel must be so structured that, in effect, it could lead to committing suicide in some of the communities of the *gola*. In the *halakha* there is a simple rule: "Between *aniekha* — the poor people of your community — and the poor of a neighboring community — *aniekha kodmim* — your poor people come first." True, as Arthur Hertzberg said last night, we must be flexible in the rearranging of our priorities within the community. But to say, "All for Israel and nothing for ourselves," is of course folly. And to say "*Im ein yerushalayim, ein bavel*" (if there is no Jerusalem there is no Babylon, referring to the Diaspora) is as unrealistic as to say "*Im ein bavel, ein yerushalayim*."

The World Jewish Congress is the forum of world Jewry. We have come here to proclaim our support for and our identification with our beloved *moledet* and at the same time to say to our brothers and sisters in the *gola*, "*Et achai ani mevakesh*" — we are looking for our brothers. My organization, the Union of Orthodox Congregations, is willing to cooperate with communities throughout the world, at the synagogue and youth levels — those of you who are here from France may know of the work which we did with the Consistoire and with students of the Ecole Rabbinique — to offer our expertise in whatever manner that may be practical and practicable: our literature, our organizational talent, our rabbis, our youth leaders, our educators, all who are familiar with the problems which face us today and who have learned to cope with them. While we must worry about our own communities, we cannot be isolationists and consider our own communities alone. "*Im ein ani li, mi li?*" but, "*Keshe'ani le'atzmi, ma ani?*"

Mrs. ANITA JAMITOVSKY (*Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO)*): It is a grave mistake to generalize about Latin America. For example, in Israel, the prevalent stereotype is that all Jewish Latin American students are leftists. In some countries, some Jewish youth will have nothing to do with Zionism because for them it is too socialistic. The problems in Latin America merit careful study, country by country, city by city, and community by community.

The image of Latin America, here in Israel and in other countries, is often folkloristic and somewhat disparaging. The Israeli media forget that, despite the energy crisis and pressure from the Left, Latin America has, relatively speaking, remained more faithful to Israel than other continents — or at least tried to avoid a stand that is too aggressively pro-Arab. In previous years, Jews took Latin American support for granted; today, they have given up that support for lost. Both attitudes are exaggerated.

Education in Judaism, I feel, should be a moral obligation, like the obligation to contribute to the Magbit. I am told that the Jews of North America invest about 60,000,000 dollars a year in Jewish education. Three additional millions invested by them could work miracles in Latin American cities where the Jewish communities are too poor to finance their own education and where Israel cannot be expected to do so either. On a recent trip throughout the region, I saw communities without teachers, without rabbis, without Zionist organizations, often with only a small WIZO group whose members exerted tremendous efforts to assure a little bit of *yidishkayt*.

As to *aliya* from Latin America, I believe that potential *olim* should be selected from a Zionist point of view, because an *oleh* who has a minimum of Zionist motivation will not think of going back, regardless of the material circumstances. In this connection, Israel WIZO has recently decided that the families of its members — and there are thousands of them — should each assume personal responsibility for the absorption of a family of new *olim*.

If I may inject a personal note, when I came on *aliya* one-and-a-half years ago, I thought that I could not be replaced as a leader in my community of origin. However, from my own experience and that of others, I can tell you that the opposite was the case: the departure of community leaders on *aliya* stimulated younger people to take their place. I hope therefore that at the next Assembly many of you delegates from the Diaspora will be part of the Israeli delegation.

Mr. GIL SINAY (*Chile*): I do not place great importance on the external front: we cannot change the course of political events. The most important problem for the Jews of the *gola* is maintaining the Jewish communities religiously and culturally, with particular emphasis

on education. And I agree with Dr. Rosen that if you want *aliya*, you must first maintain the Jewish community.

In Latin America as elsewhere there is a certain amount of anti-Semitism but the policies of the governments have never been anti-Semitic nor has there been any anti-Semitic feeling in the population at large. Dr. Goldmann once said that he was very worried about the future of Jews in Latin American countries because they were living in a changing world, in an unintegrated society, and would therefore be the victims of these changes. This was not the case in Europe, he said, because European society was integrated. I believe the opposite: there is not a single country in Europe that has not had pogroms and persecutions of Jews, because the Jews came there when society was integrated. We in Latin America came to a society that was not integrated, and for that reason we can bring our values to that society. We have therefore been respected for the one hundred years Jews have lived in Latin American countries.

The political situation in Chile today makes international headlines but I do not want to go into internal politics. The Chilean Jewish community must respect the government in power; and we can be assured that under any regime we will not suffer an anti-Semitic policy. We sent our government a letter of greetings because Chile was one of the few countries which on the last occasion at the United Nations voted in favor of Israel.

We cannot say that any Jew has been imprisoned but there are persons with Jewish surnames who now remember their Jewish origin. Although these people have never been members of the Jewish community, we have authorized our rabbi to intervene on their behalf on humanitarian grounds.

The Chilean Jewish community denounces as a lie the accusations of anti-Semitic policies in Chile, printed, for instance, in the *Daily Worker*, *Le Monde*, and *Der Spiegel*. We assure you that until now the military regime has respected us and that we are engaged in Zionist, cultural, and religious activities. Therefore, I would urge all Jews not to involve the Chilean Jewish community in attacks on the Chilean regime.

Dr. MAURICE S. SAGE (USA): Several months ago I visited the Soviet Union, where I had not been for over fifty years. In a Podolian village I sought out a distant relative of mine, whom I found in the abattoir preparing chickens for Shabbat. Over eighty years of age, he was still able to carry out this function, but he no longer felt capable of performing a *brit mila*. He made a request of me: to ask Rabbi Soloveitchik whether it is permitted to give a Jewish name to a Jewish child who has not undergone circumcision. And this in the USSR in 1974!

Recently a number of American Jewish leaders met with President Ford, who assured us of his good intentions on the question of Israel. But we must realize that America has diplomatic links with all countries. The Jewish people cannot afford to have links only with some countries and not with others.

Mr. DOV BIEGUN (*Israel*): In yesterday's debate a speaker questioned the advisability of keeping alive both the World Zionist Organization and the World Jewish Congress, on the grounds that their activities overlap. To my mind this notion is misguided. It is only natural that a large Jewish organization with an almost universal Jewish representation should be dominated by Zionist thought. It is the most telling answer to anti-Semites who are trying to divide Jews from Zionists — love the one and hate the other. We also know the special role of the World Jewish Congress. One battle we must wage from the WJC platform is to repel the onslaught of the psychological warfare which the Arabs and our adversaries have declared with so much success against us.

Dr. NEHEMIAS RESNIZKY (*Argentina*): Argentina and Latin America in general are witnessing a vast anti-Jewish campaign financed by Arab groups who are exalted by their triumphs in Europe and Africa and have great financial power. To resist this onslaught, Jewish leaders need strong moral fibre. The Jewish community in Argentina has openly declared its opposition to the pro-Arab policies of the government. We have done this respectfully but energetically, because we are convinced that the survival of Israel is in the interest also of Argentina.

I realize that there is a tendency in the communities to say that we cannot influence political events, and I would say that it is natural for the leaders of some of these communities to act with a certain amount of opportunism. But it would be a fatal error to identify ourselves unnecessarily with totalitarian and despotic regimes. I am not suggesting that any community could act against its government — this would be absurd. But we must act measuredly, because every act of unnecessary identification with such a regime on the part of a leader of the Jewish community reflects on the whole community. Moreover, it endangers our future, because our young people will never accept regimes that do not respect liberty, justice, and the rule of law.

Rabbi AWRAHAM SOETENDORP (*Netherlands*): Holland is a country where, except for the period of the German occupation, there has been no persecution of Jews. Still, our *aliya* rate is 1%, which is the highest among the Jewish communities of the Western world.

We have a new problem in the Netherlands: thirty years after liberation, there is an increasing number of Jews who suffer from the effects of the Second World War. The effects of the Holocaust are even

seen among some young people who were born after the war. They need much help, and I am pleased to say that the Dutch government has recognized that need.

It is very gratifying to see the work of the Dutch government representing Israel in Moscow. Continuing the struggle on behalf of Soviet Jewry, even at a time when we speak of détente, is very important. In this struggle, we receive the support of many non-Jews, in Holland and in other countries, and I would like here to express my personal support for the Baptist minister who a few days ago was sentenced to five years of imprisonment in the USSR.

From my contacts with young people all over Western Europe, I believe that they want to work for Israel and they also want to be involved in the struggle to alleviate the suffering of mankind. It is not a case of either/or. The Jewish people should not allow itself to be isolated from general human endeavors, despite the attempts of others to isolate us.

SIXTH SESSION

Wednesday, February 5, 1975
(afternoon)

In the chair: Mr. RON FINKEL

GENERAL DEBATE: WORLD JEWRY IN A CHANGING WORLD (continued)

IV. JEWISH YOUTH

A. INTRODUCTION

Mr. MORDECHAI BAR-ON (*Head, Youth and Hechalutz Department, World Zionist Organization*): I am neither a politician nor a theoretical academician; I see myself as an educator. When you speak to young people it is highly important to be optimistic. However, this is not a youth seminar, but a congress of leaders of the Jewish people; consequently, I will not play the role of an educator, but give you my impressions after seven years of work in this field. And unfortunately most of them are pessimistic.

The concept of youth work has to do not only with an age group but with a method of approach. It is different from formal education, which is not my subject. Formal education is essentially an attempt to impose knowledge or doctrine on young people by an outside agent — an adult, an institution, a political body. The main principle of youth work is that it takes place within the context of the peer group, and in an informal setting. There is, of course, a great need for formal Jewish education, but I maintain that the Jewish world to a large degree has neglected the dimension of informal education.

Certainly, Jewish schooling is necessary to build a Jew. If a young man discovers his Jewishness at the age of eighteen or nineteen and has had no background in a Jewish school or in a Jewish family, there is some hope for him, but he will have great difficulty in acquiring the minimal knowledge of and acquaintance with Judaism that is provided by the school and the family. On the other hand, I am sure that everybody here knows of young Jews who — after acquiring quite an amount of Jewish knowledge during years of attendance at Jewish day-schools —

lose their identification with Judaism when they go to university or even before that. Why does this happen? Because we neglected the informal aspect of their Jewish education, which at this formative age builds up attitudes, self-identity, feelings about what you are and what you ought to be — and all this in the medium of their peer group.

Therefore, I propose to speak here about how we should work with young Jews when they are not with their parents or teachers, when they are among themselves, whether it be in a youth or student club or movement or in a nonorganized setting. What happens to them when they meet informally? What do they do? What happens in their minds and hearts?

Certainly it is very difficult to make generalizations in the Jewish world. Everybody knows how tremendous the differences are among continents, countries, and even towns; between Orthodox Jews and non-Orthodox Jews; between organized youth and nonorganized youth. But in thirty minutes one can hardly avoid making generalizations. I know that for every generalization in the Jewish world you can bring not just one evidence to the contrary but many. I hope that my observations, based on seven years of experience, describe at least part of the problem.

Time and again in recent years we have talked about the problem of Jewish youth, which, in the struggle for Jewish survival, is the most difficult problem. If you exclude from this discussion the rather limited number of Orthodox youth — who put on *tefillen*, observe the Sabbath, and live a Jewish life all day and every day throughout the entire year — then the question is what I would call the active identification of youth as Jews. I do not like the term *identity* because it has a passive connotation, and youth is not ready to accept anything which is just passive. The problem for them is to find a way to identify actively as Jews. I am indebted to a definition by the famous French Jewish writer, Albert Memmi, which I quote not because it is the only way of defining Jewishness but because it is a minimal definition, and, as such, shows us how difficult a problem we are facing. Memmi said: "To be a Jew today means to participate, more or less, in the Jewish condition, and to affirm, more or less, one's belonging to the Jewish group and values." It is a typical existentialist definition, and typically minimalist. Nevertheless, it contains the word *affirm*, and this can only mean something active.

For the Orthodox, this affirmation is very simple: they affirm their Jewishness almost every hour of the day. But what about the 70% or 80%, or maybe more, of young Jews who have lost this tradition, who are in the second, third, or fourth generation of assimilation? Some say that we should not be bothered too much because the youngsters

will grow up and have children and then use those identification modes typical of adults. Maybe. But the question is: With what content will they reach that stage?

What are the typical ways in which adults in the Jewish world today identify themselves as Jews? (Here again, I am not talking about religious Jews, who are a minority, and I extend the term to include active Conservative and Reform Jews as well as Orthodox.)

First, there is passive consciousness; they just know they are Jews. It is a very important minimal element. A few months ago, in São Paulo's Maccabi Club, I saw a couple of hundred Jews, women and men, sitting around tables, eating and playing bingo. There was nothing Jewish about it, except that they were Jews — no Jewish flag, no *Hatikva*, no *bentshn*, just Jews playing bingo. And I must say that in a way I felt good because of this basic passive feeling: We are Jews and we have Jewish bingo.

Then there is an active consciousness of belonging. You read about Jewish subjects, you take an interest in Jewish lectures. You occasionally participate in activities that commemorate the Holocaust or concern Israel. The next stage of identification is more intensive: one belongs to a synagogue, or to a Jewish organization. Take the individual Hadassah woman in a small town in the United States: the fact that she goes to meetings regularly and raises contributions is a very important form of active Jewish affirmation. Fundraising is another way in which adults affirm their Jewishness. And the best, of course, is if you also affirm your Jewishness in the family.

For the average adult Jew, there are not many more alternatives than the ones I have just described. But which of these are relevant to young people? I daresay that the vast majority of young people have only the first one I mentioned: a passive consciousness of being Jewish. But unless they can grasp what it means, unless it has some effect on their lives, this passive consciousness — instead of helping them — may cause them to question their Jewishness or even reject it, because young people can understand their identity only by means of action and active participation. As we grow older, we compromise and demand less. But this is the problem for young Jews.

Unfortunately, religion is an answer only for very few. Even those who try to look into being religiously Jewish — unless they were educated in a religious way to begin with — usually do not persevere. Zionism too is a possibility for very few, because in the mind of a young person Zionism can only mean *aliya*; and since *aliya* is a very difficult process on a personal level, it is a choice made by few, unfortunately. Thus, while religion and Zionism are good answers in themselves, they are not open to many.

Some young people try to identify as Jews in terms of moral principles: they believe that by struggling for civil rights or other worthy general causes they affirm their Judaism. I think this is an intellectual fallacy, no matter how worthy the cause. It does not lead youth into the Jewish realm, but outside it.

Perhaps the most important way of active Jewish affirmation is study of Judaism. Learning is an essential element of being a Jew. You can be a good Frenchman and know nothing about French culture. This is not so for Jews and never was. Even when we were settled in our land before the exile, study of Judaism was a self-evident duty. But today young people have to learn so many other things. They finish high school, in most cases non-Jewish high schools, rush into universities, try to find a profession. To start to struggle with learning what Judaism is all about at the age of eighteen is very difficult.

Moreover, in recent decades we have been teaching our youth a Judaism of kindergarten level. Very often Jewish students complain about this: they study philosophy, science, and other subjects at the most sophisticated level; their studies do not end with Marx and nineteenth-century thought, but go far beyond; but we do not present Judaism – or Zionism, for that matter – to them in a manner that offers intellectual satisfaction. This is outrageous, the more so since Judaism offers a wealth of intellectual sophistication. My fifteen-year-old daughter had to do a paper on the religious experience of Jeremiah as an assignment at her high school. While she was writing her paper, I was able to see that there is a highly serious body of world literature on this narrow subject, concerning one of our Prophets in one period of our history. And this is only one example, of course.

Part of the problem is that so many young people do not have the background to begin on a higher level; but we are also at fault, because we have not found a way to update our understanding of Judaism in terms of the modern world.

Israel is regarded as one of the answers to the dilemma of Jewish youth around the world. And certainly it is a positive point on the psychological map of many young Jews. I am not speaking of Zionism or *aliya*, but of Israel as a point of identification, of becoming involved. We talk a lot about the centrality of Israel, and as a Zionist I uphold that idea. But we always debate the question on the political level and never put it on the educational or psychological one. The question is not whether Israel is central to Jewish life, but rather how and to what degree Israel can be central in the life of the individual young Jew in the Diaspora. And the answer is not a matter of what we want, but what can be – and we see that the centrality that we want is really a marginality in most cases.

Let me give you a simple but striking example. For us Israelis, the main events of the last eight years were certainly the Six-Day War and the October War; for us these were the central events in our lives, and to a large extent very central events in Jewish life. But for the young Jew in Córdoba, Argentina, I have to confess that the riots in his city in the spring of 1969 — the famous *Cordobazo*, during which many students were killed — had much more of an influence on his life as a Jew and as a human being than the Six-Day War.

In 1968 and 1969, what we wrongly call the New Left was a very central problem for young Jews in the Western world. I say “wrongly” because it was actually a wave of radicalism of different varieties. The New Left has since died, but the real problem that agonized us in 1968 — the confrontation of the young Jew with his universal environment — is still with us.

The struggle for Soviet Jewry has been a tremendous asset in our work among young Jews, and has served as a very important element in their reeducation as Jews. I saw the effects of this in America in 1970-1971, when Jewish students began to say to each other: We are fighting for the rights of the Jews of Russia to live there as Jews or to emigrate as Jews, but what are we ourselves doing? As a result of this, combined with other factors, there appeared what some people call the “new Jew,” a Jewish renaissance: the *chavurot*, the tremendous growth in Jewish studies, the fantastic increase in the number of young Jews who visit Israel. But the idea of a renaissance is highly exaggerated: it took place only on an initial level and never went too deep — except, again, for a minority.

I said I was going to be pessimistic. But still, the educator in me obliges me to end with a few remarks on where the openings of hope are. In my eyes, the first of these — and do not discount what I am saying simply because I am an Israeli or a Zionist — is *aliya*. I say this not from the viewpoint of Israel’s needs but in terms of the way a young Jew can affirm himself permanently as a Jew.

The second is by fortifying the religious channel as much as we can, whether it be through Orthodoxy, Reform, or Conservatism. In the last three or four years the most successful of the Zionist youth movements has been B’nei Akiva, and I am very happy about it although I am not a religious person in the B’nei Akiva sense.

Thirdly, those of us who are called secular, those whose Jewish identification is not mainly religious, have the obligation to begin a major work of translating Judaism into sophisticated modern terms.

Fourthly, there is the need of learning Hebrew. Again, I say this not because I am an Israeli or a Zionist but because I believe that this is a way of active affirmation that may attract some young people.

Then, as I said at the beginning of my presentation, the Jewish world must start thinking of a much greater resource investment in informal education — money, organizational talent, and, above all, what we have been lacking all along: the recruitment of the tremendous wealth of Jewish intellectual capacity that is needed to deal with it. Most of the intellectual energy that the Jewish people possesses is not put to work in this field, which is the most important field in which *davka* the sophistication of the intellectual is needed.

Finally, there is confrontation with Israel — and I am not speaking here in terms of *aliya* or in political terms. Yesterday, in the Jerusalem Theater, we had a gathering — a “happening” — for well over 1000 young Latin American Jews who are in Israel for two months of voluntary work. If somebody wanted to meet the Jewish people, that was the place to meet it. Why? Because by being here for two months, they had two months of confrontation with themselves as Jews.

In Isaiah we read: “You are even my witness, is there a God beside me?” Rabbi Akiva made a religiously very daring commentary on this phrase, and said: “You are my witness and therefore I am the king; if you are not my witness I am not a king.” It really boils down to what I wanted to say here: in order to regain our collective understanding — whether religious or secular, Zionist or non-Zionist — one has to be a personal witness, which means witnessing these things, not outside you but within yourself.

Dr. PAUL WARSZAWSKI (*Assistant Director, Buenos Aires Office, World Jewish Congress*): The subject of youth is, paradoxically, a very old one. The premise on which I wish to base my presentation is that there is no Jewish youth problem as such. At the most, certain general phenomena in Jewish life manifest themselves particularly in the area of youth but also everywhere else. To insist on singling out Jewish youth as the “object” of a problem only strengthens the adult representatives — adult in a strictly chronological sense — in their conviction that they are absolutely right, and heightens the exasperation of the youth representatives, who — by the very nature of the representation granted to them — feel that they are being treated as objects and not as subjects or partners. That is why any discussion of the problem, like a very sophisticated game of chess, finishes with a tie between the mutual anger, frustration, and accusations.

I would like to draw attention to some of the factors which to my understanding have an impact on Jewish youth. They include not only the general problems of the Jewish world but also those of the non-Jewish society in which the Jewish communities live. But I will not go into the latter.

One of the general problems of the Jewish world outside Israel is the change in the relations between the Jewish and the non-Jewish worlds. This relationship has been in constant evolution since the Emancipation, but, at this moment, is in a particularly intense mood of change. Throughout its history in the Diaspora, the Jewish people has lived in a more or less precarious balance between the preservation of its particularity and the search for the implementation of its universal human ideals. With the creation of the State of Israel, obviously Jewish particularism has been emphasized. Nevertheless, universalism is an important component of Zionist thinking in its traditional form. The realization of a Jewish state was not conceived as a mere manifestation of Jewish nationalism — whose legitimacy, by the way, is unquestionable. Not by accident, the predominant trend for many years was that of socialist Zionism. It was this qualifying adjective, *socialist*, that projected Jewish nationalism into a global social and political context.

Times have changed. Not much remains today of socialist Zionism. In view of the political circumstances of the State of Israel, disappointment with socialism is felt everywhere in the Jewish world. The important question today is whether the predominant focus of Diaspora Jewry's insertion into the non-Jewish world is justified, whether it contributes to better understanding between the generations and furthers Jewish identity. This question is important both for a better understanding of the question of youth and of many of the processes currently going on throughout the Jewish world.

I contend that one cannot ask Jewish youth to renounce for the sake of Jewish nationalism its search for universal patterns of social progress. Any such demand, explicit or implicit, contributes to the estrangement of a great part of Diaspora Jewish youth from their communities, because young people consider, with some justification, that exaggerated particularism is incompatible with their intense participation in meeting the elementary demands of social justice and universal equality. I suspect, moreover, that the disenchantment of the adult Jewish community with socialism does not stem exclusively from political reasoning: some Jewish communities may well be motivated by their steadily growing affluence, and their economic and social position may play at least as great a role in determining their interests as does their Judaism.

The decline of Jewish ideals of universalism can be felt in many areas and has led to the adoption of positions based on shortsighted planning, with no real thought being given to long-term consequences. For the adults, the matter may be secondary, but that is not so for Jewish youth. We have never in our history had as large a number of Jewish university students and academics as we have today. Society — and Jewish society as well — provides these students with years of

freedom and security so that they may train themselves in the art of thinking; and their thinking necessarily reflects general intellectual subjects. Jewish society then rejects the result of this thinking and sticks to concepts which are bound to repel students and intellectuals. Jewish youth is a barometer of processes that will become general in the next generation. We must not deprecate the idealism and universalism of youth nor accuse youth of lack of realism. How many laughed at Herzl and who was right — the idealist dreamer or the hard-headed realists? As a matter of fact, absolute realism is totally devoid of realism.

The struggle is not only one of particularism versus universalism. I also should like to call your attention to certain problems deriving from the religious revival noticeable in some Jewish youth sectors. This revival is to a large extent a reaction to the materialistic values and the shortsightedness typical of a large part of Jewish life, and particularly Jewish institutional life.

This phenomenon is acceptable to organized Jewish society — after all, it is much better to have a son who is Orthodox rather than a hippy or terrorist — but one should not forget that it reflects a sharp reaction to the values that dominate Jewish society today. As the religious revival is relatively recent, we still have no clear idea of the direction it will take. I am confident, however, that the confrontation in youth of religious feeling and academic thought will bring about a new synthesis between Jewish particularism and universalism.

There is another aspect of the problem which deserves mention, namely the backwardness of the Jewish community as regards the use of modern techniques, for instance in the field of communications — and I leave aside the obvious example of formal Jewish education. During the last two generations, the processes of transmission of Jewish identity have changed and, I fear, have become so weakened that the image which Jews have of themselves has become to a large degree identical with the image society at large has of us. We are constantly subjected to the impact of the mass media while our own communications system is weak and outmoded. Why, then, should we be surprised that Yassir Arafat is much better known by the mass of young Jews than Martin Buber or, let's say, Shulamit Aloni?

The problem is not just a technical one. What I want to emphasize is the rejection. In the ideological sphere, the Jewish community ultimately rejects what the Jewish university students and intellectuals propose. In the technical field, the same happens. The specialist in administration sees that the systems which he was taught are applicable everywhere except to the institutional administration of the Jewish community. The specialist in communications learns that everything

he has studied is valid everywhere except for Jewish institutional communications. The problem has nuances, but I do not think I am wrong in general. I recall what happened in a community where with great pomp and circumstance a special institution was set up for sociological studies. The institution was duly established but it lost support as soon as its first surveys did not coincide with the prejudices and estimations of the community leaders.

The extremely high degree of intolerance on the part of the Jewish institutional establishment toward any new or merely different ideas is responsible for alienating large sectors of our youth. Very narrow limits are set on dissent. The favorite form of ideological dissuasion is labeling. Someone is labeled "anti-Zionist" and that finishes him, even though he may be a professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem without a shred of anti-Zionism.

Another drawback is the high degree of bureaucracy in Jewish life. In the 2000 years we lived without having a state, we developed a whole series of more or less voluntary Jewish institutions. Jewish voluntary activity seems to have reached its lowest point nowadays and everything is enveloped in the tentacles of a far-reaching bureaucracy. While this bureaucracy is felt everywhere in Jewish life in varying degrees, the young people in particular are totally at a loss to understand the rules of the game and unwilling to invest their few resources in an unequal match between the administrators and the administrated.

There seems to be an unavoidable conclusion — that the Jewish world in the Diaspora is not fit to be inhabited by young Jews. (Perhaps the world as a whole is not fit to be inhabited by young people? I would only say in this regard that we cannot afford to imitate the others.) Young Jews have no say in the determination of the policies of organized Jewish communities. I doubt whether this applies to youth only, as I am skeptical as to the existence of real democratic processes in the communities. Youth, however, is more easily exasperated and reacts accordingly.

If my evaluation is correct, we find the explanation for the surprising phenomenon that in critical situations we witness an unexpected upsurge of Jewish identification among youth. The young Jews find no proper place in the communities, which they consider incapable of responding to the problems affecting them. And I am afraid they are right. On the ideological level, the difficulty is the emphasis on Jewish particularism as opposed to Jewish universalism. On the technical level, the immense difference between the rules of common sense and those of the organized Jewish community. On the personal level, the limits on freedom to dissent, the dogmatism, the dearth of democratic procedures. For the time being, the adult community may be able to live

with these serious failings, but not so the young people. Nevertheless, in critical periods, the reserves of Jewish identity are still large.

We know that any action generates a reaction. Therefore, it seems clear to me that the dogmatism of the adults can only provoke an opposing dogmatism among the young; that the exaggerated particularism of the community will generate an exaggerated universalism among youth; that the lack of adequate technical planning will be met with contempt. That is why I feel that that part of the young generation that is in fact integrated into Jewish life has on more than one occasion strengthened the adults' stereotypes on the subject of the young. The young generation has often let itself fall into the trap that the adult world has set for it, and does not realize that confronting the adult world on the basis of the same conceptual categories can only reinforce the process of mutual alienation.

Jewish institutional life suffers from a terrifying lack of creative imagination. My evaluation might be misunderstood as being totally pessimistic, since we cannot realistically expect an overall change in Jewish life which, in turn, would bring about changes in the sphere of youth. But I believe that if we want to break out of the vicious circle we must rely on youth. I believe there remains an important reservoir of Jewish identification among the young, and that it is they who will offer imaginative and innovative solutions. The flourishing of Jewish student newspapers in the US — although they may turn out to be short-lived — is an indication.

We can count on youth to show imagination, but the adult community must admit new ideas and not automatically label them as subversive. I do not advocate the financing of every proposal advanced by youth but I do believe that current criteria ought to be changed. The relationship between the adult community and youth groups should cease to be one between suppliers of funds and receivers of donations, and become a cooperative effort among intelligent and understanding people.

I am not presenting any ideal program. But I am sure that if the atmosphere of intolerance and narrowness in the communities continues, we shall lose the major part of Jewish youth. It may well be that the maintenance of this atmosphere will be considered necessary in order to assure the survival of the Jewish state and of the Jewish communities. If so, we must be aware of the high price we will have to pay.

Nor do I expect immediate results. One of the characteristics of Jewish life is that, whenever any innovation is suggested, prompt results are demanded. As a result, some of the best initiatives have been nipped in the bud.

I have said that Jewish youth does not feel that the organized Jewish communities are a place where it can live. The only alternative I see is for the Jewish communities to *become* places in which youth can live. Contrary to what is often thought, I do believe that Jewish youth wishes to live there. It is worthwhile investing our best resources in this. After all, the young of today are the adults of tomorrow, and it is to be supposed that all of us want them tomorrow to be within the framework of the Jewish people, and that the Jewish people of tomorrow should be better than it is today.

B. DISCUSSION

Mr. GUY ROZANOWICZ (*France*): Contrary to popular belief, Jewish youth is not a homogeneous group but is divided among the same political and cultural currents as the adult world. Similarly, assimilation is not the monopoly of the generation from fifteen to thirty years of age: the majority of uncommitted young people has its counterpart in the majority of uncommitted adults.

Jewish youth, like Jewish adults, is confronted with two major problems: assimilation and the absence of Jewish content. At the risk of generalizing, I would say that there are two kinds of assimilation. In the first type, the Jew loses his Jewish identity by melting completely into the surrounding population and concerning himself exclusively with its problems and aspirations. The struggle against this kind of assimilation is extremely difficult even for the most committed young Jewish activists, because we ourselves are the victims of another kind of assimilation, which is infinitely more pernicious: most of us affirm our Jewish identity essentially on the basis of non-Jewish values.

As a result of the Holocaust and the exodus of the North African Jewish communities, the traditional world of Judaism that our elders knew has disappeared. Most young Jewish activists today, having no knowledge of Jewish culture or values, feel Jewish not because of their faith in any ideal but in terms of their attachment to the State of Israel or of external historical pressures, such as anti-Semitism or the Middle East conflict. This type of activism may preserve the Jewish people as a people, but without spiritual content. In the long run, however, Jewish activism can make sense only as the practical application of specifically Jewish values.

I would say that the major responsibility for this state of affairs rests with the official Jewish communities and institutions. On the one hand, they have never developed a real or effective policy as regards youth, and tend to try to rid themselves of the problem by handing out some grants — often niggardly — to Jewish youth organizations; on the

other hand, the communities are becoming too technocratic and exclusively concerned with businesslike management of community affairs, notably through fundraising. On the youth level, this is reflected by the emergence of a "young leadership" which is exclusively action-oriented and unconcerned with the Jewish basis of this action. We cannot ignore political crises, but neither can we accept the transformation of the *kehila* into a business enterprise, unless we accept the reduction of Judaism to efficient community management. We must teach our youth that above all a Jewish community must have a Jewish soul and its members must be inspired to want to live and think Jewishly.

I think that it is the role of the World Jewish Congress to encourage long-term thinking along these lines, and I think that, given the ideological climate of the Western world today — where more and more voices are being heard in defense of the right to be different — it is a propitious time to do so.

Mr. MOSHE KATSAV (*Israel*): Jewish communities everywhere have the duty to inculcate their youth with national religious values and with a desire to help alleviate hardship in Israel. Jewish youth is capable of meeting the challenge. The World Jewish Congress, the State of Israel, and the Jewish communities should all cooperate in mobilizing the young for the struggle of Jewry and Israel. To this end, youth must be told about the historic, religious, and national rights of the Jewish people to Greater Israel. If there are today Jewish youngsters who are alienated from Judaism, it is we who are to blame for having failed to foster in them love for Judaism and Israel.

The development towns in Israel, which were established mainly in the 1950s to absorb the *aliya* from Muslim countries, have considerable social problems. The new immigrants have not yet been adequately integrated, and the standards of education are low. Jewish youth from the Diaspora could help solve these problems, if it decided to settle in these immigrant towns. The excessively homogenous composition of the population would thereby be changed, and the general educational level would be raised more rapidly.

Miss MARTINE OKONOWSKI (*World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS)*): The first difficulty that WUJS faces in its work is to build up a dynamic common consciousness among Jewish students, without losing sight of the different viewpoints, problems, styles, and approaches of its various national member unions. I think that WUJS, in this dialectic of diversity and unity, has succeeded in creating one of the broadest and most significant Jewish forums in existence.

However, there are other challenges, which WUJS cannot always overcome. The first of these is the poverty of the Jewish student world.

I do not deny that only an infinitesimal minority of young Jews throughout the world belong to Jewish student movements. We must make a great effort to attract students and then educate those we are able to reach. It is painful and frustrating for us to see the results of the weaknesses of the educational policy of the Jewish communities, and then to know that when our members leave student life, there will be no place for them in the rigidly structured communities. I must emphasize that we are not responsible for either of these deficiencies. WUJS is a parenthesis in the lives of its members; we can only improve on what already exists, bring out questions, increase sensitivity to Jewish culture and values. We do not have the power to change existing structures; we have no impact on real life.

The second challenge is of a political nature. WUJS is determined that the opinions expressed in its councils should reflect no influence but the democratic right of its students to be heard. Yet we are often victims of the tendency to label everything in Jewish life: WUJS is asked to declare allegiance to existing positions. The question that is most frequently posed in this connection is: Is WUJS Zionist or not?

Our answer is: we are neither Zionists nor anti-Zionists. We refuse to conform to such categories, just as we refuse to adhere to a party or a given political program. We know only this: we are the Jewish people, and Israel is the Jewish state. There is no doubt concerning our love for and solidarity with Israel and our brethren in the Arab countries and the USSR. But we ask for the right to our own language, our own approach to Israel. And we ask that each of us be free to decide as to the place of Israel in his life, as to his *aliva*, and as to his active participation in Diaspora Jewish life.

I think it is essential to respect, understand, and indeed encourage WUJS' desire for independence. A docile youth is not to be wished for by anyone. The future of our people depends on the political and cultural imagination of which youth is capable; and it is this creative imagination that we, through WUJS, ask you to support not only for us but for all young people.

Ms. NAOMI NOBEL (USA): The youth caucus at this Assembly, comprising delegates from every continent, feels that each regional Branch of the World Jewish Congress should initiate a critical evaluation of the relationship between Jewish leadership and its respective constituencies, including the process of selecting the leadership. We recommend that a profile be compiled of past leadership, covering at least ten years and including occupation, synagogue affiliation, political and organizational affiliation, and involvement in Jewish educational institutions.

We are concerned about the underrepresentation in Jewish leadership of certain important segments of the Jewish population, such as low-income-earning Jews, women, and young adults. The Torah recognizes the equal value of each Jew and this should be reflected in proportional representation. We support the move for an ongoing commission on youth, which, among other tasks, will further the development of leadership.

Miss RIVKA BOTSCHKO (*World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS)*): All young people attending this Assembly agree on the need to greatly improve Jewish education for all members of the community. Statistics show that many who completed Jewish schools and Talmud-Torahs, abandon Judaism because the level of teaching was not suitable for the modern world.

There is a lack of pedagogical training facilities for Jewish teachers, particularly in Europe and in Latin America, and the *shlichim* from Israel often do not understand the mentality of the people they have to deal with.

I appeal to all representatives of the Jewish people to encourage Jewish education in the communities, as well as innovations such as evening classes in Jewish studies for adults and summer camps for the entire family.

I also would like to propose to the Cultural Department of the World Jewish Congress to hold camps every year where Jewish teachers can meet, exchange opinions, and improve their professional knowledge; to establish a fund to support any group of Jews initiating a project of Jewish studies; to introduce innovations in curricula; to translate material on Jewish subjects into French, Spanish, German, and other languages; not to forget the small communities which are unable to look after themselves in the education field; to support and also help financially any youth movement undertaking informal education programs.

Mr. ROBERT GOLD (*USA*): The youth caucus suggests that this Assembly establish a standing youth commission of the WJC, to meet the unique problems of Jewish youth. In the framework of this commission, we propose the creation of an international information bureau in order to facilitate communication among Jewish youth leaders in the various communities. The bureau would also formulate a plan for promoting youth leadership. We would also like to suggest an international youth service league, which should be of assistance to any Jewish community in the world to which it could be helpful. This would be in line with the marvellous suggestion made earlier by Rabbi Hertzberg. Such a service, we hope, would include not only activities in the social realm but also those of a military character, perhaps even something

similar to Nahal. Finally, we should like the youth commission to co-operate closely with a new education commission, without, of course, duplicating existing programs.

Dr. JOSE E. MILMANIENE (*Argentina*): There are certain youth sectors that adopt an absolutely negative attitude toward anything having to do with the adult world and, in their attempt to produce change, fall into a kind of nihilism that brings about no changes at all. I think that the crisis of the generation gap can be solved only by gradual transformations.

The older generation, those who are in charge of organized Jewish life, have committed a grave error in not providing sufficient opportunity for the new generations to enter community leadership. It is essential to train leadership among the youth, but in most communities there are no facilities for doing so. This year the Delegation of Argentinian Jewish Associations (DAIA), the representative body of Argentinian Jewry, has taken a step toward remedying this situation in Buenos Aires by offering a training course in which it tries to rectify the myths and prejudices that many young people have concerning Jewish life.

There is another problem, perhaps even more important than the one I just mentioned, and it has to do with ideology. The social and political struggles in the world at large — and this is especially relevant to Latin America — offer possibilities for activity and development that are very attractive for young people. In contrast, our youth see a Jewish life that is parochial, passive, languishing, uncreative, and unimaginative. The Jewish community must offer our young people a vigorous, progressive-minded national and social challenge which will allow them to give expression to their strong temperament for change and revolution. As Mr. Bar-On said, we must forge a new, active concept of Jewish identity.

Mr. URI GORDON (*Israel*): In the Diaspora the young Jew is exposed to the steamroller of cosmopolitan culture. For him, the State of Israel is a fact, but he knows little or nothing of Jewish history, not to mention the role and activities of the World Jewish Congress. But if any of us thinks that here, in the State of Israel, things are any better with regard to Jewish education, he is mistaken. Have we, here in the Jewish state, succeeded in educating our young generation to acknowledge, to feel profoundly that above all it is Jewish — Jewish, with Israeli citizenship?

We have erred for many years in the way we have presented Israel to youth in the Diaspora. Many young people, having been taught to regard Israel through rose-colored glasses and expecting to find a country of kings and heroes, are sometimes shocked once they see the country from the inside, and this even causes some of them to break contact

altogether. We Israelis are mortals, and have the same characteristics as people anywhere else, both good and bad. This should be all the more understandable as our country has problems unparalleled in other countries. Only by revealing our true face can we demand of the young Diaspora Jew to collaborate more fully in the Zionist endeavor and come to Israel on *aliya*.

The matter of the centrality of Israel in Jewish life is not only a question of resolutions. We Israelis must turn our country into a better and more Jewish state if we want to assure the centrality of Israel. And we should not close our ears to criticism from the Diaspora. We need not only financial support from Diaspora Jewry, but also their advice and criticism, which I think will bring us closer in real collaboration.

As a means of furthering communication and understanding among all Jews, it is essential that Jewish education emphasize the learning of the Hebrew language, and I think that the World Jewish Congress has a role to play in this respect.

We support the proposal for the establishment of a permanent youth commission in the WJC, so that young people can communicate more easily with each other and try to mobilize Jewish intellectuals throughout the world in the service of the Jewish people.

Miss SIMONE WEINBERGER (*Belgium*): Jewish youth in the Diaspora is being alienated because Zionism, which at one time was a revolutionary movement, has become uncreative, overinstitutionalized, bureaucratic, and cut off from the reality of Jewish life in 1975. The slogan, "Make *aliya* because the *galut* means Auschwitz," is false, demoralizing, and scandalous.

Why have we not succeeded in channeling the tremendous potential represented by the idealism and enthusiasm of Jewish youth? The triumphant attitude that reigned in Israel between 1967 and 1973, the corruption and money-chasing in Israeli society, have not helped to mobilize the Jewish youth of the Diaspora, nor has the increasing social inequality in Israel, which is a scandal for Zionism and Jewish values. To all this we can add the contempt shown for the Palestinian people. Jewish youth, which is inspired by the ideals of peace, freedom, and justice, want to identify with oppressed people. We cannot be silent when people are tortured in Chile; we enthusiastically welcome the downfall of fascism in Portugal and Greece. The guilty or indifferent silence of the leaders of the Jewish communities, and of the leaders of Israel, are not likely to inspire young Jews, who are neither racist nor annexationist.

Peace in the Middle East requires mutual recognition by the Palestinian people and the State of Israel, and we will welcome a Palestinian entity to be established side by side with Israel in peace and harmony.

We should continue and intensify our efforts to combat assimilation and to involve Jewish youth in the cause of Israel, but at the same time we should try better to understand the aspirations of our youth and to treat them with less rigidity and more open-mindedness.

Mr. HARRY COOPER (*Australia*): It is disappointing that there are so few delegates and Presidium members present at the only session of this Assembly that is devoted to a debate on youth problems. It would seem that the adults pay only lip service to the importance of youth.

Jewish young people are not straying from Judaism today because they are consciously rejecting Jewish values, but because they are ignorant of Jewish values. The adult generation has failed to impart to Jewish youth any tangible Jewish learning. The Jewish communities have failed to make Jewish education their priority; they have failed to build educational institutions at the same rate as they have been building community centers and other wonderful edifices.

I would like to tell you of an innovative seminar program undertaken in 1974 by the Australian community, which numbers only 70,000 Jews. The seminars covered a wide range of Jewish topics, but the key to their success was the participation of fifteen students from New York's Yeshiva University. These dynamic religious young people, well versed in all aspects of Judaism, were able to communicate with our Australian Jewish youth. As a result of this project, we have had follow-up seminars, we now have *shiurim* on a regular basis, new youth *minyanim* are being formed, and the day-schools have opened their doors regularly at least once a month to informal Jewish education programs.

One of the lessons of this experience is that Jewish commitment can be imparted only by Jews who are themselves fully committed, and that the wishy-washy Judaism of many of our parents is not up to the task. The WJC must see to it that adequate funds are available for such informal Jewish educational programs. It is essential that small communities, where there are generally no other opportunities for learning about Judaism, put more effort and resources into Jewish education, both formal and informal; and the larger communities must help them with personnel and resource materials.

Mr. ANDRES HORBACOVSKY (*Argentina*): Latin America is a continent in crisis. In such an atmosphere the only element that can unite the Jewish community is the State of Israel and Zionism – and I mean active Zionism, not parlor Zionism.

In Argentina, following a period of dispute and rupture with the community, we of the active Zionist youth have recently begun to dialogue with adults of our community concerning problems affecting us,

such as Jewish education, assimilation, and the alienation of young people from the community. And we reach practical conclusions.

Much has been said here about the need for Jewish education. But we must bear in mind that Jewish education must have a Zionist goal, which does not mean keeping the flame alive in the *galut* but motivating the young generation to live in Israel.

We have many external and internal problems in the Jewish community of Argentina. But there also are positive developments, such as a new dialogue among leaders of the community. In this connection, I must say how proud I was of the position taken this morning by Dr. Resnizky, the head of our delegation, concerning the proper attitude of the Latin American communities faced with the changes in our region.

Mr. ANDREW OPPENHEIMER (*World Union for Progressive Judaism*): Everyone agrees on the need for our youth to be good Jews, but what does that mean? We of the Youth Section of the World Union for Progressive Judaism feel that it is essential to recreate a sense of obligation and love for *klal yisrael* and to create a sense of responsibility concerning the problems of the world in which we live. We must find a way of channeling into creative and Jewish acts the idealism and hope for the future that we young people feel. The commitment that is needed for this will not be achieved by preconceived, parochial ideologies but by creating *mentshn*.

I was amazed by Mordechai Bar-On's comment about the involvement of Jewish youth in general moral struggles. Which is more Jewish: to play bingo — albeit with other Jews — or to try actively and concretely, as our group has done, to help alleviate the suffering and dying people in Bangladesh? At the same time we are involved in various projects in Israel and in working with deprived children in European countries. We feel that this is the only way of seeking to create a total sense of Jewish obligation.

There is no question of a division among us between Zionists and non-Zionists, because we are all Zionists today. We differ only over how to build Zion, and our differences — provided they are always founded on love and never put our unity in doubt — are healthy and should not be hidden.

I hope that the World Jewish Congress will give its wholehearted support to the proposals of the youth caucus. I hope also that we will seek to break down the prejudices in our ranks as regards the outside world, and that we will not be afraid of the spiritual dimension of our Jewishness. Our guiding principle as Jews should not be a political ideology, but an abiding love for each other, for our heritage, for our land, and for our God.

Mr. RICCARDO BAUER (*Italy*): I am speaking in the name of Italian Jewish youth. In recent years Jewish youth has become more interested in and concerned with Jewish problems, and young people are particularly active in cultural programs, in which the communities are often deficient, as well as in research and educational projects, all of which increase Jewish identification and work against assimilation.

Many Jewish young people, particularly in Italy, are not affiliated with any political party, and wish to remain independent. The World Jewish Congress and the communities must support this desire and understand that the defense of the political independence of young people is vital for the continuation of Jewish youth in the Diaspora.

Mr. ALBERT MASSIAH (*France*): Lack of Jewish culture is one of the gravest threats to the future of French Jewry and the Diaspora in general. True, one of the causes is the apathy of a large part of Jewish youth toward its spiritual heritage. This apathy reflects ignorance, but it is also a result of official Jewish cultural policy, which treats Jewish culture in an elitist manner, imprisoning it, as it were, in universities and libraries and divorcing it from the people. Culture is more than a collection of works of literature and art; culture cannot be imposed, but must be lived; it is a dynamic whole that encompasses all aspects of Jewish life — from the intellectual to the culinary, and including aspects that are entirely irrational.

The communities have also erred by giving Jewish culture a uniform character, which by no means corresponds to reality. Sephardic civilization is based not so much on the written word as on customs and oral tradition, and both of these forms of expression are rejected by the West. As most of the best-known Jewish historians and thinkers have been non-Sephardim, Westerners, there is a tendency — when Jewish culture is transmitted — to favor the Western and ignore the Sephardic. This “centralization” has alienated many young people. We must promote a pluralism in Jewish culture that will provide an authentic Jewish context in which all of our young people will be comfortable and able to express themselves freely and dynamically.

Mr. ABRAHAM HILLER (*Argentina*): Although I am a member of the Argentinian delegation, I am speaking here on behalf of the Latin American Student Zionist Federation (FUSLA). With few exceptions, we in Latin America are living today under the oppressive policies of dictatorial regimes. Many of these regimes espouse policies that are quasi-fascist and ultranationalist, and our position as Jews is more endangered from day to day. In addition, we have to face the anti-Israel and anti-Semitic attitudes adopted by the nationalist Left as part of its commitment to the Third World.

What is our youth to do in such a situation? Many of us have clear objectives, and have chosen active Zionism as our cause. This is not the case with our communities, whose lack of a defined policy — both externally and internally — has reflected itself in a serious crisis in Jewish education. Today there is in fact not much difference between education in Jewish schools and general schools; this is why there is such a growing rate of assimilation. We are suffering from an identity crisis. We do not find a creative life within our own community and are losing our intellectuals.

To offer solutions here for all the Jewish communities of Latin America would be rather difficult. But as active Zionists, we believe that each and every one of them should commit itself to Zionism and reflect this commitment in its internal policies and in the educational field. And we ask the communities to offer their complete support to the youth, despite our political inexperience and our sometimes revolutionary concepts. We young people want to participate in our communities and their decision-making processes. We want to do this in the framework of a Zionist policy, which we believe is the only solution for the Jewish people in the Diaspora.

Mt. RON FINKEL (*World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS)*): Before concluding this session, I feel it necessary to remark that not one adult ventured to participate in the debate, which I think is indicative of the concern of the adult community for the youth community.

SEVENTH SESSION

Wednesday, February 5, 1975
(evening)

In the chair: Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN

1. GENERAL DEBATE: WORLD JEWRY IN A CHANGING WORLD (concluded)

V. ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN: In introducing our first speaker this evening, I shall not try to evaluate him objectively. He is much too young for that. When I was sixty years old, a friend of mine took me to the great painter Kokoschka and offered him a fabulous sum to paint my portrait. Kokoschka refused, saying: "You are much too young. Only older people have an expression which you can fix in a painting. Younger people are too fluid, and I cannot do it."

As I cannot evaluate the prime minister objectively, he will, I hope, not mind if I do it in a more personal way. Yitzhak Rabin has had three great chapters in his career. The first and longest, and in a certain way the most glorious, was a military career which ended with the Six-Day War. If any one person can be designated as the victor of that war, it is he. Being a complete *am ha'aretz* in military matters, it is not for me to evaluate this chapter, and in any event it would be superfluous after the miraculous victory that brought that chapter to an end for the time being.

I did not have the privilege of knowing Mr. Rabin then. The first opportunity I had of realizing what kind of a man he is was when I read the speech he gave at the Har Hatzofim ceremony after the victory. It is one of the glories of Israel that the victor of a war could have made such a speech, and it reflects not only on him: in this respect, he symbolizes the best that Israel has to offer to the Jews and to the world.

Mr. Rabin then entered upon his second chapter, when he became ambassador to Washington. Shortly after his appointment, I told him that I hoped that relations with America would be so wonderful and the situation so quiet that he would not have to prove his talents as a

diplomat. Unfortunately, my wish was not fulfilled, and he had to work in Washington in years that were very difficult for Israel. During those years he showed himself to be an outstanding ambassador. The proof was in what he obtained from America. Neither he nor I would say that he alone was responsible for the result, but he was certainly a central figure in the negotiations with Washington. As I have had the opportunity of knowing how Washington reacts to all Israeli ambassadors, I can testify how greatly they appreciated Mr. Rabin. To combine, without any period of transition, the qualities of a great commander with the methods of a very successful ambassador is quite unusual. The commander gives orders, but the worst thing for a diplomat to do is to give orders, and I am sure that on more than one occasion he had to remind himself that he must not be a commander but a diplomat.

Mr. Rabin has started his latest chapter, as prime minister of Israel. I shall not evaluate this chapter, because it is as yet much too short. I will say only that his becoming prime minister means much more than a change of personalities. It represents a turning point in the history of Israel — the first time that a Sabra, a representative of the new generation and the new type of Jew that Israel is creating, has assumed the highest responsibility in the country.

Mr. YITZHAK RABIN (*Prime Minister of the State of Israel*): First of all I should like to thank Nahum Goldmann for his words. I hope that as prime minister I shall be able to lead the State of Israel forward to peace, to increase its strength in all spheres, and especially to reinforce the ties between the State of Israel, as the Jewish state, and the Jewish people all over the world.

I welcome the fact that the World Jewish Congress is meeting in Jerusalem, and I welcome each of you to Jerusalem, the capital of Israel — or, better said — Jerusalem, the heart of the Jewish people.

We live in a period which I would define as the post-Yom-Kippur-War period. The Yom-Kippur War served as a kind of turning point. We are now in a period of difficulties that are greater than and different from those of the past. Unless we succeed in learning to be frank and honest with ourselves, confident but candid, also learning from the errors of the past, we shall not be able to find a proper dialogue and a correct approach to the future.

I am convinced that something happened to the citizens of Israel and the Jews of the Diaspora as a result of the Yom-Kippur War. There is a stronger desire to arrive at a dialogue, a comprehension, on a basis that perhaps did not exist before, or did not seem to be as necessary as it is today.

I should like to share with you my thoughts on the problems Israel is facing, and since we claim that Israel has proportionally more problems and more debts than any other state in the world, I do not intend to elaborate on all its problems. I shall deal only with the subject of politics and security and express some thoughts on the ties between Israel, as the Jewish state, and the Jewish communities in the world.

The political and security problems of Israel arose the moment the Jews decided to establish a sovereign Jewish state. If you were to ask me what is the essence of the Arab world's fight against us, I would say it continues to hinge on Israel's right to exist as a sovereign, independently viable Jewish state. If we were to cross this Rubicon, I believe that the basic obstacles in the path of peace could be removed fairly easily. For us, peace involves two things: the ability to live in a sovereign Jewish state, and security. These are the two fundamentals without which peace has no meaning.

If one looks back on Israel's struggle to gain her independence and maintain it in peace, one cannot but be struck by a strange phenomenon in Arab-Israel relations. Almost after every war, the Arabs have tried to return to what they had not agreed to, to what had existed, before that war. In 1947, the partition plan was decided upon. The partition plan was not unique as a solution in territories which had been under colonial rule and had gained their independence. Perhaps it is somewhat strange, but the two countries that gained their freedom within months of each other — the largest, India, and the smallest at that time, Israel — were both partitioned in the process of obtaining their independence. Both were partitioned according to the same criterion: religion. From India were created India and Pakistan. The Muslims demanded the establishment of Pakistan, a country consisting of two parts, separated from each other by 1600 kilometers. Today, the eastern part is Bangladesh. And when Nehru called on the Muslims to come and live in a democratic, secular state in which Hindus, Muslims, and Christians could live together, they answered: Thank you very much ! We, as Muslims, want to have the right to independent national determination. And they got that right.

At the same time, a second British territory — a British mandate — was partitioned according to the same yardstick. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the proportion of Jews to Muslims in Palestine was greater than the proportion of Muslims to Hindus in British India. Just as the Muslims in India insisted on their right to define themselves nationally, so did the Jews in Palestine insist on their national identity. The Arab world supported the Muslim demand in India. Not only did it oppose the establishment of the Jewish state, but it proceeded to war and bloodshed.

The results of the war are known. After the war I was a member of the delegation that negotiated an armistice with Egypt in Rhodes in 1949. We wanted more than an armistice: at that time we were prepared for *peace*, based on the frontiers as they were at that moment. But we were told: Peace with you — no ! So we agreed to an armistice as a first step on the road to peace. At that time we believed in the prospects for peace. There have been two periods in my life when I believed that there were good chances for peace. The first was then, in Rhodes, and the second, immediately thereafter.

In Rhodes, when the 1949 armistice lines — which are today called in political slang “the lines of June 4, 1967” — were fixed, the Arab states insisted that what was being discussed were boundary lines for purposes of a cease-fire, for military purposes, and that these lines could in no way prevent political demands from being raised during the transition from a cease-fire to peace. This is explicitly stated in clause 5 of each of the armistice agreements signed between Israel and her four neighbors.

After this, there was the Sinai Campaign, which changed nothing in Israel’s frontiers, although it brought about a lull, which was important. And thus, for about nineteen years, we lived with the lines which had been fixed in the armistice agreements. Every year Israel raised the demand at the United Nations for the signature of a peace agreement, based on these lines. And the Arabs would demand a return to the 1947 status, back to the partition plan, together with other demands which, in the situation prevailing in Israel, meant the dismemberment of Israel. The demand to take back the Arab refugees was, in effect, intended to turn Israel from a Jewish into an Arab state.

Then came the Six-Day War. It was not we who wanted it. It was not we who asked for the removal of the UN forces. It was not we who imposed the blockade on the Straits of Tiran. During the first stage it was, as far as Israel was concerned, a war solely with Egypt. Prime Minister Levi Eshkol made two approaches to Jordan — one through the United States and the other through the United Nations — promising that if Jordan ceased firing and did not attack Israel, the Israeli government (which was, incidentally, a government of national unity) would respect the existing boundaries. If King Hussein had shown greater wisdom and had accepted that proposal at the time, Jerusalem would still be divided and Judea and Samaria would still be under Jordanian rule. Hussein was badly led astray by the then president of Egypt, and the story is well known. After the Six-Day War and up to the Yom-Kippur War, the Arab demand was: Now we want the previous situation as a basis for peace. This was coupled with a formula — which

varies each time — on the subject of the Palestinians; and it is difficult to know, on the whole, whether this is not a formula whose function it is to introduce a Trojan horse into Israel.

Next came the Yom-Kippur War. The circumstances of the Yom-Kippur War are well known. When it ended, marvels had been achieved by the Israel Defense Army in spite of the difficult situation in which the war had opened. And then, too, I would say that the State of Israel showed generosity and greatness of heart. The Yom-Kippur War ended with disengagement agreements, and for the first time the lines were bad for Israel, in terms of mileage, as compared with what they had been at the beginning of the war. No previous Arab-Israel war had ended with Israel being in a less favorable geographical position than at the beginning of the war.

The State of Israel agreed to this concession as an expression of its readiness to promote peace. And in the day-to-day reality that evolved after the Yom-Kippur War, the State of Israel has searched, is searching, and will continue to search for ways to progress toward peace, a peace that will provide for the existence of a sovereign and secure Jewish state.

In my view there are two methods of arriving at that goal — at least in theory. The first is to say to our neighbors: There is only one way out of the present situation, and that is to pass in one go from war to a peace treaty. In the course of the negotiations, the questions in dispute must be solved, peace frontiers must be fixed, and overall Jewish-Arab relations defined.

The second method is to try and advance toward peace in stages, every such stage representing a step toward peace. Not only a withdrawal from territory, but also a step toward peace. The State of Israel is ready and willing to progress toward peace in every possible way. I honestly believe that the people of Israel wants peace, and that in exchange it is willing to make concessions. I am convinced, if the government were able to tell the people that there is a willingness on the part of an Arab state, or Arab states, to sign a real peace treaty, and that in exchange for this a lot will have to be given up — I am convinced that the majority of the nation would support such a proposal.

It is natural that there should be suspicion with regard to hypothetical assumptions as to whether peace is possible, without the other side saying so, and saying so clearly. As I have said, Israel is willing to advance toward peace. We are willing to sign a peace agreement with each one of our neighbors. We are prepared to make territorial concessions in order to arrive at peace, with one reservation: there will be no return to the lines of June 4, 1967, or, more precisely, the cease-fire lines of 1949.

I shall mention one more reservation. In my view there is no room for dialogue with those who practice terrorism and who head terrorist organizations, and this for the reasons I shall enumerate. (And I make a distinction between the question of terrorists and that of the Palestinians.) The terrorist organizations differ in their fundamental attitude, at least as far as their public utterances are concerned, from the leaders of the Arab states. When the leader of the terrorist organizations, Yassir Arafat, spoke before the United Nations, what was the essence of his concept, which he did not even bother to gloss over for tactical reasons? His concept was: the Jews are those who are of the Jewish religion, and that is all there is to it. They do not have the rights of a people, they have no right to self-determination. This is a negation of our very presence here. This is a betrayal of the 2000-year-old Jewish dream to return and reestablish a Jewish nation in a Jewish state.

He did not gloss this over. This is the essential concept of the terrorist organizations. With such people we have no basis for dialogue. If we add to this their methods of brutal murder, if we take into account that the Palestinian problem must in the final analysis be solved within the framework of a peace agreement between us and Jordan, I am all the more convinced that there is no room for talks with the terrorist organizations.

In my estimation, and to my regret, the Arab states are not at present willing to pass at once from war to peace. This was made clear two days ago by the joint declaration made by Assad and Gromyko. The Arab states, or some of them, want what they call a peace conference in Geneva. But the objective of such a conference, as can be seen from that declaration, would be to exert pressure — Arab pressure, with aid from the USSR and other important parts of the world — to force upon Israel, and perhaps also on the United States, a solution which would provide neither peace nor security.

Israel knows what the Arab states and the USSR want to obtain in Geneva. Israel does not fear a Geneva conference. If necessary, Israel will go to Geneva. She will fight for her right to obtain a real peace, to fix peace frontiers, and to determine her relations with the other states after peace has been achieved.

But we should not delude ourselves into thinking that there are great hopes for peace to be arrived at in Geneva. In the present state of affairs there is also another way open to us — and I think the government has been right to search every avenue to test and examine to what extent it is possible to advance toward peace by other methods as well. I am referring to the approach to peace by stages, the method currently in practice, advocated by the government of Israel. I have my own

views on this. I believe that in the final analysis the key to peace or war is first and foremost to be found in the relations between Egypt and Israel.

There has been no war between the Arab world and Israel in which Egypt did not lead the Arab world. No war has been ended without Egypt leading the way. In 1949, Egypt was the first to decide — on its own — to negotiate a cease-fire agreement. When this happened, all the other Arab states stood in line to enter the cease-fire negotiations. In the last war, it was Egypt who began the hostilities and Egypt who was the first to accept a cease-fire with us. Egypt was the first to agree to a disengagement agreement, and separately. When I look at the map of the Middle East, when I look at living conditions in the Middle East, I see every reason for the rulers of Egypt, if they really care for their people, to make peace with Israel. Thirty-five million Egyptians live west of the Suez Canal. In Sinai, which until 1906 did not belong to Egypt, there are only 80,000 Bedouins. I therefore believe that there is a basis — if Egypt's leaders prefer the welfare of their people to all kinds of ideas about hegemony in the Arab world — for arriving at a peace settlement with Israel. In this connection, I would like to draw attention to an interview with the former editor of *Al Ahram*, Hassanein Heikal, published two weeks ago in *Time* magazine. In this interview he supported the Nasserian concept that Egypt must give first priority to achieving hegemony in the Arab world. According to this concept, Israel is a geographical wedge which hinders contact between Egypt and other parts of the Arab world. Thus, anyone who wants Egyptian hegemony will consider Israel's existence unacceptable. I therefore hope that the desire to begin the peacemaking process will arise in Egypt and that it will be honestly expressed, even if in the first stage it is not declared publicly.

I hope the American secretary of state, Dr. Kissinger, will come here next week. This puts me under a certain obligation not to enter into too many details today. He is coming here in order to continue to explore the possibilities of promoting an interim agreement between Egypt and Israel as a step toward peace. I emphasize, *a step toward peace*.

I have recently read a number of statements made by the Egyptian president. He said, on two occasions in Paris and on February 2 before a conference of public-opinion makers in Egypt, that Syria and Egypt had no intention of attacking Israel. If the president of Egypt were to make such a commitment to Israel within the framework of a partial settlement with us, I think this would constitute a new opening and would greatly work in favor of an interim agreement.

If that is indeed what he is saying, and he is prepared to say it in the present situation, then there are two possibilities to be taken into consideration. Either it is a deception, in which case it should be exposed as such, or it is the truth, in which case it represents a serious opening. If, then, the president of Egypt is prepared to say in a binding manner to Israel that his country will not take up arms against Israel, I think that this is an opening for great hopes in our area. But, as they say in the army, let him say so *al hatofes* — in writing, in the framework of an agreement with Israel.

But, as is well known, Egypt does not talk to us directly. We have to hear it either through the press or on television. We must speak to them at times, to my great regret, by means of television. The only useful method of any kind left to us for dialogue is through the good offices of the US government. And this will certainly be one of the questions I shall have to ask the American secretary of state: What does the Egyptian president mean when he says this, and to what extent might this be backed up by a willingness to say it in a binding manner ?

I do not want to indulge in prophecies as to what may happen, not only next year but even next week. All those who tried to prophesy — there will be peace, there will be war, there will be calm, there will be tension — all of them were wrong in their prognostications. It seems that our sages were very wise indeed, and they ruled who had the gift of prophecy after the destruction of the Temple. As I do not count myself among those who think they have that gift, I shall not engage in prophecy but shall rather try to say in what direction we should work.

The direction in which the government has been acting is that of finding a way of progressing toward peace by an interim settlement with Egypt. I am convinced that this policy has given Israel the possibility of thoroughly exhausting the prospects, or searching for any prospects, for progress toward peace; and on the other hand, it has given Israel time and facilitated the understanding with the US government that enabled us to strengthen our military potential more quickly than at any other time since independence.

I do not deny that a risk is involved in pursuing this path. But I know of no path that does not contain risks. Doing nothing certainly is risky. Going to Geneva soon involves the risk of an almost immediate diplomatic freeze in addition to a possible worsening of relations with the United States.

Let me say in passing that some day, when historians investigate who it was who raised the idea of a partial settlement, they will not necessarily discover that it was the United States — but I shall say no more on that. I believe that, in the present circumstances, if it proves

possible to arrive at an Israel-Egyptian agreement that Israel feels it can accept, that would be the best and most realistic way to progress toward peace.

I ask myself an additional question. What will happen if it becomes clear — and I hope this will not happen but let us hypothesize that it will — that the effort to arrive at an interim agreement between Egypt and Israel will fail. I repeat: Israel will do everything to examine the possibilities of reaching such an accord; but let us assume that it fails. Then we will come to the other alternative, that of going to Geneva. That is to say that those in favor of a Geneva conference will not lose this possibility. But we will arrive at Geneva in the knowledge that we have exhausted all other possibilities, and that we have gained time to increase our strength.

Israel, at this moment, is still able to choose between two options, and from a position of greater strength than a year ago. Of course, where there are three Jews there are five opinions; and it is not easy when in a political process you must consider general policy, tactics, and public opinion. And if the prime minister or any other Israeli minister speaks to the French, German, or American public, it has repercussions in Israel. Every time I listen to the numerous statements of Sadat, I envy him. Nobody controls the number of times a day he speaks.

I would like to turn now to the subject of relations between the State of Israel and the Jewish people. The feeling of a common destiny was greatly strengthened as a result of the Holocaust, but has found greater practical expression in recent times. If I were to define the Jewish world today, I would say that it is composed of three constituents: the Jewish state, the Jews of the free world, and the Jews living under stress — a triangle of three interconnected Jewish problems. The Jewish state is fighting for its existence, for greater strength, for the achievement of peace, and in order to find its specifically Jewish uniqueness. What is the meaning, what is the uniqueness of the Jewish state? Is it only a haven for Jews? This is the most important thing. But because of the great number of tasks facing the state, the overall concept has not yet crystallized.

For Orthodox Jews, the answer is perhaps easiest and most obvious, but the entire question, and especially the nonreligious aspects, remains to be studied. This constitutes a challenge to the intellectuals among our people. In the Jewish state there have always been king, priest, and prophet. How should these realms be divided within the new Jewish state? This is an interesting topic which it would be worthwhile and necessary to examine.

As to the Jews in the free world, their central problem is how to preserve their Jewishness. How and what should be done to develop and construct tools and values that will maintain the Jewishness of the Jews ? I was born in Israel, not in the Diaspora. For five years I was ambassador to the United States, but would not set myself up as an expert on the question because of this fact. Nevertheless, I have the impression that religion has been and continues to be the most basic framework for those who are religious. If we do not search for a way of making Israel itself — and not only concern for Israel — into a central value in the life of the Jews, we shall lose a basic tool in the search for content to ensure the Jewishness of the Jews.

The third problem area reflects the old Jewish idea that “all Jews are responsible for each other.” I do not believe that it is possible to mobilize more Jewish action unless it is in the religious sphere, in the framework of the Israel question, or in the consciousness of Jewish responsibility for the persecuted Jew or the Jew who is in any kind of need, wherever he may be.

For the Jew living under stress, the answer is Israel, which gives him the hope of returning there and living there as a free man and a Jew: the belief that the Jews of the free world, by virtue of the concept “all Jews are responsible for each other,” will do all they can to enable him to live as a Jew, and to emigrate to Israel if he wants to.

Thus, this triangle of Israel as the Jewish state, the Jews of the free world, and the Jews living under stress, presents the overall picture. It will certainly be necessary to do a great deal of thinking in common, while maintaining the principles of Jewish sovereignty, of the sovereignty of Israel and the Israelis, bearing in mind the limits to Israel’s ability to dictate Jewish life — if indeed there is anyone trying to do this. Comprehension, dialogue, cooperation must be the basis for this process.

We will have to look for new ways, renewed contents, and new organizational frameworks to give more complete expression to the longing and need that arose after the Yom-Kippur War for the Jews in this Jewish triangle to act in unison.

Dr. Goldmann noted in his opening address that the Jewish world, and perhaps the free world as a whole, is entering into a new, more difficult phase. I agree with him. We should recognize this challenge and adapt our ideas and working methods to this new phase so that we are prepared to overcome the difficulties ahead. I hope that this Assembly will stimulate new thinking and new ideas to this end.

If we do not free ourselves of yesterday’s concepts, we will not be able to meet tomorrow’s needs.

Dr. GOLDMANN: Our next speaker, Pinhas Sapir, is one of my oddest and closest friends in Israel. I have been looking forward to this occasion, as I have never had an opportunity to say publicly how I feel about him. Pinhas Sapir is a very modest man. I am not an expert on economics, but in my opinion if there are a few persons who deserve the title of "Builder of the State of Israel," he is one of them. Ben-Gurion used to say that Pinhas Sapir, had he been born in America, would have been Ford and Rockefeller rolled into one. Some people may not agree with his economic methods, but I am sure I am speaking on behalf of all of you when I emphasize how much we owe to Pinhas Sapir for his role in building up the state.

He has now entered on a new period of his career. We know that he did not want to become prime minister and preferred to be chairman of the World Zionist Executive. As his new functions call for a great involvement with *galut* affairs, we will have many more opportunities to work closely together. I am sure he realizes that I am now becoming his "boss": I am chairman of the Claims Conference and he will be a vice-chairman; I am president of the Memorial Foundation and he will be a vice-president. I hope that our friendship will not suffer because of this new relationship. Pinhas Sapir will also be called upon to be active in the World Jewish Congress, due to the new relationship between the WJC and the World Zionist Organization to be established by this Assembly. Relations between our two organizations have been close for many years and, with his leadership on the WZO side, I am sure will be even closer in the future.

Mr. PINHAS SAPIR (*Chairman of the Executive, World Zionist Organization*): This is the first time that the World Jewish Congress is holding its Assembly in Israel, in united Jerusalem. Such a gathering should have taken place here years ago, but even though it tarried, it had to come. For Israel is the heart of hearts of the Jewish people.

Almost twenty-seven years have passed since Israel was proclaimed an independent state. In our Declaration of Independence we wrote:

The catastrophe which recently befell the Jewish people was another clear demonstration of the urgency of solving the problem of its homelessness by reestablishing in Eretz Israel the Jewish state, which would open the gates of the homeland wide to every Jew and confer upon the Jewish people the status of a fully-privileged member of the comity of nations.

And the reestablished State of Israel did indeed open its gates wide — and Jews from all over the world began to return to their land. From 650,000 inhabitants in 1948, we have today grown to a population of almost 3,000,000 — 3,500,000 including the minorities. We have followed the process of our growth, our increase, and our renewed strength like people in a dream. The fact that we are doubling, tripling,

and quadrupling our rate of growth has inspired us with wonder. And in the Diaspora, too, most Jews now stand erect and hold their heads high.

However, this marvellous process of "the children returning within their borders" has seemingly stopped, as if it had lost its impetus. The gates are wide open, but few enter. Our hopes remain high for large-scale immigration from East and West, but there is disappointment in our hearts.

And we have been confronted by another disappointment: we were certain, we believed with all our hearts, that the horrible memory of the Holocaust on the one hand, and the marvellous phenomenon of Israel's sovereignty on the other, would ensure the national survival of the Jewish people everywhere; that the rejection of the Diaspora and the emotional attraction of Israel would together totally wipe out the danger of the Jewish people assimilating and acculturating in its foreign environment. We thought that the Holocaust had taught our people that assimilation is no solution and national estrangement no way out. We also thought that an ancient nation, once it had its own sovereign state, would no longer be attracted by assimilation. But we were greatly disappointed: apparently the lesson of the Holocaust has become blurred and the vision of Israel's independence has lost some of its original radiance. On the one hand there is a growing and tenacious belief that what happened cannot happen again, and, on the other hand, Israel's sovereignty is accepted by many of our people as a fact, a matter of course, which no longer makes an impression or arouses enthusiasm.

Twenty-seven years after the establishment of the state, we again face serious phenomena of assimilation and alienation. And it is very possible that assimilation in our day is even more serious than it was in former times. In the past, assimilation was generally a conscious process — it was an intended assimilation. Nowadays, it may be unintended, nothing more than gradual absorption. We do not know of any ideology of assimilation today which is based on motive, on apologia, on reason. Nowadays, we witness the phenomena of ignorance, estrangement, and loss of identity, with no ideological connection. An indifference to Judaism, a lack of interest in keeping and preserving it, is at present our main problem. Formerly, assimilation was usually a response to the fact that "it is hard to be a Jew." Today's assimilation is usually an answer to the question: Why be a Jew, of all things? This awful question has many roots. It arises and results from specific factors of our time: free, democratic, and pluralistic societies; close contacts between Jews and non-Jews; a crisis situation in the Jewish family, which is progressively losing its Jewish values and is in any case losing the faculty of handing these values on to the next generation. There is perhaps a paradox here: the freer and more liberal a society is, the

better it prepares the ground for an assimilation born of indifference. The more hostile and alien a society and the more difficult the environment, the better it curbs and restrains the assimilation process. It is apparently against this background that one can explain both the Jewish renaissance in the Soviet Union and the many signs of Jewish decline in the West.

Unfortunately, Israel has not proved to be the lodestone to the extent that we wished. She is gradually becoming less attractive and less inspiring in the minds of Jews generally, and in the minds of the young Jewish generation in particular. We thought that at least to our younger brethren, Israel would signify the victory of the spirit and the ideal over matter and materialism; we thought that their rejection of the fleshpots would bring them here. But they are not interested in exchanging one fleshpot for another. And we have not succeeded, for some reason, in preserving a special character; we have not succeeded in continuing to cultivate our uniqueness; we have not been able to prove that we are indeed fulfilling what is proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, that this will be a State of Israel founded on the pillars of freedom, justice, and peace as visualized by the Prophets of Israel. Justice is indeed being done, but it is not always seen to be done. The justice of our struggles and our wars was clear and proven to us, but not always to others, and at times not even to our brethren in the Diaspora.

After the Holocaust of the Jewish people, after the birth of Israel, we took it for granted that the Jewishness of every Jew, wherever he was, was firmly established and not open to question. We only debated the question of how to turn him from a Jew into a Zionist. We were all under the impression that the distance between the two was not great and that it was possible to cover it without much effort. Perhaps, however, we were fundamentally wrong, and the distance between Jewishness and Zionism is greater than we estimated. Whatever the reason, we have not only failed to advance on our way; it is quite possible that we have lost ground. Our main struggle today is for Jewishness itself, for the soul of the Jewish people. If we do not recognize and acknowledge this fact, we shall lose a considerable part of our people and more and more Jews will be cut off from us.

Possibly, though, this loss of ground obliges us to come to an additional and far-reaching conclusion: no longer are Jewishness and Zionism separate and apart, like two stations on the road, two rungs of the ladder; if Zionism means the unity of the Jewish people and recognition of the central position of Israel — then Zionism and Jewishness must, in the present circumstances, be one and the same. Just as there is no Zionism without Jewishness, so it is very doubtful whether today there is Jewishness without Zionism. How can there be Jewish education today without Israel being central to it from the perspective

of both the past and the future ? The World Jewish Congress, which comprises the great majority of Jewish organizations in the world, Zionist and non-Zionist, must serve as the great mover in spreading Jewish education in the Diaspora, in deepening it and in improving its quality. The World Jewish Congress must wage an all-out battle against assimilation and acculturation. When we see millions of Jews losing their national identity, it is essential that the World Jewish Congress not confine itself to its political activity but take its place in the forefront together with the government of Israel and the Zionist Organisation, in order to join them in repulsing the waves of assimilation which threaten to engulf our people in all countries of the Dispersion. The World Zionist Organization has now concluded an agreement with the World Jewish Congress which will strengthen the collaboration between us. This agreement is based on clear objectives; on the recognition of the unity of the Jewish people and of Israel as the center of its life and its creativity. The agreement is based on the joint recognition that it is essential to make the World Jewish Congress function in a much more democratic manner.

The problem of Jewish education in the Diaspora is, to my mind, the most urgent problem for our survival as Jews. It is essential to set up — and set up soon — a movement for Jewish education comprising all Jewish organizations, whatever their framework. We must mobilize all communities, all organizations, and all political parties, for a struggle whose aim it is to keep the Jewish spark alive and save the body of Jewry from becoming feeble. It must be clear to all of us that a Jewish education that is not linked to Zionism has a doubtful lease on life. Judaism cannot regain its strength merely as a philosophic or existential concept. Judaism can recover its ancient glory only by being conceived as a challenge, a struggle, and a confrontation. There is no Jewish challenge nowadays other than the struggle for the sovereign existence of our people in the land of its fathers.

The world Jewish community must understand that it is facing a poignant and unambiguous choice: a Zionist Jewish education or liquidation — it is as simple as that. Jewish education based on a Diaspora ideology is simply no longer possible. If a Jewish community wants to retain its children under the aegis of Jewish philanthropy, this will in the end lead to one result only — the loss of its children through assimilation. It would seem that the period of ideological compromises in Jewish education — trying to have the best of both worlds — has passed, never to return. If anyone still believes that it is possible to strengthen a young person's identification with Jewishness without putting the stress on the revolutionary act of *aliya*, he is living under a dangerous illusion.

At a time when more than a million Jewish children do not benefit from any Jewish education at all, when about a third of the Jewish

marriages in the United States are mixed marriages and when in some countries the rate is even higher than that, there is no room for dispute about competencies, for quarrels over influence, for organizations to try to dominate educational ideology. At a time when hundreds of thousands of youngsters do not know the first thing about their Jewishness, there can be no discussion about the order in which education is to be provided — first Judaism and thereafter perhaps “also” Zionism. It is possible that in some places and in many cases Jewish consciousness can arise only after and as a result of Zionist knowledge. If Jewish youngsters visit Israel, serve here or study here, with us, this could constitute for them the springboard to a Jewishness which has hitherto been for them only a far-off, strange, and unknown world.

Many Jewish communities these days are only empty shells, without content. Even if such communities formally provide their children with a Jewish education, it is nothing but mere routine. Jewish education cannot take the place of a Jewish community and a Jewish home. If the community does not positively influence and enrich its Jewish education system, such education will not solve the problem of the existence and the values of the Jewish people. The community must therefore be aware of its situation, recognize its own limitations, and not content itself, for lack of choice, with temporary and artificial solutions. There is no ideological education without a challenge, without motivation, and in present circumstances there is no challenge and no motivation for Jewish education other than the central position of Israel.

While a Jewish community may have been able to do without these basics in its Jewish education system in the past, it is very doubtful that it can permit itself to do without them now, unless it has despaired of the Jewishness of its children. The Zionist Organization has now undertaken to implement a project for widespread action to change the face of Jewish education in South America. I hope that we have succeeded in ensuring the necessary funds for this action. We must prepare similar campaigns in other countries, but I must make it quite clear that the Zionist Organization is unable to do this on its own. The entire Jewish community must be mobilized for the urgent implementation of this task, and the Congress, with all its Branches and constituents, must do everything in its power to help in this sacred work.

The question I ask myself is the following: Are there any grounds for believing that the eyes of most Jews will be turned toward Israel because it is from here that their Jewishness will draw fresh life and strength? The question is whether we possess the light which can illumine the path for the young Jewish generation. Can Israel, in spite of its difficulties and problems, serve as a moral, spiritual, and cultural support for world Jewry?

We believe that there is more to Zionism than a national message: it holds, so we have always hoped, also a message for mankind in general. In this respect Zionism has followed Judaism, which has equally always conceived of itself as "a light unto the nations." The security difficulties and the economic problems turned our preoccupations inward toward our own concerns; the dimension of the human message and the universal mission grew smaller.

We began to feel that the opening to the world at large through which our unique light must be shed, was gradually closing, and that, almost imperceptibly, nationalist, religious, and cultural walls began to rise around us; an undesirable reality of "a nation that shall dwell alone" has turned into a kind of vocation, a kind of goal of national realization. We should be very worried by whatever represents us as "just another state," as "just another people in its sovereign state," which has been characterizing us more and more in recent times. If I may say so, it is not in this manner that we will enhance *aliya*; it is not through nationalism that the centrality of Israel in the Jewish world will be achieved.

Zionism never intended to create a solitary and isolated island here, surrounded by an ocean of hatred and enmity and eternal hostility. Through no fault of our own and in spite of our efforts we have not up to now succeeded in building bridges to our Arab neighbors. There are some among us who try to implant in us the belief that the Sambatyon dividing us from our neighbors is such a raging river that it is not possible at all to bridge it. In other words, they want to tell us that the war between us and the Arabs is one for all eternity. This is not the Zionist vision, and such a prospect is not likely to attract millions of Jews to us. And the attempt to prove it by signs and portents is only likely to repel many Jews.

Let us state things clearly: only a State of Israel which tirelessly and resolutely works toward a rational solution with its neighbors can become a national home for millions of the House of Israel. A State of Israel which excludes the possibility of an agreement acceptable to both sides of the conflict is condemned to keep to its present dimension and nothing more. Many of our brethren in the Diaspora are prepared to stand by us in repulsing any attempts to destroy us. However, they want also to be convinced that we have not lost our sincere belief that there will be an end to the wars, and that a settlement will come about in our region. Zionism was born in order to safeguard the lives of the Jews living in their land and of those coming to that land. And let us not forget for one moment that only through peace can our life and our existence be safeguarded; and though peace may tarry, it will surely come. Therefore, let all our efforts be directed toward strengthening Israel and bringing peace nearer.

Let us not fall prey to the Spartan notion to which the difficulties of our existence have given rise. Let us not be taken in by slogans which are alien to the Jewish and the Zionist spirit, in spite of the desperate attempts to hitch them on to the traditions of ancient Israel. During my travels among world Jewry I never had the feeling that there was any doubt about it being possible to make the aims of Zionism come true without "Greater Israel." I never heard people say that it was essential to retain all the territories in order to establish a national home in the broadest and most comprehensive sense. The Zionists of the first *aliyot* did not begin by establishing themselves in densely populated Arab centers in particular; they sought empty and free spaces. A realistic approach was the cornerstone of Zionist realization; concession was a very fundamental principle; and, fortunately for us, the movement was guided by people filled with faith and consciousness. Men of action, motivated by building and creating, they were at the same time ready to make concessions when the need arose. In agreeing to partition, they certainly made a concession, but this was the only way that would ensure the establishment of the State of Israel.

In order to try and renew our power of attraction, which has weakened somewhat in recent years, we must make clear to ourselves and to Jews everywhere that the State of Israel was established in order to serve as a dwelling place for a population whose absolute majority would be Jewish. Jews will be drawn to Israel from the East and the West, from the United States and from the Soviet Union, guided first of all by the desire to live a Jewish life in a Jewish state, among Jews.

The processes and tendencies of the late twentieth century must make all of us realize that the Jewish people cannot exist without the State of Israel. But neither is the existence of Israel safe without the Jewish people, without a constant stream of *aliya* flowing from that people. This mutual affinity, this total reciprocity, this complete interdependence between us and the Diaspora, should weaken the influence of isolationist circles, the importance of different identities, and the significance of separate organizations. If we share one fate, if we have one supreme task — then we are one organism. And this great organism must undertake the realization of *aliya*.

Aliya to Israel will not only be the work of the *shlichim*, whatever their ability. Not through *shtadlanut*, not by moralizing, and not even by persuasion, will we obtain a large *aliya*. The call to *aliya* must come from the inside, from the Jewish community itself, from the heart. From now on, the fate of *aliya* must be entrusted to the Jewish people itself, in every country, in every community, and in every Jewish home. If they do not give an impetus to this mission and shoulder this burden, the *shlichim* will not be able to come to their rescue. This task, which

is of the utmost importance, will give content to the structure of the Jewish community, will strengthen it, will infuse it with life, and will bring it back to its old glory. It would be desirable for the Jews of the world to accept this mission of *aliya* well in time, the earlier the better. Not a few communities clutched at *aliya* only when the earth began to tremble and the ground began to give way under their feet. Do not wait until it is too late, recognize the importance and utmost value of *aliya* while the ground still holds and while you are still firm on your feet. We in Israel will not spare any efforts or guidance, we will not refuse aid and support, our *shlichim* will do all they can to bring the required information into every home and reply to all questions asked.

A lot is being said about the need to reinforce the military strength of Israel. This need is self-evident, resulting from the political and security conditions which have accompanied the state since its establishment, and which prevailed even before then. But military strength, a prime condition for our survival, is not sufficient on its own. A state, in particular a peace-loving state, cannot exist, either physically or spiritually, without firm economic foundations. While continuing to fight for our security, we have succeeded in less than one generation in changing from an economically underdeveloped state with primitive market conditions into one with exports amounting to more than 3,000,000,000 dollars a year, representing 1000 dollars of annual exports per inhabitant. This is a tremendous achievement for such a small state. Unfortunately, the needs have not lessened during this period but have rather increased, compared with those of other states, and we have to import enormous amounts primarily because of our security requirements.

During all these years we have benefited from the help of world Jewry, which, since 1967, has transferred about 5,000,000,000 dollars to Israel. One half of this sum was donated as contributions, and the other half consisted of loans. The principal machinery mobilizing these funds were the Magbit, under its various names in various countries, and the Israel Bonds Organization. Although these sums constitute only a small percentage of the expenditures of the Jewish Agency and the government, their economic importance, not to mention their weight as an expression of identification with Israel, has been considerable. As against this, business investments have been relatively small. It is true that we do not measure the involvement of world Jewry in Israel's economy only in terms of investment capital. The advanced know-how and the contact with other markets that foreign investors bring to us are extremely important. All of us should nonetheless be aware that despite the many efforts made in order to attract investments, the response of the Jewish sector, which can take an active part in the development of the Israel economy, has been inadequate.

The need for world Jewry's help in order to develop the Israel market economically has acquired a new and important dimension today, for two main reasons. The economic power of the Arab states has been greatly strengthened by the enormous wealth which has accrued to some of them. The oil states, some of which consider themselves in direct confrontation with Israel, have seen their income increased fourfold and more within the past eighteen months or so. These large funds are used in order to purchase arms directed against Israel, and serve as a basis for activities within the countries of the Western world aimed at isolating the State of Israel through the combined power of oil and money. One of the ways in which we can react is by strengthening Israel's economy. We have always been a few facing many, and now we also have to face tremendous sums of money. Israel's citizens alone are unable, in spite of the heavy tax burden, to mobilize the resources required for this confrontation. This will only become possible if world Jewry lends a hand and enters wholeheartedly into the task of developing the various sectors of Israel's economy, first and foremost the industrial sector, which holds the key to a modern economy and to the absorption of immigrants in conditions of acceptable living standards.

The second reason necessitating the mobilization of the economic forces at the disposal of the Jewish people is that there are signs indicating that Arab money works not only against Israel but also against Jews wherever they are. I should like to believe that the Western world has not sunk so low as to make such discrimination possible. Nonetheless, the mere fact of this possibility is an additional reminder, if one were needed, that the enemies of Israel conspire against the Jewish people wherever it may be. Their argument that their hostility is directed only against Zionism is only a flimsy pretext.

The answer lies above all in the strengthening of the ties between the Jewish business community, which is an important element in the most developed world markets, and the Israel economy. We, the Israelis, have proved that we know how to utilize the means put at our disposal. Now, more than ever, it is necessary for these means to be channeled to us.

The eyes of the world are now on this area, and we must achieve two things which are most urgent. First, we must prove that a small state can develop a modern economy although it must at the same time fight to preserve its sovereignty, keep to its vocation of absorbing immigrants, and ensure that its society is a progressive one and can serve as an example to others.

Second, we will thereby give proof that the strength of the Jewish people has not waned. On the contrary, we know that the force of

ancient Israel is still with us — in science, in culture, and also in the economic field. But we must ensure that others, too, become aware of it. There is no better manner of achieving these aims than to harness Jewish economic ability, talent, and potential for the strengthening of the Israel economy.

When the nations of the world, and our Arab neighbors in particular, see that even under the present circumstances, we can increase our population through immigration and become more powerful economically, this will be decisive proof of Israel's vitality. Her opponents will gradually become used to accepting her presence. It is this recognition, even if it is at first a grudging one, which will lead to negotiations that will, I believe, bring peace in their wake and open a new era for the population of Israel and the Jewish people as a whole.

If Israel is to become a light unto the Jews of the world, she must renew her image. She must be an antithesis to the norms of life in a materialistic world which is acquisitive and shuns values.

Israel must be a state founded on a society of cooperation and commitment, a society whose margins are narrowing and which is all center, all heart, all kernel; a society joined to each of its citizens by a thousand filaments, veins, and arteries; a society knowing how to assess and accept the contribution of each individual and in which there is no individual withholding his contribution; a society knowing how to elevate each citizen and increase his value, both as a Jew and a human being, and not at the expense of his fellow man but together with him, by and for the community as a whole, its spiritual and material resources; a society which does not trample underfoot and does not repel by obtuseness, indifference, and strangeness, but a society emphasizing the unity which implies uniqueness, a society knowing where it is heading, and causing all eyes to turn to the essential aims, to the correct priorities, to the most vital challenges.

If we can acquire all these characteristics, then all the rest is merely a question of implementation. If we act in conformity with Zionist values, our national home will continue to benefit, to gather strength, to take in additional millions of Jews, to be an inspiration for the imagination, the dream, the desire for realization cherished by our Jewish brethren all over the world.

Let us leave here united and prepared for great deeds to shape the unity of the Jewish people, to give effective impulse to promoting and deepening Jewish education — a great factor in *aliya* — and to concentrate all our forces for the greater strength, development, and prosperity of the State of Israel.

2. MESSAGES FROM JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

The following two messages were read to the Assembly :

We use this opportunity to send our heartfelt greetings to the delegates and the guests of the Congress. We wish the Congress success in its fruitful work for the good of the State of Israel and the whole Jewish people.

Knowing about the great and careful attention which the World Jewish Congress pays to the problems of *aliya*, and especially *aliya* from countries in which there are difficulties in connection with the repatriation of Jews, we would like to express our hope that the efforts of the Congress in this direction will not weaken and that it will continue its active and extremely necessary efforts directed to attaining these noble and humanistic goals.

We, a group of Jews from Leningrad who have been waiting for many months and years for permission to emigrate to Israel, believe, in spite of all the obstacles in our way, that the hour is not far off when our desire and our most cherished dream will be realized and when we will be able to join our people in Israel.

Leningrad

Yampolsky, Chertin, Sokiryansky,
Kazakevich, Strugach

* * *

Together with the Jews throughout the world, we, the Jews of the Soviet Union, send our greetings to the World Jewish Congress and wish its members successful solution of the most important problems which our nation is facing.

We hope that the World Jewish Congress will make a significant contribution to the consolidation of the Jews throughout the world, to the mobilization of their efforts in support of the State of Israel. We are confident that the existence and prosperity of the State of Israel is a guarantee of our people's existence in the future. We are compelled to inform you that the situation of the Jews in the USSR continues to remain tragic. The latest victim of this situation was Dr. Mikhail Shtern, who was sentenced in December 1974 to eight years of imprisonment in camps of intensified regime. The Prisoners of Zion are being kept in extremely harsh conditions in the camps.

Soviet propaganda brings down torrents of slander on the Jewish people, on their past and their present, on their religion and culture, on Zionism, and on the State of Israel. There are no Jewish national institutions of any kind, be it in the political, social, or cultural field.

It is natural that under such conditions most of the Jews in the USSR are losing the elements of Jewish culture. They are losing their ties with the past, and do not see any prospects for the future as part of the Jewish people. Yet, another tendency is developing in the Soviet Union, a tendency of reunification with the Jewish people in the State of Israel. One can judge the strength of this tendency by the fact that tens of thousands of Soviet Jews have managed, despite the extremely difficult conditions, to emigrate to the State of Israel. At the same time, there exists a large group of Jews who are still deprived of the possibility to leave and who are continuing their struggle for the realization of their dream.

We sincerely hope that the World Jewish Congress will make its contribution to the struggle for their right to emigrate to Israel and for the improvement of the situation of the Jews in the USSR.

We would like to draw the attention of the delegates of the Congress to the fact that the tendency of the Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel is directly dependent on successful absorption. In this connection, we think that the problem of absorption must become the concern of world Jewry as a whole and we would like to ask the Congress to take steps in this direction.

Shalom.

Respectfully yours,

(Signatures of 150 Jews from
Moscow, Leningrad, Vilnius,
Riga, and Kiev)

EIGHTH SESSION

Thursday, February 6, 1975
(morning)

In the chair: Maître DAVID LAMBERT;
later Rabbi WOLFE KELMAN

THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS IN A CHANGING WORLD

A. INTRODUCTION

FORTY YEARS OF WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS – ACHIEVEMENTS AND TASKS

Maître DAVID LAMBERT (*France*): For those of you who are new to the World Jewish Congress, I will say a few words about our next speaker. Born into a family of jurists and trained as a jurist himself, Gerhart Riegner left Germany when the Nazis came to power in 1933. In 1936 he was asked by Nahum Goldmann to head the Geneva office of the Congress. During the war, Dr. Riegner earned the recognition of world Jewry through his role in drawing the attention of the Western Allies to the plight of the Jews of Europe and trying to arouse the conscience of the American and British governments to do something about it – a difficult and thankless role, full of disappointments. Since the war he has been intimately involved in all the international activities of the WJC in favor of Jewry. He was one of the prime movers in the establishment of the dialogue with the Christian churches and continues to play a capital role in this sphere. He is particularly qualified to speak on the past and future of the WJC.

Dr. GERHART M. RIEGNER (*Secretary-General, World Jewish Congress*): I have been asked to speak today on the forty years of the World Jewish Congress, its achievements and its tasks. I am proud to be able to make this account today, after nearly thirty-nine years of service to the organization. I am proud to have seen the growth of our movement, and I am proud to belong to it today, when in a particularly difficult period it will have to show that it has the maturity to face the changing world whose problems we have been discussing during the last two days.

What are the achievements of the World Jewish Congress and what are its tasks ? I will try to present to you, in telegraphic style, some of its accomplishments during the last forty-three years — if you count from the first preparatory conference in 1932 — or the past thirty-nine years, if you count from the constituent Assembly of 1936.

We started as a small group fighting against the rise of Nazism and warning of its dangers. We have become, in these forty years, the most representative Jewish organization that exists today. We are not yet the universal body that we want to become, but we have made colossal progress since our beginnings. We are still missing some important bodies in the United States of America. We are still missing amongst us very important communities of Eastern Europe, notably the great Jewish community of the Soviet Union, which are prevented by political conditions from joining us. But the recent decision of the Board of Deputies of British Jews and the formal entry of this important organization into the Congress this evening represent yet another great accomplishment in Jewish unity. The Jewish community of Denmark has also recently joined us, and, a few days ago, thanks to the untiring efforts of our good friend Hilel Storch, the Stockholm Community Board decided to recommend to its larger body its affiliation to the World Jewish Congress, and we hope this will take place in the next few weeks. In Western Europe today, we have in fact only the question of the affiliation of CRIF in France, where we have a very active Section and where we maintain very good relations with this representative body of the Jewish institutions of France.

I hope that the presence here of the important B'nai B'rith delegation will contribute to bringing our two organizations closer to each other and ensuring a gradually ever-growing measure of cooperation; and perhaps one day we will also see them formally in our ranks. In the United States we also have the question of the American Jewish Committee, which is also represented by an observer here, and which I hope will also find its way into the community of Jewish organizations, which it has for many years felt unable to join in a formal way.

We are therefore nearing a chapter where the unity of the Jewish people will in reality be established, at least in a formal way, and there is no doubt that the representative character of the World Jewish Congress is today much greater than it has ever been. If some journalists in Tel-Aviv tell us that the Congress is an organization of a few people who support Nahum Goldmann and that the Board of Deputies and others are not representative organizations, we say to these gentlemen that the representative character of the Jewish communities and bodies throughout the world is not determined in Tel-Aviv, but by the communities themselves.

This expansion of the Congress constituency indicates the great progress that the basic tenets of the Congress philosophy have made throughout the Jewish world — the concept of the unity of the Jewish people and its joint action on common problems. It was still a revolutionary idea in the 30s, when the foundations of the Congress movement were laid. It is today practically universally accepted. Today it is not the basic concept of Jewish unity and action, but rather its application that is from time to time challenged or subject to discussion. The tendency to establish special international Jewish bodies for particular situations must be resisted. The multiplication of Jewish organizations is, in the final analysis, divisive and does not serve but rather impedes the progress of Jewish unity. The Congress is a large enough forum for all Jewish trends and opinions to meet and to discuss in common, and in complete freedom, all the basic problems with which the Jewish world is confronted, however divided the opinions may be on some of the issues.

We have certainly attained great respect for the Congress in the non-Jewish world, where the WJC is recognized as the most representative Jewish organization. Regular contacts have been maintained or developed with many governments and influential political personalities and groups. The representations of the Congress have always been received with respect and understanding. Consultations with the Congress on important Jewish matters have often been sought by governments themselves. The president of the Congress has on numerous occasions been received by heads of state and government, both in the West and the East; and in the nongovernmental world the Congress has pursued a policy of friendly consultation with all significant international movements, whatever their political or religious tendencies and whatever their specific field of interest. It has succeeded in establishing excellent relations with many of these organizations and in interesting them in many of our concerns, and is today considered one of the pillars of the community of nongovernmental organizations.

We have succeeded in establishing harmonious relations with our affiliates, and I owe it to them to express particular thanks and appreciation, because they have, on the whole, shown unswerving loyalty and attachment to the Congress. Whenever we have asked them to make representations to their governments or to local authorities, or to support the efforts made by the Congress in matters of general Jewish interest, their response has always been immediate. This would seem to be decisive proof of their attachment to the idea of the Congress and its action.

Moreover, the Congress has succeeded in building up an excellent group of collaborators during these years, perhaps the most competent

that any Jewish organization has assembled. And it has been able to create a unique bond of loyalty between the Congress and its co-workers. It is not rare to find high officials of the Congress who have served in our ranks, despite the modest remuneration they receive, for 20, 25, 30 years and more. They are not only employees. They are real collaborators with responsibilities and status, who sit with equal rights in the councils of the Congress, and are listened to with respect by the lay leaders.

We are proud to have acquired in recent years young collaborators who have joined us in pursuing the same goals, in the same spirit of comradeship and team spirit, in our work for the Congress.

This is the place to express my gratitude for the untiring efforts and devotion of the heads of the departments — my friends Roth, Kaplan, and our new colleague, Mr. Harkavi, and to their assistants and co-workers; to the WJC regional directors, Max Melamet, Marc Turkow, and Natan Lerner, and their assistants; to the other directors of the World Jewish Congress; and to my own assistants. I include in this homage the secretaries who serve our national affiliated bodies, with whom we work day in and day out, and who in a sense are the complementary officials of the World Jewish Congress network throughout the world.

Let me not forget at this moment to greet WJC veterans who after decades of service have left the Congress and are now enjoying a well-deserved retirement. We have the great pleasure to see amongst us Alex Easterman and Maurice Perlzweig, who for decades served and led the diplomatic activities of the Congress with great distinction. And we have with us Aryeh Tartakower, who has, in no less a distinguished manner, served the Congress in many capacities, and who is now writing the history of the World Jewish Congress, which I am sure nobody else could do with the same competence.

I send a word of greeting also to our old friend Aaron Steinberg, who headed the Cultural Department in London for over two decades and who remains in our deep affection.

The political achievements of the World Jewish Congress cannot be put together in a short address of an hour. I can only give you a few striking examples of what the Congress has been involved in and what it has done.

The Congress, as Dr. Goldmann said at the opening session, was the organization that warned the world at large, and the Jewish world in particular, of the danger represented by the Nazi movement. The Congress was the first to communicate to the world the plan for total extermination of the Jews. It played a decisive part in breaking the

financial blockade during the war, and in the limited positive action that could be taken to save whatever could be saved.

The Congress conceived the postwar program of the Jewish people, in Atlantic City in 1944, at one of the most memorable conferences in modern Jewish history — a program which, together with the Biltmore program of the Zionist organization, became the basis of Jewish action after 1945. All the concepts with which we have dealt during the past quarter-century — the restoration of Jewish rights where they had been abolished; the concept of German reparations; the punishment of war criminals and crimes against humanity; the concept of claims to the heirless property of those who perished in the Holocaust; the fight for human rights; the support for the establishment of the Jewish state — all these were the guiding lines of the Atlantic City conference.

The World Jewish Congress has made a lasting contribution in the field of human rights, inside and outside the United Nations, in the elaboration of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, at least five of whose articles bear the mark of WJC efforts. We have contributed to the elaboration of the covenants on human rights; the two conventions on the elimination of discrimination in the fields of occupation and education are the results of initiatives from the World Jewish Congress. The Congress played a leading role in the German Reparations Agreement and, indeed, in elaborating its whole underlying concept. The very detailed chapter on this subject in my printed report to this Assembly is a unique document from a Jewish, general, and historical point of view, and recounts the fantastic result — for the Jewish and German peoples, and for the people of Israel.

We are proud of our record in the field of the protection of Jewish rights in North Africa. I believe that it was only thanks to the foresight and vision of the World Jewish Congress that the North African Jewish communities, particularly in Tunisia and Morocco, lived through the period of their first years of independence without any clash and without any serious incidents. If today a great part of the Jewish communities of Tunisia and Morocco, probably more than 400,000, are living here in Israel or in France or Canada or some other country, it is thanks to the negotiations that my friend Easterman and I conducted before the independence of these countries in order to secure equality of rights, including the right of emigration, that these people were able to leave those countries when the necessity arose. It is a unique record of planning and foresight that we have shown in the field of North African Jewry.

We have a similar record of positive action with regard to the rescue of Jews in other Arab countries, especially here in the Middle East. From the petition we submitted to the United Nations in 1948, resulting in the adoption of a special UN resolution and the trans-

mittal of the whole record to the Security Council, up to our successful efforts in recent years to save the remnants of Egyptian and Iraqi Jewry, our record has been a very positive and constant one. We have succeeded in emptying and saving these communities, with the sole exception of Syria, whose government nobody so far has been able to move.

Although the Congress' role in the struggle for Soviet Jewry has been criticized, I want to repeat — and this is borne out by the record — that this criticism is unjustified. The WJC was the first organization publicly to raise the Russian Jewish problem, at its Executive meeting in 1957 after the death of Stalin, because before Stalin's death we did not dare raise this problem out of fear of reprisals. It was the Congress that was the first to call together the first international conference on the problem of Soviet Jewry, in 1960. If you want to know the record of the Congress in this regard, read the chapter on this subject in my report of WJC activities.

It was the Congress that was the pioneer throughout the years, and especially in the late 50s, in the question of Christian-Jewish relations. I am not going to give a report on this here, but I hope to be able to say something at the General Political Commission. I am pleased at the presence here of Dr. von Hammerstein, as the official observer of the World Council of Churches. I am glad to state in his presence that we have made considerable progress, conceptually and otherwise, in this field.

We have sought an ongoing consultative process with the major forces and institutions of the Christian churches, instead of casual and occasional contacts. We have sought conditions of equality under which these consultations have to take place, at the same time recognizing the basic differences which exist and which should be respected. We have tried to establish in this respect a united Jewish front in order to do away with the splintered approach of the Jewish organizations in this type of work. I am glad to say that in all three of these endeavors we have succeeded.

I believe that the recent audience of the international liaison committee between the Catholic Church and world Jewry with the pope is sufficient proof of the progress which has been made. Many in the Jewish world do not know or understand what happened there. This was not just an audience of a few Jews with the pope. This was an official consecration by the highest authority of the Catholic Church of an official liaison committee between the Catholic Church and the Jewish people on an equal footing. If the *Guidelines* and the establishment of a special Church commission on the Jews are in themselves an important step forward, the fact that these particular decisions were

taken at this moment in Jewish history implies a political act of great importance which I leave to you to judge and to evaluate in the right way.

I would like to speak extensively about our contribution in the cultural field, but I have to be very sketchy. In this field, as in many others, it is very difficult to cite particular points of achievement, because the cultural process is a stream that develops by anonymous forces and which you cannot seize and point to things which you have influenced. I can say, however, that we have made some outstanding contributions in this field. We were first really to formulate the concept of a Jewish cultural policy vis-à-vis the non-Jewish world. One of the greatest contributions in this field, which is completely unknown, is the contribution of Dr. Aaron Steinberg, who saw to it that the cultural and scientific history of mankind that was being written by a special committee of Unesco dealt with the contribution of the Jewish people throughout history, century by century, in all its phases. Normally, if you open a general textbook you will find a chapter on the Jews in antiquity; then there is a long hiatus, and suddenly in 1948 a Jewish state appears. The persecutions to which Jews have been subjected throughout the centuries may be mentioned; but the positive side, the cultural and spiritual influence of Jews throughout history, is completely suppressed. Thanks to the efforts of Dr. Steinberg, the Unesco undertaking does not follow this pattern. This standard work, which will be reproduced in many languages, will serve as the basis for hundreds of smaller books and pamphlets. This is a lasting contribution from the point of view of our representation as the Jewish people in the history of mankind.

A Jewish cultural policy of the Jewish people can only be based on a pluralistic approach. We welcome any positive cultural endeavor or activity, whether it comes from strictly religious, less religious, Conservative, Liberal, folkist, or whatever other trends that exist among our people.

In recent developments in Jewish education, our 1959 Stockholm Assembly will go down in history as the place where Jewish education was proclaimed the greatest and the first priority in Jewish life. If the concept of Jewish education has made some progress in our minds and in the minds of the general public since then, it was in Stockholm that, for the first time, such an assembly of Jewish representatives from all over the world proclaimed this as the first priority.

The WJC can take great credit for the establishment of the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture. The idea of not spending the last dollar of the Claims Conference funds, but of using the last installment of the German reparations money for a permanent institution for Jewish

cultural activities, came from the British Section of the World Jewish Congress. It was against the considerable opposition of the welfare organizations and others that we succeeded in bringing it about. What the Memorial Foundation is doing today is one of the most important activities in Jewish life. For the first time, and I hope it will grow, there is a permanent fund for activities which are not just philanthropic, but educational, cultural, research, and so on.

Although I cannot go into our other activities in the cultural field, such as our work among academics, I should mention the colloquia of French Jewish intellectuals, which are one of the most remarkable contributions to contemporary Jewish thought. I regret that their proceedings, which have been published in book form and have been reviewed very favorably in the press, are not yet available in other languages. I can only recommend to you to become acquainted with them if at all possible. In the field of popular education, our friend Turkow has made an outstanding contribution in Latin America with the Popular Jewish Library series, hundreds of thousands of whose booklets have been distributed and sold to Jews and non-Jews, particularly youngsters, all over the region. Well over 150 titles have already appeared.

Also due to lack of time, I cannot go into the research activities of the Congress to the extent I would like. My friend Dr. Roth will I hope forgive me if I limit myself to saying that the Institute of Jewish Affairs, which before him was under the directorship of Jacob and then Nehemiah Robinson, has a very fine record and has made very lasting contributions to the political activities of the Congress. I hope he himself will say a few words about the Institute in order to bring this aspect of our activities before you.

I see from the clock that I have given too much time to the past. I will now go to the future and I hope you will excuse me if I take a little more time than I originally expected. Our task for the future is of course to adapt the Congress and its machinery to the new world of which we have spoken so much in the last few days — a world of change and uncertainty. The greatest change in the Jewish world that has come about since the time we mapped out the plans for the postwar period is of course the central role that Israel plays in every aspect of Jewish life. We recognize this central role; we recognize that Israel is today the central creative force in Jewish life. I can only echo Mr. Rabin's words of last night, when he spoke of the unique experiences that resulted from the Six-Day and Yom-Kippur Wars, both among the population of Israel and in the Diaspora. It has brought us closer, it has convinced us both that we need each other. I wrote about it in my report, and I shall not repeat it here, but it seems to me that these two events have brought about an atmosphere where we can and must start a new chapter in our mutual relationship. There is something emerging in our

feelings, which you can see reflected in the press during this great assembly. A serious endeavor must be undertaken to see how we should conduct this new dialogue in the future, and what new forms and methods of cooperation and consultation we can devise.

Dr. Goldmann spoke about this on the first evening. There is no example or model that we can use. We have to invent new structures, we have to see that imagination prevails and that new ideas are tried out. Nobody at this moment has the answer, but this is a top priority. If we want to face the period which is ahead of us, we have to find these new structures for consultation, cooperation, and narrowing the gap between us in order to stand shoulder to shoulder in the face of the dangers awaiting us in the immediate future.

I believe that the agreement we are about to sign with the World Zionist Organization is a good step in this direction, although it is not the full answer. I hope that the workshop on Israel and the Diaspora will give us some more ideas on how we should tackle this problem. It is clear that from this Assembly should go out the statement that this is one of our main priorities in our endeavors for the future.

Of paramount importance, of course, is the fight for Israel's existence and acceptance in the Middle East. The support for Israel which we have been giving without hesitation and unstintingly will have to be increased in intensity at a time when the Jewish people finds itself more isolated, at a time when our own Jewish communities may feel that it is more and more difficult to find and keep friends because our position has become more difficult. In this new situation we have to mobilize all our forces, inside and outside the communities. We have to devise new methods; we cannot apply the old routine methods which no longer work. We have to apply a new effort in a new people-to-people program in which everybody is mobilized and pleads the cause in the circles which are accessible to him — doctors to doctors; architects to architects; labor leaders to labor leaders — in every endeavor of Jewish life we have to organize understanding and support for our cause.

We must choose the battlefield on which to fight. We must not look for defeats. What happened at the UN and at Unesco should be a lesson to us. It is not an accident that the majority and minority at Unesco were quite different from what we had at the United Nations. I don't want to go into this now, but this is a very important lesson for all of us to learn.

Another priority is the fight for Jewish rights that we have always conducted — our classical task, only it will be more difficult — to continue our fight for the Russian Jews, to continue our fight for the Jews in the Arab countries. But this struggle should not be centered only on our own interests — and we have already spoken in the debates

several times about this — it also has to be a fight for general human interests. We should not adopt the attitude that is adopted by many today, an attitude that expresses itself in a tendency on the part of many Jews to withdraw into their own shells, to defy the outside forces and to move more and more away from their traditional liberal attitudes of openness to the world and faith in human progress. While this faith may sometimes have been superficial and naive, the current disillusionment and bitterness also imply a lack of a sense of reality and have created a dangerous polarization in attitudes. A new self-centeredness which sees the outside world only in terms of black and white is the unhappy consequence of this stand. There are, of course, deep historical reasons that explain this change in behavior. The trauma of the Hitler years, consciously or unconsciously, dominates the thinking of the generation that went through the horrors of the Nazi period. It is undoubtedly largely responsible for this type of reacting in extremes.

However, no people, not even the stiff-necked and nonconformist people that the Jews have been throughout the centuries, can live in the modern world in complete isolation. No people can ignore and defy the outside world without losing its sense of reality. Withdrawal is therefore an ill-advised recourse. Our difficulties will only be increased, and our future will be seriously jeopardized if we do not succeed in convincing the elements that are shaping the world of tomorrow of the legitimacy of our position, and if we do not find our proper and rightful place in this changing world.

We have to go out to the world, we have to find the synthesis between the universal and the particular, because only if we find this synthesis can we hope to be part of the world which is in the making.

My next priority is to pursue our universalistic aspirations in the World Jewish Congress, which means not to give up hope and not to write off the Jewish communities of Eastern Europe. At this time I will only say that I am not ready to write off the 3,400,000 Jews of the Soviet Union. We have to seek new methods to get them, to inspire them; we have to find ways to break through the walls and to make it possible for them to live a Jewish life. It is no more difficult to change this than to have changed the emigration policy of the Soviet Union.

My next priority is — and again I am sorry that I do not have the time to treat the subject in depth — to make the representative nature of the Congress a reality in practical life. It is not enough to say that we speak on behalf of such and so many organizations; we have to make this a reality, and that is one of the greatest and most difficult tasks. I am thinking in particular of the American scene, where umbrella organizations exist but nobody really controls the whole scene. We have to succeed in making the ideology, the ways, the influence, and the force

of the World Jewish Congress find greater expression on the American Jewish scene. I am not looking for a conference; I am looking for a practical way to solve the problems that exist — problems that we cannot ignore.

At the same time, we should not give up hope that those who are standing outside will one day join ranks with us. Nor should we give up the hope — even if today it is a dream — that one day a real unification of American Jewry will come about. I hope that with the cooperation of the World Zionist Organization we can achieve a good deal toward that goal, even if we may not be able to reach the goal itself. When we speak of organizational problems, I believe we must also say to our Israeli friends that the present representation of Israel in the World Jewish Congress is not the most satisfactory solution. I understand the difficulties that exist in this country, but representation only by political parties does not give to the outside world the image that the outside world expects from the totality of life in Israel today. Under the present system, the cultural, intellectual, and social forces are not expressing themselves, but are channeled only through the political parties. I am not reneging on what we have agreed on; but I am saying — I believe on behalf of a large segment of our constituency — that here also new ways have to be found in order to enable the intellectual, cultural, and trade-union elite of this country to speak to us through the Israel Branch of the World Jewish Congress.

The next great priority for me is special attention to small Jewish communities. If anybody needs the World Jewish Congress, it is the small and isolated Jewish communities dispersed throughout the world, which do not have their own institutions, which may not even have a rabbi, teacher, youth leader, or any Jewishly trained leader. Lavy Becker has been a pioneer in this field in the Caribbean area. We have tried, with Nathan Jacobson and with Gerald Falk to establish a similar setup in Southeast Asia and the Far East. We have not yet succeeded, but we should give this concern top priority in the future of our endeavors. The larger communities will have to assume the role of patrons of the smaller communities, not in the old sense of imperialistic disdain for the poor fellows, but in inspiring them and in giving them service.

The next point on my agenda — and I have intentionally mixed external and internal problems so that I shall not have to end my talk with half the points not being mentioned — is the development of our program with regard to the Third or Fourth World. This is one of the great contributions and ideas which the Congress has produced in the Jewish world in recent years. Our friend Marcus Einfeld is trying to pilot this pioneer program and, with the limited funds which were made

available, has made quite remarkable progress in many directions. As African ties with Israel have been cut, it is all the more important that we take up this challenge. It is all the more important that we get through to those who have never had relations with Jews, who have never read a book on Jews, who have never known what the Jewish people is, where it comes from, what it has gone through, what its basic tenets are. We have to acquaint them with us and teach them so that they can find a partner and a friend in us. There are many things we can do. In my opinion the greatest priority would be to establish chairs or courses on Jewish civilization in their universities; we must approach this problem not in a political but in a cultural way. There are hundreds of other ideas that can be brought up. It is clear that we have to find the way to these emerging countries. We have mentioned them dozens of times in the last few days, and we have to draw the consequences of this changing world.

I would also like to mention in passing that the Jewish people must also establish some connection and contact with Mao's China, one of the great emerging powers of the world. If we do not do it, who will do it for us ?

I have spoken of the development of our relations with the Christian churches, and I think that we should go on with this. We should not be afraid of it; we should not fight the battles of the past. I believe that we should also start relations with the Muslim world. We are living in a world where, in the long run, Jewish-Muslim relations will have to be brought about. And if the Congress does not start looking for some pioneering ways, who will ?

This brings me to perhaps the most important of our functions, and that is planning for the future. Planning for the future, as I pointed out in the case of North Africa, is the most noble task of the Congress, which no other organization really has ever fulfilled. We live too often from hand to mouth; we react to events, rather than foreseeing or anticipating them. Our great problem today is Latin America. What are we going to do about a continent which is sitting on a volcano and may explode any day ? The Jewish communities of that region will by necessity be affected by the changes — not by anti-Semitism, but by the eruption of social forces. What shall we say to these communities ? What should they do ? How should they plan their future ? If we do not do it, who will do it ?

I believe that we should set up in the Institute of Jewish Affairs a special planning section. I believe that the Institute should be expanded. I think that the Institute should have regional branches. Perhaps I am dreaming for the moment, but I think the Institute should have permanent correspondents — political and scientific analysts, sociologists, economists — in all parts of the world.

I now come to the last two points, with which I will end. The WJC has to proclaim the maintenance of the Jewishness of the community as one of our major goals. This struggle calls for the adaptation of the mass media to Jewish educational needs, something which does not exist — except for Israel — in any country in the world. We are really in the eighteenth century in our educational methods, yet it is through education that we will have to reach our goals. I will not go into details, but just want to say that we cannot do this alone. Mr. Sapir appealed for our cooperation yesterday; we should be partners in the fight against assimilation and for the Jewishness of the community.

This brings me to the last point, the problem of youth, which we discussed yesterday. This Assembly is a great event for the WJC in that for the first time in its history a youth delegation of nearly fifty people is attending such a gathering. I am glad that we especially invited youth, and we have to learn for the future how to improve the methods through which the youth can express itself in the WJC. There should be representation of youth in all Congress organs. There should be a WJC program to deal with Jewish youth organizations. I fully subscribe to Arthur Hertzberg's proposal for the establishment of a youth service, and in fact I made the same point in several speeches a few years ago. I believe that we have a wonderful idealistic youth in our midst but they go, not always to us, but to others. It is not by ruling or disciplining them but by giving them the largest possibility of expression that we can obtain their confidence and the possibility of a dialogue. The method is the most important thing in dealing with youth. One of the most important problems for the communities is how to ensure leadership. We know how hard it is to find leaders today; how can we find those who will lead tomorrow ?

If we do not do it together with the Zionist organizations, with all the forces that will help in the same endeavor — then this task will not be fulfilled. Let us not clip the wings of the new generation. Their non-conformist attitudes are a natural thing; if they are not nonconformists in their twenties, when will they ever be ? If they must be for the establishment now, when will they ever express themselves fully without the maneuvering of the establishment ? Encourage them, give them freedom of speech, give them money, give them everything you can: this is the investment for the future of our communities.

Some of the goals I have mentioned are obviously a dream today. Those who know me know that I am a very realistic man; but you cannot fulfill and you cannot achieve if you have no dreams.

If we want to fulfill these dreams, we have to have faith in the creative force and genius of the Jewish people. If we have this faith

— and we have reason to have it, after a unique history of thousands of years of which everybody can be proud — then we will succeed, if you all help.

B. DISCUSSION

Mr. MORRIS BRAFMAN (*USA*): I regret that Dr. Riegner did not mention that a cable with a message from the Warsaw Ghetto was sent on April 14, 1943, to Dr. Stephen Wise and to Dr. Nahum Goldmann, urging the Jewish leadership in the United States to sit on the steps of the White House in Washington and not to move until the president of the United States ordered American bombers to destroy the European railroad system over which Eichmann was then transporting millions of Jews to the gas chambers. The Jewish leaders met, and decided to do nothing. I give credit to Dr. Goldmann for saying publicly in Jerusalem many years later that we failed.

I was impressed with the report of what the Congress has done during the past forty years, and I would like to propose what we should do now. Let us face facts: there is no *aliya* from the free world today. Why is there *aliya* from Russia? I have conducted some research, and I have on tape 1500 interviews with Russian Jews, both inside and outside the USSR. Among the many reasons for their desire to come out, there is one basic common denominator: their children's future. Whether one likes it or not, we in America feel that our children and their children have a future there. But can we be so sure — after the Yom-Kippur War and the oil blockade and blackmail — that the same holds true for France, England, Canada, Australia, and almost every country in Latin America? I think it is the duty of this Assembly to reevaluate the Jewish positions and render a courageous verdict. We might come to the conclusion that we should tell certain Jewish communities to pack and go to Israel.

I would also propose that this assembly of world Jewry, meeting in Jerusalem, issue a call to young Jewish men and women in America to come to Israel for one year — not to pick oranges but to guard the borders of the state. After the year is up, if they so wish, they can go home. There are 429,000 young Jewish men and women in American colleges today, in desperate need of a cause to fill their lives. I am convinced that if such a call is made, they will answer it.

Mr. IZAK WARSZAWSKI (*VARSAT*) (*France*): We have heard a thorough report from Dr. Riegner, a survey of Jewish life — political, social, cultural — over the last forty years.

The principal question is whether during the last forty years the WJC has kept up with the thinking of the Jewish masses, that is, the Jewish communities.

We can say with certainty that the political declaration made at the opening of this Assembly is in accordance with the thinking of the Jewish communities round the world — that is, the centrality of the State of Israel and unconditional solidarity with the State of Israel. It is today impossible to organize any Jewish activity without Israel as its center. And no national-minded Jew can oppose the general political line fostered by the WJC.

Another question: After forty years of existence and after the establishment of the State of Israel, is the WJC still necessary? If there were no WJC today, the leaders of the State of Israel would have to create one, because a world Jewish organization working for the good of Israel is a necessity. The State of Israel cannot always act in favor of all Jewish interests.

It is true that in recent years the WJC has been able to gain more adherents and thus reduce the fragmentation in the Jewish world. But the Congress still must become universal. We should not limit ourselves to central Jewish organizations, but should go out to the small communities, as the WJC French Section has done. As a result of its efforts, the French Section includes forty-six provincial Jewish communities in France. Sooner or later, the central Jewish political organization in France, the CRIF, will be forced to follow the example of the mass of French communities and adhere to the program of the WJC. In this connection, I welcome the affiliation of the Board of Deputies to the Congress.

We must also not forget the non-Jewish world. This is an important role of the WJC and if it is not carried out, if we do not get through to the non-Jewish masses, then the situation will become much worse. We know that today we are faced with a great danger — not only physical anti-Semitism, but political anti-Semitism, which goes under the name of anti-Zionism. The WJC must stand in the front ranks of the fight against anti-Zionism.

The Rt. Hon. LORD JANNER OF LEICESTER (*Great Britain — Board of Deputies of British Jews*): I am happy that the Board of Deputies of British Jews, which was founded more than 200 years ago, has decided to join the other participants in the World Jewish Congress in pursuing the tremendous task that lies before us. We know, and the leadership of the World Jewish Congress has confirmed it, that we will continue to have the possibility of dealing directly with our government on matters concerning our country, the Jews in our country, and the Jews elsewhere. But this is a time when the unity of the Jewish people must be fortified, for the attack on Israel and what Israel stands for — which means really an attack on Jewry itself — is confronting us in a form that is at least as difficult as what we have experienced in our own lifetime.

In all our respective governments there are representative bodies which we can readily approach. It is our duty to do so as regards Israel and its problems. We have seen the political consequences of the oil blackmail, not only in the United Nations but at other international gatherings. Israel is fighting against odds in every direction. But we can make use of many opportunities, in all parts of the world, to defend Israel's cause, which is the cause of the Jewish people. Our friends in Canada are doing this extremely well. We should bring our message to the political leaders of the small countries in particular, and also to others whenever we can. I want to stress the necessity for all of us to get into action immediately. Our long-term policy is important, but time is extremely short for us. At international conferences delegates have opportunities of talking to each other in intimate circles. These delegates should be informed about the Jewish position so that at least some among them will advocate our cause. Please — before it is too late — see to it that the people who represent your respective countries are informed about the Jewish position. As an old parliamentarian, I know that action of this kind is effective.

Mr. YAIR ZABAN (*Israel*): This is the first time that a representative of Maki, the Communist Party of Israel, is participating as a full delegate in an Assembly of the World Jewish Congress. This step reflects the recognition of the oneness of the Jewish people, of its destiny, and of its struggle. In fact, however, our presence here is merely a symbolic and demonstrative expression of the process of profound change we have undergone in relating to the Jewish national problem, a process associated most of all with the name of the late Moshe Sneh, whom many veterans of the WJC will remember from the 30s and 40s.

What has caused this change, this soul-searching that has brought us to this point? Above all, an increasingly acute realization that for the Soviet leadership and the official Communist establishment, we Jews are God's stepchildren: in their eyes, we do not have equal rights as a nation.

The Jewish people in Israel finds itself today in dangerous confrontation with the Soviet Union and all the tremendous power it represents. The USSR is waging against us an ideological and propaganda campaign unprecedented in its one-sidedness. This rift with the Soviet Union has taught us that we must beware of excessive rashness and not put our trust in the illusion of *shtadlanut*. We need not only an Israeli policy but a clear Jewish national policy, which should work toward the following objectives. First, international détente, because the cold war holds no glory for Israel or for the Jews. The second imperative is an energetic search for Arab-Israeli peace, for if this conflict is not settled,

our rift with the USSR will not easily be healed either. We Jews must recognize the existence of a Palestinian nation and its right to self-determination provided that it is prepared to coexist peacefully with the State of Israel. For the Palestinian problem is today the detonator that can activate the bomb that is the Egyptian front. Moreover, recognition of the Palestinians is essential if we want to gain the understanding of Diaspora Jewish youth for Israel's struggle. Thirdly, we must do everything we can to deglobalize the conflict; all of us must avoid making damaging and irresponsible pronouncements that cause Israel to be seen as the outpost of one international bloc against the other. Finally, we should conduct an energetic and considerable campaign against anti-Israelism, anti-Zionism, and anti-Semitism in Soviet propaganda and policy. This Assembly should address a dramatic appeal to the Soviet Union for a change in its relations with the Jewish people and with our state. I would suggest the establishment of a special commission to undertake this challenging task.

Moreover, I would like to suggest some ways of making the World Jewish Congress more democratic. We should resolve to convene the next Plenary Assembly not later than three years from now. Thirty percent of the delegates at the next Assembly should be elected delegates. And a special commission or department should be established within the WJC to secure the implementation of more democratic procedures.

Mr. HERSH CYNOWICZ (*India*): My experience has been that those who do not know the Jewish people and Judaism are usually the most favorable toward us, or at least neutral. Therefore, I think it would be a waste of time to attempt to acquaint the people of the so-called Third World with Judaism and the Jewish people. In fact, I do not believe in the existence of a Third World. There are two blocs today — the American and the Soviet — and the uncommitted countries will gravitate to one side or the other. And I believe that the WJC in its political activities must act in consequence of this fact.

The small communities scattered throughout the world are extremely important for world Jewry and the WJC, and deserve their full support. These small communities are important not only for their intrinsic value but also for their political value in the struggle between the great power-blocs and the contacts that the WJC should maintain with both sides.

I also feel that our work with the Christian churches is important, despite the reduced strength of the Catholic Church, and here I would like to pay tribute to Dr. Riegner for his successful role in this regard. I would suggest that the WJC form regional Christian-Jewish committees to help in this historic task.

Finally, the WJC should see to it that the Jews of Syria be allowed to emigrate. It was possible in Egypt and Iraq, and the same must be achieved for Syrian Jewry.

Rabbi AWRAHAM SOETENDORP (*World Union for Progressive Judaism*): Unfortunately, there is at this Assembly a lack of dialogue between the young and the older generation, as revealed by the absence of adults from the discussion on youth problems yesterday, and the absence of young people from the discussion today. Yet the desire for dialogue exists on both sides. Perhaps we should an hour of *d'var tora* to bring together youth and older people.

I am in favor of intensifying our struggle for Soviet Jewry. But we can benefit from the idealism of Jewish youth only if we also allow for an opportunity of identifying with general human suffering in the world. In this respect the United Nations, despite its other failings, has created international assistance programs which are worthy of support by Jewish organizations.

Mr. ERIC MOONMAN, MP (*Great Britain — British Section, World Jewish Congress*): I feel that our views as expressed in this debate have been too pessimistic. But if we read the report of WJC activities, we see quite clearly that many positive things have been accomplished by the Congress. I am sure the same is true of many organizations represented at this Assembly, and I for one would like to hear about these positive experiences and not only your *tsores* and analyses.

I am not surprised that we cannot win the hearts and minds of all Jews all of the time and on all issues. After the Yom-Kippur War many Jews who had forgotten they were Jews came forward to help. But with the passage of time they drift again. Any study of social organization, of human relations, makes us aware that we have not lost them but that they have gone on to another level of interest. And the strategy of the utilization of Jewish manpower is to be able to call on those people when there is another crisis. It is wrong to bemoan the fact that you cannot use this resource all of the time.

Dr. Riegner has spoken of the need for more sophisticated methods to defend the Jewish cause, and I agree. But we must realize that we cannot use specialist methods without specialist people, which creates a new situation between professionals and lay leaders — a different structure of decision-making.

Abba Eban, in his statement, drew attention to the importance of the European Economic Community which, he said, was the one positive feature on the world scene today. I would suggest that the World Jewish Congress should have a presence in Brussels in order to monitor what is being done there, so that we can have a better under-

standing of how to influence public opinion. Europe is one example. I suspect the other regions can provide other examples of how the WJC can do something quite unique that no Jewish community could do on its own.

Let us not attribute the problems of our own Jewish organizations and communities to the World Jewish Congress. The WJC will be only as strong as we want it to be, and if we continuously fail to look at its positive features then we really are not worthy of being at this Assembly.

Mrs. CLARA MAYAN (*Independent Zionist Movement*): As a survivor of the Holocaust and an active member of the underground, I am in a position to appreciate only too well how necessary the aid of the World Jewish Congress was. I am not here to accuse, for I realize our situation at the time and how difficult contact was. And some help did arrive — funds here and there, and even some forged passports. But no one, not even we ourselves, believed that the Holocaust was in fact approaching. In any event, I do not accept the idea that the *sho'a* had to be the price for the establishment of the Jewish state.

There should no longer be any differentiation between “we in Israel” and “you in the Diaspora”; I do not accept the notion that “we” were created for the defense of the state and that “your” role is only an emotional one. We need you. And I welcome the proposal that young people come here, not to pick fruit but to defend our frontiers. Once having faced the reality of Israel, they will understand that their place is here.

As an educator I welcome the various suggestions for creating new tools for teaching the history of our people. I do not want to teach our children exclusively about the Holocaust and persecutions. I want to give them a picture of our brilliant past. They must know the positive elements in Jewish culture, in the Torah.

Ahad Ha'am said if a state, a country, is devastated, it can be rebuilt; but for a nation that is destroyed there is no recovery. We have to do everything so that our nation is not destroyed, so that there is no differentiation between Jews in Israel and Jews throughout the world. Today, only 20% of us live in Israel. We would like to see that proportion reversed in the future, with 80% of the Jews living in Israel and 20% abroad.

Mr. MALVYN BENJAMIN (*Great Britain — British Section, World Jewish Congress*): Dr. Riegner was quite right; we must bring our youth into the World Jewish Congress at every level, and not content ourselves with having a session on youth problems every few years.

The WJC Third World program, which is already bringing results, should have been undertaken many years ago.

We have been fortunate in the past in having leadership of quality, devotion, and intellect. For many years we have had as president a man of high distinction. But the torch must be passed on to a new generation.

Is it conceivable that there should be only one candidate for the leadership of the World Jewish Congress over the next years? We know that candidate is a man whose achievements are monumental; but today his views are totally out of tune with the mainstream of Jewish thinking, and even very repugnant to many of us who believe that they give aid and succor to the enemies of Israel and of our people. We must have a more vital, responsive, and responsible leadership.

Dr. SHMUEL ZANWEL KAHANA (*Israel*): During the last three days, the speakers have all pointed to the main problem of our people today: the spiritual acculturation and the assimilation that characterizes the young generation. I am sorry that Dr. Riegner in his presentation offered hardly any practical suggestions for solving this problem.

The entire WJC budget for cultural and spiritual activities, for this fundamental need of our time, amounts to perhaps 50,000 dollars. It is true that the Congress' Cultural Department was transferred to Israel — and this decision was correct, because efficient action against assimilation can originate only in Israel. We have transferred an office, a vessel, but the vessel is empty and will remain empty as long as the spiritual aspect is ignored.

There is no future for the nation if it has no past. Our generation is cut off from its roots and therefore from the youth, from the future. If Israel becomes a state like all other states, it will not have anything to offer Jewish youth. If we want to arouse enthusiasm in Jewish youth — Israeli youth included — we must go back to our roots, to the values that come from our past.

Mr. MORDECAI LEVENE (*Great Britain — British Section, World Jewish Congress*): One of the questions raised by Dr. Goldmann in his presidential address was dual loyalty. I am well acquainted with this question and would not say that it should be ignored. Undoubtedly, we should prepare some publications and briefings on this matter, for use if the need arises, but we should not ourselves build it up into an issue.

On the subject of unity of the Jewish nation, the WJC must increase its efforts to bring into its fold a large number of Jewish communities

that have been left outside the Congress. Only after this is done will the World Jewish Congress really be able to claim that it speaks in the name of the Jewish people as a whole.

The incoming Executive will have to intensify efforts to encourage youth involvement in our work. I am not minimizing this problem, which confronts not only the Congress but other Jewish organizations as well. I feel, however, that the young should also earn their right to be represented at the highest levels.

Mr. HILEL STORCH (*Sweden*): No one is exempt from criticism, but I wonder whether the gentleman from England realizes to what extent Dr. Goldmann is responsible for the very existence of the Congress. I can also tell you that when we in Sweden needed help in saving Jews during the war, it was Goldmann who came to our aid. He has devoted his life to Israel and the Congress.

Israel and the Diaspora are vitally important for each other, and cooperation between the two is essential. But I must tell our Israeli friends that we often do not get any cooperation.

Finally, we have sung the praises of many important people here, people who are practically institutions; but we have forgotten one institution: the heroic Jewish mother who sends her children off to the army and sits by the radio every night to hear whether her daughter or her son has been wounded or killed.

NINTH SESSION

Thursday, February 6, 1975
(afternoon)

In the chair: Mr. SYDNEY M. HARRIS, QC

1. THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS IN A CHANGING WORLD DISCUSSION (concluded)

Mr. EZRA KOLET (*India*): Dr. Riegner's assurance this morning that high priority will be given to small communities was a shot in the arm for those of us who live in isolated and small communities in remote corners of the world and are trying, with the utmost difficulty and against the greatest handicaps, to maintain our Jewishness. Our concern should be for all of *am yisrael*; every single individual Jew is of importance and his continuity has to be maintained.

The Third World is really a misnomer: one cannot regard the countries of the Arab world, Africa, and Asia as one group, and it is in fact dangerous to do so. The people of India, which has always been very tolerant, has a very friendly attitude towards the Jewish people and towards Israel — and in the long run, the attitude of the people is more important than that of the government, because governments change. People in India want to know more about Jews and Judaism, and here we have a role to play. But at the same time we must assume our role as Jews in the national activities and efforts of all the countries to which we belong; otherwise, we can never hope to be heard by our fellow citizens. For example, some years ago the All-India Women's Conference was presided by a Jewish lady; by virtue of the fact that she was an important Indian personality, she was able to have access to Nehru, who was prime minister at the time, and secure his intervention with the then Egyptian president to allow the departure of many Jews from Egypt.

This Assembly is a very good example of a world parliament possibility: here we are, people from different cultures and different countries, but we are united by a common faith and common emotions. Our example represents a hope for the world.

Dr. EDWARD SIMON MADANES (*Great Britain – British Section, World Jewish Congress*): I agree with previous speakers who advocate the introduction of more democratic procedures into the World Jewish Congress. In particular, I am very concerned about the neglect of Polish Jewry by the Congress. The representatives of Polish Jewry – which suffered the most during the Holocaust – were not admitted to the Claims Conference when the latter was organized, and today they still have no say in the decisions concerning allocation of the funds from Germany. While efforts are being made to create a commemoration house for Polish Jewry, nothing to date has been allocated for this purpose from the funds of the Claims Conference.

Neither has the World Jewish Congress looked into the question of further demands on Poland with regard to Jewish property in that country, relics of historic value, synagogues, and cemeteries. Many people will say that the living come before the dead. Maybe so, but let us not forget that we must not cut ourselves off from our past. And Polish Jewry, as Dr. Goldmann has so rightly declared, is a principal element of our glorious past.

Mr. MICHAEL LEXNER (*Denmark*): I hope that the fact that the Board of the Danish Jewish Community chose me, its youngest member, to represent Danish Jewry here will perhaps inspire other communities to let some of their young people attend meetings such as this one, sometimes with and sometimes without more experienced leaders, because I believe that many decisions are much easier to take if both groups contribute and decide together.

I want to praise the extremely important work the World Jewish Congress is doing in the realm of political activities affecting Israel and world Jewry as a whole. Before the November 1974 vote at Unesco to exclude Israel from Unesco activities – and even before the Danish press was aware of the situation – we were contacted by the WJC and asked to approach our Foreign Ministry, which we did. I do not know whether it was because of our visit that Denmark voted against the Unesco resolution, but one thing is certain: it did no harm.

Following this most recent injustice committed against Israel, a group of non-Jewish Danes spontaneously took the initiative in organizing a campaign under the motto, "For Israel's Right to Exist." Seven famous Danish artists contributed drawings on this theme for postcards printed in fourteen languages, including Arabic and Russian. With every set of cards the buyer received a letter urging him to mail them to his friends in Denmark and abroad, to Unesco, and to UN offices throughout the world. A special office has been established in Copenhagen to receive telephone orders and to maintain contact with politicians, the press and radio, and organizations throughout the

country. Members of Danish WIZO have served as volunteer workers, and I am happy to tell you that in less than six weeks, this office has sent out more than 150,000 postcards, which have also been distributed in the other Scandinavian countries and in the United Kingdom. Knowing that I was coming to this Assembly, the Danish originator of this campaign — a non-Jew who has devoted himself exclusively to this cause, ten hours a day for the last three months — asked me to try to get support in other countries as well, and I shall be happy to furnish further details to all those who are interested.

Dr. JOACHIM SCHNEEWEISS (*Australia*): Since its establishment, the WJC has exercised diplomacy with considerable skill, whether it be in the limelight or behind the scenes. Of course, there were bound to be some mistakes over the years, but on the whole I believe that in this respect the Congress has been sinned against far more than it has sinned. I am by no means a devotee of every decision and every policy approach that the WJC has adopted over the years, but, certainly until such time as we are able to develop alternative and better policies, I think it is incumbent upon us to support the leadership in the common endeavor that faces us.

From time to time, there are Jewish communities which seem to forget fundamental Jewish principles, and I am quite concerned about this. For example, in the Australian context, I believe that if there is a problem in relation to aborigines, the Jewish community should speak out on this issue in no less certain terms than, I believe, responsible Jews should speak out on the issue of apartheid.

The World Jewish Congress should increase its regional activities, particularly in the area I come from, for there are tasks that can be accomplished far more effectively by a regional grouping. It does not help to pay lip service to the concept of regionalization as against excessive centralization. If you want effective regional arrangements you must provide the necessary funds. The same applies to the need for mobilizing the support of Jewish academics, who, together with the student world, are of increasing importance.

Listening to the youth debate yesterday afternoon, I was bitterly disappointed. The youth delegates were given a special opportunity at this Assembly to put their viewpoint across but I feel they failed to galvanize the adult Jewish community into increased efforts to bridge the generation gap and attract youth. I am afraid the alienation of Jewish youth in so many countries will not be remedied by what emerged here yesterday.

Several speakers referred to the question of double loyalties. This is a question that always comes up whenever one is engaged in a public examination of Jewish issues in confrontation with Arab spokesmen.

To my mind, it is a non-problem. Take the case of Herbert Morrison, who during the First World War was jailed as a pacifist and conscientious objector; this did not prevent him, in the Second World War, from becoming the most effective home secretary of the United Kingdom. The concept of dual loyalties is a myth, and the less we discuss it the less we shall create a problem which in fact does not exist.

Mr. JEAN ROSENTHAL (*President, Representative Council of the Jewish Institutions of France (CRIF)*): I thank you for having invited CRIF, which represents 550,000 French Jews, to attend this Assembly in an observer capacity. This Assembly confirms the strong emotional and intellectual links that bind all of us together. Certainly we Diaspora Jews have our problems. Nonetheless it is our concern for Israel which is our strongest common denominator. Every one of us should endeavor to bring home to our respective governments the paramount importance of safeguarding the freedom and independence of the State of Israel. Let me add that the majority of the French people, regardless of the policy pursued by its political leaders, is pro-Israel.

Mr. GERARD ISRAEL (*Deputy Secretary-General, Alliance Israélite Universelle*): I bring you greetings and wishes for success from the Alliance Israélite Universelle, which, seventy-five years older than the World Jewish Congress, has the same fundamental aim: to serve the people of Israel, in the Jewish state and in the Diaspora.

I think that the World Jewish Congress, which enables so many Jews, from all continents and of all political and ideological convictions, to express themselves and confront each other's opinions, is an absolutely irreplaceable forum in Jewish life today. In view of the political, cultural, and educational difficulties affecting the Jewish people, the Congress will have an enormous responsibility in the years to come. If I may offer a bit of personal advice, these fundamental problems should receive the undivided attention of the WJC, and the Congress should not waste its time on questions of structure.

Dr. SAUL LANGNAS (*Israel*): First of all I should like to refer to Dr. Riegner's remarks concerning the composition of the Israel Branch of the World Jewish Congress. To my knowledge, the WJC Israel Branch is more democratic and more representative than any other Branch of the Congress, for its composition is based on the composition of the Knesset.

We have heard calls here for a democratization of the World Jewish Congress. This slogan is nothing new: the entire Israeli press — which, by the way, is not particularly fond of the Congress — has for a long time been demanding such a democratization. However, the WJC has never pretended to be an organization with a mass membership. Under its statutes, its membership is composed solely of communities and

organizations. To this extent, it is impossible to ask for democratization, which would mean holding direct elections among 14,000,000 Jews all over the world. Such a proposal would be impractical, to say the least. In any event, as we can see in the case of the Soviet Union, where 100% of the population votes in all elections, such elections are not in themselves a guarantee of democracy.

Certain speakers here have suggested that Sephardim in Israel are discriminated against. I would remind those delegates that the speaker of the Knesset and the chairman of the Knesset's Foreign Affairs and Security Committee — both extremely important positions in Israel — are Sephardim, and that almost all the parties have tripled or quadrupled the number of their representatives in the Knesset who belong to the Oriental communities. The number of scholarized children from the Oriental communities has more than trebled, both in the elementary and secondary schools as well as in the institutions of higher learning. Is that discrimination ?

Finally, we heard one of the speakers charge that the standard of education among Israeli youth is extremely low. This is absolutely untrue. When the state was established, we had one university, in Jerusalem; today we have five, not to mention the Technion, the world-famous Weizmann Institute of Science, the many yeshivot and vocational schools. Despite the great cost of higher education in Israel, today 30,000 students are enrolled in institutions of higher learning.

Mrs. BLUETTE NORDMANN (*Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO)*): A number of women at this Assembly have been asking: What are we doing here ? There is something to this question, but still, we must recognize that there has always been room in the WJC for women's organizations. In fact, the European Conference of Jewish Communities, held in 1972 under the auspices of the WJC, gave us women hope that at last an important organization in the Jewish world had understood the role that we could play as equal partners in all activities. The agenda foreseen for this Sixth Plenary Assembly when it was scheduled to take place in The Hague included a workshop on the woman's role in the community. This workshop must have gone astray between The Hague and Jerusalem, which we sincerely regret.

The time is past when women could be confined to educational and cultural work and kept at home, despite all the praise showered on us for our work in these areas. We know very well that too many communities still are reluctant to share all their burdens with women. At an Assembly held under the theme of a changing world, and in a year that the United Nations has proclaimed International Women's Year, we ask that women be accorded a position of full equality in all aspects of WJC work and in all its departments.

Dr. MAURICE GRYNFOGEL (*France*): The official French attitude toward Israel in recent years has been characterized by three successive aspects: hypocrisy, as exemplified by the declarations of General de Gaulle after the Six-Day War; cynicism, as manifested by President Pompidou's sale of Mirages to Egypt through Libya; and, finally, defiance, as shown by Foreign Minister Sauvagnargue's historic handshake with Arafat and the open sale of arms to Arab countries in the Middle East.

The French Section of the World Jewish Congress has analyzed these developments coolly and objectively, benefiting in its deliberations and decisions from its solid roots in the various components of the French Jewish community, in Paris as well as in the provinces. The French Section also cooperates with CRIF — of which I and many other members of the French delegation here are also members. Both organizations respect each other's identity in the joint efforts for our common cause.

In analyzing the past and living the present, we orient our activities toward the concerns of the future. Our three basic preoccupations are the centrality of Israel, Jewish education, and aid to oppressed Jews.

We must be objective and acknowledge the understanding shown by the French government for the situation of Jews in Arab countries, and our approaches to the French authorities in this regard have resulted in often successful diplomatic interventions.

In the field of Jewish education, we in France have the same problems known to most of you — alienation, underequipment, and lack of inspiration. But initiatives such as the colloquia organized by the French Section for French Jewish intellectuals redound to the credit of the WJC.

As to the centrality of Israel, many people ascribe the renaissance of a Jewish consciousness in France to the Six-Day War. They may be right, but only partly so. There has been and continues to be a strong Jewish consciousness, which expresses itself courageously whenever the occasion arises, and the famous Finaly Case of the late 40s and early 50s is but one example among many. We will always be unconditionally at Israel's side when its sovereignty and existence are challenged. But on the cultural level, we want authentically Jewish answers to the problems with which we are confronted, and we would like the guidelines for the future to be laid down in a spirit of harmony and deep reflection.

Chief Rabbi MENAHEM FINK (*Netherlands*): I welcome the choice of Jerusalem as the venue for this Assembly, and I hope that future Assemblies of the World Jewish Congress will always take place here. If we take seriously the often-cited ties between Israel and the Diaspora, there can be no other place.

The WJC must be and must remain the highest representative body of the whole Jewish people, both in the eyes of the outside world and of world Jewry.

A great deal has been said here about the need to increase *aliya* to Israel. There was mention of fundraising for Jewish causes. But both these goals require first of all that Jews remain Jews. Therefore, the greatest importance should be attached to improving Jewish education.

Mr. SOLLI MARCUS (*Great Britain – British Section, World Jewish Congress*): For a decade the major *raison d'être* for the commitment of Jewish youth was identification with Israel, though on different levels and in varying degrees. This is no longer so, because Israel is no longer a panacea for Jewish youth. There is nowadays an ideological vacuum, confusion, and apathy. Unfortunately, Israel today is identified with the Right, and this suits the leaders of Diaspora Jewry, which has become more affluent. This identification closes the door to real challenges for youth within the established structures of Jewish communities.

Abba Eban quite rightly said that pragmatism is not sufficient, that we have to find anew the idealism that was inherent in the Zionist movement and in the World Jewish Congress. But how shall we find this idealism ? Yesterday, delegates sat quietly as someone defended the fascist regime in Chile, and I was ashamed. In Israel, the early values of *chalutzit* are only whispered about in the corridors. As to Diaspora Jewry, it is basking in the glory of Israel's military victories but it is not prepared to face up to shortcomings either in the communities or in Israel.

To me, this Assembly is very disappointing. There is no soul to it, just a series of monologues. Yet, it is the duty of the World Jewish Congress to build a bridge, a two-way relationship between Israel and the Diaspora. It is not enough to feed money and immigrants into Israel, but also new ideas and spiritual values. The World Jewish Congress must help to broaden the basis of Jewish education, to open up the communities to progressive Zionist youth movements, and to create a democratic framework in the communities which would allow for constructive criticism.

I was quite horrified when one of the delegates called for an *aliya* of volunteers to guard Israel's frontiers. Israel is capable of guarding its own frontiers. We need an *aliya* to dig the soil and to plant in Israel; but such an *aliya* will come only when there is peace in the Middle East.

Last night, the prime minister in his excellent address referred to Sadat's statement that he would not attack Israel unless he were attacked. There was something missing in the prime minister's speech:

there was no declaration that Israel would not attack Egypt either if she were not attacked first. On the problem of the Palestinians too, there was something missing. Somehow or other, one identifies the terrorism of Arafat with the right of the Palestinians to self-determination. I feel it is time for us to recognize that right, on the condition that they recognize the right of Israel to exist as a sovereign state and that they cease to use terrorism as a political weapon.

I feel that this country is living in a state of suspended motivation and this is being projected onto the Diaspora as well. Disraeli once said, "If I want to read a book, I write one." The Jewish people has an over-draft on its heritage; it's time to write a new book.

Mr. ABRAM WOLF SAFIRSTEIN (CAROL) (*France*): It is true that the State of Israel and the Jewish people are today in a fateful period. However, we should heed Dr. Riegner's admonition not to let ourselves become isolated from the non-Jewish world. The task of the World Jewish Congress is to strengthen national consciousness among Jews, and at the same time to be our spokesman and link with the non-Jewish world.

But our ideas and our discussions should not remain confined to this hall. A people is not an abstract thing, and if we want to defend our people we must have the active participation of all Jews. Like other peoples, we have our silent majority, which consists of loyal Jews who support the State of Israel. But theirs is primarily an emotional attitude, and from exaggerated enthusiasm one can easily fall into doubt and sometimes even anger. In today's situation, what is needed is not emotion but rational awareness.

The World Jewish Congress and its member organizations throughout the world must draw much closer to the Jewish masses. Democracy should be introduced, without fear of criticism. Only in this way will the Congress earn the name of a world Jewish organization.

The question has been raised as to whether the Jews of the Diaspora have the right to concern themselves with Israel's policies. The fact that Prime Minister Rabin came to speak to us yesterday evening about Israeli policy indicates that he feels it is proper for the Jews of other countries — who represent 75% of the Jewish people — to express their opinions on all problems of the Jewish state that affect every Jew.

Mr. RON FINKEL (*World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS)*): The question before us is the future of the Congress. At this moment when we witness the broadening of the representativeness of the WJC by the inclusion of organizations such as the World Zionist Organization and the Board of Deputies of British Jews, it is well to caution against altering one of the basic qualities of the Congress. Too many Jewish

organizations, international and communal, are excessively ruled by form and structure. They are essentially rigid. The greatest quality of the WJC has been its flexibility, and the challenge for the future will be for the Congress to maintain and to develop its role as a stimulator and catalyst in all aspects of Jewish life.

The challenges posed by Dr. Riegner this morning, especially those directed to representativity and responsibility, are an aspect of the workings of the Congress. We the youth certainly endorse his hope that the party system here in Israel will loosen its stranglehold on the WJC Israel Branch so that the Congress in Israel can be open to all elements of Jewish expression, based on equality and integrity. Especially here in Israel we are seeking out our peers at all levels, including, but certainly not only, in the party system.

Finally, we must avoid the tendency in the Jewish world to seek the lowest common denominator of Jewish expression, a tendency towards a monolithic Jewish world. Unity, yes, but unity based on diverse expression; a pluralistic approach to all matters, based on our shared commitment to Israel and the Jewish people.

Mr. DONALD SILK, CC (*Great Britain – British Section, World Jewish Congress*): I had not intended to participate in this debate but feel now that I must take the floor lest the intervention by Mr. Benjamin this morning be interpreted as representing the opinion of British Jewry and the British delegation. Dr. Goldmann, if I may say so, is *sui generis*, but I submit that his years of great work and dedication do not deserve the disparaging and disrespectful remarks made by Mr. Benjamin. These remarks have not detracted from Dr. Goldmann's greatness but only from Mr. Benjamin's credibility.

Mr. PERCY SASSOON GOURGEY, MBE (*Great Britain – British Section, World Jewish Congress*): We should pay particular attention to the work of the World Jewish Congress in respect to Jews in Arab countries, because in the case of the Jews in Syria it is literally their lives that are at stake. As we shout – and rightly so – for Soviet Jewry, so should we shout for Syrian Jewry. The Arabs are extremely sensitive on the question of their ill-treatment of their Jewish citizens. Moreover, let us never forget that if the Arabs claim that there were 500,000 Arab refugees from Palestine in 1948, it is true that nearly 750,000 Jewish refugees have come to Israel because they were persecuted by Arab governments. We also should not forget that compensation is due to Jews from Arab countries, particularly from Iraq and Egypt, as a result of the confiscation of their property.

On the choice of leadership of the Congress, it seems to me that, with all the criticism that one may sometimes level at Dr. Goldmann's policies, his leadership of the WJC is beyond question, not only because

of his own outstanding personal qualities and the immense service he has rendered, but — perhaps even more important — if we do not reelect Dr. Goldmann as president of the Congress, it could be interpreted by our enemies as a rejection of the forces of moderation in Israel and throughout the Jewish world.

Mr. ITZHAC SHMUELI (*Israel*): I should like to begin by saying one thing to Dr. Goldmann's credit: he is the only Jewish leader who has had the courage to state — with reference to the efforts of Jewish leadership to save Jews during the Nazi period — that our conscience is not clear.

Indemnification alone is not enough. We demand that the tens of thousands of Nazi criminals who are still at liberty be brought to trial. We hear people say that the matter is dead by now. Yet that fine, honest German gentile, Beate Klarsfeld, has shown us how alive it is. But should she be the only one to remind us of this ? Where is the World Jewish Congress ? The Congress is doing nothing in this matter because Dr. Goldmann is not interested in it.

When Dr. Goldmann makes a public pronouncement, even in a so-called private capacity, the world sees him as president of the World Jewish Congress. Who authorized him to issue a statement in New York warning Israel not to begin a preemptive war ? In whose name does he make such false accusations ?

Just as there have been changes of government in Israel, so should there be a change in the leadership of the World Jewish Congress. We will do everything in our power to see to it that Dr. Goldmann leaves his position now.

Mr. CHARLES KOKLIN (*Sweden*): I am a member of the delegation of the WJC Swedish Section and also member of the Board of the Jewish Community of Stockholm. As many of you perhaps know, our community is unfortunately not a member of the World Jewish Congress, the result of a decision taken years ago, when our community was different from what it is today. I am glad to say that the current leaders of the Stockholm Community and also the majority of its members have other ideas of Jewish life and Jewish responsibility than they may have had in earlier years.

The Stockholm Community today is aware of its responsibilities toward the Jewish people, the Jewish future, and our homeland, the State of Israel, and this awareness is reflected in our activities. We are part of the Jewish people and are working actively for Israel and for Jewish rights in Sweden and in other countries.

I am well aware of the important work which has been done by the Swedish Section of the World Jewish Congress. In my opinion, the time has come for the Jewish Community of Stockholm to show its sense of responsibility and its connection with the world-organized struggle for our people and I am glad to state that our Board of Directors is now considering the question of membership in the World Jewish Congress. I do hope that this question will be decided in a positive manner in the near future.

2. REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Mr. DONALD SILK, CC (*Great Britain – British Section, World Jewish Congress*), presented the report of the Credentials Committee, which he had chaired and which had met on three occasions since the beginning of the Assembly. The number of duly appointed representatives at the Assembly was as follows:

From national member communities and organizations	329 delegates 79 alternates
From 20 associated international organizations	92 delegates 33 alternates
Executive Committee members representing national constituents and associated international organizations	36
Honorary officers and ex officio members of the Executive Committee	16
Giving a total of	585
In addition, 11 organizations were represented by observers and fraternal delegates	32
Bringing the total number of participants to	617

representing 46 countries throughout the world.

The Credentials Committee report called to the attention of the plenum the nonchalant manner in which the question of accreditations had been treated by a few of the communities, which either did not submit their delegations' accreditations prior to the Assembly or did not do so on the letterhead paper of the organization concerned. Such practice, it was felt, could lead to abuse. The Committee further felt that – whereas the special allotment of forty youth delegates had been

intended to benefit smaller Jewish communities which, due to their limited number of delegates, could not satisfy the recommendation that youth should comprise 10% of each delegation — in fact many of the forty special youth delegates came from the largest communities.

Mr. Silk paid tribute to the active members of his Committee and expressed a special word of thanks to Mr. Sidney Gruber, who had served as secretary of the Committee, and to his assistant, Miss Ruthy Alchek.

TENTH SESSION

Thursday, February 6, 1975
(late afternoon)

In the chair: Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN

ADDRESS BY MR. MENACHEM BEGIN, MK

Dr. GOLDMANN: As you know, it is not the function of the plenum of this Assembly to debate Israel's political problems. Consequently we had invited only the prime minister to address the plenum on this subject, which he did yesterday. In view of the fact that Israel does not have a government of national unity at this time — and I do not mean to say that I am for it, because it is not the WJC's business to express itself on such matters — and that there is a numerically and emotionally very strong Opposition, we felt — and the prime minister has expressed his understanding for this feeling — that the hundreds of delegates from abroad have the right to hear the other side.

I have differed with Mr. Begin most of my life, but at the same time I have appreciated and admired him, not only for his devotion to the struggle for the establishment of the state, but also for the gentlemanly and fair way he has conducted the Opposition since independence. I thank him for accepting our invitation.

Mr. MENACHEM BEGIN: (*Joint Chairman, Likud Party of Israel*): I have come this evening in order to speak to you, basing myself on a double assumption, namely, that no matter touching the State of Israel is foreign to the Jewish people, and no matter touching the Jewish people is foreign to the State of Israel.

Both the Jewish people and its state — I believe it would be desirable to revive Herzl's appellation, which was not *the Jewish state*, but *the state of the Jews* — are at a crossroads. We know where we stand. The pervasive question is: Where are we going?

It can be answered in two ways: on the basis of facts, and in particular an awareness of the intent and the guile of the enemy. It is also possible to respond on the basis of self-delusion or as a result of dupery. If we choose the first way, we shall have no evil to fear. Although we shall be faced with trials, difficulties, and problems, we shall stand fast

and shall progress from the evil to the good. If, God forbid, it is the second kind of answer which is given, we are liable to suffer a disaster whose extent I shall not even allow myself to describe. We must not only beware of the possibility of such a disaster, but we must also warn against it, after the experience of this generation, unparalleled in the history of Israel in suffering, heroism, and rebirth.

It is my duty to tell you that just as the enemy practiced military deception in the ten days between Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur in 1973, he is today practicing political deception. The former weapon is sharp; the latter is fraught with danger. Recently the enemy has been full of peace proposals. He even announces that he will be ready to conclude a peace treaty. This impresses those who do not grasp the facts fully or who prefer to ignore them.

For the enemy always adds his two conditions. One is complete withdrawal by Israel to the lines of June 4, 1967, the lines which a man like the former foreign minister, Mr. Abba Eban, called "the Auschwitz lines." This expression is not to my liking but it is how he described them. And even if Israel withdraws to these lines, she will not have peace, because then she will have to restore — to use the expression used by the enemy — the rights of the people called by the strange and unhistoric name of Palestinian. The two conditions together mean one thing only: the creation of conditions that would place the existence of the Jewish state in immediate danger.

It is therefore no wonder that a week ago a statement was issued on behalf of the Opposition and of the government, to the effect that Sadat is willing to conclude a peace treaty with a State of Israel which would no longer exist. This statement was made in the name of 90% of the Knesset members and cut across party lines, with the exception of the Communists and their followers.

Please, my dear brothers from tens of countries, when you return to your homes tell this truth to your neighbors, Jewish and non-Jewish: our enemy talks of peace, but his heart is filled with treachery and the hope of destroying Israel. Then we will also be able to withstand the campaign of political deception that is being waged against us with full force all over the world, in the Americas as well as in Europe.

Against this background I should like to explain the interim agreements. We are living in a paradox: we shall advance toward peace by withdrawing without peace. In general, a paradox has two senses, one of which contradicts the other. I would respectfully explain that this particular paradox does not even have one sense; it has no relation at all to reality. Let us remember: if we withdraw without peace, then, with our approval, the state of war remains in effect. A state of war can be turned at any moment into an active war. And, in a state of war,

surrounded by enemies who we know do not want peace with us but our destruction, we should not be expected to abandon positions that protect our existence, our freedom, and our future. By withdrawing without peace we shall only be moving toward the lines of June 4, 1967, and – God forbid – toward war, in circumstances more difficult and more terrible than can be imagined. That is what the interim agreements are.

I shall give you two concrete examples of the implications of withdrawal without peace.

The demand is made that in the near future we should abandon the Mitla and Gidi passes in the Sinai range, as well as the oil fields of Abu Rodeis. Let me tell you that Israel needs 8,000,000 tons of oil a year. We obtain 4,000,000 tons from the Abu Rodeis fields; the remaining 4,000,000 come from two other sources, each of which provides 2,000,000 tons. One source always has a question mark over it; especially in times of hostilities, it is liable to be cut off. We have experience in this matter. I shall say no more.

If we abandon the Abu Rodeis oil fields, as we are asked to do, we shall lose 50% of the supply of the energy source which we need not only for industrial purposes, but, even more, for the defense of the Jews' state. This is not only an economic problem but a security problem of the first order.

The front today is 160 kilometers long. If we give up the Sinai passes, it will be 400 kilometers long. At the moment, relatively small units of our army can use these passes to block the enemy's path. If we withdraw behind them, our soldiers will be exposed, not on the battlements, but in the sand. There is in fact no line of defense worthy of the name this side of the passes. As the enemy is in possession of both sides of the Suez Canal, in a matter of five to six hours he can bring across five to six divisions. If we withdraw from the passes, we will no longer have a natural line of defense; our only line of defense will be our soldiers. Moreover, because of the length of the new line, we would have to mobilize tens of thousands from our reserves, not for a month but for much longer, and in so doing we would be harming our vital resources.

Look at it as Jews, as human beings, as experts. Ask other experts. Is there any nation which, in a state of war, would withdraw from such strategic defense positions, as if to make the enemy's work easier for him, knowing full well that the enemy is out to annihilate it? Therefore I propose that we should all keep to the great rule which is also established in international law: no withdrawal without peace. I should like you all to understand that only nine months ago this was the agreed policy of the entire nation, with the exception of Rakah – from the Likud to Arie Eliav, my opponent and friend. There are different

schools of thought as to what a peace treaty should contain. That is a question to be decided, but in spite of the different schools of thought, everyone agreed that this time we want peace. Peace finds its expression in peace treaties. We cannot, after ten attempts by the Arabs to annihilate us, after five great wars, after having sacrificed tens of thousands of our best sons — after all this, we cannot allow a state of war to continue. This time we demand negotiations for peace treaties and the signing of peace treaties; and failing such peace treaties, our army will stay in all the places in which it finds itself today.

That was the nationally agreed policy. It has been compromised. Let us unite and right what has gone wrong. Let us renew the national policy, and it will meet with the approval of the whole Israeli nation and of every friend of Israel. For that policy represents truth, reason, and concern for the future of the nation. Whatever the differences may be as to the contents of the peace treaties, without peace treaties there can be no withdrawal. Our army will remain where it is, and in this way it will protect the nation and will serve as a deterrent to starting a new war.

I said that there are various schools of thought. It is my privilege and my duty to present to you the thinking we have been following ever since Herzl and Jabotinsky. The many supporters of these principles are to be found in all the Zionist parties in Israel.

First, our right to Eretz Israel. After having said these simple words, my inner ear can hear a voice saying in a deprecatory manner: Oh, that's history. But in the name of what did we come here, if not in the name of history? Eretz Israel is a beautiful, a good land, a land of milk and honey. But we are not chauvinists: Switzerland is more beautiful. Why did we stick to this country? Why, through all the generations, did we pray for rain, not in the countries in which we were settled, but in this country? That's right, history. The basic right, the origin, the love, the past, the present, the future. Are we to be considered sinful because we love Eretz Israel? On Yom Kippur every Jew recites an almost endless list of sins. They are so numerous and so serious that for that reason the Jew does not say "the sin that I have sinned" but "the sin that we have sinned," because the man has not been born who could sin all that much. The list is long, but one sin I have not found in it: the sin we have sinned in loving Eretz Israel. We will not confess to this sin. This is our land. We have not conquered it, we have not penetrated into it, we have not grabbed it, we have not stolen it. We have returned to it, we have liberated it, we have redeemed our right to Eretz Israel.

But it is not merely history. It is not merely justice and truth. It is also concreteness, practicality, the security of our existence. If we were, God forbid, to hand over Judea and Samaria to foreign rule, by now everyone knows that "foreign rule" would mean Arafat; no one any

longer has any illusions about this; and if Hussein were to get Judea and Samaria, he himself has announced that he would hand them over to Arafat, in accordance with the decision taken in Rabat. Arafat in Judea and Samaria? We would be unable to breathe in the Jewish state. Our children would not be able to go to school in the Jewish state. All towns in Israel, except Haifa, would be within range of their fire. Bet-Shean, Ma'alot, Shamir — so many tragedies. Must all towns in Israel be like them?

You see, therefore, that the right to Eretz Israel and the right to security are one and the same. There is no distinction. Come to the Knesset, look through the window. Eight years ago the Knesset was shelled from the nearby hills. There are some who are ready to put Arafat on those hills. And, under the famous plan, Bethlehem should be in the enemy's possession. Where is the nation that would commit this folly? And where is the state which is entitled to demand from a nation like ours, after all we have suffered, that it should commit such a folly?

Second, the Arabs in Israel have rights and they have the option of acquiring citizenship. Ever since we adopted Zionism, we have believed in equal rights. The idea that a state must be nationally homogeneous — or, as they say in North America, ethnically homogeneous — has a tainted origin. It does not even come from Weimar, it comes from Berlin. A free man believes that people of different origins, both national and religious, can live together in one country. This is what we believe. This is what the Zionists have always believed. Did we not know that there were Arabs in Eretz Israel? We, after all, were the minority, and they were the majority. Today we are the majority, by almost two thirds. A majority of which people like Herzl, Nordau, Jabotinsky, Weizmann and Ben-Gurion, Ussishkin and Berl Katznelson could only dream. Only in their dreams could they see it — equality of rights for a Jewish majority and an Arab minority, and free choice as to citizenship. If they wish to have our nationality, it must be granted to them. If they prefer to maintain their former nationality, we must not force our citizenship on them. Everything by free decision. Ever since Alsace-Lorraine, the attempt to enforce citizenship has been regarded as a wrong. Do not let us commit it.

In what manner does equality of rights express itself? We have today in Israel 70,000 Jews who are residents, but not citizens. They have all the rights as individuals and as members of the Jewish nation. One right they do not have: that of voting in Knesset elections. They are Jews. The same applies to Arab residents. If they become citizens, they will also vote in Knesset elections. If they do not want our citizenship, they will be residents with all the rights of individuals and members of the Arab nation; and we recognize the Arab nation. With all our heart and

soul we believe in the equality of rights of peoples in one country and in one state.

Third, cultural autonomy for the Arab minority. We Jews have fought for cultural autonomy in the countries in which we were settled. We must acknowledge the same right for the Arab minority. Let them teach their children their language, their heritage, their culture, their religion. That is their right.

Fourth, a humane solution to the refugee problem. In the Knesset we say: The Jewish nation is a nation of refugees; it must have understanding for the bitter fate of the refugee. No part of our people ever wanted the problem of the Arab refugees to be created. In 1947 and 1948 all of us cried out to them: Stay here, only do not shed our blood. But every war is cruel and dreadful and creates a refugee problem. We have a proposal for a humane solution: for those Arab refugees living in the areas under our jurisdiction, we shall solve their problem by giving them housing worthy of the name, as well as stable employment. They will not be living on international charity; they will no longer be refugees.

As to the refugees in the Arab states — as was done in the case of Greece and Turkey in the 1920s, as was done in the whole of Europe after World War II, as was done in India and Pakistan — the Arab states, with their oil, their water, their land, and their billions, will solve their problem, and in this manner a wound will heal which we never wanted to open. This is a humane, possible, and practical solution of the refugee problem.

Fifth, direct negotiations for peace treaties. Why should the Jewish people be the sole exception? Wars are followed by negotiations. In negotiations, peace treaties are arranged. In peace treaties, both frontiers and relations are settled. How, after all we have suffered, after all we have done, can we accept that when it comes to this fateful issue there should be one nation that is told: You shall not have a peace treaty, there will be no negotiations with you on a peace treaty, there will be only interim agreements. We are offered the prospect of withdrawal in stages, which means giving up our national security and the hope for peace.

Sixth, a total cease-fire. Five times the Arab states have undertaken to cease fire, and five times they have announced that this undertaking also covers the irregular forces. They have not fulfilled this undertaking. With this fact, too, the world has come to terms. Why should we come to terms with it? We must demand, at least for a certain initial period, a total cease-fire. No more destruction. No more bloodshed. Arab shall not harm Jew and Jew shall not harm Arab. And during that period we will sit down and deliberate as to how to make peace.

Once more I sum up and say: Whatever schools of thought there may be on what the terms of peace should be, without peace there will be no withdrawal in any sector.

Having set out before you the principles governing our thinking, I again hear a voice in my inner ear, saying: This is all very well and it is even just, but it is impossible to achieve. With all due respect, if it is just, then one must at least try and achieve it. In our cruel world it is necessary to achieve justice.

Exactly eight years ago, in February 1967, were there many Jews and Zionists who regarded the reunification of Jerusalem as something within the realm of possibility? I remember the day during the Six-Day War when there were those who said that, having reached the Judean Mountains, we should halt there and not go down into the Jordan Valley; but we did go down into the valley, and today our army is on the Jordan. And today the vast majority in Israel, with the exception of Rakah, says that we must remain on the Jordan, for the sake of our lives, our future, and our very existence.

I could provide other examples, but these will suffice. If one believes in the justice of the cause, and if one looks facts squarely in the face, it can be achieved. Why should we give up and negate the historic achievement of the people of Israel for Eretz Israel in the Six-Day War?

But then people say: If this is the case, if we insist on our rights, then war is inevitable. My dear friends, there are no inevitable wars. All wars are the result of human error. If I had the time, I could show you, on the basis of documents, that the two World Wars could both have been avoided. But there is no time for this, so I shall give you some examples from our own experience.

On Yom Kippur, 1973, we were taken unawares. The enemy learned that we were unprepared, and then he attacked. In May 1973 we received information that the enemy was about to attack. We partially mobilized, and he did not attack. (Afterwards we were told that that mobilization cost 45,000,000 Israeli pounds. How many millions of *dollars*, not Israeli pounds, would the Jewish people have been prepared to give in order to have avoided the Yom-Kippur War!) In November 1974, we received information that we might be attacked. We mobilized 12,000 experienced soldiers. We put the army in a state of alert; we were not attacked.

The conclusion is simple: there are no inevitable wars. If we are ready and on the alert, we can deter the enemy. If the enemy knows that he will suffer a resounding defeat if he renews his aggression, then he will be deterred for a long time to come. He does not want defeat.

And the voice that counsels retreat and abandonment for fear of war is an old voice. It has been echoing in our ears since the 1930s. We know the results. Let us beware. War is not inevitable.

As I said when I began to speak this evening, nothing that touches the State of Israel is foreign to the Jewish people, and nothing that touches the Jewish people is foreign to the State of Israel. In the light of this fact, I would like to put before you a number of proposals.

I propose that there be set up at an early date a Council of the Jewish People and their State, for purposes of deliberation by you, just as in the Knesset. I shall mention one possible model. The important thing is the principle. Thirty members of the Knesset, elected by the Jewish people in Israel, and thirty representatives from the Diaspora could form this joint council. All of them would be elected democratically. Meetings would be held for two or three days each month, to deliberate on problems of the Jewish people and the Jewish state.

Take a look at what the Arabs are doing. They have all united — the kings, the Socialists, and the pro-Communists. They, the murderers of children. Opposite this Arab unity of hatred, blackmail, imperialism, attempted domination, from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic Ocean — let us put the historic unity of the Jewish people. Fifteen million Jews — 3,000,000 in the homeland and 12,000,000 in the countries of the Dispersion — all standing together. The Council I propose would be a practical expression of this unity. It would deal with our problems.

Here is one of these problems. A few hundred kilometers from here there is a Jewish ghetto — this is the literal truth. Thirty years after the liberation of Auschwitz — a ghetto, where 4500 Jewish souls live in fear at night, where women are abducted, murdered, and tortured, where children are in constant terror, and where insults, beatings, and breaches of confidence are rife. In connection with the disengagement agreement it was said that great efforts would be made in order to free our brethren in Syria. Dr. Kissinger spoke with Assad, who said to him: The Jews feel very well here. Only a week ago, some who had been rescued from Syria arrived in Israel and spoke up. A ghetto in our days, and the world is silent? Let this Council launch a campaign throughout the world. Ten flights by one Boeing would rescue our brethren from shame, degradation, hunger, oppression, humiliation, and fear for their lives.

The return to Zion of the Jews of the Soviet Union is an awakening without precedent. I can bear witness: I was there thirty-five years ago. Eretz Israel for the young generation was a geographical concept; they really called it "Palestine" — that alien name for Eretz Israel. Today they go into concentration camps — a real manifestation of *kiddush hashem*. This is one of the greatest phenomena in history. Zionism

conquers Communism. Not by force, but by ideas, for that is the power of Zionism against Communism. More than fifty-five years after the Bolshevik Revolution there are hundreds of thousands of young people in the USSR who say: We want to go to Eretz Israel, the historical homeland of the people of Israel. We should recite the *Shehecheyanu* blessing every day because we live in this great historic period.

At present there is a decrease in *aliya* from the Soviet Union. With all due respect I want to say, in connection with the cancellation of the trade agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States, that we Jews, whatever our citizenship, should not allow the impression to prevail in the United States that this is the fault of our great friend Senator Jackson, one of the righteous gentiles of the nations. We must be grateful to him. And if I may make a suggestion, perhaps the World Jewish Congress would also send him a special cable, expressing thanks for all he has done for our brethren and for the future of our people, for the return to Zion from the Soviet Union.

In connection with this historic problem, I would propose that an international Jewish conference meet soon, in order to renew the campaign for free *aliya* from the Soviet Union. I suggest that it be held not in Brussels but in New York. And I propose that on the opening or closing day, hundreds of thousands of Jews — from Israel, from Europe, from the Americas, from the Soviet Union — should again demonstrate on Hammarkjöld Plaza.

My dear friends, look at the terrible paradox: the enemy attacked us on Yom Kippur, he spilled our blood and intended to destroy us. Only through the heroism of our sons were we saved from a holocaust. The enemy wants to annihilate us, and he says so, in fact, explicitly — and yet he is regarded as peace-loving! And we, who are protecting the saving remnant of a persecuted nation, and who do not want our cities to be within range of their artillery or their Katyushas, and want to protect our women and children and want to maintain our right to Eretz Israel — we are today being described as rejecting peace, as hard, stubborn, stiff-necked. What a paradox!

The great Arab nation — and we have every esteem for the great Arab nation — today has nineteen sovereign states, 12,000,000 square kilometers; in a short while they will have a twentieth state. We, the Jewish people, have one small country, Eretz Israel. One percent of the great Arab nation will live in a free, democratic, and progressive country, with equal rights, under a Jewish government — yes, a Jewish government — in Eretz Israel; this is Zionism, this is Judaism. This is justice. They want to deprive us of our land, of all of it. The United Nations heard Arafat say so explicitly.

The revival of the Jewish state is the righting of an unparalleled wrong. Righting a wrong is quite simply justice. They want to renew the wrong. And to renew a wrong is the embodiment of evil. The justice of our cause must be explained to all the nations. If we explain, they will understand. This, too, will be one of the tasks of the Council of the Jewish People and the Jewish State.

Above all, the main thing is that we stand together, all the Jews, from Eretz Israel, from the Soviet Union, from Europe, from everywhere. These are fateful days; we are standing at a crossroads. And the question is: Whither? With God's help we will still see the majority of all the Jews in Eretz Israel, living in peace and security, in freedom and human dignity. And in us, or in our children, the vision of both Micah and Isaiah shall come true: "For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord out of Jerusalem."

ELEVENTH SESSION

Thursday, February 6, 1975
(evening)

In the chair: Mr. NATHAN JACOBSON

1. PRESENTATION AND ADOPTION OF PROPOSALS CONCERNING STRUCTURAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

Mr. NATHAN JACOBSON (*Australia*): For an organization like the World Jewish Congress, comprised of so many different organizations in different parts of the world which represent so many trends of thought, its Constitution is of vital importance.

On behalf of all of us, I would like to express thanks to Mr. Monroe Abbey, a distinguished Canadian lawyer who has served as chairman of the Committee on Organization, as well as to the members of his Committee, for the tremendous amount of work they have done.

A. INTRODUCTION

Mr. MONROE ABBEY, QC (*Canada*): For some time the need for changes in the organizational structure of the World Jewish Congress has made itself felt. At its meeting in Montreal in May 1970, the Governing Council decided unanimously

to authorize the president to appoint a committee whose task it will be to review the organizational setup of the World Jewish Congress in the light of new developments and to propose suggestions concerning organizational changes for consideration by the next Plenary Assembly.

Subsequently, Dr. Goldmann appointed the following members of the Committee on Organization: Mr. Monroe Abbey (chairman), Mr. Yehuda Benari, Dr. Isaac Goldenberg, Mrs. Rose Halprin, Dr. Lavoslav Kadelburg, Rabbi Joseph Karasick, Rabbi Wolfe Kelman, Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld, Dr. S. Levenberg, Mr. Jean Nordmann, Dr. Max Nussbaum, Mr. Jacques Orfus, Mr. Louis Pincus, Mr. Edy Rauch, Dr. Tibor Rosenbaum, Mr. Avraham Schenker, and Mr. Donald Silk, with the president,

the chairman of the Governing Council (Dr. Joachim Prinz), and the secretary-general (Dr. Gerhart Riegner) belonging to the Committee ex officio.

At later stages, there were some additions to the membership of the Committee and some changes in its composition. Mr. Itzhak Korn, Mr. Shad Polier, Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, and Mr. Jacques Torczyner joined the Committee; Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg took Rabbi Lelyveld's place on becoming president of the American Jewish Congress. Mr. Ron Finkel took the place of Mr. Rauch when he succeeded the latter as chairman of the World Union of Jewish Students. Several executive officers — Mr. Armand Kaplan, Dr. Natan Lerner, Mr. Max Melamet, Dr. Stephen Roth, Mr. Marc Turkow — and also Mr. Will Maslow were invited to attend meetings of the Committee. Dr. F.L. Brassloff acted as its secretary, and he has rendered really yeoman service.

At the meeting of the Committee that took place in Jerusalem on February 2, and again at today's meeting, the following additional participants were invited and present: Mr. Itzhak Harkavi, Mr. Jacob Katzman, Mr. Philip Klutznick, Dr. Benno Milnitzky, Dr. Nehemias Resnizky, Mr. Moshe Rivlin, Rabbi Joseph Sternstein, and Mr. Kalman Sultanik.

You may be asking yourselves why I have named all these people. First, because of their concern; and, second, to advise the Assembly that the proposed constitutional changes are not merely the suggestions of several people but have been considered, at one time or another, by some forty members of the Governing Council, which actually represents the great majority of its membership.

The composition of the Committee reflected the wide range of views within the Congress. It held seven sets of meetings: in Nice in January 1971, in Geneva in July 1971, in Paris in October 1971, in New York in June 1972, in Tel-Aviv in June 1973, in Zurich in January 1974, and in Jerusalem in February 1975.

The Committee made progress reports to the Governing Council and to the World Executive, which both considered the proposals elaborated by the Committee and arrived at unanimous resolutions on them, except for the meetings on February 2 and today, when Mr. Benari asked that his dissenting opinion be recorded as a *votum separatum*.

At its meeting in Tel-Aviv in June-July 1973, the Executive, after having given its unanimous approval to the proposals, decided on the establishment of a Legal Committee for the preparation of a revised

Constitution in the light of the envisaged structural changes. The Committee was also asked to take into consideration, as far as possible, the suggestions made by the Board of Deputies of British Jews in the course of the negotiations on its joining the Congress. This Committee, consisting of Mr. Will Maslow and Dr. Stephen Roth, performed, with the active assistance of the secretary-general and of Dr. Brassloff, a very useful job. It scrutinized thoroughly the proposals for structural changes and made in addition a number of valuable substantive suggestions and stylistic corrections of the text of the old Constitution. The draft of the revised Constitution was approved unanimously by the Governing Council at its sessions in Zurich in January 1974 and in Jerusalem in February 1975, and is now before the Plenary Assembly.

The revision maintains to a large extent the old structure. It is to the credit of the Second Plenary Assembly, held in Montreux in 1948, that the edifice then erected stood the test of time — almost thirty years — so well.

The basic nature of the organization of the Congress as "*a voluntary association of representative Jewish bodies, communities, and organizations throughout the world*" (Article 1 of the Constitution) does not call for any substantive change. It was merely found appropriate to speak in future of participating communities and organizations and also to replace the term *associate membership* by *associate status*. This change corresponds to the requirements of the Board of Deputies of British Jews to facilitate its joining the World Jewish Congress.

One of the main tasks was to achieve that the organs of the World Jewish Congress should be constructed and composed in a way which takes into account the developments that have led to the present situation, and which enables the organs to function efficiently.

This holds good in particular for the Governing Council, which was set up by the World Executive meeting in Strasbourg in 1965. It was originally thought that the Council should consist of twenty-five members only, but its membership now actually amounts to about fifty, for very good reasons. This increase was necessary largely because of the growth of the WJC in the USA in recent years, particularly through the joining of the great religious organizations. They have a legitimate claim to be represented in the Governing Council and also the smaller communities feel rightly that they should have some place in it. A system of rotation was introduced to make this possible. The enlargement of the Governing Council was also effected by the president extending standing invitations to representatives of the World Zionist Organization and to some international organizations whose interests would otherwise have been underrepresented.

In the light of the experience gained during almost ten years, it is felt that the Governing Council has finally established itself among the main organs of the Congress for the deliberation of major problems of Jewish and of WJC concern and of defining Congress policies. Its half-yearly general meetings, which were very well attended, were in this respect very useful. The Governing Council has, however, not been able to perform executive functions between World Executive meetings as originally envisaged. This is the reason for the proposed establishment of a new organ with real executive functions, on which I shall report soon.

As to the former Governing Council, it will in future be called the *Governing Board* in order to avoid confusion with the *General Council*, which is the new name of the old Executive Committee. This change of nomenclature was necessary because the term *Executive* has to be reserved for the new top leadership body.

Whereas the functions of the old Governing Council were not clearly defined, the revised Constitution contains such a definition for the new Governing Board. It is its function to govern the WJC between meetings of the General Council — the new name of the old Executive Committee — in accordance with policies laid down by the Plenary Assembly, or the General Council in session between Assemblies. The decisions of the Governing Board will be reported to the next meeting of the General Council. Certain powers until now held by the old World Executive, as the Executive Committee was usually called, are transferred to the new Governing Board. The reason for this is that the new General Council, which replaces the old World Executive, will meet only every two years; certain matters have to be dealt with more quickly, and it is intended that the Governing Board will meet twice a year.

The old Constitution contained merely the authorization for the Executive Committee to set up the Governing Council, without spelling out its composition. The new, revised, version legislates on the composition of the Governing Board. The members of the new leading body, which will be called the Executive, will belong to the new Governing Board. The membership of the various national bodies in the Governing Board is to be fixed by a key which assures permanent representation of the larger communities (with a Jewish population of more than 80,000), according to their numerical strength. In addition, it is envisaged that the key will provide for eight delegates to represent in rotation the other, smaller, national bodies. In addition, there will be members appointed by international bodies in associate status designated by the Plenary Assembly to receive such representation. The Board may also, by a two-thirds vote, grant representation on the Board to new bodies joining the WJC between Plenary Assembly sessions.

Other members of the Governing Board will be the chairmen of the standing commissions and the directors of departments and of the regional Branches.

The actual key of representation on the Governing Board will not form part of the Constitution but will be fixed by the Plenary Assembly; this allows for flexibility and adaptation to circumstances. You will see from the proposed key of representation that has been distributed here that the Governing Board will have about seventy members.

The new Governing Board will in future have the authority to set up permanent commissions and will elect their chairmen — a task which up till now was allotted to the old Executive Committee. Particularly mentioned are commissions on international, cultural, and organizational affairs, but others, too, may be established.

The most important innovation is the creation of the new organ called the *Executive*. The need for a small group which would be a truly executive body, which would be in charge of conducting the affairs of the Congress, could meet frequently, and would be convened quickly if necessary, has made itself felt for some time.

On an experimental and provisional basis the president, as a result of discussions in the Committee on Organization and in the Governing Council, decided in 1972 to invite the chairmen of the Governing Council, the treasurer, the secretary-general, and the chairman of the World Zionist Organization to work with him in dealing with the affairs of the WJC. The Governing Council also took note that the president intended to invite to meetings of this leadership group — if the agenda should require it — all or some regional chairmen, the heads of the International Affairs Commission and of the Israel Political Committee, and heads of departments if matters within their competence would be discussed, as well as representatives of major organizations affiliated to the WJC if their presence should be necessary for the discussion of the agenda. The group — a kind of “small Executive” — has met regularly since the beginning of 1973.

It is now proposed that the new body called the Executive should meet at least four times a year. Two of these meetings should be held in conjunction with the Governing Board or the General Council or the Plenary Assembly.

The new Executive will conduct the affairs and act on behalf of the WJC in accordance with the decisions of the Governing Board — that is, the former Governing Council — between meetings of the Governing Board. The decisions of the Executive will be reported to the next meeting of the Governing Board.

The composition of the new Executive will be: the president, the vice-presidents, the chairman of the Governing Board, the chairman of the General Council, the treasurer or treasurers, the chairmen of the regional Branches, and the secretary-general. The Executive may establish a smaller committee from among its members to conduct the day-to-day activities of the World Jewish Congress between meetings of the Executive.

The old Executive Committee, usually called the World Executive — or, to give it its new name, the *General Council* — was supposed to conduct the affairs of the Congress between Assembly sessions and to meet once a year for this purpose. This concept has, however, proved to be unrealistic. In reality, it was impossible for purely technical reasons — particularly financial considerations — to have yearly Executive meetings. In future, the new General Council is expected to meet every second year unless a Plenary Assembly is held in such year.

There will be three categories of the members of the General Council: full, associate, and honorary members. The members of the Governing Board (that is, the former Governing Council) will automatically be members of the General Council. Other full members will be the holders of offices designated to full membership by the Plenary Assembly or the General Council; and members nominated as their representatives by national or international bodies, the number of these representatives to be allotted in accordance with a key fixed by the Plenary Assembly which shall take into account the representation of such bodies on the Governing Board.

Associate members will be holders of offices so designated by the Plenary Assembly or the General Council, and members so nominated as their representatives by national or international bodies, according to the key mentioned. The Plenary Assembly and the General Council are further authorized to elect honorary members of the General Council.

As you can see from the proposed key of representation on the General Council that has been distributed here, the General Council will have more than 200 members.

The General Council will receive and may review reports from the Governing Board and/or the new Executive. It will determine the general policies of the WJC between Plenary Assembly sessions.

In the past, the Executive Committee functioned mainly through its regional Branches. The new General Council will continue to establish its own Branches in Europe, Israel, Latin America, North America, and such other places as it finds appropriate, and determine their responsibilities. The Branches will consist of all the members of the

General Council located in the respective areas. The Committee on Organization and the Governing Council are proposing — for adoption by this Plenary Assembly, acting for the General Council — a resolution concerning the functions of the regional Branches. The text of this draft resolution has been distributed here.

As to the *Plenary Assembly*, no major change is envisaged. It is common knowledge that it has been impossible to convoke sessions regularly every four years in view of the high costs involved. Assemblies took place in 1948, 1953, 1959, and 1966. It was planned to hold the Sixth Plenary Assembly by the latest in 1973. It is felt that these intervals are too long, and that in future a four-year interval should be strictly adhered to unless the Governing Board, due to extraordinary circumstances, decides otherwise.

A few other points of an organizational character have also been settled by unanimous agreement.

On the question of how to proceed in the event of a vacancy in the office of president, it is proposed that the Executive shall call a special meeting of the Governing Board within three months and propose to it the designation of an acting president who shall exercise all the powers and duties of the president until the next meeting of the General Council, which shall elect a new president, who shall hold office until the next Plenary Assembly.

You will note that the key of representation on the General Council provides for seventeen youth delegates over and above those allocated to the World Union of Jewish Students. The Committee on Organization proposes that the Assembly recommend that a subcommittee be set up to consider the election and the financing of representation of youth and their participation in the General Council.

Under draft Article 10, paragraph c, of the proposed revised Constitution, heads of departments of the World Jewish Congress will be appointed by the Governing Board subject to the approval of the General Council. Under the same paragraph, regional directors will be appointed by the Governing Board in consultation with the respective Branch, subject to the approval of the General Council. It should be noted, however, that the Committee on Organization proposes that the incumbent heads of departments and regional directors be elected by the Plenary Assembly, and that accordingly Article 10, paragraph c, of the revised Constitution should only apply to their successors and to positions which may be created in the future.

It is also proposed that the Assembly set up a Budget and Finance Commission; in addition there is a draft resolution laying down the procedure for the preparation of the annual budget of the WJC.

Another matter concerns special relationships of the WJC with other organizations. In 1966 the Brussels Plenary Assembly adopted a resolution on cooperation with the World Zionist Organization. That resolution noted with deep satisfaction the decision of the 26th Zionist Congress on close cooperation between the two organizations and urged the WJC Executive Committee to establish the necessary machinery for the implementation of cooperative efforts. Representatives of the WZO had already participated as observers in various bodies of the WJC and in Congress activities. It was agreed that they would from then on act as full representatives of the WZO. The Executive Committee meeting in Israel in 1970 resolved that, in order to strengthen the links between the WJC and the WZO and to make cooperation more permanent, the number of representatives of the WZO on the WJC Executive Committee should be increased from three to seven. There was consensus at the Executive Committee meeting in Tel-Aviv in 1973 that a special relationship with the WZO should be arranged and that special representation of the WZO on the new Executive and other governing bodies of the WJC should be provided for.

The proposed revised Constitution, in Article 4, paragraph c, provides for the possibility of entering into such special relationships with major Jewish organizations and for the representation of such bodies on various organs of the WJC. The Governing Board is authorized to enter into such a relationship by a two-thirds vote and subject to the ratification by the General Council.

There remains the most important issue of whether the purposes of the World Jewish Congress require a change of definition. This matter was also carefully discussed. There was agreement that the text contained in Article 2 of the present Constitution can be maintained. The basic ideas stated by the Plenary Assembly in 1948 hold good. Only one change seems to be eminently appropriate. In 1948, under the impact of the Holocaust, it was stated that, among other purposes, "the World Jewish Congress is organized to assure the survival of the Jewish people." We have passed the stage where the idea of mere survival was paramount in the minds of Jewry. A text omitting the reference to survival, and stating among the purposes of the WJC the ensuring of the continuity and development of the religious, spiritual, cultural, and social heritage of the Jewish people is apposite today, as is world Jewry's integral relationship to Israel.

The relevance of the central role of Israel for world Jewry is obvious today, but this was not yet the case when the WJC Constitution of 1948 was adopted, only six weeks after the establishment of the State of Israel. Noncontroversial as Israel's central role is, the World Jewish Congress must not mechanically repeat the text of the Jerusalem Pro-

gram. Firstly, if the aims of the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organization were identical, there would be no need for a World Jewish Congress. Moreover, there are communities which would not want, or, in view of the position of their respective countries, would not be able, to accept the Zionist program.

The wording proposed by the Committee on Organization and the Governing Council in draft Article 2, on the purposes of the WJC, should be acceptable to all communities which belong to the Congress. The preamble and first operative paragraph of Article 2 read as follows:

"The World Jewish Congress is organized to foster the unity of the Jewish people, to strive for the fulfillment of its aspirations, and to ensure the continuity and development of its religious, spiritual, cultural, and social heritage, and to that end it seeks:

(1) to intensify the bonds of world Jewry with Israel as the central creative force in Jewish life and to strengthen the ties of solidarity among Jewish communities everywhere;"

This text indeed is a declaration of Jewish peoplehood.

The proposals now before the Assembly are the result of assiduous and continuous work on the part of the bodies that reviewed the present structural setup. These proposals are to find their place in the revised Constitution and in the organizational resolutions which have been presented to you, which it is hoped will constitute workable instruments for the Congress to perform its functions efficiently and effectively.

I wish to thank all those who served on the Committee on Organization — both lay and professional — especially the secretary-general, Dr. Riegner, and the Congress' legal adviser, Dr. F.L. Brassloff.

I have the honor to present to the Plenary Assembly this draft Constitution and the relevant resolutions, which come to you with unanimous approval except for the reservation made by Mr. Benari, and I move that it be adopted by the Assembly.

B. DISCUSSION

Next, Mr. JACOBSON announced that two delegates had amendments to propose, which would be considered and voted upon before the Assembly took up the revised Constitution as a whole. He called first on Mr. Benari to introduce his amendment.

Mr. YEHUDA BENARI (*Israel*) noted that the draft before the Assembly provided for a relatively large Executive, which would establish a smaller committee from among its members to conduct the day-to-day activities. In his view this was impractical because the Executive members lived in too many different countries. He proposed an amendment to the effect that the Executive should comprise solely the president of the World Jewish Congress, the chairman of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, the chairman of the Governing Board, the chairman of the General Council, the treasurer, and the secretary-general.

Dr. GOLDMANN said that unfortunately Mr. Benari's suggestion was not feasible because the Executive must include the chairmen of the regional Branches. Unlike the WZO, the Congress was not built along party lines but reflected regional interests, and the four regional chairmen were among the pillars of the Executive.

The amendment was put to a vote and rejected.

Mr. DONALD SILK, CC (*Great Britain - British Section, World Jewish Congress*) noted that under the proposed text, there was no limitation on the number of vice-presidents. In his view this undermined the purpose of a small authoritative body such as the Executive. He proposed an amendment which would explicitly limit the number of vice-presidents to a maximum of three and stipulate that one of them should be the chairman of the World Zionist Organization.

Dr. RIEGNER pointed out that it was up to the Assembly itself to determine how many vice-presidents it would elect. He said the rule should be kept flexible, as future needs of regional representation could not be foreseen. He also pointed out that even if the restrictive wording proposed by Mr. Silk were adopted, the Assembly would still be free to amend the Constitution if and when it wanted to elect more than three vice-presidents. Therefore, the wording should remain unchanged.

The amendment put forward by Mr. Silk was rejected by the Assembly.

At the request of Ing. GEORG ROSENSTEIN (*Switzerland*), it was agreed to postpone to later in the Assembly the vote on the resolution concerning the composition of the General Council and the Governing Board, in order to allow the delegates more time to study the proposed keys of representation, particularly their implications for the smaller communities.

The Plenary Assembly then adopted, by the required majority, the Constitution as revised by the Committee on Organization and the Governing Council, as well as the organizational resolutions proposed by the two bodies, with the exception of the resolution on the compo-

sition of the General Council and the Governing Board, which was deferred for consideration later in the Assembly.

(For the full texts of the revised Constitution and the organizational resolutions, see Appendix II.)

2. FORMAL ADMISSION OF THE BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS

Mr. JACOBSON: For years, the World Jewish Congress has suffered under the tremendous handicap of not having as its affiliates some of the most important Jewish communities in the world. One of these is the British community, comprising some 500,000 Jews. We have now reached the happy state where the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the representative body of this great community with great traditions, which has contributed so much to the establishment of the State of Israel and supported it so strongly, is ready to be admitted to the World Jewish Congress. This is indeed an historic occasion which will be deeply engraved in the annals of the World Jewish Congress. It is with pleasure that I now call upon Dr. Stephen Roth, executive director of the European Branch of the World Jewish Congress, to propose the admission of the Board of Deputies to the Congress.

Dr. STEPHEN J. ROTH (*Executive Director, European Branch, World Jewish Congress*): I am very grateful for having been given the privilege of moving the admission of the Board of Deputies to the World Jewish Congress. I assume I have been selected for this role because the Board's joining is in some way the crowning of many years of effort which I have put into creating an amicable and good working relationship between the Board and the WJC and finally negotiating the concrete terms of accession.

Our president, Dr. Goldmann, said in his opening address that the Board's adhesion is an important milestone in the history of the Congress. It is indeed so, for several reasons. Firstly, the Board, with a history of more than 200 years, is probably the oldest representative national Jewish organization, encompassing practically the entire Jewish community of the United Kingdom and recognized as such by the government of the country. Secondly — and my friends from Britain will surely not misunderstand me when I say that I state this with some sadness — the Board of Deputies of British Jews represents one of the five largest communities in the Diaspora. I say it with sadness because this is a result of the destruction of the great Jewish centers in Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Germany, and so on. And thirdly, their joining is a milestone because it symbolizes the great changes that have been taking place in the life of our people in the

almost forty years between 1936 – when the Board first considered and by a narrow vote rejected affiliation – and 1974, when it voted to join the WJC by a majority of some 95% of its members.

The dramatic events during this period – the Holocaust and the birth of the State of Israel – have completely changed the complexion of British Jewry. From a community largely dominated by assimilationist Jews, ruled by the “Anglos,” as we used to call them, or the “Grand Dukes,” as Zangwill termed them – as isolationist and insular as any Little Englander – the lessons of Jewish history have turned British Jewry into a community passionately devoted to Jewish national aspirations and to maintaining our Jewish heritage and identity, filled with a deep sense of solidarity with *medinat yisrael* and the entire Jewish people. British Jewry is democratic to the core; the reins of government have been taken over from the Grand Dukes by *amkho*, the children and grandchildren of East European immigrants. The two lords who grace the leadership of the Board and its delegation to this Assembly are not hereditary peers but have earned their distinction for their work in the socialist Labor movement.

This fundamental change in Anglo-Jewry, which is but a small mirror of the wider change in world Jewry, express itself in a desire to occupy Anglo-Jewry’s rightful place in the councils of world Jewry. British Jewry has, of course, a great record of assisting their brethren abroad, since the time of Sir Moses Montefiore; but it was more the help of the stronger and wealthier community – living in one of the most powerful empires of the world – given to the weaker and poorer sections of our people, rather than sitting in joint counsel on the basis of equality – rich and poor, large and small, hammering out a common policy – as we do in the WJC.

I have seen these changes not just from the vantage point of the World Jewish Congress, but also from inside the Board, in which I have been an active Deputy for twenty years. When I was entrusted with the general secretaryship of the WJC British Section, I regarded it as my first task to create harmonious relations with the Board. That required assuring the Board that the British Section fully recognized the authority of the Board as the spokesman of Anglo-Jewry. To me this was obvious. I felt that members of the WJC, whose goal is the unity of the Jewish people, must recognize that unity like charity must begin at home, on the national level. From there we could go on, from harmony to cooperation, from cooperation to negotiations about joining, aided undoubtedly by parallel developments in Great Britain as a whole: the weakening of insularism, the entry into Europe, and generally a greater sense of internationalism.

But all this would not have been enough had there not been during those nearly forty years an able, devoted, and very representative group

of people gathered in the WJC British Section, who with their work and achievements have given honor to the name of the World Jewish Congress in Britain — people like the late Noah Barou, Sydney Silverman, and Lady Reading, and — *lehavdil ben chayim umetim* — Maurice Perlzweig, Alex Easternman, and such old stalwarts as Izhak Nathani, Aba Bornstein, and Maurice Orbach, all of whom are present here in this hall. And even more important than their past work was the attitude of the leaders of the British Section, headed by its chairman, Jacob Halévy, in being willing to give up their positions, their seats, the *kavod* they enjoyed, thereby making possible what they originally had set out to achieve — the affiliation of the entire Anglo-Jewish community. I think this Assembly should pay tribute to this rare and exemplary devotion.

I also wish to pay a personal tribute to the immediate past president of the Board, Michael M. Fidler, who during his term of office negotiated the terms and got through the first recommendation of adhesion by the Board; and to the present president, Lord Fisher of Camden — to us, his friends, just Sammy Fisher — who put the final seal to this marriage.

Of course, old traditions die hard, particularly in Britain, and this is why some members of the Board were still fearful of terms like “membership,” “affiliation,” etc. I am glad that the Congress leadership has been flexible enough not to lose sight of the essence for the sake of semantics and has agreed to the changes requested by the Board, as approved by this Assembly a few minutes ago.

I have very great pleasure in moving the admission of the Board of Deputies of British Jews to the World Jewish Congress.

Mr. JACOBSON: The motion will be seconded by Mr. Jacob Halévy, the outgoing chairman of the British Section of the World Jewish Congress.

Mr. JACOB HALEVY (*Chairman, British Section, World Jewish Congress*): The British Section of the World Jewish Congress was established because the Board of Deputies of British Jews had rejected affiliation with the Congress. I believe part of the reason for this rejection at that time was that the Board had misgivings that it might be considered as speaking in Britain on behalf of an international body. In the wake of the Holocaust and with the reestablishment of the Jewish state, these misconceptions are gone.

Mr. Michael Fidler, former president of the Board of Deputies, Lord Fisher, its current president, and especially Dr. Roth, contributed much to the decision of the Board to participate in the Congress.

From its inception, the man who worked greatly for the strengthening of the British Section was Dr. Maurice L. Perlzweig, and I

am happy that he is with us this evening. Other early stalwarts of the Section were Dr. S. Levenberg and Barnett Janner (now Lord Janner). After Dr. Perlzweig came the late Sydney Silverman, whom I succeeded almost a quarter of a century ago. The general secretaries of the British Section were Dr. L. Zelmanovits, then Dr. Roth, and finally Jack Barnett — all have made great contributions. I would also like to thank Dr. Elizabeth Eppler for her outstanding work in the cultural endeavors of the British Section.

The British Section has been involved in many activities in every field of life of British Jewry. It was responsible for the publication of the World Jewish Library series, organized symposia, helped in tracing the families of those who survived the Holocaust, and generally was an important factor.

I relinquish my function as chairman of the British Section with great delight, and I welcome the Board of Deputies into our Congress. We now have unity and I hope that before long the Representative Council of the Jewish Institutions of France (CRIF) will also join so that the World Jewish Congress will truly represent the largest part of Jewry in the Diaspora.

Mr. JACOBSON: I wish to put on record that the Assembly has adopted the motion by acclamation. I now call on Lord Fisher of Camden.

The Rt. Hon. LORD FISHER OF CAMDEN (*President, Board of Deputies of British Jews*): Today makes history and my colleagues of the British delegation join with me in expressing our appreciation at the manner in which the Assembly has received Dr. Stephen Roth's motion in regard to the participation of the Board of Deputies in the future work and activities of the World Jewish Congress.

I want here to pay a tribute to the former British Section of the World Jewish Congress under the chairmanship of Jacob Halévy and his distinguished predecessors. The relationship between the Board of Deputies and the British Section has always been friendly and, in fact, in time of need there has been close cooperation. Many members of the British Section are active and leading members of the Board and serve on its committees. In fact, Dr. Stephen Roth, who was one of those who initiated the discussions, is at present vice-chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and Dr. Levenberg, an outstanding scholar, writer, and publicist and active in the World Jewish Congress, is a vice-president of the Board of Deputies. I could mention many other names and the Board has benefited greatly by their experience and knowledge. Over the years there have been several attempts to bring about a "shidukh" but for various reasons, all now part of history, it just did not happen. It is only right, therefore, that you should know some-

thing about the "*kala*" and I will venture to give you a brief outline of our "*yichus*."

The Board of Deputies, of which I have the honor to be president, is 214 years old and during that long period our community has had many experiences, some happy but many sad, but we have survived, and it has been said of us that we are one of the best organized Jewish communities in the world, with a splendid and loyal staff. If this is so, it is not entirely as a result of our merit, because we are fortunate that we live on a small island, which makes for immediate contact between all the areas in which Jews live. Although we had our share during the war, it was nothing compared to the sufferings of our people in Europe, and we were not invaded. All this has given us in Britain a continuity and a cohesion which has made us the community we are today and about which it can be said that we have unity but not uniformity.

The bulk of the Jews in the United Kingdom came between 1880 and 1912, pouring into the country from Eastern Europe, trying to escape from the pogroms and repression. My own parents came from Bialystok, and although I was born in the East End of London — the ghetto — I spoke Yiddish and only realized that there was a language called English when I went to school. Such were the conditions in which most of us lived and which could never be tolerated today. In those early days we were looked upon with great distaste as an unknown alien element and a member of Parliament at that time is on record as complaining in Parliament "about the riffraff and rubbish coming from the ghettos of Europe and who were sullyng the fair land of Britain." Since then we have made a little progress and I say with pride that the Jews of Britain have made outstanding contributions far beyond the proportion of their numbers in every field of human endeavor, be it arts, science, medicine, law, or industry, and have helped materially to improve the quality of life in our country.

Our Jewish population is about 410,000 out of a national population of 55,000,000 and there are forty-five Jewish members of Parliament — three of whom are with us (Greville Janner, Eric Moonman, and Maurice Orbach) — out of 635 members of Parliament in the three major political parties, and many of our Jewish members of Parliament hold Cabinet and government office. The Jewish MPs thus constitute 7.5% of the total membership of the House of Commons. There are also a number of Jews in the House of Lords, in addition to my friend Lord Janner, a former president of the Board, and myself. Gradually our community has established itself and advice is sought from us by government authorities, the last occasion being the Working Party on Race Relations set up under my friend and predecessor, Michael Fidler, a former member of Parliament and president of the Board, who was also one of those who initiated the discussions which have led to our

entry tonight. This Race Relations Document had a wide circulation not only in the community but in universities, schools, and religious bodies all over the country and abroad.

We have, also by tradition, an excellent relationship with governments of all colors in our country and we are readily and courteously invited to discuss any subject we wish with the prime minister of the day or any other Cabinet minister and we do not hesitate to make use of this, not only for ourselves but for any Jewish community in the world which may be persecuted or harassed, and who are not as fortunate as we who live in a free country.

Of course Israel has been in the forefront of our minds and we have spoken very frankly about our feelings when a British government has, in our opinion, not acted properly and fairly, but I am glad to say that today there is a close and friendly relationship between the British and Israel governments and the present British prime minister is particularly helpful.

I do not wish to give you the impression, however, that in Britain everything is *goldene glück*. No such thing; we have had some very difficult times, particularly when the British Fascists under Mosley set out to attack us and there was physical violence in the streets when we and many non-Jews reacted successfully.

Today the Fascists are a shadow of their former selves, but when they poll about 115,000 votes in a general election, despite the fact that they won no parliamentary seats, we have to watch the situation closely. In addition, we have a number of committees within the Board dealing with a variety of matters which may concern the Jewish community; for example the Law and Parliamentary Committee monitors government legislation. Other areas covered by committees include, inter alia, education — although we do not ourselves run the education establishments; Jewish aliens; Israel and foreign affairs (including Soviet Jewry and Jews in Arab lands); *shechita*, which is now a problem because of the laws of some of the EEC countries; Jewish defense, about which I will tell you more in a moment; and an Executive Committee upon which all Committee chairmen also serve and which deals with overall policy matters.

I come back to defense at home, and in view of our recent experiences, we have strengthened this department. We have suddenly realized that we have a new kind of enemy, a new phenomenon of which we have had no experience; a bitter enemy, rich beyond our wildest dreams, ruthless, and growing more sophisticated, which makes him more dangerous. The best way I can describe this is to tell you of the particular incident which brought it home to us — I refer to the full-page newspaper advertisement, costing approximately £ 4000, criticizing

the Jewish community of Britain for sending money to Israel, and implying disloyalty. Immediately the warning bells rang in our ears. We took instant action in several ways, as a result of which the newspaper apologized as far as a newspaper would, and refused another identical advertisement from this seemingly innocent-sounding body, whose title referred to Anglo-Arab understanding, whilst other newspapers which were also offered the advertisement refused it. In addition we have had discussions with the appropriate government department.

Why do I tell you this ? Because I believe that this is the first strike; we are gearing ourselves to other attacks which may come, because if it can happen in England, I want to warn you that it can happen anywhere else in every country represented here today. Remember we are dealing with an enemy who can buy anything with his money and who, I believe, is seeking to damage and weaken the Jewish communities around the world; this will automatically affect Israel and put more pressure upon it. We will take a positive approach, and we will, by means of suitable publications and lectures and possibly meetings, show the people of Britain the true image of their Jewish neighbors and the benefits they have given and the great services they have rendered, in war and peace. We will also carry the matter further by showing our government the weaknesses in our Race Relations Acts, which should properly provide for prosecution for race hatred, not only against Jews but other minority groups as well. At the same time we will try to instill the necessary discipline in our various Jewish organizations so that we have united action when required, and I am sure that the whole community will respond, from the left to the right. I am not a pessimist by nature, but in a difficult economic climate, with possibly heavy unemployment, which is affecting the whole Western world, greater care than ever is necessary. This week, the Assembly here has already given us much, and most important has been the development of a sense of family with our brothers and sisters from far lands whom we normally would rarely if ever meet.

As we grow closer together through the World Jewish Congress, each can help the other in self-protection, and together we can help Israel, the homeland which we love.

Mr. Chairman, we present our greetings to our remarkable president and we congratulate and thank you for your conduct in the chair. We also congratulate the officers to be elected, and we wish for peace in Israel and good health, happiness, and contentment to our brethren everywhere.

Dr. GOLDMANN: Rarely have I taken the floor with so much satisfaction as I do at this moment. First, I want to express my thanks to the British Section, not only for the splendid work they have done for

so many year under the leadership of some of the greatest figures in the history of the World Jewish Congress, but also for the gentlemanly way in which they agreed to dissolve the Section in order to enable the Board of Deputies to join the Congress.

In 1936, the participation of the Board in the constituent Assembly of the WJC would have been of great importance. The motion to join the World Jewish Congress was defeated by a majority of seven. Those seven votes caused a delay of more than thirty years. It was not easy for a body that has existed for more than 200 years to even allow the semblance that it would give up its sovereignty. My friend Michael Fidler, who was president of the Board when the negotiations that led to tonight's decision began, was the only one who could take the initiative. On our side, Dr. Roth was the moving spirit. When the United Kingdom joined the European Economic Community, he determined to bring British Jewry into the community of European Jewry and he has succeeded, with the help, naturally, of all the others.

What a Jewish community brings into the World Jewish Congress is not only the weight of its numbers, its qualities, its mental and other resources — it brings in that characteristic of Jewish life in the Diaspora, a specific spirit, something of the country, the people with whom it lives. I hope for the sake of the World Jewish Congress that the Board of Deputies will bring in, in addition to its factual weight, something of the spirit of the great British people. Weizmann was one of their great admirers. The British can serve as a model to the Jews and Israel in two respects: their ability to compromise and their ability to adapt themselves to realities. These qualities explain in part the greatness of the British. The Jews, on the other hand, were forced throughout 2000 years of persecution not to adapt themselves to realities and not to accept compromises. If we had done otherwise, there would no longer be a Jewish people.

If the Arabs were like the British, we would have had peace long ago, because the British have a tremendous genius for accepting change and defeat, and for forgetting negative events. In our generation they lost the largest empire in the world, yet they are quite happy. If we Jews had lost such an empire, we would have a Tisha b'Av twice a week. Therefore, I hope the Board will bring some of this British spirit into our deliberations.

I want to say, in simplicity and sincerity, that I am very happy that the Board of Deputies has finally come into the Congress, and I am confident that they will make a great contribution to the work of the WJC, which means to Jewish life.

TWELFTH SESSION

Saturday, February 8, 1975
(evening)

In the chair: The Rt. Hon. LORD JANNER OF LEICESTER

SYMPOSIUM: JERUSALEM AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The Rt. Hon. LORD JANNER OF LEICESTER (*Great Britain*): A few months from now, celebrations will be held here to mark the 120th anniversary of the commencement of the construction of the first Jewish settlement outside the walls of the Old City. The project undertaken in 1855 was begun on the initiative of Sir Moses Montefiore, who visited Palestine on seven occasions. Sir Moses, who was a longtime president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, was active in England in support of human rights in general and those of the Jewish people in particular, and intervened on behalf of the Jewish communities in Russia, Rumania, Morocco, Damascus, and elsewhere; he carried out activities similar to those which the World Jewish Congress and others interested in the safety of our people are doing today.

The area in which the nineteenth-century settlement was situated continues to be developed and improved through the energy and foresight of the distinguished mayor of Jerusalem, Mr. Teddy Kollek, who once again has shown what a great pioneer who has Jerusalem's interests deeply at heart can achieve.

What I said during my maiden speech in the House of Lords in 1970 still holds true today. Jerusalem has always been a unified city, except for the nineteen years when the eastern part of the city was under Hashemite occupation after being captured by Jordan in the 1948 war. Since its reunification in 1967, there is a free flow of movement and trade between all parts of the city and its surroundings. All the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Jews and Arabs alike, enjoy compulsory free education for their children from the age of five to fifteen. For the first time the Arabs of Jerusalem have free schools and kindergartens for their children. There are new municipal youth clubs, playgrounds, maternal and social centers. And those activities are due in no small measure to the work which Teddy Kollek has done in the ten years he has been in office.

I think that the following quotation from the London *Daily Telegraph* is appropriate for this gathering :

To Christians and Muslims, Jerusalem is a place where supremely important things happened long ago. To them therefore it is an object of pilgrimage. To Jews, on the other hand, it is the living centre of faith, or, if they have no faith, of their identity as a people. To them it is a place to be possessed, today and forever. There is no essential incompatibility between these different needs. Jewish political possession of Jerusalem and absolute freedom of access to it by Christians and Muslims – these have always been twin-declared principles of the State of Israel.

I could not express myself in better terms. I am convinced, as I believe are Jewish people throughout the world in common with their fellow men who have visited Jerusalem or have read about the situation here, that every regard and respect is shown in this city for all other faiths and for all moral ideas. Jerusalem must remain the capital city of this great country Israel in order that the world may derive from it the guidance which is so essential to us all.

I intended to make a speech of introduction for the next speaker, but on second thought I think this would be superfluous. There is nobody who does not know of Teddy Kollek and what he has done for Jerusalem in the years that he has been the distinguished mayor of this city. We regard him with great affection and respect. I have very much pleasure in asking him to bring us greetings from the city of Jerusalem.

Mr. TEDDY KOLLEK (*Mayor of Jerusalem*): I am very happy to welcome you here in the Jerusalem Theater, which is regarded as one of the achievements of our city. Its construction was interrupted four times by government bans on building, and we finished it just before the last ban. I am glad it is here to receive you.

Normally I make fairly short speeches, partly in order to try to educate my fellow citizens to follow the example, obviously with very little success. But as my educational efforts in that context are only directed toward Israelis, you will have to bear with me for a few minutes tonight. You will hear tonight from three great scholars, and I am speaking to you only as the mayor of Jerusalem.

Everybody connected with the decision to unite Jerusalem in 1967 was absolutely and clearly aware of the great political difficulties the future would bring. Maybe those difficulties were forgotten somewhat in the years following 1967, because unification proved to be relatively painless and successful, and there was generally a feeling of over-confidence which contributed to forgetting the political difficulties some of us had foreseen in 1967.

The historical circumstances in 1967 were such that there was no other decision possible than the decision to unite the city. Under other

circumstances, the Jews possibly could have waited for another period in history, continuing to pray for the return to Jerusalem; but once the fighting had started and the city was united, there was no other choice and no other way open to the decision-makers than to declare Jerusalem united and in its entirety the capital of our country.

This is, after all, what Jewry and Zionism are all about. There cannot be any Zionism without Zion. On this, I believe, there is no difference even between Golda Meir and Nahum Goldmann. It is obvious that Jerusalem cannot be anything but the capital of Israel. To make it paradoxical, it would be easier to give up Tel-Aviv than Jerusalem. Some may even want to do so.

As to the administration of the city — it is an open city. There is religious freedom and all holy places of all religions are guaranteed for the first time in 2000 years. Also for the first time in 2000 years, Jerusalem is again ruled by its indigenous people and not by others, and is again the capital of its country. No other people has ever made Jerusalem its capital; only the Jews did so.

Jerusalem today enjoys comparative prosperity and a terrific upsurge in cultural and religious activity, unprecedented probably in any other city in the world. It is a pluralistic city and we have equal respect for all citizens who live here. Our greatest everyday problems are not the political problems about which you hear so much, but our urban problems.

One such problem is closing the gap between Jews and Jews — Jews who came earlier and Jews who came later — and between Jews and Arabs. I think the Israel government and the city administration have done a great deal in this respect — not enough maybe, but still a great deal.

You may have heard a lot abroad about the Black Panthers. This problem was never as important as the media made it out to be, and if it has petered out so quickly, it is because of the very great projects in the fields of education and social welfare that the city has introduced and is carrying out. Much more, however, needs to be done. The same is true about closing the gap between Jews and Arabs — and here again more has to be done.

We are building, I believe, the most beautiful city in the world. I am sorry that you are sitting in your meetings all the time and not driving around the city more. You can attend meetings anywhere, but you can see Jerusalem only while you are here.

Our enemies will resort to any argument in order to prove that the city is mismanaged, is badly built. Their most recent attempt is exemplified by the Unesco decision, which was so obviously unjust that

I think it has backfired and done us more good than harm. If that Unesco meeting had been asked by the Arabs and the Soviet Union to decide that the Earth is square, it would have done so.

I am aware, as you all are, that we have not solved the political problem of Jerusalem. While it is now comparatively quiet, while we have learned something about how to coexist, while there is very little violence here as compared to other places and to what we expected in 1967, the aspirations of Jews and Arabs and of many Christian groups and communities here are worlds apart. We have not yet found a formula how to meet these aspirations. If Jerusalem were on the moon, my feeling is it would be easier to find the correct formula than here on Earth and particularly in the Middle East.

Nevertheless I do believe that solutions, within the framework of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, can be found and many beginnings in this direction have been made. We may have lost some opportunities or perhaps only the conviction that we have done everything possible. Some argue that if we had followed up on certain ideas it is doubtful whether we would be any further ahead than we are today. But the fact is that for the past seven or eight years we have done more than anybody could have expected seven or eight years ago.

I believe that we shall find solutions for the severe problems confronting us, both the urban problems and the political ones. We will find the right answers despite the fact that Jerusalem is under the microscope of the world, which does not make things easier. It may take us a long time, but do not worry about the outcome. We have gone through difficult periods before. In 1967, I was not among those who thought the Messiah had arrived, and today I do not believe that things are catastrophic. I hope you do not believe so either. Let us keep our spirits up. With your help, with our combined efforts, we shall keep Jerusalem as a united city and the most beautiful city.

Professor SHEMARYAHU TALMON (*Jerusalem*): It is an age-old tradition that the joy of a Jew never can be complete as long as Jerusalem lies in ruins. A man who paints the walls of his house will leave a corner unpainted, always to be reminded that as long as Jerusalem is not restored, one's own house should not be without blemish. Laying a festive table, a hostess is enjoined intentionally to display a piece of inferior quality to recall to her and to her guests the plight of the Holy City. At the very apex of his rejoicing, a bridegroom, by tradition, will break a glass to symbolize the incompleteness even of marital bliss, as long as Jerusalem lies in ruins. He will act so in the knowledge that, as it is said in the famous song of the palmist (Ps. 137:6), no joy is complete "*im lo a'aleh et yerushalayim al rosh simchati*," as long as Jerusalem cannot be the crown of his enjoyment.

What characteristics of the city, what features of her specific history have accorded to Jerusalem this centrality in the thoughts and sentiments of the individual Jew, of the Jewish people as a social, religious, and ethnic group, and of the Israelite nation as a political entity? In order to fathom the depth and the intensity of the Jewish feelings for Jerusalem, one has to delve into the very beginnings of Israel as they are portrayed in the traditional holy literature, the canon of Hebrew Scriptures, the *Tanakh*.

Historically speaking, Jerusalem precedes Israel. The area on which the city is built, especially the site of the Ophel, had been inhabited since the Early Bronze or even the Chalcolithic Age, as potsherd finds prove. From somewhat later times, burial grounds and caves have been unearthed. These are dated to the third and the early second millennium before the Christian era. Epigraphic evidence provides further information on the city. Egyptian potsherds, dating from the nineteenth century BCE, on which are inscribed curses against the pharaoh's enemies, refer to two governors of *Rushalimum*. In the Tell el-Amarna documents of the fourteenth century, a ruler of *Urusalim* by the name of Abdi Hepa is mentioned. An earlier episode about Jerusalem is referred to in the biblical tradition embedded in Genesis 14, which reports the patriarch Abraham's encounter with Melchizedek, the king-priest of *Shalem*. This name *Shalem* is in fact an apocopated version of the West-Semitic composite designation *Ursalimmu*, from which the Greek *Jerusalem* was derived. The name *Ursalimmu* identifies the city as a "foundation" of, or for the deity *Shalim* or *Shulmanu*, who was then worshipped there. We may assume that a sanctuary dedicated to that deity had stood on the site, and, probably, that Melchizedek officiated there. However, these disconnected bits of information do not add up to a meaningful account of the early days of Jerusalem prior to her conquest by David in about 1000 BCE. It is only then that Jerusalem enters history.

David hailed from the tribe of Judah, which had led a rather secluded existence in the southern plains of Canaan, isolated from the other tribes in the central and northern parts of the country by a chain of Canaanite strongholds which had withstood the invading Israelites. Foremost among these was the city-state of Jerusalem. Though surpassed by other cities in respect of land area and population, political strength and economic wealth, Jerusalem had headed an alliance of southern Canaanite city-states in the days of Joshua, and had remained of focal importance for any ruler who aimed at gaining control over the country. David realized that he had to gain a foothold in the center of Canaan to stem the Philistine expansion, and, from there to consolidate his rule over the whole of Israel. The capture of Jerusalem was the turning point in the young king's career. From here began the construc-

tion of an empire which was to encompass most of the smaller nations in the Fertile Crescent: Edom, Moab, Ammon, the Aramaean kingdoms, Phoenicia, and Philistia.

The capture of Jerusalem proved to be an arduous task. Perched on a mountain, surrounded by valleys and enfolded by hills — "*yerushalayim harim saviv la*" (Ps. 125:2), the city controls important junctions of the main highways which on the one hand provide access to the hill region of Judah and Samaria, and on the other connect the upper country with the fertile Judean lowlands. David's army was inexperienced in laying siege to a walled city of that magnitude. His troops were not equipped with the catapults and battering rams necessary to breach the seemingly impregnable fortifications and thus to take the city by a frontal attack, a situation which we have reexperienced in our own lives. He had to take recourse to exceptional measures in order to get inside the battlements.

Some of David's men, led by Joab, gained access to the city by way of a subterranean shaft, which can be seen to this day, through which the city received its water supply from the perennial Gihon spring in the Siloam valley. From there they opened the gates for the bulk of the army to complete the conquest. Thus, the pride and strength of Jerusalem, her excellent water system which assured her of an adequate water supply even under siege, became the cause of her downfall.

David conquered Jebus — Jerusalem — from the local Jebusites, who, so it appears, were not indigenous Canaanites but rather foreign invaders, probably Hittites. Some reflection of these historical circumstances may yet have been retained in the words of the prophet Ezekiel who, in his time, castigated Jerusalem for her sinful ways of life which resembled those of the early inhabitants of Canaan: "Canaan is the land of your ancestry and there you were born; an Amorite was your father and a Hittite your mother" (Ez. 16:3). David acquired from Arauna the Jebusite his threshing floor in order to build there an altar which was destined to become the core of the future Davidic-Solomonic temple. This transaction obviously was meant to symbolize the personal attachment of David and his house to the city of Jerusalem, which came to be considered a crown possession. It is of interest to note the similarity between the acquisition of the threshing floor by David and the sale and acquisition of the Machpela in Hebron by Abraham, especially if Arauna of Jebus and Ephron of Hebron in fact were the Hittite kings of those cities. Even if we cannot fully appreciate the meaning of these actions, which apparently are charged with some symbolism, the parallelism shows an intention to approximate the figures of David and Abraham.

David renamed the conquered city, or at least her citadel, "City of David." But the Bible also preserves the pre-Israelite designations, Jerusalem, Shalem, Jebus, Zion, and possibly Mount Moriah. To these, new names were added: City of Judah, Holy City of the Temple, Ariel, etc., and "the City" par excellence. Altogether, the city is mentioned by diverse appellations some 2000 times in the Hebrew Scriptures. References to Jerusalem in later literature, including the writings of the Rabbis, stands no comparison with this number. In this case the quantitative check points to qualitative values. The mere word-count reveals the focal importance of Jerusalem in biblical history, and her importance as a source of inspiration for biblical thinkers, poets, and writers.

With the capture of Jerusalem, the last barrier dividing Judah from Benjamin and the rest of the Israelite tribes had fallen. The way was opened for the unification of all Israel. Having no previous specifically Israelite history, Jerusalem was almost a natural choice to become the capital of the realm, since she would not evoke partisan rivalry as would have such prominent Israelite tribal cities as Hebron and Shechem. Thus, Jerusalem became the beacon of Israel's unity and a symbol of the transition from peoplehood to nationhood, from tribal confederation to statehood, so much so that the very name of the city, *Jerusalem*, became synonymous with the land of Israel and the Kingdom of Israel.

The transformation in the geopolitical setup of Israel entailed the creation of a nationwide organizational structure centered in Jerusalem which could efficiently handle the military, economic, legal, and administrative affairs of the realm. The royal court in Jerusalem emerged as the hub of a network of agencies which handed down to the population the king's administrative and juridical decisions, supervised the levying of taxes and the recruitment of the citizenry for military and corvée duties. It is of significance that some of the high-ranking officials in the king's cabinet bear names, such as Shawsha or Shisha (I Ki. 4:3), which point to their foreign ethnic extraction. Others are expressly identified as foreigners, such as Uriah the Hittite and Ittai the Gathite, who were officers in David's army. Because of the lack of Israelite experts for public administration and for the newly introduced weaponry and military techniques, David, and later also Solomon, attracted to the court experienced foreign advisers and military men.

The non-Israelite courtiers constituted the nucleus of a stratum of foreigners within the population of the capital, which was reinforced by other groups of the royal entourage. For political reasons, David, and more so Solomon, entered into marriages with the royal houses of neighboring nations: Edom, Moab, Ammon, Geshur, Maacah in Transjordan, Tyre, Heth, and even Egypt. These foreign wives and their

retinues considerably increased the foreign element that resided in Jerusalem. Accordingly, in David's and certainly in Solomon's times, the city had a multiethnic population, which to a large measure became integrated into the Israelite majority. The resulting symbiosis affected the social and cultural life of the capital in the early days of the monarchy and apparently also characterized life in the city under later Davidic rulers. The Israelite population was brought into direct contact not only with the achievements of other peoples in the realms of technology, architecture, military organization, and administration, but also in the fields of literature, theological and philosophical speculation, and cultic life. The situation led to an assimilation of alien modes of thought and behavior into the framework of the traditional Israelite culture. Now Jerusalem was not only *ir ve'em beyisrael*, the capital of Israel, but also had become the metropolis of a realm that spanned the whole extent of the Fertile Crescent, the vast area from Egypt to Mesopotamia. The cultures of Canaan, Mesopotamia, and Egypt provided models of government and sociopolitical ideologies focussed on the image of the king, which buttressed the standing of the nascent monarchic regime.

Solomon, as our biblical sources report, was prolific in composing proverbs and songs on living and growing things in the style of the pragmatic-educational "wisdom" widely practiced in the ancient East. His accomplishments outshone those of the famous wise men of the East and of Egypt (I Ki. 5:9-14) and impressed even the queen of Sheba in the Arabian peninsula (I Ki. 10:1-10). All this gives evidence to a rather liberal sociocultural outlook which provided an adequate basis of coexistence for the ethnically and culturally diversified citizenry of Jerusalem.

As already stated, and as her name indicates, Jerusalem had for ages served as a cultic center. There the king-priest Melchizedek had ruled in the days of the patriarch Abraham. In Joshua's days, during the period of the conquest of Canaan, another king of Jerusalem, similarly named Adonizedek, presumably fulfilled the same dual function. Again, the last pre-Israelite ruler of the city, Arauna the Jebusite, possibly also held a cultic office. From him, as we said, David acquired the threshing floor which was to become the foundation of his new temple. In post-biblical times this threshing floor was considered the navel of the Earth, the *omphalos* of the Universe. Tradition ascribes to David the composition of songs and psalms and even the consolidation of the Temple liturgy, so much so that he became the proverbial "singer of Israel's psalms" — *ne'im zmirot yisrael* (II Sam. 23:1).

What was the general appearance of Israelite Jerusalem at that time? Jerusalem of the late biblical period occupied a mountain which slopes into deep valleys on three sides: to the east, the Kidron valley, which

separates the city from the Mount of Olives; to the south and west, the Hinnom valley. Thus, an impression of majestic height is conferred upon the mountain on which Jerusalem stands. On the southern slope of this eastern ridge stood ancient Jebus, renamed "City of David" after the Israelite conquest, whereas the northern Mount Moriah, or Zion, later became the Temple Mount, on which also the royal palace was built. In the initial stage, under the Jebusites, Jerusalem occupied an area of about ten acres, adequate to house a population of approximately 3000 people. David apparently expanded the city's circumference toward the north by partially filling in the depression between the city and Mount Moriah. It is possible that on this fill the fortress named "David's Tower" was built, as well as the king's palace, the "Cedar House." Solomon carried further the development of the city. He completed the filling in of the depression and thus linked the City of David with Mount Moriah, which now became the acropolis of Jerusalem. Following the standard layout of a capital city in the Syro-Palestinian area, he erected on Mount Moriah-Zion, over the "holy rock," the Temple with its forecourts, and to the south of it, the palace. The Temple was linked with the palace by at least two gates: "the Gate of the Runners" and "the New Gate." This combined Court-Temple complex on the acropolis was verily "a king's sanctuary and a royal palace," as is said of Beth-El in the Book of Amos (7:13).

The construction of the Temple was the capstone of a variety of other building enterprises initiated by David and brought to their height by his successor Solomon. These edifices, especially the Temple and the royal palace on the acropolis, conferred upon the city an unprecedented impression of grandeur. From biblical times and through the ages, the beauty and glory of Jerusalem fired the imagination of poets and bards who extolled her greatness in psalms and hymns which became the core of the Temple liturgy, and subsequently the foundation of the hymnologies of the synagogue. From the very days of her capture by David, Jerusalem thus emerged as the center of Israel, where the bases of the Hebrews' political and spiritual identity were hammered out: one God, one Temple, and one legitimate priesthood; one king, one legitimate dynasty, and one nation.

The conceptual pattern of Jerusalem as a cultic-spiritual and cultural center, which persists until our own days, was already set at the beginning of her history under David and Solomon. It is a commonplace that the concentration of Israelite worship at the Temple of Jerusalem built by these two kings marks the inception of institutionalized monotheistic religion. What is not sufficiently realized is that this innovation in the dimension of the spiritual, together with the concurrent establishment of the hereditary monarchy in Israel, signified a new departure in what we would call the "cultural" life of Israel.

Jerusalem then became the seat of a new class of courtiers who were men of letters. They created the biblical narrative style and biblical historiography, thus adding new dimensions to the traditional literature. Inspired by the royal splendor, the display of might, administrative acumen, economic success, and architectural achievements, they authored the "royal psalms" and the "songs of Jerusalem" which are main pillars of the biblical Book of Psalms. The emerging culture, centered on and in Jerusalem, fully coalesced with the cultic and spiritual centrality of the Temple-city. This perhaps unique fusion of the cultural and the mundane, of the political dimension with the spiritual-religious, was to distinguish Jerusalem in her subsequent history. It is this comprehensiveness that made Jerusalem a metropolis, a mother city, in the truest sense of the word, at first for the Israelites, and later for an ever-growing *ecumene*.

However, while Jerusalem thus became the symbol and the most significant exponent of the transition from peoplehood to nationhood and to statehood, she was never exclusively subjugated by or identified with the new social phenomenon. The city that in antiquity had experienced one decisive transformation of her significance, could easily retransfer and readjust to ensuing different historical situations. She has in fact done so for many hundreds of years without losing her prestige and her symbolic value, conferred on her by David and Solomon.

David had banded together the diverse components of his realm by impressive military feats. His son and successor Solomon, it would seem, set out to underpin the tenuous political unity, symbolized in the capital Jerusalem, by a farsighted liberal philosophy in matters concerning the cultic and the cultural. In his day, Jerusalem probably was no less cosmopolitan than in ours. The city teemed with foreign traders, artisans, and workmen who brought to it the produce and the creativity of their native lands. Presumably for these temporary residents of the city and the realm, and not only for his foreign wives, Solomon provided the means for meeting their cultic and spiritual needs by building various high places around and in Jerusalem, concurrently with the construction of the splendid edifice dedicated to the worship of Israel's one and only God. Specificities — creedal, spiritual, and cultural — were united, not absorbed. The aim was not a mixed culture or a syncretistic religion, but rather a peaceful coexistence of particularities in the holy space of Jerusalem, their cultural and cultic peculiarity unimpaired. The spirit of that age is captured, so it seems, in the prophet Micah's vision of the future Jerusalem, which again is to become the cosmic center toward which all people will gravitate :

Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, nor ever again be trained for war; and each man shall dwell under his own vine, under his own fig tree undisturbed; for the Lord of Hosts himself has spoken. All peoples may walk, each in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever. (4:3-5).

Professor ANDRE NEHER (*Jerusalem; formerly Strasbourg*): No people in the world is like the Jewish people. No city in the world is like Jerusalem. It would seem that these sentences are really commonplace — and I am convinced that none of those taking part in tonight's symposium, none of those taking part in the Sixth Plenary Assembly of the WJC, held in Jerusalem for the first time, can take exception to the second of these sentences: *No city in the world is like Jerusalem*.

I am, moreover, convinced that none of those who are *not* taking part in tonight's symposium or in the Assembly, or even of those who totally deny the concept of the Jewish people and in any case deny Jerusalem the right to be the capital of the Jewish state and the spiritual center of the whole Jewish people — not even Pope Paul or King Faisal — will object to that second sentence.

It seems to me that our task at tonight's symposium will be to prove, or at least attempt to find a way of proving, that this second sentence has universal validity and that it is rooted in and justified by the first sentence. We shall, in fact, try to discover the causality by which *no city in the world is like Jerusalem* only because *no people in the world is like the Jewish people*. The temptation is therefore great to speak in greater detail on the eternal uniqueness of the Jewish people historically — in terms of time — and to deduce from this the eternal uniqueness of Jerusalem geographically — in terms of space. However, I shall not do so because I feel unable to say, "No city in the world is like Jerusalem," as if it were indeed just a trite phrase linking me to everyone else. I can only pronounce it as a sudden, revolutionary revelation, moving me to the bottom of my soul. When I pronounce it, it is not for me simply a collection of words outside myself, on which I can construct some kind of philosophy of history and some kind of objective lecture; I am, after all, once again a *Jerusalemite*, and Jerusalem burns within me like the burning bush which is not consumed. I am a *Jerusalemite*, and my "I" is embedded in the concrete Jerusalem of *hic et nunc*, of this evening. *No city in the world is like Jerusalem* — I cannot, nor do I want to, repeat these words parrot-fashion; they belong to the four most secret and fundamental constituents of myself. Not as Isaiah has said (62:1).

For Zion I shall not be silent, and for Jerusalem shall I not rest until her righteousness shineth forth, and her salvation burneth as a torch,

but for *my* sake I shall not be silent, and for *my* sake I shall not rest . . .

Yet I am not a Jerusalemite by birth like Yehoram Gaon, or a Jerusalemite of old like Professor Talmon; I am *once again* a Jerusalemite, a new immigrant.

Since the time I spoke to you in 1966 at the Fifth Plenary Assembly of the WJC, a fateful event has happened in my life, the pertinent event of *aliya*. In the interim, between two wars — the Six-Day War with its immediate sequel of Jerusalem's unification, which electrified me; and the Yom-Kippur War, when I was already in Jerusalem among my people — between those dates I came from France to Israel and became a resident of Jerusalem.

In the midst of Jerusalem do I dwell,
In her midst do I dwell in my house,
In her midst do I go on my way,
In her do I rise and recline.
Jerusalem is my Shma Yisrael.

And the implications of that revolution in my life, that event of returning to Israel, of dwelling once more in Jerusalem, its meanings and implications — that is what I want to describe in what I would call a personal existential confession, firstly as a Jew and secondly as a human being.

As a Jew, do I not belong to the only people which has passionately, yearningly, faithfully loved Jerusalem since its inception, the people which sees its redemption, its future, its messianic deliverance, not in the next world and in a new heaven, but “next year in Jerusalem”?

And yet, were I to be asked what is the justification for Jerusalem being the capital of the State of Israel and the spiritual capital of the whole Jewish people, I would not place the emphasis on the well-known, famous, and hackneyed fact that there exists a glorious chain — touching to the point of tears — of poems, prayers, supplications, cries, and hymns which have been uttered by Jews ceaselessly for hundreds of generations, and whose “leitmotiv” is love for Zion and Jerusalem. For these poems, prayers, cries, and supplications were uttered by Jews who were outside Israel, by the waters of Babylon, in the four corners of the Earth.

I would not put the emphasis on this chain, but rather on another chain that exists in our history — also without a break — of poets, worshippers, supplicants, of those weeping, crying and joyfully singing, who left behind all the waters of Babylon everywhere and came to Israel and Jerusalem. For there is a vast difference between a yearning love which is like a betrothal, and another kind of love which is like a sanctified marriage.

It is well known that Ludwig van Beethoven wrote wonderful letters to his distant, eternal, and “immortal” beloved; but he never married her. He remained faithful to his love and she remained faithful to him beyond his death, yet they never married. Allow me to think that if Beethoven had agreed to marry, he would certainly have ceased writing letters to his love; but in that case he might have composed not only the *Appassionata* but also that Tenth Symphony of which he dreamed after having composed the *Ninth* and the *Ode to Joy* — that Tenth Symphony which would have passed beyond all joy to a greater joy, an ode to the eternal and immortal beloved, but a beloved that was *near*.

I was blessed with that overwhelming joy by fulfilling, to the letter and to the slightest concrete detail, the Prophet’s message (Isaiah 62:4,5):

Thou shalt no longer be called deserted, and thy land shall not be called wilderness, for thou shalt be called “my delight is in her” and thy land betrothed. For the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be for betrothal. As a man betrotheth a virgin so shalt thy children betroth thee, and as the groom rejoices in the bride, so shalt thy God rejoice over thee.

Yes, I went up to Jerusalem according to the precept of Isaiah, of Moses, of Israel, becoming betrothed and married.

Not only is Jerusalem my “Shma Yisrael”; Jerusalem is my home — a man’s home is his wife. We know, my wife Rina and I — for in my happiness I also have a private wife, to whom I was married according to custom — that in leaving our home in France and entering our new home, Jerusalem, we took a step which it is essential for every Jew to take who wishes to pass from a romantic and pathetic dimension of the mere yearning love of the betrothed, to the dimension of overwhelming love in the concrete and pragmatic everyday tasks in cooperation with our fellow builders of the earthly Jerusalem.

It is very easy to dream of an ideal, heavenly Jerusalem. It is more difficult to live in an earthly Jerusalem with all its mundane and complex elements, and not give up the dream of the heavenly Jerusalem; not to be torn between the aspiration for the ideal and recognition of the many obstacles and shortcomings on the way to that ideal.

But it is precisely this conviction — that the challenge to bridge the gulf between what exists and what is required derives from God’s call to his chosen people, from the commandment given you now, this day, this moment of your life and God forbid you should let it slip by — it is this conviction which strengthens us and which will strengthen you when you, too, agree to take the jump from the Zionist dream to the fulfillment of *aliya*; it bestows on us, and it will bestow on you, that overwhelming joy with a capital *J*.

And not only do we earn joy, but as I have said, we also earn the justification of our right to Jerusalem as the eternal capital of the Jewish state and the political capital of the whole Jewish people; not through yearning and being faithful to an immortal but distant love, not through mere nearness of heart and soul, but through physical, tangible, bodily, personal love, the dwelling of bride and groom together in their home, in Jerusalem's houses and in her streets, her universities, her alleys, her synagogues, her community centers, her theaters, her hotels, her "Katamons" — Jews living together as brothers.

The Christians were quick to exchange Jerusalem for another Jerusalem — Rome; the Muslims exchanged it for Mecca. Only the Jews remained faithful to Jerusalem, for which there was no substitute. It is this impossibility to substitute, this exclusiveness, to which I give political effect by coming to live in Jerusalem as a Jew.

The Jew addressing you this evening is certainly known to you as a thinker and writer with universal interests. Let me remind you, without undue modesty, that my name appears in the *Who's Who* of the world's philosophers. It is therefore proper for me to ask myself whether my coming to Jerusalem might not cut me off from the general body of mankind and from universal culture, and tie me to the particularism of an isolated Jew who must from now on live behind closed doors and in the restricted sphere of his own culture.

This question is no doubt justified — but once again Jerusalem provides the answer. My personal experience as a new immigrant in Jerusalem teaches me the exact opposite of what my superficial and, I would say, rational view might have led me to expect. It is the very fact of my limiting myself and shrinking into the isolation and distinctiveness of Jerusalem which has brought me closer to, has integrated and aligned me with, the nations of the world, in a way which was barred to me when I was immersed in the French culture, of which certainly no one can say that it is not universal.

Yehuda Halevi's famous dictum that the Jewish people is the heart of human history and that Jerusalem is the heart of the Jewish people, is personified and made real before my eyes and ears in unified Jerusalem. When I rise, as I often do, to be inspired anew by the act of creation when the wonderful dawn breaks over the summit of Mount Scopus, and I witness the scene which I would call "the renewal of the end of time"; when I hear the call of the muezzin calling my Muslim brother to his prayer, and the sound of the bell calling my Christian brother to his, and the voices of my Jewish brothers who have preceded me in midnight worship at the Western Wall — it is then that I feel that Jerusalem is not only my Shma Yisrael and not only my home, but also the sole messianic utopia in the world which has found its fulfillment

in the daily reality of history. That is to say that Jerusalem is already today, in our history, Isaiah's glorious vision of the latter days: "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations." Jerusalem is a house of prayer for all the nations.

And indeed, she is more: it is not only in the religious sphere that unified Jerusalem is, in effect, a messianic laboratory for all religions. The term is apt also on the simple human and social plane — not only vertically between man and his Creator, but also horizontally between nations, between one civilization and one culture and another.

On that day in June 1967 when the leaders of Jerusalem blew up the barbed wire and the reinforced concrete and the barriers that had divided the city ever since 1948, they also broke through the obstacles separating man from his fellow man, nation from nation, the "I" from the "Thou," and him who loves from him who hates. In this desire to create a coexistence of peace and brotherhood between communities which had previously been separated and torn from each other by a barrier of war and hatred; in the undoubted success of the coexistence between Jews and Arabs in Jerusalem in spite of occasional and superficial incidents — in all this there has been a messianic transcendence which I was privileged to experience together with the other residents and builders of Zion and Jerusalem. It was enhanced simply by meetings, by conversations on sacred and lay matters, by certain work undertaken in common in Jerusalem's homes, her streets, libraries, universities, markets, hospitals, social service institutions, and buses. Jerusalem's buses — what a microcosm, what a sample of the whole of humanity within a vehicle crowded with people of all social classes, religions, and communities !

Not so long ago, the slogan of the Republicans in Spain was: "It is good to die for Madrid." One of Teddy Kollek's deputies in the task of reuniting Jerusalem since the Six-Day War — my friend Dr. André Netan'el Chouraqui, an author, who immigrated from France like me, but who preceded me by a long time — wrote a book whose title is a slogan in itself: *To Live for Jerusalem*.

The Torah was right in stating that the Jewish people is a "nation that dwelleth alone and of whom the gentiles would take no account." At least Jerusalem is not taken account of by the gentiles as the capital of the Jewish people: it does not enter their calculations because their calculations are erroneous. Jerusalem is not negotiable, because she is not simply a factor in the world's mathematics, or in its civilization or in its fragmentation. We are firmly resolved not to lend a hand in erecting a twentieth-century Tower of Babel constructed, this time, not of bricks and mortar, but of nuclear stuff and of oil. The wall dividing Berlin still stands and its separating and disuniting effect continues to

grow. Our Western Wall in Jerusalem unites and integrates, and its unifying power is growing not only for our own benefit but for that of all mankind.

To conclude: the efforts of those who built our country, the builders of Petah-Tikva, Degania and Tel-Aviv, the efforts of the pioneers in the Sharon and the Emek, in the Galilee and in the Negev, in Gush Etzion and in the Arava, were, in effect, predicated on finding a significance where none had existed, creating life in the desert, a life from a void, something from nothing. Our own efforts, the efforts of Jerusalem's builders of today, are meant to bestow on a place which has had a messianic significance for generations, an additional messianic significance, an essence beyond mere being.

And if I may be permitted to make use of a daring image from the Midrash and Cabala – the builders of Jerusalem are able today to have more creative imagination than the Almighty, for God knew only how to build a new world alongside the twenty-six worlds that were destroyed, whereas the Jerusalemite knows how to unify, to mend, and to rehabilitate that same city that was torn in two for twenty years, and to create its messianic perfection out of itself.

Jerusalem! Fifteen psalms were sung unto thee by King David and the other psalmists. This evening I have tried, with the Jerusalem *chutzpa* which is so pleasant, to sing a new *Shir haMa'alot* unto thee, the song of a new immigrant. It is not for me to decide whether I have failed or succeeded, and your decision will not add or detract from the essence of the matter. Jerusalem herself will decide by testing me as a new immigrant in her midst.

I did not intend to sing a song for Shabbat in Jerusalem, although Shabbat in Jerusalem is an experience worthy of celebration in a song; my intention has been to sing a psalm for a working day in Jerusalem.

Therefore, open thy gates to me, oh Jerusalem, and grant me the right to continue to keep my Sabbaths, the holy Sabbaths, as well as to create and do my work, the ordinary, the day-to-day work which is in effect the holy of holies – in your midst, my Jerusalem.

Rabbi Dr. JOACHIM PRINZ (*Orange, New Jersey*): The problem of Jerusalem does not entail merely strategic considerations of security and boundaries. It entails most delicate imponderables that can be traced from antiquity to our own day.

As a leader of the World Jewish Congress I want at the outset to make one principle crystal clear: although we in the *gola* have established a close and profound relationship with Israel on many levels, it is up to Israel alone to determine her destiny. The political and military decisions of Israel are none of our business. They are the

business of Israel. The border lines will be drawn by Israel and her negotiating partners. It is Israel who must deal with the Arabs and with the big powers. The Diaspora can have no voice in these matters, although we must voice the hope for peace. It is the children of Israel who are doing the bleeding and the dying, not the children of the *gola*. The *gola* prays for peace, the only way to a secure future in the Middle East.

The limited role of the *gola* with regard to peace negotiations does not, however, apply to the question of Jerusalem. Jews outside Israel hold a variety of views on other issues, but I wish to state here in my official as well as my personal capacity that Jerusalem must remain the undivided and totally free capital of the State of Israel. This subject is the only one which cannot be a debatable issue in any possible peace settlement.

The Christian world will not fully understand our position in this respect. For the imponderables have hardened into fact, and the dreams into reality. We in the *gola* who criticize Israel's failure to adequately inform world public opinion must also blame ourselves. For we have miserably failed in our respective countries to make our Christian neighbors understand the uniqueness of our Jewish existence which calls for a wedding of the land of Israel and the people of Israel — a marriage for which there is no *get*, no divorce ever to be decreed by anyone.

A week ago I attended, in a small kibbutz not far from Jerusalem, Mishmar David, the wedding ceremony of my oldest granddaughter, who married the shepherd of the kibbutz. The wedding took place in a very small and very simple room. For me it had more glamour and genuine elegance than any wedding at which I as a rabbi have officiated in America.

The orthodox officiating rabbi was kind enough to permit me to read the last *brakha* of the traditional Seven Blessings. And I said: *Mehera hashem eloheinu yishama be'arei yehuda uvechutzot yerushalayim kol sasson vekol simcha, kol chatan vekol kala* — Let there soon be rejoicing in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem.

Suddenly I realized that I had spoken the words of this blessing thousands of times in the almost fifty years of my rabbinical duties without really understanding their meaning. What was totally new to me was the reality of Jerusalem, the reality of Judah, the reality of the *chatuna* in the kibbutz. I was vividly reminded that this blessing is as valid in the *gola* as it is in Israel, because of our eternal and profound spiritual union with Jerusalem. All the children of the Jewish people,

whether their wedding takes place in New York, Buenos Aires, or anywhere in the *gola*, are being married in Jerusalem. For there exists in Judaism a geography of the spirit.

Bridegroom and bride, *chatan vekala*, are the symbols of life. There is no Jewish life without a Jewish Jerusalem. This term, *Jewish Jerusalem*, has to be defined, for we are dealing here not merely with the spirit but also with reality. We are not dealing merely with Jewish history and our historic memory. I remember the days during the British Mandate when we could pray at the Western Wall but no Jew was permitted to sound the shofar there, for that was considered to be a political demonstration. I remember the days when we stood in front of the barbed wire that divided the new Jerusalem from the Old City — a period during which the old synagogues were destroyed, the Torah rolls desecrated, and ancient Jewish tombstones used to pave the streets.

These appalling wrongs have now been righted. From the first day after the Six-Day War, there was free access to all the holy places. Jews streamed to the *kotel*, kissed and embraced it as though it were the bride of Israel. Those of us who saw it shortly after the Six-Day War began to understand that this piece of architecture was the architecture of the Jewish heart and the material of which Jewish dreams are fashioned.

Ever since the reunification of the city, every Christian church and every Muslim mosque has been under the protection of the Jewish state. Neither the Roman Catholic Church nor the World Council of Churches has anything but the highest praise for Israel's respect of the integrity of the churches and the mosques. King Faisal, who is not merely the king of Saudi Arabia but also the spiritual leader of the Wahabi Muslims, one of the most rigid and strict sects of Islam, lately expressed his wish to pray in the famous Mosque of Al-Aksa. King Faisal could come today to pray in Al-Aksa.

The Jerusalem in which the Jews have formed a majority since 1842 — today the majority is 75% — is not merely undivided, it is indivisible. It is the undivided and indivisible capital of the State of Israel. It is also a metropolis in which each faith and each community enjoys and will continue to enjoy its full rights — to be guaranteed under any peace treaty to be concluded. Is this a dream ?

This is the greatest of political possibilities of our time. The notion of an internationalization of Jerusalem is dead. Neither the pontiff of the Catholic Church nor any other religious leaders, including our own, would accept that an atheist government guarantee the safety of churches, synagogues, and mosques.

The *gola* must endeavor, for the first time systematically, to create on the part of their respective governments and their Christian neighbors a comprehension for the unique historical, religious, spiritual, and cultural relationship between the people of Israel — wherever they may live — and the land of Israel. The World Jewish Congress can and ought to contribute toward this objective.

Thus, Jerusalem may someday become *yerushalayim ir aliza*, the city of *sasson vesimcha*, the city of *chatan vekala*, the city of rejoicing, the city of hope — the city of life and living together.

Lema'an tziyon lo echeshe ulema'an yerushalayim lo eshtok. In the early years, when I was a Zionist propagandist — not by profession but by conviction — we always quoted this prophetic sentence which Professor Neher so movingly cited here in his very profound statement.

Now all that has become a reality. The reality of today's dream will, we hope and pray, become the reality of tomorrow's reality.

The following declaration was then read out and adopted by the Assembly :

DECLARATION ON JERUSALEM

We, the representatives of Jewish communities in all six continents, have come to Jerusalem not only to participate in the deliberations of our Sixth Plenary Assembly, but as pilgrims to renew our irrevocable commitment to this Holy City as the immemorial center of the spiritual life and aspirations of the whole House of Israel.

We revere this city, as do adherents of other traditions, for what it has given mankind in the past. But as Jews we look also to the future. For we are not wayfarers who pass through the city and are content to remember what once was. We believe with a perfect faith that Jerusalem will yet fulfill its vocation in human history as the city of peace and reconciliation, of social justice and human brotherhood. We hear the voice of the Prophet as clearly today as did our fathers twenty-five centuries ago: "I will bring my people from the East country and from the West country. And they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem... And Jerusalem shall be called the city of truth."

In the name of this ideal we stand steadfast with the people of Israel in the resolve to maintain the unity and integrity of Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel.

The government of Israel and the authorities of this city have brilliantly and conclusively demonstrated that they provide effective guarantees of free access to, and the reverent safeguarding of, the holy

places of other faiths; and there can today be not even the shadow of a doubt that freedom of worship for all religious communities will be protected by all the powers of the state.

We salute Jerusalem, the city of fulfillment, the city of the future. Neither time nor circumstances can shake our loyalty to this ideal. Our fathers remembered Jerusalem in joy and in sorrow, in freedom and under oppression. Through all the Jewish centuries they affirmed the hope for which it stands in a daily liturgy, and it found expression in the writings of our greatest poets and teachers.

We have come to Jerusalem to make the solemn pledge that we shall remain faithful to this heritage.

THIRTEENTH SESSION

Sunday, February 9, 1975
(evening)

In the chair : Mr. JACOB KATZMAN

ELECTIONS

Mr. JACQUES TORCZYNER (*USA*): I have the pleasure of submitting to you the unanimous report of the Nominations Committee, which has held three meetings. I thank the members of the Committee for having been so cooperative and making my task so easy.

As president of the World Jewish Congress we nominate Dr. Nahum Goldmann. We do so because he was truly a founder of this organization and has been its leader ever since Stephen Wise left us. True, at times he makes statements which some people deem controversial. But he is a leader of the Jewish people, who has met the great personalities of our time. He will go down in history for his achievement in bringing about the agreements providing for German reparations to the Jewish people and the State of Israel.

Dr. Goldmann is an extraordinary man in many respects. He has never let his political differences interfere with his feelings of friendship for those with whom he may differ. He has many interests beyond his devotion to his people. He is well versed in art, in literature, in music. Throughout his whole life Dr. Goldmann has fought for Zionism, for the Jewish people, and for the State of Israel — for our cause as he sees it.

The World Jewish Congress represents the Jewish people as a whole. Regardless of differing individual opinions within the Congress, at a time when Israel faces important political decisions, when the Jewish people is on the eve of a new era, we want the leader of the World Jewish Congress to continue in office for another term. I propose the election of Dr. Nahum Goldmann.

Mr. JOSEF KLARMAN (*World Zionist Organization*): I call on the delegates to vote against the reelection of Dr. Nahum Goldmann as president of the World Jewish Congress. Before explaining my reasons, I would like to emphasize that I am well aware of Dr. Goldmann's Zion-

ism, his public activities, and his merits. When I was a young man I read his early writings, I listened to his brilliant speeches at the Seventeenth Zionist Congress, in Basel in 1931, and I have followed everything he has written or said in public ever since. No one could teach me anything new about his greatness.

I shall now turn to my reasons for opposing Dr. Goldmann's continuation in office and draw your attention to certain statements he has made.

In his opening speech at this Assembly, Dr. Goldmann declared that he was the first to fight for the right of Russian Jewry to emigrate, to go to Israel. I deny that this is so. In 1972, the Zionist Executive in Jerusalem decided to withdraw its invitation to Dr. Goldmann to be the main speaker at the Jubilee Congress on the grounds that Dr. Goldmann had made a statement in London which was harmful to the struggle for *aliya* of Russian Jews. You may be sure that the Zionist Executive itself does not go as far in that struggle as I would wish. Therefore, if it canceled its invitation to Dr. Goldmann, there must have been a strong justification indeed.

Two weeks ago, Dr. Goldmann gave an interview to the German magazine *Stern*. The reporter asked him: "Dr. Goldmann, the trade agreement between the USSR and the United States has just been canceled. Emigration will cease. What do you have to say on this subject?" Dr. Goldmann replied:

I warned the Israelis and the Jewish leaders that the Soviet Union would not permit any interference in its domestic policy. I am surprised that the impression prevailed for such a long time that she was willing to make concessions. A policy of willful deception has created the impression that the Soviet Union was ready to become involved in this dispute.

Thus, Dr. Goldmann has said that we should not interfere in the matter of emigration — of *aliya* of Russian Jews. In this hall are two fearless fighters from among our brothers and sisters in the United States — Charlotte Jacobson and Dr. Hertzberg. They went to the president of their country and told him: No! They did not flinch before the US secretary of state; they announced that they would fight. There was a time when the United States broke off diplomatic relations with czarist Russia for the sake of a single Jew. Today, Dr. Goldmann warns against interference. Will you now return to your countries and say we should abandon our brothers in the Soviet Union?

I pass on to another point. Anyone who argues that Dr. Goldmann opposed the establishment of the Jewish state is mistaken and misleads others. Dr. Goldmann upheld and defended partition of Palestine. This meant that he was for the establishment of the State of Israel. On May 9, 1948, Dr. Goldmann opposed the proclamation of the state at

that time. I was a member of the Advisory Political Committee to the United Nations at Lake Success, and I heard his statement. Dr. Goldmann said: "Please do not be in a hurry to proclaim a state. I have information that negotiations are possible with the Arab countries. In order to avoid bloodshed, let us obtain their agreement." At the time I marveled: How can the shrewd Dr. Goldmann be so naive as to think that it is possible to persuade the Arabs, to pacify them, to influence them not to oppose us, and that he is the one who can achieve this ? Doesn't he know what has been going on in Eretz Israel for more than fifty years ? Doesn't he know what took place in 1920, in 1929, in 1936 ? Is this the way in which they can be pacified ? Are we to be dependent on the good graces of the Arabs, to give their agreement or not, as they please ?

About a month ago, Dr. Goldmann was interviewed in Paris, the capital of that den of vipers which is our adversary. Oh, how they hate the State of Israel ! To the anti-Semitic *Le Monde*, Dr. Goldmann said : "I gave a warning in 1948. Now see what has happened." What is the meaning of these words ? And he said to another newspaper: "Without the agreement of the Arab countries we cannot exist here." Two days ago, the minister of defense of the State of Israel declared: "Peace frontiers with them exist, but if they do not want peace, they are war frontiers." This means that it is our firm decision that this state shall exist whether the Arabs want it or not. We shall not await the approval of the Arab countries. But what Dr. Goldmann said puts Israel's existence in doubt.

I cite another example. In a German newspaper, Dr. Goldmann is quoted as follows: "What Golda Meir did when she was prime minister was totally unrealistic. Not to recognize the Palestinian people ? The fact that there has never been a Palestinian state is no reason." Why ? Says Dr. Goldmann: "The Jews, too, as you know, for 2000 years did not have a state." There is a comparison for you !

We, the people of Israel, for 2000 years have been clinging to Eretz Israel with every fibre of our hearts and our souls. We have returned, we are returning, and we shall return — not by favor, not by force, but by right. Do the Palestinians have such a right ? Their claim is a denial of our right to this country.

Two days after Arafat appeared before the United Nations, when the entire enlightened world — to the extent that there is one — was shaken, when the Jews of New York demonstrated on Hammarskjöld Plaza, Dr. Goldmann was interviewed by the London *Times* in his capacity as president of the World Jewish Congress. He said: "The government of Israel must enter into negotiations with Arafat." And he went on to suggest that Arafat should at once set up a government in exile for that

purpose. Arafat — the chief executioner of our children ! When Sisco, the United States assistant secretary of state, stated that Arafat represented terrorist organizations, he excused himself the following day in New York on the grounds that it was not he who had said so, but Arafat who was saying that he represented the PLO. Dr. Goldmann, nevertheless, advises us to enter into negotiations with the PLO, and when he came to Israel he repeated this advice on his arrival at Lod Airport. And a few days ago, we heard the prime minister of Israel declare in this hall that Israel will not negotiate with Arafat.

Moreover, Dr. Goldmann says we must return to the 1967 borders. The prime minister says that this will not be done, even if it prevents peace. The former foreign minister has declared that “anyone advising us to return to the 1967 borders is advising us to return to the Auschwitz lines.”

It is of course Dr. Goldmann's right to express any opinion he wishes. Every Jew is entitled to do so. The State of Israel belongs to the whole people of Israel, and Dr. Goldmann, who is an Israeli citizen, can do what all Israelis do: he can come here and express his opinion. If he has any plan that does not seem to conform to official policy, let him make his proposal to the Israeli government and persuade it. Who would not receive Dr. Goldmann? Ben-Gurion esteemed him despite the differences between them. Levi Eshkol received him, and so did Golda Meir. Let him give them advice, let him try to persuade them. But to go abroad, to appear on non-Jewish platforms, on hostile platforms at a time when we are alone in the world — that he is forbidden to do. Moreover, Dr. Goldmann cannot argue that he is speaking in his private capacity. With all due esteem and respect, if he were a private individual, would the press take the trouble to interview him? Would it give full-page publicity to his statements? After all, each interview begins with the words, *Dr. Nahum Goldmann, president of the World Jewish Congress....* This is his visiting card, and no distinction is made between his person and his office.

I know that Dr. Goldmann is able to take criticism and accepts it like the man of culture and the philosopher he is, a man who knows that differences of opinion will exist. I want to recall an opinion Dr. Goldmann voiced at the Seventeenth Zionist Congress, in Basel in 1931. At the time, his brilliant speeches captivated 129 Congress delegates, including myself, as against 103 opposing delegates. As chairman of the Political Committee of the Seventeenth Congress, Dr. Goldmann asked the Congress to dissociate itself from an interview given by Professor Chaim Weizmann, who was then president of the World Zionist Organization. In arguing his case, Dr. Goldmann declared that one could not make any distinction between the president and the private individual

and that therefore the president could not make any private declaration. In this context, Dr. Goldmann advised Professor Weizmann to resign, and Weizmann did so.

Perhaps Dr. Goldmann will obtain a majority in the vote we are about to take. He may have the support of the majority of the Jewish people. But he should also realize that he does not enjoy this support among the parties represented in the government and the Opposition in the State of Israel, and among the millions of Jews who fear for Israel's fate. Israel, whose ship of state any wind could cast ashore — and Dr. Goldmann is not a wind, he is a hurricane! Therefore, Dr. Goldmann should now heed his own counsel, the advice he gave to Professor Weizmann. If not, if he allows his nomination to be put to the vote, I urge this Assembly to vote against it.

Mr. PINHAS SAPIR (*World Zionist Organization*): I am not speaking in my capacity as chairman of the World Zionist Organization, but as one of the eighty-two delegates at this Assembly who belong to the World Labor Zionist Movement. We met in caucus and, after also listening to those who were against the idea, we decided to support Dr. Goldmann's nomination for the presidency of the World Jewish Congress.

Mr. Klarman, I know that you are a decent person. I am sorry that it is only here that you choose to cite the minister of defense so beautifully, and that you speak so respectfully of the prime minister. I suggest that you and your friends extend this respect to the prime minister when you have business with him outside this hall.

Dr. Goldmann has said that if he thought there were any discrepancy between his Zionist creed and his office as president of the WJC, he would not be a candidate for that post. And I must say that his sixty years of service to Zionism and to world Jewry and the Jews in Israel need no certification from me.

The first time I heard Dr. Goldmann argue for partition was at a time when Mr. Klarman and his friends regarded partition as the destruction of Jewry. Their devotion to their cause did not prevent them from dancing in the streets with everyone else the night of the Lake Success decision. But in the days when there was a struggle against partition, Mr. Klarman and his friends fought against it with the same passion. There was a need to fight *for* it, and Dr. Goldmann was one of those who did.

In the first years of the state, when the state was fighting for every dollar, when the state had nothing to eat, when Weizmann was induced to sign a letter to Churchill asking him to recommend that Israel be given fuel on a few months' credit — in those days Dr. Goldmann was

the spearhead in the fight to obtain German reparations, which were of tremendous value for the existence of the State of Israel and the beginning of its economic activity. And thanks to Dr. Goldmann, the sums obtained were far higher than expected. Let me add that Dr. Goldmann also ensured the livelihood of more than 120,000 families, through the personal indemnification payments. And let me remind you, my dear friend Klarman, that your people were violently opposed to these initiatives.

The State of Israel rests on two strong pillars: security, which costs a lot of dollars; and the country's development, for which too foreign exchange is needed. Dr. Goldmann has never tired of seeing to it that these monies continue to come in. I ask myself where he gets the strength and the patience to go again and again to the Germans and ask them for dollars for the Jews and the State of Israel.

It is no secret that at the present time Dr. Goldmann is concerning himself with the question of additional potential immigration from the USSR. The Israeli government has given its approval, and he has set the matter in motion.

Nor is it a secret that there are differences of opinion among us on this or that notion. There are things I question in what Dr. Goldmann says, although he always emphasizes that he is speaking as a private individual and not as president of the World Jewish Congress. I do agree with Mr. Klarman that it is difficult to make a distinction between Dr. Goldmann, the private individual, and Dr. Goldmann, the president of the WJC. My colleagues and I would urge Dr. Goldmann to bear in mind when he gives interviews that no one distinguishes between his private view and his view as president of the World Jewish Congress.

After weighing the issue, my colleagues in the party and I have decided to vote for Dr. Goldmann because of his great services to Zionism, the Jewish people, and the State of Israel.

There followed a procedural discussion on the manner of voting. The chairman, Mr. KATZMAN (*USA*), announced that a petition for a secret ballot had been submitted to the Steering Committee, which had examined it and found that thirty-nine of the 115 signatures were invalid because they were not those of delegates. The chairman noted that in any case he would have ruled the petition out of order because there could be no secret ballot if there was only one candidate. The vote would be by show of hands, and delegates were free to vote in favor or against, or to abstain.

Dr. RAPHAEL KOTLOWITZ (*World Union of Tnuat HaHerut-Hatzohar*) challenged the ruling of the chair. The ruling was put to a vote and upheld by the Assembly.

The chairman called for a vote by show of hands on the nomination of Dr. Goldmann, and announced that the overwhelming majority had voted in favor of his election. He then called on the newly elected president of the World Jewish Congress, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, to address the Assembly.

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: My friends, first of all I want to thank the majority that voted for me and I also wish to thank my friend Klarman for the dignified and gentlemanly way in which he argued why I should not be elected.

I do not want to argue with him about Israeli policy, because I am in principle of the opinion that questions of Israel's policy do not belong to the Congress, and I would violate my own position if I were to argue with him here. I would be very happy if some day he would arrange an unofficial meeting at which the Congress and others could have a lengthy and thorough discussion on these questions with Menachem Begin, whom I respect personally very much, although I don't accept any of his political ideas.

There is one point in Klarman's speech which I want to clarify, because the press here has distorted the issue and made the accusation, or given the impression, that I was against the proclamation of the Jewish state. I have told the true story in my memoirs, but I want to take a few minutes to tell it to those who do not know it. I was one of the main fighters for partition of Palestine and for the creation of a Jewish state. At a certain moment I was even more outspoken than Ben-Gurion, who, like Sharett and others, was in favor of partition all along but, because he was chairman of the Zionist Executive, had to be more cautious than I until a decision was taken; at the Zionist Congress in Basel, Ben-Gurion himself declared that I was the main fighter. If I was, it was because I believed that without a Jewish state there was no future for Zionism.

The incident I am referring to happened when the state was voted into being by a two-thirds majority in the United Nations. The Arabs were completely isolated and in a mood of despair and bitterness. At that time, I had unofficial contacts with some Egyptian diplomats (I promised then that I would never divulge their names and shall not do it now). They sent word to me — not officially — that, although under no condition would the Arabs accept a Jewish state, an attempt could perhaps be made to avoid that the reaction of the Arabs should be a war, an invasion of Israel. During a top secret meeting they informed me that they had reason to believe that if Sharett and I, who were regarded as the moderates, would meet with the prime minister of Egypt, Nokrashi Pasha, in Rhodes or Malta, we might prevail on the Arabs not to start a war. I was afraid of a war, and one of the greatest

miracles of Jewish history is the fact that we won the War of Liberation. So I reported this offer to the Zionist Executive in New York and added that the American administration was in favor and that President Truman was ready to give us his personal plane to fly to whatever meeting point would be chosen. If you ask me whether I thought there was a great chance of success, my answer is no, but I believed it was worth trying, and I suggested that the proclamation of the state be postponed for a week or two. That was all.

The Zionist Executive in New York was against postponement, but we decided to send Sharett to Israel to try and convince Ben-Gurion — because the decisive man was naturally the great figure of Ben-Gurion — to wait a week or two. Sharett came to Israel but Ben-Gurion felt that, in view of the general enthusiasm, it was impossible to delay the proclamation of the state; in addition, he did not believe for a moment that the Arabs would not react by war. So Sharett telephoned and said “Nothing doing.” When I came to Israel two or three weeks later and asked Ben-Gurion why he had not tried, he said to me: “It was easy for you, sitting 6000 miles away, to have a cool head. If you had been here and had cried and danced with the Jews in the streets, you would not have postponed it for an hour either.” And maybe he was right.

But to draw from this the conclusion that I was against the proclamation of the Jewish state is to deviate from the full truth — to use English understatement. I fought for the state for decades, and I think that one of the great sins of the Zionist movement was not to have accepted a small state in part of Palestine when the British offered it in 1937, which would have saved hundreds of thousands of Jews during the Nazi period.

Now let me make one or two more personal remarks.

I had great doubts about accepting reelection. I am nearing eighty. Although I am in good health, I have no guarantee from *hakadosh barukh hu* how long I shall continue to be so. It is an absolutely abnormal situation that, including the years when I was chairman of the Executive, I should have been president of the Congress for over twenty-five years. It is ridiculous. I would be delighted to continue, as long as I am in good health and spiritual vigor, as an adviser to the Congress and for someone else to succeed me as president. Maybe it is my fault that I did not prepare a successor in good time, but the fact is that at the moment there is no one who would be accepted by consensus or near-consensus.

I am very glad that my election was not unanimous. I am against unanimity always: it is boring and it is a sign of lack of life. Movements and peoples who are alive do not act unanimously, and I regret very

much that Jewish life is unanimous on so many questions. I like a fight – it is more interesting, it's fascinating, it forces people to think. I would feel something were wrong if Herut had voted for me; I never expected them to vote for me. I may mention, by the way, that I brought them into the Zionist Executive; I argued for years with Ben-Gurion, saying, "Even if you disagree with them, and I disagree too, they have a right to be in the Executive and to fight us; that is democracy." But I do not think that problems of Zionist policy have anything to do with the World Jewish Congress. That is where your comparison with Weizmann is wrong, Klarman. I helped bring down Weizmann as Zionist president because we disagreed on policies of the Zionist movement; had we diverged on any other matter, I would never have tried to depose him.

So I decided to accept the presidency again and to look around for a successor. I do not take on any obligation to serve for the full term. I will most probably not serve the full term, but you will have to leave it to me to decide when I can no longer be your president. We have made provisions, through procedures and rules in the Constitution, as to how a new president should be elected. The Zionist Executive was right to ask that we see to this before they sign their agreement with the WJC, because it is a very important matter.

I want to say one word about my so-called nonconformist personal opinions. First of all, they are not so nonconformist any more. My friend Eban – whom some of you thought of as my successor (it may not have been a bad choice) – goes even further than I in some matters. He says that without the Russians there cannot be peace, which in the eyes of some people in Herut is a mistake. Some ministers say that one day we may have to talk with the PLO, naturally on condition that they abandon terror and accept the existence of Israel. My friend Rabin said that we will never talk with the PLO. I have great respect for Rabin; I am politically much closer to him than to his predecessor, but I told him: "Strike out the word *never* from your diplomatic dictionary; *never* does not exist in politics." A great statesman told me recently that now is the last chance for Israel to achieve peace; I said to him, too, "Strike out *last*." There is no *last* thing in history, there is no *never* in history. For years Israelis said they would never negotiate with the Arabs except directly; today they talk to them through Kissinger.

I want to make another remark, because it has political importance. I am an old friend of Kissinger's and I do not like the Israeli press or Kol Israel to report that I am his opponent and that I think that he does harm to Israel. He is one of the most fascinating figures I have known in my long life. There are people who collect butterflies, others paintings, and others medals – I am a collector of ancient glass and of

impressionists, but my main collection is of interesting people. It is the only reward in being a politician, which is a bad job, I assure you — without Hitler I probably would not have gone into Jewish politics. As to Kissinger, whom I have known well for twelve years, he is not an enemy of Israel. Whoever will succeed him as secretary of state will probably be less friendly toward Israel than he is. He is a much better Jew than I ever expected him to be. My remarks about his policies were badly reported. I do not believe that Kissinger's policy of disengagement will succeed. I would be happy if it did, just as I would be pleased if Begin's program could be implemented. If Kissinger should succeed within the next ten days with his disengagement plan, this would delay the possibility of a terrible new war for another six, eight, or ten months. But I have my doubts about his step-by-step policy. I am not against his trying it. If he succeeds, I will bless him — all should bless him. If he does not succeed, we must go to Geneva. He agrees with this, because he understands that without the Russians there cannot be real peace.

Those who do not accept my opinions should be the first to vote for me as president of the Congress, because I very often hold back precisely because I am president of the WJC. Wait to hear from me when I no longer am! Ever since my famous disagreement with Golda Meir two years ago, I have been silent. You can imagine that newspapers run after me — not because I am a great man but because I am a nonconformist, which is very interesting to the press. For two years I refused to speak out, and when finally I gave an interview to the *Observer*, I asked my friend David Astor a day before the paper went to press to cancel it. Why did I make the recent statements in *Le Monde* and in Israeli papers? I am smart enough to know that to speak out prior to the Assembly would do me harm, and I could have waited three months. But, having spent a few weeks in the United States, I felt that I had the duty to warn Israel. I believe that we are reaching a decisive moment and I am very worried about the policies pursued by Kissinger and Israel's political options. I felt, therefore, that to the extent that I have any influence, I should speak out. I said yesterday to a group led by Sapir, one of my best friends, that if I had to choose between my duties to the World Jewish Congress and my duties to Israel as a Zionist, I would prefer my duties as a Zionist, even if I had to resign from the Congress. And that is why I have broken my silence.

Those who have sleepless nights about my nonconformist interviews can have a good rest in the near future. I am reminded of the story of the Jewish soldier who was called to the army in the Russo-Turkish War. When he took leave of his grandmother, she said to him: "Moishele, take a piece of good advice: A war is a very bad thing, so give a shot, and take a rest." I gave a shot, and now I will take a rest.

When I feel that I must shoot again, I will, but for the near future you can sleep well.

Years ago, when, without being on their list, I conducted an election campaign for the Independent Liberals, Ben-Gurion got up and said: "I reject all his ideas, but Nahum has a right to speak out; it is his duty." Ben-Gurion was a great man. The moment I feel that my duty as a Zionist, my duty to Israel and to the Jewish people, commands me to speak out again, I will do so. Naturally I will take into consideration the worries of my friends and, if I can avoid it, shall refrain from antagonizing people, including Herut. If I can help it I shall keep silent, but the decision will be with my conscience. After sixty years of Zionist work, I have a right to be guided not by your advice, however much I appreciate it, but my own conscience.

When I look back on the first Assembly that elected me and compare it with this Assembly today, when I think of the many years I have devoted, together with my colleagues, to our work, I believe it was worthwhile investing the effort, facing quarrels, attacks, criticism, in order to create a World Jewish Congress which today represents so many Jewish communities and in fact the vast majority of the Jewish people all over the world.

Therefore I am glad and proud, and grateful to you for having elected me, to remain president of the World Jewish Congress.

Mr. TORCZYNER then presented the recommendation of the Nominations Committee for the election of four *vice-presidents*: Dr. Nessim D. Gaon, of Geneva; Rabbi Dr. Arthur Hertzberg, of Englewood, New Jersey; Rabbi Dr. Joachim Prinz, of Orange, New Jersey; and Mr. Ezra Z. Shapiro, of Jerusalem. Mr. Torczyner further reported that petitions signed by at least fifty delegates had been received for two other nominations for vice-president: Rabbi Awraham Soetendorp, of The Hague; and Mr. Sam Norich, of Madison, Wisconsin. Rabbi SOETENDORP then took the floor to withdraw his candidacy and to urge the election of Mr. Norich, who had the full backing of the youth caucus at the Assembly. Mr. Norich's candidacy was supported by Mr. PHIL HORN, speaking on behalf of the youth caucus.

After some discussion on the procedure to be followed, the Assembly approved an amendment proposing the election of five vice-presidents instead of four, and a procedural motion that the delegates vote on the five nominations en bloc.

The Assembly confirmed the election of the five vice-presidents who had been nominated.

Mr. TORCZYNER then presented the Nominations Committee's proposals for the other members of the new Executive of the WJC:

<i>Chairman of the Governing Board:</i>	Mr. Philip M. Klutznick (Chicago)
<i>Chairman of the General Council:</i>	Mr. Leon A. Dulzin (Tel-Aviv)
<i>Treasurer:</i>	Mr. Sol Kanee (Winnipeg)
<i>Secretary-General:</i>	Dr. Gerhart M. Riegner (Geneva)
<i>Regional Chairmen:</i>	
<i>Europe:</i>	Lord Fisher of Camden (London)
<i>Israel:</i>	Mr. Itzhak Korn (Tel-Aviv)
<i>Latin America:</i>	Mr. Gregorio Faigón (Buenos Aires)
<i>North America:</i>	Mr. Edgar M. Bronfman (New York)
<i>Member of the WJC Executive as Chairman of the World Zionist Organization (in accordance with the agreement between the WJC and the WZO):</i>	Mr. Pinhas Sapir (Kfar Saba)

The nominations were accepted by the Assembly.

Finally, Mr. Torczyner put before the Assembly the following proposals of the Nominations Committee:

<i>Honorary Vice-Presidents:</i>	Rabbi Dr. Israel Goldstein Dr. Moisés Goldman Professor Aryeh Tartakower
<i>Honorary Members of the General Council:</i>	Mr. Monroe Abbey Mr. Aba Bornstein Mr. Alexander L. Easterman Mr. Jacob Halévy Mrs. Rose Halprin Mr. Izhak Nathani Professor André Neher Dr. Maurice L. Perlzweig Mr. Shad Polier Dr. Aaron Steinberg Mr. Hilel Storch

Heads of Departments:

<i>International Affairs Department:</i>	Mr. Armand Kaplan
<i>Institute of Jewish Affairs:</i>	Dr. Stephen J. Roth
<i>Cultural Department:</i>	Mr. Itzhak Harkavi

Regional Directors:

<i>North America:</i>	Mr. Max Melamet
<i>Latin America:</i>	Mr. Marc Turkow
<i>Europe:</i>	Dr. Stephen J. Roth
<i>Israel:</i>	Dr. Natan Lerner

*Chairman of the Budget and
Finance Commission:*

Mr. Edgar M. Bronfman

*Ex officio Members of the
General Council:*

Director, WJC Rome Office
(Mr. Fritz Becker)
Associate Director, Paris
Office
(Mr. Jacques Lazarus)
Legal Adviser
(Dr. Friedrich L. Brassloff)

The Assembly accepted the nominations.

FOURTEENTH SESSION

Monday, February 10, 1975
(morning)

In the chair : Mr. JULIUS ROSETTENSTEIN

1. REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL COMMUNITIES

A. INTRODUCTION

Mr. LAVY M. BECKER (*Canada*): When we talk about small communities we are talking about more than forty Jewish communities among the sixty-four or sixty-five that are affiliated with the World Jewish Congress. These small communities comprise up to 3000 people each. It should be noted that even in large countries with large Jewish communities, such as Great Britain, France, and the United States, there also exist many small Jewish communities which are almost as isolated as those in the Far East or in the Caribbean.

The chairman of our workshop was Mr. Ernesto Freund (*El Salvador*), who is president of the Federation of Jewish Communities of Central America and Panama. We had thirty-three participants, representing seventeen countries, of which ten are small countries. There were a number of delegates from Israel, who had a broad range of interest. Two ministries were represented, if not formally at least by the presence of officials from the Ministry of Education and from the Ministry of Absorption. Various departments of the Jewish Agency also were represented in our workshop.

The discussions touched on the whole gamut of Jewish life in small communities. The participants were eager for an opportunity to exchange views on how to maintain Jewish traditions in a community with very limited human resources. It appeared that even when small Jewish communities are near to large ones with skill and experience in the maintenance of Jewish traditions, contacts between them may be very limited.

From the outset, the workshop recognized the need for small communities to turn to larger ones for their human resources. Logically,

they should turn first to the nearest large community. For instance, Mr. Falk of Australia, who attended the workshop, is concerned not only with the communities in Australia itself but, as chairman of the Federation of Communities of Southeast Asia and the Far East, he is concerned about the small Jewish communities in Manila, Singapore, Bangkok, Japan, Hong Kong, etc. There was recognition that the small communities of that area could use the resources of the larger Jewish communities in Melbourne and Sydney.

The workshop also recognized the importance of the contribution Israel could make, in two directions. Israelis should go into the communities to assist them, and we should bring people from the communities to Israel for shorter or longer periods of training.

It was felt that people sent to help small communities should preferably be young or, in any case, young in spirit. Some suggested the appointment of retired rabbis, while others cautioned that the people sent should be able to cope with the considerable task awaiting them. It is not a matter of coming to deliver a lecture for one evening. Whoever wants to be helpful must do some advance planning and learn about the composition and background of the community he would serve. There was strong criticism of a certain rabbi who had been engaged by a small community and within a few months after his arrival had everyone upset because he wanted to impose his own ideas and had no understanding of the specific local context and needs. Similar criticism was expressed about some *shlichim* from Israel.

The point was also made that those who come should be willing to stay for a relatively long period and that they should endeavor to teach and to guide the people in the community rather than merely lecture to them. A good method to this end, it was felt, are seminars and discussion groups which bring families together, and not only individuals.

Lastly, we had a discussion about interchanges between Israel and the communities in the Diaspora. The advantages of training in Israel were fully appreciated but it happens that those ready to come to Israel for training do not always possess the necessary leadership qualities. The trainees should be selected individually, not in groups. Also, such training need not be limited to young persons only. The second possibility was for Israelis to be sent to the small Jewish communities. There, one should not apply only formal or intellectual criteria. One should not forget the power of dance and music and song and enthusiasm that Israelis could bring to these communities.

A delegate from Great Britain noted that there were as many as 200 *shlichim* in London, and virtually none in the small communities of

the United Kingdom. Most *shlichim*, he said, whether they came from Israel or from elsewhere, do not want to work in small communities.

Since workshops do not have the right to propose formal resolutions, we made a recommendation which we hope the Governing Board will take into consideration. Our workshop has unanimously recommended that the new Governing Board establish a standing commission to deal with the problems and concerns of small Jewish communities. This would not only provide for continuity of work but give these communities an office to turn to, and hopefully some secretariat that could respond to their requirements. A Dutch participant, for instance, spoke of the predicament of his community, which needed educational material in Dutch rather than in English, French, or Spanish. If established, the office within the World Jewish Congress could act as a coordinating body and bring such requests to the attention of organizations that have the resources and facilities to follow up on them.

B. DISCUSSION

Mr. EZRA KOLET (*India*): We agree wholeheartedly with what has been said. The only suggestion I want to make is that, as far as possible, there should be an attempt not only to train a member of the local community but to keep him involved in this kind of activity. Those who come from abroad to help a small community need not necessarily be from Israel, because there should not be a feeling that they come with the idea of taking people away to Israel. This is a big problem. My own children were trained in Israel as teachers and were so fascinated by Israel that they came back to India for a couple of years only and then emigrated. The result is that we no longer have any teachers in a small community like Delhi. Nevertheless, to train local people in Israel to become teachers so that they can then spread the good word back home has great advantages, particularly in avoiding the language problem and lack of familiarity with local conditions.

I would suggest that a list of all small communities be established and made available to them, so that they could more easily communicate with one another.

2. REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON THE AIMS OF JEWISH EDUCATION

A. INTRODUCTION

Dr. LEON KRONITZ (*Canada*): The workshop on the aims of Jewish education was chaired by Mr. Jacob Halévy (*Great Britain*) and

attended by participants from many countries with widely differing attitudes. There was a lively discussion.

Mr. Itzhak Harkavi of Israel, head of the WJC Cultural Department, gave an instructive talk on educational and cultural issues in the Jewish world. Some of those taking part in the discussion underlined the teaching of Jewish values. Indeed, teachers generally know how to teach a sentence in the Torah or a chapter in history, but there are few who know the great and important secret of how to teach Jewish values.

In my own presentation, I pointed to the most serious problem that three out of four Jewish children receive no Jewish education at all, notwithstanding all the talk about the priority of Jewish education. The reasons for this may be found in the indifference of parents and the Jewish community in general, the inability of current Jewish education to offer stimulation, and in the poor teaching of the Hebrew language in the Diaspora. In my view, there is need for a radical change of the curriculum, which still dates back to the nineteenth century. The lack of teachers is also a serious problem. Most schools must make do with part-time teachers. Although Israeli teachers contribute considerably to Jewish education in the world, it is difficult to build up an educational institution with teachers who leave after two or three years. We might perhaps consider, instead of bringing teachers from Israel, to train young people from our communities in Israel on the express condition that they will afterwards teach in Diaspora schools. Lack of textbooks and teaching aids is also a general handicap. We need help from the State of Israel in these matters.

Jewish education is vital to the continued existence of Judaism. There have been times in the history of Jews when ideology was the most important thing. Today, the greatest danger is assimilation and the best remedy is Jewish education. If a Jew does not contribute to the Magbit he is ostracized, but he is never ostracized for failing to give his children a Jewish education.

The workshop recommended the creation of an aggressive movement for Jewish education to penetrate the community and the Jewish home. It suggests a roof organization for educational matters, to coordinate all the different activities of the numerous organizations competent in this field. We propose a "Magbit for education," with the full machinery that is required.

B. DISCUSSION

Dr. ARIEH LEON BAUMINGER (*Independent Zionist Movement*): I take issue with Dr. Kronitz' assertion that the curricula in Jewish edu-

cation date back to the nineteenth century. We in the State of Israel have modern curricula. There is a special section for this purpose in the Ministry of Education and Culture, and the people working there are psychologists, pedagogues, professors of the Hebrew University, the Weizmann Institute, and other institutions of higher learning. And I assume that in the Department for Education and Culture in the Diaspora, there is a similar section for curricula.

I believe that it is important to inculcate knowledge about the Holocaust and Jewish heroism. This was also a recommendation of the workshop. This is taught in Israel, particularly between Pessach and the 27th of Nissan, the Day of Remembrance of the Holocaust and Heroism, which was voted into law by the Knesset in 1953. In the Diaspora, they know only about the Warsaw Ghetto uprising but they know nothing of the uprisings in the ghettos of Bialystok, Sosnowiec, Krakow, Lodz. One way of furthering this end is for communities in the Diaspora to "adopt" Jewish communities that were annihilated in Eastern Europe — as we do in Israel and as has been done in Argentina and perhaps elsewhere — thereby creating a link with the original Jewry of Eastern Europe.

Mr. ISRAEL VISHNITZER (*Representative of Soviet Jewish olim*): I would like to pay tribute to the Jews of Israel, who have undergone great sacrifices to build up a land where Jews may come from all over the world, especially from those countries where they can no longer go on living.

The material assistance that a newcomer receives is a great thing; however, serious mistakes are being made which are hindering the process of absorption. As a result of these mistakes many *olim* have left the country or have decided to leave, and *aliya* from the Soviet Union has almost disappeared. The only reason for the drastic decline in *aliya* is that *aliya* officials cannot and do not want to understand the psychology of the new immigrant.

Here in Israel the idea prevails that Russian Jews are cowed and somehow degraded. Russian Jews have always been in the vanguard of the Zionist movement, and Jewish patriotism has always been deeply implanted in the hearts of Russian Jewry. We should not forget the triumphant and joyous reception given by the Jews of Moscow to Golda Meir when she arrived as Israel's first ambassador — and that was during the Stalin period — not to mention the wave of patriotism among Russian Jews after the Six-Day War.

The *aliya* movement in the USSR is inner-directed, and has never been dictated from above. It is evident that in Israel people think otherwise. In addition, we are treated as if we were incompetent in practically all matters. After having lived under a rigorous dictatorship, it is

unbearable for us to be told that we must learn how to walk. It is unbearable that an engineer from Russia is not an engineer, a doctor not a doctor, and a locksmith not a locksmith. It is unbearable to be told by Jewish Agency functionaries: "Who asked you to come? If you don't like it, leave." The bureaucratic approach to everything is unbearable. The *olim* from Russia include many intelligent people, and they must be allowed to show some initiative.

I have been in Israel ten months, and sometimes people ask me how I like it here. My answer is that it would take too long to describe what I do not like, so I would rather say what I do like: the fact that we are here among our fellow Jews.

Mr. MARC TURKOW (*Executive Director, Latin American Branch, World Jewish Congress*): With reference to Dr. Kronitz' report, I feel that statistics can be misleading and cause us to generalize and thereby ignore some positive developments in Jewish education.

There are small Jewish communities in Latin America where 95% of the children receive a Jewish education and speak Hebrew. It may not be a very good Hebrew, but it is Hebrew. Countries such as Peru, Venezuela, Panama, and Mexico are veritable centers of Jewish education. Some of their Jewish schools are of such a high quality that there are many non-Jewish candidates for admission and the directors have had to establish a *numerus clausus* for non-Jews.

Jewish education must be organized in such a way that it corresponds to local circumstances and needs; and it is a mistake to believe that giving children a Jewish education in school is sufficient if there is no Jewishness at home. Their parents — the middle generation — must be educated Jewishly as well.

Notwithstanding the need to take local circumstances into account, Jewish education must be coordinated on a global level. There is already too much fragmentation, too many departments. One of the problems that has to be dealt with is the training of teachers for Jewish schools.

One last word, on education about the Holocaust. I can tell you that in Latin America Jewish children are well-informed on the *sho'a*. The Latin American Jewish Congress publishes pamphlets in Spanish which are used in the Jewish schools; these pamphlets do not only describe the killing of our people but also deal with the heroism of Jewish youth during that tragic period.

Mr. SHIMON AVIZEMER (*Israel*): I have just one comment on Dr. Kronitz' presentation. It is true that teachers, curricula, the teaching of Hebrew, the teaching of values — everything we understand by the Jewish education complex — should be given great attention. But if the

child, the pupil, lives in an un-Jewish home, everything we are doing will be in vain. If the Sabbath and kashrut are observed at home, if it is a Zionist home, then the school will be an important addition. But the school is liable to be a burden, even to foster hypocrisy, if the child returns to a home empty of content. In my view, if we really take a serious attitude toward this question of education, then along with education in school the World Jewish Congress must address itself to the education of adults and parents.

Mr. SALOMON GEMEINAS (*Argentina*): It seems to me that something is basically wrong when a workshop on Jewish education must be conducted in English, as this one was.

Reference has been made to a uniform Jewish education. I cannot see how we can institute a program of uniform education for the United States and South America, where the problems are different. For example, in Argentina all the students at the Jewish teachers' seminary are at the same time pursuing their studies at universities; and perhaps 90% of the teachers in Jewish schools are university students. At the universities our young people, like Argentinian students in general, are caught up in the ideological conflicts that are affecting all of South America, and we must take this into account when planning our program.

The problem of organization is very important. On the question of education we in Argentina have been approached separately by Israeli universities, by the Israel Ministry of Culture and Education, and by the WZO Department for Education and Culture in the Diaspora. In order to unite our forces, all institutions working in this field should be grouped in a central body responsible for contact with the *gola*.

Mrs. MATHILDA GUEZ, MK (*Israel*): I wish there were more such positive developments in Jewish education as described by Mr. Turkow. But in some places children receive no Jewish education at all, so the statistical average would be misleading.

I am of North African origin and came to Israel nineteen years ago. I have visited France many times and know the Jews in France intimately. I am worried by what is going on there. As long as the North African Jews were in Muslim countries, there was no danger of assimilation. But the moment they came as French-speaking people to France, assimilation made giant strides: mixed marriages are numerous, and a Jewish home a rarity.

The situation was different for the Jews who came to France from Eastern Europe and who knew no French. They stayed among their own, spoke Yiddish, and were not as exposed to assimilation. But for the North African Jews the danger of assimilation is immediate and continuously growing, and they must be saved from it.

I agree with Dr. Kronitz' line of thinking and I would recall a proposal he made in the Zionist Executive to establish a mixed teachers' seminary in Israel. The young people coming to Israel from abroad might stimulate the local teachers, and they would raise one another's standard. In this way we shall get a generation of teachers and educators who will benefit both the State of Israel and the Jewish people as a whole.

A problem arises when Israel is asked to send teachers to the Diaspora. What are we going to do in Dimona, in Kfar Yeruham, in Mitzpe Ramon, in Eilat, in Kiryat Shmona, in Ma'alot ? There we depend on women soldiers to teach the children. And to our great regret most of the children reach the eighth and ninth grade without even being able to write an essay. When they fail, it is said that the Oriental communities are backward. What are we giving them which could cause them to make perceptible progress ? It is not the best teachers who go to the development towns. And if these teachers are unwilling to settle in those places for the sake of a noble task, why should we send them to New York or Paris or London ? Therefore, we must rally around Dr. Kronitz' plan, and shoulder our responsibility both toward the Jewish people and toward the State of Israel.

Professor SARA FEDER KAYFETZ (USA): We cannot underestimate the basic importance of the home and the responsibility of the husband and wife for teaching their children the way of Judaism.

We must tackle the need for teachers and guides. Next we must teach the parents, see to it that they go to a school or seminar or workshop to enable them to bring Judaism to their children instead of the children only bringing it home from school.

When I was president of Pioneer Women of America and Canada, I took part in the leadership of American Jewish life, and I want to put on record here that there are too few women in the leadership of the World Jewish Congress. If you want the younger women to come into the Congress, then you must offer them an opportunity to share in its leadership. We, as Pioneer Women in twelve countries, have learned how to train and teach women in leadership and in Judaism. Their children come to Israel to settle, and five former presidents of Pioneer Women have already settled in Israel, an indication of our interest in the land.

We ask that in future, women be attracted at least to the Education Committee so that they can help establish seminars and workshops to help the mothers and, may I add, the fathers too.

Dr. KRONITZ: Mr. Turkow was right: there is much that is bright in Jewish education. I also agree with the delegate from Argentina that educational problems vary from country to country and that there can be no uniform education.

Dr. Bauminger told us that modern curricula are used in the State of Israel. I know that, but if he came to some towns in Canada and in the United States, I would show him what kind of curricula are used there.

I agree completely about giving a role to women. There were many women at our workshop and they participated and contributed their share to the discussion.

As to Mr. Avizemer's comment about the home, the trouble is that nowadays it is not the children who learn from the parents, but the parents who learn from the children.

3. REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON JEWISH ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Dr. FRIEDRICH L. BRASSLOFF (*Legal Adviser, World Jewish Congress*): Some thirty people participated in the workshop on Jewish aspects of international law, which was chaired by Maître Alexis Goldschmidt (*Belgium*). The first speaker to introduce the topic was Justice Haim Cohn, who made a rather critical assessment of international law generally and more particularly in the context of the United Nations, for instance in the field of human rights.

The other two speakers were more positive. One was Professor Yoram Dinstein, who pointed out that the World Jewish Congress and Jewish international lawyers could do quite a lot in this field and who warned us not to undertake too much and not to duplicate work on matters the State of Israel had taken responsibility for.

The third speaker was myself. I suggested that we should examine the very wide field of international law with a view toward selecting subjects on which the World Jewish Congress could do pioneering work, as it had often done in the past.

There was general agreement that human rights in general and the rights of minorities specifically were of great concern to the World Jewish Congress. Eventually, our workshop made two carefully phrased recommendations.

One is to the effect that the World Jewish Congress should appoint a committee to explore the possibility of promoting a cooperative effort to establish a representative institution for the protection of national minorities, with purposes similar to those of the Congress of National Minorities at the League of Nations. In that Congress representatives of the Jewish people were very active, and the Germans also were very active; but when the Nazis came to power the activities of the Germans were no longer compatible with Jewish concerns and the whole minor-

ities problem changed. We cannot, of course, repeat exactly what we have done in the past, because we are now living in a different age and in a changing world even as regards international law.

The second recommendation — which sums up our thinking in terms of a practical approach — is for a committee of experts in international law to be set up, preferably under the auspices of the Institute of Jewish Affairs in London, to examine the desirability of establishing a Jewish Institute of International Law. The envisaged Institute would deal in such a manner as it thinks appropriate with questions of international law, of Jewish or general concern. This is a key provision because there was overwhelming agreement in the workshop that no clear-cut, mechanical distinction could be made between matters of Jewish concern and matters of general concern.

The chairman, Mr. ROSETTENSTEIN (*South Africa*), announced that there would be no discussion on this report, which would be dealt with in the Steering Committee.

4. REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON INTELLECTUALS IN THE COMMUNITY

Professor JEAN HALPERIN (*Chairman, Preparatory Committee, Colloquia of French-Speaking Jewish Intellectuals, French Section, World Jewish Congress*): Our workshop on intellectuals in the community was held under the chairmanship of Professor André Amar (*France*). We had two introductory statements: one, very brilliant and profound, by Professor Israel Singer of New York, who analyzed the situation of Jewish intellectuals in America, particularly in the United States; and another, by myself, in which I dealt with the situation of Jewish intellectuals in the European countries. The discussion was lively and we heard useful statements in particular from the representatives of Iran, South Africa, Israel, France, Ireland, and Brazil.

We found that the problem of the Jewish intellectual alienated from the Jewish community is not new. As far back as seventy-five years ago, Chaim Weizmann, then a young man, had the utmost difficulty in attracting Jewish intellectuals to the Jewish cause. In a letter to Theodor Herzl he complained that the Jewish intellectuals tended to fight more for the causes of the revolutionary movements than for those of the Jewish people.

Nevertheless, we also identified a new aspect of the situation in the growing interest of both Jewish and non-Jewish intellectuals in everything that concerns Israel and Jewish thought.

We also noticed that the problems before us were closely linked to problems discussed in other sessions, such as education, Israel and the Middle East, the Third World, international law, and the Jews in the Soviet Union.

If it is true that we are at a crossroads, then we must shoulder special responsibilities. The challenge facing us is how to bring back the Jewish intellectuals who have left the Jewish community and how to commit them to a more active participation in Jewish life.

We have been made aware of the original concept of the Jewish people as a single entity — *am hasefer* — not allowing for the intellectual to remain outside. By contrast, the secular intellectual nowadays — the man who seeks truth — by virtue of his mission must stand by himself, aloof from the group.

We asked ourselves whether we were interested in the Jewish intellectual only as a figurehead, or for his spirit. This week, when the *Sidra Truma* is being read in the synagogue, we can say that we have come to the conclusion that vis-à-vis the intellectual we must assume as a postulate: *Zot hatruma asher tikchu me'itam* (This is the offering that you shall take from them). Their offerings — the greatest possible choice of intellectual offerings — need to be contributed to the collective action on behalf of the Jewish collectivity.

Another matter that we considered in our workshop was of a more political nature, namely the attitude adopted by Jewish intellectuals when the campaign against the recent Unesco resolutions was being waged. We have established that signatures of Jewish intellectuals of great renown and authority have been removed from some lists, notably in the United States, simply because the persons concerned do not satisfy all the criteria of the organizational establishments of Jewish institutions. Names such as Chomsky and Stone were mentioned, and it was said that there was a lack of openness on the part of organized Jewish life. Obviously, we cannot expect to start a dialogue with Jewish intellectuals who keep us at a distance if we insist in advance that they should belong to a certain organization or political party.

We should also bear in mind that in the United States there is a tremendous number of Jewish university graduates, and consequently an enormous job to be done. Our workshop agreed that freedom of thought and expression must be accorded to Jewish intellectuals who are outside of Jewish life. We should make every effort to offer them a platform where they can express their opinion, orally or in writing, and we should do so particularly when we are not *a priori* in agreement with their views. This is the only way of bringing them into a dialogue and also the only way for us to explain our position to them. It will involve

an additional responsibility for those Jewish intellectuals who are committed to Jewish affairs because it is they who will have to conduct the dialogue.

Some participants, in particular the spokesman for Israel, stressed that Jewish intellectuals should be given the opportunity to help us project a more truthful and more favorable image of Israel. The workshop expressed the wish that efforts be made by the World Jewish Congress, by the World Zionist Organization, or by the State of Israel, to bring Jewish intellectuals who are alienated from Judaism to Israel in order to confront them with Jewish and Israeli reality.

The overall picture, as with regard to education, is neither black nor white nor merely dark. As an illustration I want to point out that in France the current economic adviser to the president of the Republic is a committed Jew who in his latest book, on poverty in developed countries, has devoted a whole chapter to the economic doctrine of the Bible; and that Mitterand's economic adviser also is a committed Jew, who participated in a series of lectures at the Centre Universitaire d'Etudes Juives in Paris on the economic and social tenets of the Bible.

We noted that the world at large, the Catholic Church, the political parties of the Left, the Third World, and others that cannot be labeled, expect from Judaism and from Israel far more than we ourselves do, and therefore we have to assume a special responsibility. In this context, incidentally, I have learned that the Academy of International Law at The Hague has invited for the coming year a great Jewish expert on international law to deliver a course on the contribution of Jewish thought to international law.

We have also understood that we cannot demand an attitude of *na'aseh venishma* from intellectuals alienated from Judaism, and that we must accept the opposite way so that they should say to us: *Nishma, ve'im naskim, na'aseh*. For that, however, it is necessary for them to be able to listen and for us to be able to make ourselves heard.

On the practical level, attention was drawn to the useful program of conferences organized by the Institute of Jewish Affairs in London, which has attracted a number of estranged Jewish intellectuals. Many references were also made to the yearly colloquia of French-speaking Jewish intellectuals, and the workshop expressed the wish that this example be followed in other countries. Similar colloquia which are now being organized in the United States should also be followed up.

Lastly, we agreed that the World Union of Jewish Students deserved increased support from organized Jewry, as it is evident that from the ranks of today's students will emerge the intellectuals of tomorrow.

5. REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON ANTI-SEMITISM AND ANTI-ZIONISM

A. INTRODUCTION

Dr. STEPHEN J. ROTH (*Director, Institute of Jewish Affairs*): The workshop on anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism, which met under the chairmanship of Mr. Avraham Schenker (*World Zionist Organization*), had up to fifty participants. Mr. Phil Baum, of the American Jewish Congress, and I reported on latest developments.

The purpose of the workshop was to consider whether and to what extent anti-Zionism should be regarded as anti-Semitism. We approached this question on three levels: on the theoretical level, to determine whether or not anti-Zionism is necessarily anti-Semitic; on the pragmatic level — which is the most important one — to establish whether in our information campaigns it is useful to expose it as such; and on an internal level, to assess the impact of anti-Zionism on certain Jewish circles.

At first there seemed to be a wide gap between our respective views, even between those of Mr. Baum and myself. Some took the extreme position that all anti-Zionism is identical with anti-Semitism, almost by definition. One speaker even termed anti-Zionism the most dangerous form of anti-Semitism. Others suggested that it would serve no purpose and might even do harm to equate the two. Later on in the discussion it appeared that the differences of opinion were due to the different conditions in various countries. Thus, we could agree, more or less, that in the Soviet Union and in Communist propaganda, anti-Zionism is mostly, though not always, a cloak for anti-Semitic attitudes.

On the other hand, delegates from the United States argued forcefully that anti-Zionism was not motivated by anti-Semitism and had no anti-Semitic effects. They felt we should not try to label it as anti-Semitism but try to fight it head-on as anti-Zionism. In the US, they claimed, if we tried to make it easier for ourselves by fighting it as anti-Semitism, which is a more discredited philosophy, it would not work and would be counterproductive.

The position of participants from other countries was somewhere in the middle. Their experience had shown that on occasion anti-Zionism had anti-Semitic overtones which should be made clear to everyone.

Several delegates from Latin America referred to a special phenomenon, the impact of anti-Zionist propaganda on the Jewish community and particularly on Jewish youth in the universities. They reported that anti-Zionist pressure, foremost by certain groups sympathizing with the Third World, was so strong that many Jews, especially at the univer-

sities, preferred to dissociate themselves from Zionism. This is, of course, a very serious problem.

To sum up, the overwhelming majority was of the view that anti-Zionism is not necessarily anti-Semitic and that it would be a mistake to call every anti-Zionist statement, such as criticism of Zionist or Israel policies, anti-Semitic. We agreed that the approach to the problem should be a pragmatic one, based on the knowledge that anti-Semitism is a discredited philosophy, and anti-Zionism something that in certain circles is even fashionable and fits in with some of the present trends.

One form of anti-Zionism, we agreed, is to be regarded as anti-Semitic, and that is, not the criticism of Zionist policies, but criticism of the basic Zionist concept that the Jews as a people have a right to national self-determination, which includes having both their own state and their own identity in the Jewish communities throughout the world. A denial of this right, we felt, is anti-Semitic.

In the course of our discussion of *hasbara*, a suggestion was made for a task force to take on the challenge of psychological warfare. As this went beyond the terms of reference of our workshop, we did not discuss it. I am, however, reporting the idea in the hope that the Governing Board will take note of it.

B. DISCUSSION

Mr. SHIMON AVIZEMER (*Israel*): For historical reasons, the Jewish people has addressed itself mainly to the Christian world when reacting to anti-Semitism, and rightly so. I would suggest to the new Executive of the World Jewish Congress that from now on more attention be given to Muslim attitudes toward Judaism.

To my regret, the Zionist movement and Jews in general have not seriously applied themselves to this problem. We live as Jews in Eretz Israel, in the Middle East; we have lived and shall be living in an area predominantly Islamic. Not all Muslims are Arab, not all Arabs are Muslims. Islam, in its contacts with Judaism, has always been steeped in misunderstanding. This is not a political matter. It seems to me that the World Jewish Congress in its cultural and informational work should deal with this question of Islam and the Jewish people, Islam and Eretz Israel.

We must become more conscious of this question. I would say that we must construct a framework for more contacts, just as we are doing with regard to the Christian world. I do not know of any body more

suitable to undertake this task, and less prone to political suspicions, than the World Jewish Congress.

Mr. DOV BIEGUN (*Israel*): I am grateful to Dr. Roth for a very fair summing up of the work of our workshop. I took some time to put forward a concept of a special task force to fight what I believe is an organized campaign of psychological warfare against Israel, and indeed against the Jewish people as a whole. I am not quite sure whether this is completely clear to the vast majority of our people, even whether our leadership has taken note of this very serious situation.

We are being told in a variety of ways and from many quarters that the Jewish people is denied the right to nationhood and hence the right to national determination. Once you go a step further, we have no right, of course, to the State of Israel, and the state as such has to disappear.

This new campaign is based upon the tyranny of words. In the late 1930s, when Hitler did his devilish work against Czechoslovakia, there existed two political parties with the same name. The ruling party in Czechoslovakia, headed by President Benes, was called the National Socialist Party, as were the Nazis in Germany. The tyranny of words came to the fore there in all its power and cruelty, with its deceptions and disastrous consequences for world Jewry and for the world as a whole.

We are facing today a similar situation when words are being played upon in a manner reminiscent of the time when Hitler had at his disposal the entire political machinery to wage psychological warfare. This is now being copied in a cunning and astute way by the Palestinians and their supporters, who are led by the ideologists of the Algerian Revolution, by men sent from North Vietnam, from North Korea, indoctrinated and trained in special schools outside Moscow and Leningrad. I believe that the task force I mentioned would have plenty to do to counteract this well organized campaign. We all know the slogans: a free, democratic, secular state is to replace the State of Israel. Notice: *free*, like all the Arab regimes; *democratic*, like Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Libya, Algeria. As to a secular state, where is the model? You have the ruler of Libya dictating to non-Muslim tourists what they should eat during Ramadan. In Saudi Arabia, they still cut off the hands of thieves. In short, because of the tyranny of words, people do not distinguish between their real meaning and their assumed one, and words become weapons against our people.

Yesterday we were told by the delegates from South America how this phenomenon is converting the regimes in one country after the other, and is even undermining the self-confidence of our own people,

of our own youth. For not only in biblical times have many of us worshipped other gods.

Mr. YONA KESSE (*Israel*): I am glad of the opportunity to praise highly the work of the WJC Institute of Jewish Affairs, which is an important source for our orientation with regard to modern anti-Semitism.

I have read Dr. Roth's background paper. He differentiates between original anti-Semitism and anti-Semitism which dresses up as anti-Zionism. Such differentiation is perhaps important theoretically. In practice, the result of this anti-Zionism is sometimes perhaps graver than that of the original anti-Semitism.

When, for instance, socialist youth organizations oppose Zionism and support the PLO, and say that the State of Israel is bound to be liquidated, I do not know whether this is not anti-Semitism in a modern version, because if their precept were carried out, not only the Jews of Eretz Israel but Jewry as a whole would be the victim. This is a most important point in evaluating anti-Semitism disguised as anti-Zionism.

Secondly, although the anti-Semitic stock-in-trade is very variegated nowadays, it concentrates on one point — the renewal of the hatred for the Jewish people and the State of Israel. Does it not contain a theory which entirely coincides with the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*?

The founders of Zionism thought that with the establishment of the state, anti-Semitism would vanish. I do not know when anti-Semitism will vanish, and although we do not have to see an anti-Semite in every gentile, it is a fact that the Christian world has still not freed itself from a special attitude toward the Jews, even if this does not take the aspect of brutal anti-Semitism.

The opposition to the State of Israel, to the Jewish renaissance, has given rise to anti-Semitic phenomena, because there are anti-Semites — so-called anti-Zionists — who reject us and our right to the land. Today's anti-Semitism is directed against us, not so much as a dispersed people, but as a people building its independence and its future anew.

Mr. SIDNEY WALTER GOLD (*Great Britain*): One of the tragedies of this generation, with our subtle and sophisticated education, is that Jews appear to have lost their instinct to recognize anti-Semitism. Our fathers and our grandfathers had a much better-developed instinct. They could smell an anti-Semite, they did not have to listen too carefully. We listen. Our sense of smell is gone, and we don't even understand the words. The late Dick Crossman, a well-known British MP and a great friend of Israel, once said that if you scratch the skin of any non-Jew, even the most sophisticated, you find an anti-Semite. And we have forgotten this.

How can we make subtle and sophisticated distinctions in a world where propaganda is not subtle and sophisticated, in a world where such propaganda is hitting at us hard enough for delegates here to report that many Jews, young Jews and others, are being taken in by it ?

In England, we had a great anti-*shechita* agitation a few years ago. When we investigated, we discovered a row of anti-Semites. Their love of animals was really their hatred of the Jews. The delegates here ought to realize this, and ought to go back to their countries and try to awaken a clear understanding again of what anti-Semitism really is.

Dr. ROTH: It is a great pity that Mr. Kesse and Mr. Gold were not at the workshop, where we could have had more time to examine the subject. I would, however, point out to Mr. Gold that in my introduction I made it clear that a denial of the right of Jews to their own state, an attack on the very concept of Zionism, was regarded as anti-Semitism. Mr. Gold also referred to the instinct of our forefathers, but the situation has changed, and as a state and nation we must be prepared to be criticized, even attacked, as other nations are. Moreover, it is not enough if our gut reaction tells us what is anti-Semitic; it must be something which we can explain to the non-Jew as anti-Semitism.

The suggestion by Mr. Avizemer to tackle the problem of Jewish-Muslim relations on the religious level should go forward from this Assembly to the Governing Board as a very useful proposal.

The same applies to Mr. Biegun's suggestion for a task force, and I would ask him to prepare a memorandum which could form the basis of a discussion by the Governing Board.

6. REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON ISRAEL AND THE DIASPORA

A. INTRODUCTION

Alderman MICHAEL M. FIDLER, JP (*Great Britain*): The discussion on Israel and the Diaspora was introduced by Rabbi David Polish of the United States and by Professor Uriel Tal of Israel. Your rapporteur served as chairman. Rabbi Polish dealt extensively with the necessity of connection and correlation, particularly between the young people in Israel and young people in the various countries throughout the *galut*. He was particularly conscious of the position of Jewish education and Jewish institutions in the United States, where he felt there was insufficient ongoing contact with their counterparts in Israel. One of his most emphatic phrases was that the *galut* exists for Israel, but Israel exists for the entire Jewish people. One of the most telling points he

made, I thought, during the discussion, was that Zionism itself had become a casualty following the establishment of the State of Israel: there has been a tendency for Israel simply to behave like any of the many nations represented at the UN.

Professor Tal emphasized the importance of our keeping in touch with the younger generation — students, soldiers, and others in Israel. He dealt with the general position, with the political position, and with those involved in what he called the religious revival. He took pains to point out that he was not necessarily thinking in terms of a return to Orthodoxy, but a desire of being identified with the Jewish basis of our people.

Dr. Nahum Goldmann addressed the workshop and dealt with the importance of establishing some means whereby the views of the Diaspora, represented through the Jewish leadership in the Diaspora, might be brought into closer contact with the State of Israel. Following Dr. Goldmann's statement, there was a debate in which thirty-one speakers from eleven countries as well as a representative of the World Sephardi Federation participated.

One of the problems is to what extent we in the Diaspora should be impressing our views on the government of Israel when it takes decisions of vital interest to Jews outside Israel. The controversy in Israel about "Who is a Jew" is a point in case. This question is still unresolved and the answer will have enormous repercussions outside Israel. When matters of this kind are discussed, the views of Diaspora Jewry must certainly be made known to the Israeli leadership.

By the same token, certain events in Israel — be it the shooting down of a plane or a raid into Lebanon — might require explanations and an adequate presentation to the Jewish and non-Jewish public in various countries. Therefore, these aspects should be discussed with the Jewish leadership in the Diaspora. The essence, of course, is that we are all part of one family.

Speaker after speaker emphasized the importance of exchanges of young people between Israel and the Diaspora, notwithstanding the overriding importance of encouraging *aliya*.

The question was raised as to what extent Diaspora Jewry might advise the government of Israel on its policies. All questions of foreign policy and defense naturally were deemed entirely within the sole competence of the Israel government. While we in the Diaspora face the political consequences of what may be done by the government of the State of Israel, it is the Israelis themselves, and the Israelis alone, who face the military consequences; therefore we must always bear in mind

that while we may offer advice in these particular fields, the decisions must be taken by the State of Israel itself.

We also recognized in the workshop that there are things which we do in the Diaspora which affect the Israelis. I do not simply mean fundraising, but political and other activities which have a bearing on the welfare and security of the State of Israel.

It is a product of this Assembly, and has certainly emerged from our workshop, that the old concepts of "we" and "they" have been destroyed — we in the *galut*, they in Israel, or the other way round. We have arrived at the stage when *we* means *all of us*. Now we need to find the institutional means of enabling the two parts of our family to identify more easily.

B. DISCUSSION

Mr. PERCY SASSOON GOURGEY, MBE (*Great Britain*): We all appreciate Mr. Fidler's stepping in at the last moment in the absence of the two rapporteurs and giving us a thought-provoking exposé on the discussion in the workshop. May I add a few remarks.

On a theoretical level, it was felt that there was a great difficulty in reconciling the sovereignty of the State of Israel with the autonomy of the Jewish community. It was also felt that we should try and impress upon Diaspora youth in particular that it is not only when Israel is facing a war or a crisis or an emergency that there should be a deep attachment to Israel.

Another point was that not only Jews in the Western Diaspora, but non-Jews as well, felt that the West could not abandon Israel without failing itself. In fact, Israel is fighting the battle of the free world. It was also felt that the crux for Jews in the Diaspora would come when war became a possibility and the question of loyalty had to be decided. Every Jew in the Diaspora had to make up his own mind as to where his priorities lay.

Further, a number of practical ways were suggested of cementing the relationship between Israel and the Diaspora. These included the twinning of synagogues, as many Diaspora communities are organized around synagogues. Hospitality committees in various Jewish communities abroad might be set up in order to entertain Israelis, to meet foreign Jews, and to exchange views. A third idea was that, in Israel, since there are so many different communities, there should be a meeting of the immigrants' organizations, so that they might better understand their respective positions.

Finally, it was felt that this is such an important subject that there should be special committees set up by the various organizations in the Diaspora in order to go into the matter in greater depth and prepare adequate memoranda on these suggestions.

Mr. FIDLER: I would urge that the introductory papers by Rabbi Polish and Professor Tal, which were of such importance, be reproduced and distributed to those who have been at this Assembly. I would also hope that, since a tape recording was taken of all the ideas that were expressed, a summary of the various ideas in fields of further activity will be put down in black and white and circulated to all delegates.

But especially I hope that you will all support me and the workshop in our efforts to get an ongoing relationship established between Israel and *galut* leadership, which to us seemed to be the crux of our whole problem.

7. REPORT OF THE WORKSHOP ON THE THIRD WORLD

Mr. MARCUS R. EINFELD (*Director for African, Asian and Commonwealth Affairs, World Jewish Congress*): This is the first meeting of the World Jewish Congress, and probably of any major Jewish organization, which has given consideration to the problem of the Third World and the relations that Jews should have with the peoples of those countries.

For purposes of the World Jewish Congress' program, the Third World consists of those countries — principally in Africa and Asia, but also in the Caribbean — where there are either no Jewish communities at all, or where the Jewish presence is so slight as not to have made any serious impact on the thinking and the operation of society. In most cases, the people of these countries not only have no direct contact with Jews — they have very little knowledge or understanding of the Jewish people: our beginnings, our aims and purposes, our relationship to Israel, our religion and faith, and the place of our culture and history in our present-day lives as Jews. Such knowledge as people of the Third World do have of Jewish people is usually highly colored by anti-Jewish propaganda emanating from a variety of sources.

We have managed over a period of time to build a relationship enabling us to make direct approaches to people in Third World countries on matters in which Jews have an interest. But the reason for our success is not simply because people in those countries want to know about Jews. It is a prerequisite for any successful orientation toward Third World countries that Jews themselves become sincerely interested in helping in the solution of the problems of the peoples of those countries. For however serious our problems may seem to us,

their problems seem to them very much more serious and more fundamental. In their eyes, the Jews are well protected and reasonably well off in the vast majority of the countries in which they live, and therefore do not need priority attention.

Consequently, our contacts have extended far beyond diplomatic and political circles. We have sought to build contacts at the student level, in academic circles, amongst journalists and media representatives, amongst clergy, trade unionists, and various other sections of society that are influential or molders of public opinion. In many Third World countries, public opinion reflects the thinking of perhaps 100 or 200 people. Newspapers are either not free or are of poor quality, or are not read because people cannot get hold of them easily or understand them easily. They do not have the kind of media-soaking that we who live in the West are subjected to.

In our workshop, which was chaired by Dr. Maurice Grynfogel (*France*), we first discussed the theories, themes, and purposes of such an orientation. I need not stress how important it is for the Jewish cause to find sympathy in the countries of the Third World, which comprise more than three quarters of the global population. The governments of these countries vote in international fora — not only in the hysteria of the United Nations with Mr. Arafat, or only in Unesco, but in many other international meetings concerned with trade, civil aviation, health, and a wide range of topics of importance to Jews in Israel and in some seventy other countries. These countries have the power to decide on matters which affect us greatly, as individuals and as communities. Moreover, our interests should extend to the problem of the Third World because in the long run Jews have an interest in everything that helps to make a secure and sound world order. We are unable to survive as a minority if the world is in turmoil and everyone at each other's throat, because Jews are always vulnerable.

The workshop then dealt with future programs. Among the many projects suggested was an institute for Jewish studies in India. Another idea was for Jewish academics to spend part of their academic year in African and Asian countries, talking to Africans and Asians — either from the platforms of university lecture halls where they would talk about Jewish matters, or using the same or less formal platforms in order to radiate our interest in their problems. Some participants suggested the establishment, with Africans and Asians, of joint working parties and study groups. These would enable idealistic, humanistic Jews who cannot find a place in what they consider to be the barren agendas of Jewish life, to give vent to their universalism through a Jewish forum. It is vital to recognize that for more than a generation

most Jewish intellectuals have not found a place in Jewish institutional life. Their idealism can be harnessed to a Jewish cause if we can find for them an outlet for their universalism and their humanitarianism. This is one area where we have found an immensely encouraging response from Jewish intellectuals, including journalists and people who are not religious or do not participate in Jewish institutional life but who find satisfaction in this type of program in a Jewish context.

It was also suggested that we should participate, in an institutional form, in international relief work, particularly for countries susceptible to recurrent natural disasters.

We also discussed the question of how to deal with the problem of South Africa. In this context, I want to pay tribute to our friends from South Africa who are here with us at this Assembly in a very large and representative delegation. I am very glad that we had the opportunity of engaging in a fruitful dialogue with our South African friends, both during my visit to their country last summer and here at this Assembly. Together, we have sought to find a compromise way in order to express our opposition to a system which is inimical to Jewish teachings and ethical and moral standards, and yet adequately protect the lives, future, and communal existence of the Jews in South Africa.

There are three main questions Black Africans ask us: What do the Jews have to say about apartheid? What are South African Jews doing to change the system? Why is Israel so friendly with South Africa?

I believe we must find a way in our contacts with Black Africa to express our moral abhorrence and yet to defend what must be defended. Considering all the money and effort that is put into saving even one Jew from certain countries, we are in no position to prejudice the lives of 120,000 Jews in South Africa. I have no difficulty in telling this to Black Africans we meet, whilst expressing uncompromising opposition to and even dedication to the overthrow of the horrendous social system existing in South Africa today.

The workshop presented an opportunity for a frank discussion of the South African problem, and I believe has set the pattern by which world Jewry and South African Jewry can build a solid and fruitful ongoing cooperation.

We had the pleasure at the workshop of the presence of a number of Israelis who are not delegates — representatives of the Foreign Ministry, professors of African and Asian studies at the Hebrew University, and some others. These are people with whom my colleagues and I have been working since the WJC program for African and Asian affairs was established two-and-a-half years ago. They have always given us their full cooperation and encouragement. Their participation was a

most constructive element in the workshop, to such an extent that it has recommended to the Congress that we establish an international advisory body for the Third World program.

We are seeking to build throughout Europe, the United States, Canada, and elsewhere, programs by which visiting African and Asian students, and others who are there on short-term visits, can come into contact with Jewish communities. We recommend that communities invite African and Asian diplomats and other visitors to speak to Jewish organizations on the problems of their home countries. And we propose to invite Jewish newspapers and publications to ask African journalists and writers to contribute articles so that we may learn about them, and at the same time find an outlet in African publications for material which is of concern and moment to us.

FIFTEENTH SESSION

Monday, February 10, 1975
(afternoon)

In the chair: Mr. JACOB KATZMAN;
later Mrs. FAYE L. SCHENK

1. REPORT AND RESOLUTION OF THE CULTURAL COMMISSION

Mr. ITZHAK HARKAVI (*Head, Cultural Department, World Jewish Congress*): The Assembly's Cultural Commission was chaired by Rabbi Joseph Karasick (*USA*). Before presenting the Commission's resolution, which was agreed on in coordination with the Assembly's Steering Committee, I would like to point out the following.

First, the Commission — and, I understand, the entire Assembly and the Congress as a whole — view the cultural question as something central, something that has priority today because of the galloping process of assimilation and the dangers lying in wait for the Jewish people in this regard in all the countries of the Diaspora. Secondly, the Assembly's Commission, which held three sessions on its own and also met today with the Steering Committee, decided to submit to the plenum the overall issues and not all the detailed proposals that were made. Thirdly, certain matters were dealt with not in a resolution but in suggestions and recommendations which will be submitted to the World Jewish Congress for examination. Fourthly, taking into account the current work program and the proposals for new action, it was recommended that a larger budget be requested for the cultural activities of the Congress.

Dr. ELIZABETH E. EPPLER (*Senior Research Officer, Institute of Jewish Affairs*), who had served as the Commission's secretary, read the

CULTURAL RESOLUTION

The Sixth Plenary Assembly expresses its satisfaction at the transfer of the Cultural Department to Jerusalem and at the fact that the Department, in keeping with the tradition of "From out of Zion shall

go forth the Law," will continue its fruitful activities in cultural leadership for Jewish communities the world over.

To this end the Assembly resolves to intensify Jewish cultural activities in conjunction with existing Jewish cultural and educational institutions and directs the Department to concentrate its efforts on:

- 1. the strengthening of Jewish consciousness through the teaching, at all levels of education, of Jewish values and traditions and of the history of the Jewish people in Israel and the Diaspora;*
- 2. giving its particular attention to the small communities throughout the world as well as to Jewish communities in Eastern Europe;*
- 3. the establishment of a cultural clearing house under the auspices of the Department, for the purpose of avoiding duplication and insuring maximal utilization of Jewish cultural resources throughout the world;*
- 4. sending teams of qualified young professionals to reside in the smaller communities throughout the world for extended periods of time, the purposes thereof being guidance and assistance for these communities, the training of local lay personnel and the launching of new cultural programs for these communities;*
- 5. the appointment in each regional Branch of the WJC of a cultural liaison officer for the purpose of helping to fill the cultural needs of the communities within the region and of establishing ongoing ties with the Cultural Department in Jerusalem;*
- 6. the establishment in cooperation with WJC member organizations and communities of a worldwide network of regional cultural activities for the entire family, the purpose thereof being the need to contribute to the meaningful survival of individual Jews and Jewish communities, especially the smaller communities;*
- 7. the encouragement of and cooperation in the establishment of chairs of Jewish studies at universities and institutes of higher learning, and their interaction with Jewish institutes of learning and with Jewish academics and intellectuals;*
- 8. continuing close cooperation with the WZO in the promotion of Jewish culture and especially joint endeavors to accelerate the successful integration of immigrants in Israel;*
- 9. the convening of annual meetings in Jerusalem to be attended by Jewish writers throughout the world to exchange ideas;*
- 10. the continuation of such welcome initiatives as the first colloquium on the methods of teaching Yiddish at the university level, which was held in New York;*

11. *close cooperation with the Brit Ivrit Olamit in its devoted work for the spreading of the Hebrew language in the countries of the Diaspora;*
12. *the commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the publication of the first Jewish newspaper in Amsterdam, in conjunction with the World Federation of Jewish Journalists, by the recognition of August 1975 as Jewish Press Month, as a means of strengthening and encouraging the Jewish press of the world;*
13. *cooperation with the WZO and the Israeli Ministry of Education and Culture in the provision of information on Jewish life abroad to schools in Israel and in the conducting of workshops and the organization of seminars on Judaism for young Israeli teachers, students, and intellectuals;*
14. *the establishment, following the decision by the Governing Board, of a Standing Commission on youth and young adults and the definition of its program and scope;*
15. *the establishment of a world center for the training of young leadership on a regional basis in cooperation with all interested member organizations and communities;*
16. *continuing support of and cooperation with appropriate institutions for the promotion of Jewish cultural endeavor in all its aspects, especially in the area of publications, so successfully achieved in the past.*

For the implementation of these programs of the Cultural Department, the Sixth Plenary Assembly strongly urges the consideration of a substantial increase in the budget of the Department.

The Cultural Resolution was adopted by the Assembly.

2. REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON SOVIET AND EASTERN EUROPEAN JEWRY

Mrs. RAYA JAGLOM (*Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO)*): We were deeply disturbed and grieved to see so few of you attend the Commission on Soviet Jewry, when in fact we were dealing with a matter of life and death. As chairman of the Commission I wish to put on record that only thirty delegates attended although 200 had announced their intention to do so, and that all the other participants were recent immigrants from the Soviet Union. I do not think that this performance is in the interest of the World Jewish Congress nor does it add to our prestige.

The meeting of the Commission was held at a crucial moment in the historic struggle of Soviet Jewry for national survival. No longer is the issue of Soviet Jewry only one of the main problems of Jewish life: the fight for the recognition of the elementary rights of Soviet Jewry to both *aliya* and normal life as Jews has become a matter demanding the attention of all who are concerned with major international politics. Soviet activists and the Jewish people were successful in bringing the tragic situation of Soviet Jewry to the attention of world public opinion, and the problem cannot today be ignored or disregarded.

Years of struggle have brought relative success, reflected in the presence here of some distinguished *olim* from the Soviet Union. We are now confronting a new situation. Some 100,000 Jews from the Soviet Union have come to Israel and hundreds of thousands more are expected. But at the same time, the Soviet authorities continue their policy of harassment against those who express their desire to leave, and a persistent anti-Semitic campaign is being conducted there. For us the problem of Soviet Jewry continues to be a major issue, second in importance only to the security of the State of Israel.

The problem has reached a fourth and very dangerous stage. The first stage was the miraculous renaissance of Jewish consciousness among Soviet Jews — their reawakened Zionism and their heroic fight for freedom, which came out into the open after the Six-Day War in 1967. The second stage was the immigration into Israel, since 1971, of 100,000 *olim* from the Soviet Union who came here to find their homeland. The third stage began in 1974 and was caused by absorption difficulties in Israel: Russian Jews postponed their application for emigration and took a wait-and-see attitude. Even worse, a new trend of *yordim* and *noshrim* appeared. Of those who came to Israel, 4000 have left for the United States, Canada, Belgium, Italy, and Australia. Those are the *yordim*. The *noshrim* are those who choose to remain in Vienna, or to go directly to other countries, including Germany. The fourth stage began lately, when the Soviet Union decided to repudiate its trade treaty with the United States, and there now seems to be a struggle in the Kremlin for a return to a Stalinist line, which would mean not only a tight restriction on Jewish emigration but Soviet Jewry might again be trapped in Russia. The fight to secure the freedom of Soviet Jewry must become the main aim of the World Jewish Congress and the Jewish communities of the free world.

For the benefit of those who were not at the Commission meeting, I shall sum up its work. But first I would like to thank the two vice-chairmen. One was the Hon. Greville Janner, QC, MP (*Great Britain*), who for the last five years has been in almost daily contact by phone with Jews in the Soviet Union. We owe him a lot, and you should have

seen his joy last night in welcoming to the Commission the same people he had spoken to over the phone when they were still in Moscow. The second vice-chairman was Professor Giorgio Sacerdoti (*Italy*). The Commission had very distinguished speakers. Mrs. Charlotte Jacobson (*World Zionist Organization*), who is chairman of the American Section of the WZO Executive, gave a comprehensive report on the activities of American Jewry for Soviet Jewry and analyzed in detail the implications of the Jackson amendment. Leonard Shapiro, professor of political science with special reference to Russian studies at the London School of Economics, gave a useful and controversial talk on Soviet Jewry; he felt there was some hope that the Soviet regime might undergo changes and become more tolerant toward Jews. We also had the privilege and pleasure to hear Victor Polsky and Professor Alexander Voronel.

While we were in session, there was a quiet demonstration of relatives of *refusniks* — people to whom exit visas have been refused. We were presented with a petition signed by five persons, four mothers and a father, who were part of a delegation of some fifty people waiting outside the hall and who transmitted to us a list of 600 *refusniks* together with letters to be sent to their relatives in the USSR. We invited the delegation of five into the Commission room, listened to them, and read out their petition, which I shall now read again for your benefit:

We apply to you full of worry for the fate of our relatives and friends who for a long time and without any reasons, have been detained in the USSR. Despite the numerous applications they have submitted, and despite statements made by the Soviet authorities that everybody who so wishes is able to leave the USSR, hundreds of Jews in different towns of the Soviet Union, for a variety of fabricated reasons, are refused the right to join their relatives in Israel. Most of them are dismissed from their jobs, their children are expelled from the universities and colleges. Various forms of harassment and repression are common, beginning with telephone disconnections and ending with imprisonment. It is prohibited for them to leave their towns, and all correspondence is permanently censored, and, from time to time, interrupted.

We are sure that only the unceasing struggle of the Jewish people and their friends all over the world can rejoin the separated families.

We appeal to you, members of the World Jewish Congress, representatives of all the Jewish communities of the free world, to strengthen our open struggle for the right of every Jew who wishes to be repatriated.

So-called quiet diplomacy, in this case, will not do any good. Statements by Congress President Nahum Goldmann, which were repeated with pleasure by the Soviet press, did not help the Soviet Jews at all.

We request you to help our brothers, and to be more active in the struggle for their freedom.

We then heard a statement by Mr. Rafi Bar-Lavia, who spoke as a representative of Jews from Georgia. Mr. Bar-Lavia said that the Georgian *olim* objected strongly that none of them had been invited to

the United States to address the Jewish communities there; that Georgian intellectuals were not being given equal opportunities by Israeli television, press, and society in general; and that the funds set aside for the absorption of Soviet Jews did not benefit Jews from Georgia. He pointed out that the first *olim* to arrive from the USSR were eighteen Georgian families, who had also been the first to apply for emigration to Israel. Mr. Bar-Lavia urged that the *aliya* from Georgia be accorded full partnership in Israeli life.

Next, the Commission had the pleasure and the privilege of being addressed by Dr. Goldmann, who said that we had suffered a great defeat as a result of the Jackson amendment. He said he had warned American Jewry weeks ahead that the USSR would not accept the Jackson amendment. Dr. Goldmann believed that emigration would go on nevertheless, but he expressed deep concern about an eventual resumption of the cold war, which would harm Russian Jewry. In his opinion only détente could improve the prospects for the Jews of the USSR. He felt that a certain amount of public pressure for emigration to Israel was useful, but he also advocated quiet diplomacy through friendly channels.

At its evening session, the Commission was greatly privileged to listen to Dr. Victor Polsky and Alexander Voronel. Dr. Polsky described the increasingly unhappy plight of Soviet Jews seeking to go to Israel. Professor Voronel, who since his *aliya* has become a member of the scientific community in Israel, declared that the Jews in Moscow and other towns eagerly awaiting the decisions of the Congress would be disturbed to learn how little interest in their cause was evidenced at this Assembly. He urged the World Jewish Congress to play a more active role in obtaining permission for future *olim* to come to Israel. He added, however, that it would be a catastrophe for Israel if half a million Jews were suddenly permitted to leave the Soviet Union, because Israel was not ready to receive them.

The first resolution adopted by our Commission, which has been distributed here, concerns Soviet Jewry and would, in essence, have the Assembly call upon the Soviet authorities: to cease harassment of free emigration; to liberate all Jewish Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR; to halt the anti-Jewish campaign; to stop interference with postal and telephonic communications between Jews in the Soviet Union and their relations and friends abroad, and with broadcasts directed to Jews in the Soviet Union; to restore to the Jews of the USSR their national, cultural, and religious rights.

Two more resolutions were proposed by Soviet immigrants themselves and approved by the Commission. One of these, while expressing appreciation for the efforts made by the government and people of

Israel to integrate and absorb Jewish *olim* from the Soviet Union, calls for such efforts to be intensified. The other proposed resolution would call on the Executive of the World Jewish Congress to consider as a matter of urgency the means whereby Soviet Jews may be given a voice and allowed to participate in the work of the World Jewish Congress.

Mr. SALOMON FRIEDRICH (*World Union of Tnuat Haaherut-Hatzohar*): We have made considerable progress as regards the struggle for Soviet Jewry. Years ago, when we came to Congress meetings, it was difficult to get a resolution passed in favor of *aliya* from the USSR. We were told that in order not to harm the Jews in Russia, we should not speak of *aliya* and family reunion, we should not manifest too vigorously or make too much noise. And we were asked who had authorized us to speak on behalf of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

Today, *barukh hashem*, 100,000 Jews have come to Israel from the USSR, so we have someone who is entitled to speak in the name of Soviet Jewry. And we have seen that we can achieve the desired results by undertaking an appropriate campaign of protests and manifestations, by organizing world Jewry and seeking out friends in the democratic world to help us in the struggle.

In practically every Western country, there is a parliamentary committee for Soviet Jewry. In France the parliamentary committee consists of 234 senators and *deputés*, from the Left as well as from the Right. The European Parliament in Strasbourg has also discussed the question and adopted unanimous resolutions in favor of the Jews of the Soviet Union. It is our duty to encourage all our non-Jewish friends who are together with us in the struggle for free emigration for the Jews of the USSR.

I believe that no act in this struggle has been as important, as well-covered in the world press, and as strongly felt in the Kremlin as the Jackson amendment. I therefore would like to propose that the World Jewish Congress record its recognition, as follows:

The World Jewish Congress hails Senator Jackson and his colleagues in the United States Senate for their action in favor of the right of the Jews of the Soviet Union to emigrate, and encourages them to continue to work for this just cause.

I submit this as a *votum separatum*. If, however, there is any opposition, I would ask that it not be put to a vote but simply recorded.

The Hon. GREVILLE E. JANNER, QC, MP (*Great Britain*): We are all deeply indebted to Senator Jackson. I greet Mr. Friedrich's sentiments with total agreement, but I have grave doubts concerning his suggestion that we should have a vote of thanks to Senator Jackson. Mr. Friedrich referred quite correctly to the work that is being done by

non-Jews in the battle for Soviet Jewry. Our voices are expected by the Soviets; but it is when non-Jewish voices are heard that they are more inclined to listen with care. But there are many others who may deserve votes of thanks, among them my own prime minister. Moreover, it might cause embarrassment to other friends of ours in the United States who may also be in the presidential race. Let us merely declare publicly our gratitude to those who have helped. Let us appeal to the non-Jews to join us in what after all is not a Jewish cause alone but a great humanitarian cause. Let us ask them to support us in attempting to see to it that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is respected. Let us salute Senator Jackson and our other friends from this forum and express our thanks. But please, Mr. Friedrich, do not insist on a formal resolution.

The importance of the possible repercussions on the political scene in the United States that could result if the Assembly singled out Senator Jackson was further underlined by Mrs. ROSE HALPRIN (*USA*) and Rabbi ISRAEL DRESNER (*USA*).

Mr. JACOB KATZMAN (*USA*): With regard to the draft resolution on Soviet Jewry, the chair has received a proposal from Mr. Robert Goot (*Australia*), for an amendment which would include in the text of the resolution a reference to non-Jewish Prisoners of Conscience.

Mr. SIDNEY WALTER GOLD (*Great Britain*): The draft resolution on Soviet Jewry seems to miss an essential point. Should we call on the Jewish communities to engage in open activities for everyone to see, or should we deal with the problem — as some high officials of the World Jewish Congress have always been telling us to do — through backstairs diplomacy by asking distinguished non-Jews who visit officials of the Soviet government to put in a word for us, and consider this the only method of conducting the campaign? I do not expect a bold resolution but I feel that it should include a passage calling on Jews to demonstrate openly and to employ other means that draw attention to the problem in the press and other media.

Mr. YEHUDA BENARI (*Israel*): As much as I appreciate Mrs. Jaglom's efforts on behalf of the Jews in the Soviet Union and as chairman of the Commission, I do not agree with the draft resolution she has presented. In its present form it is merely another platonic appeal to the Soviet authorities and lacks recommendations for decisive action. I feel that we should take note of the great struggle going on in Soviet Russia, of the sudden awakening of Jewish national consciousness despite the long isolation from centers of Jewish religion and culture. We should register our satisfaction with this phenomenon, which places on us a tremendous responsibility. At the moment, different ad hoc committees in various places are each making separate efforts to

alert public opinion to the plight of the Jews in the USSR. The World Jewish Congress should set up a special department, not to coordinate these efforts, but to promote them by making available relevant information. Moreover, in the context of the current discussions at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, we should insist that the Jewish communities in the Soviet Union be entitled to have contact with the centers of Jewish culture and tradition.

Dr. SCHNEIER LEVENBERG (*Great Britain*): Mr. Gold raised an important question. My reply, on the basis of Congress experience over many years, is that we have never confined ourselves to one method of struggle, nor should we. Quiet diplomacy does not exclude activity to influence public opinion. We must conduct private diplomatic work and we must engage in public demonstrations.

As regards the vote of thanks to Senator Jackson as proposed by Mr. Friedrich, I feel it would be an error to single out one individual, although of course we are very grateful to him. On another aspect of the Soviet problem, some people ask why we speak only about Jews, why we do not support the democratic forces in the USSR, why we do not talk about those non-Jews who would like to leave the country. While we are very sympathetic to all human beings fighting for their legitimate rights, we must not confuse the issues; in this Assembly of the World Jewish Congress we should confine ourselves to the issue on the agenda, namely the struggle for the rights of Soviet Jewry.

We must use every opportunity to put forward our case; in particular, we should try to induce governments to raise the issue at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Mrs. JAGLOM then read out the Commission's proposed preamble to the resolution on Soviet Jewry, which, for lack of time, was not yet available for distribution. The preamble expressed serious concern over the 40% reduction in Soviet Jewish emigration in 1974; the continued policy of harassment and trials of Jews for expressing their desire to go to Israel; and the continued incarceration of Jewish Prisoners of Conscience. The preamble also saluted the heroism of the Soviet Jewish activists. Finally, it expressed regret at the Soviet Union's repudiation of its 1972 trade agreement with the United States, and underlined that the right to emigrate is a fundamental, universally recognized right transcending all commercial considerations.

Mrs. CHARLOTTE JACOBSON (*World Zionist Organization*) and Mr. GREVILLE E. JANNER, QC, MP (*Great Britain*) proposed that a paragraph be included in the resolution expressing the determination of the WJC and its member communities and organizations energetically to continue the Soviet Jewry campaign by all lawful means until the demands made in this connection were accepted and implemented by

the Soviet authorities. This was supported by Mrs. ROSE E. MATZKIN (USA), who added that the basic resolution as proposed by the Commission should be adopted, and that the various detailed suggestions be taken into account in a program of action.

Mrs. BERNICE SALPETER (USA): I still feel that the proposed resolution lacks teeth. It is not enough to call upon the Soviet authorities, who will not give us satisfaction. We should also call on delegates to this Assembly to approach their respective governments with a view to obtaining some kind of assistance in our fight to free the Jews in the Soviet Union. I would like to see the addition of a clause to this effect in the text of the resolution.

Rabbi AWRAHAM SOETENDORP (Netherlands): I would like to raise again the point, which was stressed at the Commission, that there are also non-Jews in the USSR who are struggling for human rights. The campaign for Russian Jews and the campaign for non-Jews need not be merged, but there could be an expression of concern in some Jewish bodies for certain individuals who struggle for their human rights, which are also the human rights of the Jews in the USSR.

Mr. KATZMAN: Before putting the resolution to a vote, I want to make it clear that the various improvements and amendments presented here will be taken into account by an editing committee that will fix the final text.

The resolution was adopted by the Assembly. In its final form, it reads as follows:

SOVIET JEWRY

While noting that numbers of Jews have in recent years been permitted to leave the Soviet Union, this Sixth Plenary Assembly views with serious concern the forty-percent reduction in 1974 of the number of Jews permitted by the Soviet authorities to emigrate to Israel, as compared with 1973.

The Assembly condemns the deliberate and continued policy of harassment and trials of Jews for expressing their desire to go to Israel, and of the widespread refusal of applications by Jews for exit permits. It further condemns the continued and particularly harsh incarceration of Jewish Prisoners of Conscience, who languish in Soviet prisons for having struggled for the right to leave the Soviet Union for Israel in spite of persecution and of Soviet policy to do everything possible to deter them from applying for exit visas. The Assembly reaffirms its strong support and admiration for their great heroism and inspiring courage.

The Assembly places on record the appreciation of the Jewish people for the continuous action of governments, national and international organizations, and distinguished citizens in many countries, as well as of all our affiliates, in favor of our fellow Jews in the Soviet Union.

The Assembly notes with regret the recent repudiation by the Soviet Union of its 1972 trade agreement with the United States and rejects the attempt to attribute this repudiation to the clauses of the agreement concerning the liberalization and cessation of harassment previously accepted by the Soviet authorities after prolonged negotiations.

The Assembly declares its wholehearted support of genuine détente and the most needed improvement of relations between Western nations and the Soviet Union, but feels impelled to underline that the right of every person to emigrate is a fundamental, universally recognized right which transcends all commercial, economic, or political considerations.

I. The Assembly therefore calls upon the Soviet authorities:

- a. to permit free emigration and to cease harassment of all Jews who desire to leave for Israel, in accordance with international and Soviet law and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;*
- b. to liberate all Jewish Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR;*
- c. to halt the anti-Jewish campaign in official organs of the Soviet Union which stimulates anti-Semitism, including trials of Jews on spurious charges and the meting out of unjust and harsh sentences, completely out of proportion to the severity of the alleged offences;*
- d. to stop interference with postal and telephonic communications between Jews in the Soviet Union and their relations and friends abroad and with broadcasts directed to Jews in the Soviet Union;*
- e. to restore to the Jews of the USSR their national, cultural, and religious rights, as permitted by the Soviet Constitution, and to grant them the right – which exists in many of the Socialist countries – to maintain regular contact with other Jewish communities and organizations in the world.*

II. The delegates to this Assembly pledge themselves and their communities and organizations to continue the campaign for the freedom of Soviet Jews by all lawful means and with utmost energy until our above demands are accepted and implemented by the Soviet

authorities. We look forward to the continued and valued support of enlightened opinion and people of goodwill everywhere in this struggle.

- III. While appreciating the efforts made by the government and people of Israel to integrate and to absorb Jews from the Soviet Union, the Assembly calls for such efforts to be intensified.*
- IV. The Assembly calls on the Executive of the World Jewish Congress to consider as a matter of urgency the means whereby Soviet Jews may be given a voice and participation in the work of the World Jewish Congress.*

The chairman then called on Ms. NATASHA SHTIGLITZ, a recent immigrant from the USSR, who appealed for the delegates' help in prevailing on the Soviet authorities to allow husbands and wives whose spouses were in Israel to join them.

Mr. RAFI BAR-LAVIA (BALVASHVILI) (*Israel*): There has in the past year been some sensitivity and excitement among the Georgian Jews in Israel, who complain over a lack of attention and understanding. When I asked the chairman of the Commission on Soviet Jewry why Georgian immigrants had not been included in information missions to the United States, she replied that it was a problem of language. This is an offensive reply. The Georgian Jews count thousands of cultured people: historians, physicians, engineers — and English-speakers. Therefore I rather think that there must be another reason why Georgian Jews have been barred from the missions to the United States, and I would strongly urge that in the future they be enabled to participate. I would also suggest that the resolution make it explicit that Soviet Jewry includes Georgian Jewry.

Mrs. JAGLOM: The draft resolution on Poland that is being presented by the Commission was proposed to us by the World Federation of Polish Jews.

We know that at the outbreak of World War II, nearly 4,000,000 Jews lived in Poland. By the time the Communist regime was established, only 200,000 were left, and at present less than 10,000 Jews reside in that country. Most of them are old people, invalids, and survivors of concentration camps. They have no possibility or hope of leaving the country.

Polish Jewry, which was annihilated almost totally, has left behind a great cultural heritage as well as enormous material wealth. There were the properties of Jewish communities such as public institutions, homes for the aged, orphanages, buildings of various sorts, and land. The Jews

who perished also left behind their private assets in the form of cash, securities, jewelry, art pieces, and other valuables deposited in bank vaults.

There are also tens of thousands of Jews who contributed to pension funds, but who left Poland after the takeover by the Communist regime. Both under international law and under the Polish legal system, these people have claims to pension payments.

The draft resolution which you have before you takes these elements into consideration.

Mr. BERNARD GORE (*World Federation of Polish Jews*): Except for minor drafting points I agree with the resolution. The last paragraph, however, seems too weak and should be reworded to make it clear that the Executive of the World Jewish Congress should initiate, and take appropriate steps for, the collection and exhibition of relics, and that this action should be for the benefit of Polish Jewry.

Mr. DOV BIEGUN (*Israel*): While I agree with the resolution, I would like to make an additional comment. Thirty years after Auschwitz, thirty years after the destruction of a community which Dr. Goldmann rightly called the fortress of Jewish culture, Poland is a desert from the Jewish standpoint — a country in which every vestige of Jewish memories and Jewish graves is being obliterated, to such an extent that in Auschwitz there is no sign at all that millions buried there are our own brethren. It is particularly important to stress this situation because there is a campaign afoot in many parts of Europe, starting in Germany and spreading to many lands, which purports that the Holocaust, the slaughter of millions, is a product of the fertile imagination of the Jews and never really occurred. It is high time for the World Jewish Congress to put its weight behind the demand to establish a memorial in Auschwitz and for the payment of compensation to Jewish organizations for properties lost.

Rabbi ISRAEL MOWSHOWITZ (*USA*): Just as it is important for us to call upon the Polish government to do that which it has not done, so is it necessary for us to express gratitude for that which it has done. Only five weeks ago I visited Warsaw and was told by the Polish government as well as by the United States ambassador that the government will declare the Twarda Street synagogue a national historic shrine. Likewise, there are now assurances that the cemetery in Warsaw will be a national historic shrine. The Yiddish Theater, which I saw performing and which is excellent, is being helped by the government. And the Polish government also supports the Jewish Historical Society Museum. An expression of thanks should be incorporated into the resolution.

Mr. KATZMAN: When making the final revision of the resolution, the editing committee will consider the suggestions made here.

The resolution was adopted unanimously. In its final form it reads as follows:

POLAND

The Sixth Plenary Assembly calls upon the government of Poland:

- a. to take all appropriate steps to preserve and where necessary to restore all Jewish cemeteries and to prevent desecration of the graves;*
- b. to give to the World Federation of Polish Jews and interested bodies and individuals free access to all historical records of Polish Jewry now in the possession or under the control of Polish authorities;*
- c. to recompense representative organizations of Polish Jews for all real and personal property appropriated from Polish Jewish communities;*
- d. to honor its undertaking to hand over to surviving Polish Jews one of the prison barracks in the former Auschwitz concentration camp for use as a memorial to Jews martyred in that camp;*
- e. to resume social insurance and other pension payments to Jews who had to leave Poland because of the anti-Semitic campaign that began in 1967.*

The Assembly further calls upon the Executive to consider whether arrangements could appropriately be made through the WJC or a representative body of Jews from Poland for the collection and exhibition of relics from the great Polish Jewish community.

3. ADDRESS BY MRS. BEATE KLARSFELD

Mrs. CHAIKA GROSMA, MK (*Israel*): I have the honor to introduce to you a courageous woman, a daughter of the German nation, who considered it her duty not to remain silent, not to rest, but to do everything in her power to remind the world, and the German people in particular, of what had been done to the Jewish people during the Holocaust.

Beate Klarsfeld worked for and obtained the ratification of the Franco-German agreement on the extradition of Nazi criminals. This she achieved, one might say, by private action. She is working relent-

lessly to track down Nazi criminals who hold official posts in Europe and elsewhere — posts which have a bearing on the Jewish people and the State of Israel. She is totally committed to this cause — reminding the world, searching in archives, submitting documents, demanding that criminals be brought to justice.

Beate Klarsfeld decided that the debt owed by the world to the Jewish people must be expressed in terms of ensuring the existence of the State of Israel. In Israel, a public committee has been established for the support of Beate Klarsfeld's activities. She has come here at the invitation of this committee, and has brought with her new documentation about persons with a Nazi past who are about to be nominated to posts connected with the Middle East.

Mrs. BEATE KLARSFELD: Thank you for having invited me to address you. I will not make a long statement, because I am not a lecturer. I prefer to express myself through deeds whose meaning is evident to everybody. I prefer also to act on the spot, in the lion's den, rather than to express beautiful ideas without risk in conference halls.

To begin with, I would like to give you the reason why I act the way I do. I am German and non-Jewish, and it is as a German that I fight the Nazi criminals, with the aid of my husband Serge, who wages this battle as a Jew. Our object is not a manhunt, as many people wrongly imagine. Indeed, we are fighting a defensive battle. We are trying desperately to prevent the rehabilitation of German criminals condemned in absentia after 1944. Among their victims were thousands of men and women who were in the French resistance and more than 100,000 French Jews who were deported to extermination camps.

It is inadmissible that some of the greatest criminals in German history should continue to enjoy a scandalous impunity while the German people for a long time to come will still have to suffer from their deeds.

Each of us carries on his shoulders both the good and the evil that is his people's burden — if I am a daughter of Goethe, of Schiller, of Beethoven, I am also a daughter of Hitler, of Himmler, and of Eichmann. I am not crushed by this. Far from it. I do not blush for my people. I have no guilt complex. I know that above everything else, being German implies special responsibilities. Not only to plant trees in Israel but to be committed actively, energetically, in the fight against Nazism and against anti-Semitism.

I have said it often and it surprises many people: I have a deep national feeling. Since 1945 the German people is divided into two states, each belonging to a different ideology. It is a great people which is divided forever. And my national feeling binds me not to accept what

dishonors my people. Whatever I do, I do as a German, endeavoring to observe three moral principles that should guide the policy of the German people, which I try to represent. First, to remove the former Nazis from German politics. Second, to prevent the rehabilitation of Nazi criminals. Third, to demonstrate concretely the solidarity of the German people toward the Jewish people, if necessary at the price of material or political sacrifice.

That is why, for instance, four months ago I went to Rabat, to the Arab Summit meeting, in order to distribute in the streets pamphlets denouncing a policy which aims at the destruction of the State of Israel. Without having any guilt complex at all, I believe that the German people has special responsibilities toward the Jewish people, and I try to assume them with lucidity and courage, in the cruel world that is ours.

No, I am not living in the past, but I bear the consequences of the past and I am fully engaged in the fight today. Thus I opposed the German Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger, former deputy director of Hitler's foreign radio propaganda. Thus I never ceased to fight in 1968 and 1969 against the neo-Nazis of von Thadden. Thus in Warsaw in 1970 I chained myself in the street to protest anti-Semitism. Thus I was arrested in Prague in 1971 for protesting against repression and anti-Semitism, and thus I am still forbidden to enter East Germany.

I have protested in Damascus against the persecutions of Syrian Jews and the refusal to supply lists of Israeli prisoners. For the past four years, my husband and I have been conducting a continuous and methodical campaign against the impunity of virtually all the Nazi criminals who operated in France and who deported more than 100,000 French Jews. This campaign has taken me from Germany to South America, from a police station in Cologne to one in La Paz or Lima, in search of the justice due to the Jewish people and never rendered.

Indefatigably on radio, on television, in the press, at numerous meetings I am asked to attend in France, in Switzerland, in Belgium, in Holland, I have tried to mobilize the energy of my audience in favor of Israel, whose existence is so threatened.

The trial of the perpetrators of the final solution in France will help this mobilization, because it will be a historic trial such as that of Eichmann, and will throw light on the responsibilities of the Vichy regime and the Germans.

To fight effectively means to be committed permanently, in spite of personal worries, in spite of our two small children, in spite of innumerable material difficulties. Our fight to bring the Nazi criminals to justice consists not only of spectacular acts but involves patient and minute work in researching, in documenting, in disseminating the documentation — it is a juridical and a police job, and I thank you for supporting our action financially, and for joining the Israeli committee supporting the fight I wage.

We have already achieved a great success with the Bundestag's ratification on January 30 of the Franco-German agreement concluded in 1971. We will now try to obtain the condemnation of the principal Nazi henchmen by the German courts. But it will not be easy at all, because they are reintegrated into German society in important posts. It will be hard for the German courts to condemn men like SS Obersturmführer Kurt Lischka, chief of the Gestapo's Jewish Section in 1938, the top Nazi police officer in France, and today a business executive in Cologne. Men like the SS-man Herbert Hagen, former chief of the Jewish Section of the SSD, today a sales manager. Or SS Hauptsturmführer Heinrich Müller, former chief of the Gestapo in Paris, who later became a judge in Lower Saxony; or SS Hauptsturmführer Horst Lauber, formerly of the service responsible for the execution of hostages in France, now a judge in the *Land* of Baden-Württemberg.

The link between the Nazi anti-Jewish past and the present anti-Israeli Germany is symbolized by the distinguished deputy from Essen, Ernst Aschenbach, spokesman for the past twenty-six years in the Bundestag for the great industrialists of the Ruhr, the same ones who profited so much from Jewish slave labor. As long as four years ago Aschenbach's nomination as representative to the Commission of the European Economic Community in Brussels was blocked. Six months ago, we forced him to resign from his post as rapporteur on the Franco-German convention in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Bundestag. Aschenbach not only was the chief of the political section at the German embassy in Paris from 1940 to 1943, a post where he actively cooperated with the Gestapo in order to deport the Jews of France. Today, he is a founding member of the parliamentary section for European-Arab cooperation, created in March of last year in Paris. I have asked the parliaments of the Arab states to remove from his post Ernst Aschenbach, accomplice in the genocide of the Jews.

But I have also asked the Arab world to change its unjust aggressive policy toward the State of Israel and to accept its sovereign existence within secure and recognized borders. I have asked the other Arab states to intervene with the Syrian and Iraqi authorities in view of

ameliorating the living conditions of the Jewish communities in Syria and Iraq. In spite of the tenor of my message, I was accorded an entry visa, permitted to land, and, without incident, to hand over my dossier to the Egyptian authorities. From Cairo I took a plane to Damascus but there I was not admitted and had to spend eighteen hours at the airport before returning to Beirut. The Lebanese gave me a visa and I immediately tried to contact the parliament and then the local press correspondents. But a few hours later, five police inspectors broke into my hotel room and took me and my luggage to the Sûreté Nationale. After the interrogations, to which, alas, I am by now accustomed, they took me to the airport at two o'clock in the morning and put me on a plane to Rome.

What I really want to get across to the Israeli youth is that they will find the moral strength and stamina needed to protect the State of Israel only in their precise knowledge of the annihilation of the Jewish people in Europe thirty years ago.

The Jews of our generation have a terrible privilege and a frightful responsibility. They are the Jews of Auschwitz and of the State of Israel. And if Auschwitz was the abnegation of the Jewish people, the existence of Israel is the abnegation of Auschwitz. Never before, in 2000 years, have the Jews had such responsibilities. To escape extermination at the hands of the most cruel executioners, to revive the Jewish state, to ensure its survival — these responsibilities must dominate, beyond any personal interests, the Jewish fate both in Israel and in the Diaspora.

As for me, whom Leon Dulzin has called “the ally of the Jewish people,” I hope I am only the vanguard of a collective movement in Germany and Western Europe — a movement for Israel, a courageous effort to take stock of Europe’s responsibilities toward a small people persecuted for centuries, martyred in our own century, and whose state ever since its inception has wanted peace.

Mr. KATZMAN: I shall not engage in the banalities of expressing thanks or appreciation to Beate Klarsfeld; anything of that nature would only take away from what we feel. Suffice it to say that our hearts are at one with you in the struggle for our common humanity and for decency in the world for all mankind.

4. PROPOSAL ON ISRAEL-DIASPORA RELATIONS

Alderman MICHAEL M. FIDLER, JP (*Great Britain*), in his capacity as chairman of the workshop on Israel and the Diaspora, introduced the following resolution on behalf of the Assembly’s Steering Committee, which had unanimously approved it:

RESOLUTION ON ISRAEL-DIASPORA RELATIONS

Whereas the prime minister of Israel in his address to this Sixth Plenary Assembly called for the establishment of some appropriate form of effecting a close, workable, and continuing relationship between Israel and the Diaspora, and

whereas the president of the World Jewish Congress has urged that this proposal be treated as a matter of great urgency, and

whereas the Workshop and Commission concerned with Israel-Diaspora relationships and communication, representing the overwhelming desire expressed by so many participants in the Plenary, unanimously urged the development of an appropriate and established institutional method to achieve this desirable end, and

recognizing that questions of representation, as well as legal and technical aspects of the proposal, require careful analysis;

Now therefore be it resolved by the Sixth Plenary Assembly that :

- 1. We enthusiastically endorse the general objectives as expressed herein and the need to establish with all possible speed a mutually acceptable institutional means for the consideration of the legitimate interests and concerns of Israel and the Diaspora which are now irrevocably and inextricably interwoven and interactive.*
- 2. We direct the incoming Executive to take immediate steps to consider the best ways and means of giving effect to this overwhelming need and to give it a high priority on its agenda.*
- 3. We authorize the Executive to involve such technical and expert assistance as may be necessary to aid it to expedite the preparation of a report to and action by the Governing Board at the earliest possible date.*

The resolution was adopted by the Assembly.

5. REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Mrs. FAYE L. SCHENK (USA) announced from the chair that Mrs. Rose Matzkin (USA), who had chaired the Commission on Israel and the Middle East, had had to leave, and that the Commission's resolutions would be presented by Mr. Eric Moonman, who had been the Commission's secretary.

Mr. ERIC MOONMAN, MP (*Great Britain*) read the

RESOLUTION ON ISRAEL

The Sixth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, held in Jerusalem from February 3 to 10, 1975;

salutes the government and people of Israel as they prepare to celebrate the twenty-seventh anniversary of the creation of the Jewish state, the fulfillment of the millennial Jewish dream that kept Jews faithful to Zion throughout their dispersion;

recalls that the restoration of a sovereign Jewish state in the land of Israel has been consistently supported by the Jewish people and constantly reaffirmed during the difficult years of its existence;

is deeply conscious of the close ties between Israel and the Jews of the Diaspora and of their shared concern with the problems and pride in the achievements of the State of Israel. This unity was manifested once again in 1973, when the Jewish people stood firmly by the State of Israel, then compelled, as in the past, to defend itself against the aggression of those seeking its destruction.

The Assembly reaffirms the solidarity of world Jewry with the State of Israel at this critical stage of its development and pledges to aid in strengthening its foundations.

The Assembly emphatically rejects the call for the establishment of a so-called secular state in Palestine, which would only result in the abolition of the State of Israel.

The Assembly resolves to use every available means to have the decision isolating Israel from the regional groupings of Unesco rescinded, and to try and ensure that such decisions do not occur in any UN or other international agency in the future.

The Assembly emphasizes the continuing need to use all possible means to support Israel in the fight against terrorism.

It further expresses the hope that in the near future a mutual understanding will be reached between Israel and all the peoples of the region.

The Assembly reaffirms its support for Israel in its continuing search for a just and lasting peace negotiated freely between Israel and its Arab neighbors, based on legally binding treaties and embodying secure and recognized boundaries.

It expresses again its confidence that such a peace agreement, based on the mutual desire for cooperation, will usher in a new era of prosperity and creativity for all the peoples of the Middle East.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. MOONMAN then presented the

RESOLUTION ON JEWS IN ARAB COUNTRIES

The Sixth Plenary Assembly expresses its full solidarity with Jews still in some Arab countries and its grave concern at the continued discrimination and oppression to which they are subjected, particularly in Syria, and deplores the inhuman conditions imposed upon its Jewish community, whose 4500 members are denied all elementary human rights, including the right to move beyond a limited distance from their homes and the right to leave the country;

pays tribute to the fortitude and courage of these Jews in danger and adversity;

records its appreciation of world public opinion, governments, parliaments, international and national organizations, and leading personalities all over the world, as well as of the continued humanitarian efforts of the member organizations of the WJC on behalf of Jews in Arab countries, and takes note that these efforts have already brought some positive and encouraging results;

calls upon all those who cherish the ideals of human dignity and liberty to intensify their efforts on behalf of Jews in Arab lands, to impress upon the governments involved the urgent need to cease the oppression of the Jewish communities, to prevent further deterioration of their precarious situation, and to respect their right to leave the country in accordance with elementary principles of international law as proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. PERCY SASSOON GOURGEY, MBE (*Great Britain*): I would like to make three points in regard to this resolution and hope they will be incorporated in its final draft.

First, the resolution as it is worded now does not bring out a point of cardinal importance, namely that lives of Jews are actually in danger. Since the terrible hangings in Iraq in January 1969 more than fifty Jews in that country have been killed or have died in jail as a result of torture. In Syria, since the Yom-Kippur War, nearly a dozen Jews have been killed, and last April the bodies of four Syrian Jewish young women were found on the Syrian-Lebanese border.

Secondly, the resolution, while referring to Syria's violation of human rights, does not make it clear that Syria herself has accepted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The third point I want to make concerns a Jew, Albert Elia, who has been in jail in Damascus since 1971. I spoke to a relative of his in Jerusalem yesterday and understand that they are deeply concerned about his welfare. In view of this, and in view of the very moving statement we heard from Mrs. Beate Klarsfeld, I hope these points will be incorporated into the final version of the resolution.

Mr. DOV SHILANSKY (*Israel*): When the Germans said that they would annihilate the Jews, we did not believe it. After that bitter lesson, when the haters of Israel tell us that they will annihilate us, we must believe that it is their desire to do so and we must prepare to face them.

The resolutions adopted here do not, in my view, express the full gravity of the matter. They do not provide for the unity of the Jewish world vis-à-vis those whose declared aim is to wipe us out. They say that they will annihilate the Zionists, but they mean the Jews. We must realize — and I turn especially to those who have come from the Diaspora — that if the State of Israel fares well and lives in security, then they too will fare well and be secure. If, God forbid, it should go badly with us, it will go badly with every Jew wherever he may be. Therefore I call for these resolutions to be amended so as to show that we, the Jewish people, will fight the terrorists in every place and at every moment.

Mr. MICHAEL KLEINER (*Israel*): I would like to suggest two additions to the resolution on Israel which was adopted. If possible the editing committee should take my remarks into account, and in any case they should appear in the record.

The subject just raised by Mr. Shilansky should be reflected in the resolution on Israel, particularly since a resolution in the same spirit has been adopted by the Knesset. The other addition that I would like to see should affirm the right of every Jew to settle everywhere in Eretz Israel. Jews and Arabs can improve their relationship by living together in the same towns and cities. I regard Jewish settlements in the West Bank as a matter of principle and not as a political issue. If in any other part of the world Jews were not permitted to settle, we would protest. It is very strange that the only place today where Jews are not free to settle is part of historic Eretz Israel.

The resolution on Jews in Arab countries was put to a vote and adopted.

6. REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE GENERAL POLITICAL COMMISSION

Dr. ELIEZER BURLA (*Brazil*): As chairman of the General Political Commission, I am pleased to tell you that the Commission had a fruitful session and heard reports on various countries, especially South Africa and Latin American countries. I want to express our satisfaction at the presence of Dr. Franz von Hammerstein, secretary of the World Council of Churches' Commission on the Church and the Jewish People, whose statements impressed us by their honesty and sincerity. I also want to thank Dr. Riegner for his detailed and impressive report on Christian-Jewish relations. Finally, I want to express appreciation to the members of the Commission, especially its vice-chairmen, Mrs. Esther Zackler and Professor Robert Weill, and to Dr. F.L. Brassloff and Mr. Armand Kaplan, whose suggestions were invaluable.

We are submitting several resolutions on different subjects, and I would ask Mr. Marcus Einfeld to read them out to you.

Mr. MARCUS R. EINFELD (*Director for African, Asian, and Commonwealth Affairs, World Jewish Congress*) read out the draft resolution on International Women's Year, which was adopted together with an additional paragraph, proposed by Mrs. RUTH WINSTON-FOX, JP (*International Council of Jewish Women*). The resolution was adopted, and in its final form reads as follows:

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR

The Sixth Plenary Assembly notes that 1975 has been designated International Women's Year by the United Nations, with the basic aims and purposes of the International Year being equality, development, and peace.

The Assembly calls on all member communities and associate member organizations of the World Jewish Congress to give full support to the activities of the Year on the international, regional, and national levels and to cooperate in this respect with the organizations of Jewish women belonging to the World Jewish Congress.

The Plenary Assembly further recommends that the World Jewish Congress initiate and encourage actions of its participating communities and organizations for the improvement of the status of Jewish women within the framework of the communities.

To achieve these goals the Assembly urges:

- a. *greater participation of women in the communal structure, including positions of leadership;*

- b. particular attention to the Jewish education of women and the image of women in Jewish education;*
- c. improvements of the legal status of women within the traditional framework.*

Mr. EINFELD then presented the draft resolution on Unesco, to which — following a proposal from Mr. SALOMON FRIEDRICH (*World Union of Thuat HaHerut-Hatzohar*) — it was agreed to add a reference to the action taken by governments and parliaments to withdraw or reduce their financial contributions to Unesco. In its amended form, the resolution as adopted reads:

UNESCO

The Sixth Plenary Assembly recalls the fruitful cooperation of the Congress with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization during almost three decades, and reaffirms its continued belief in the ideals and purposes of the organization;

expresses dismay and indignation at the resolutions adopted by the 18th session of the Unesco General Conference, accusing and condemning Israel of altering and defiling the historic character of the city of Jerusalem, withholding assistance from Israel in the fields of education, science, and culture, and denying her request for inclusion in the European Regional Group of Unesco;

recognizes that these resolutions were politically motivated and totally without foundation, and regrets that a great number of member states allowed these resolutions to be adopted;

records with appreciation that numerous prominent non-Jewish and Jewish personalities all over the world have strongly protested against these vindictive resolutions and declared their unwillingness to cooperate with Unesco until these decisions have been rescinded; and looks forward to even wider support for this stand;

notes with satisfaction the action taken by a number of governments and parliaments to withdraw or reduce their financial contributions to Unesco in protest;

strongly urges that Unesco reconsider the anti-Israel resolutions at the earliest opportunity and return to its fundamental principles and aims. Failure to rescind these resolutions would change Unesco's character, would do irreparable harm to its work, and might even endanger its very existence.

On a request from the floor, Mr. EINFELD read out both the draft resolution on the United Nations and the one on the UN Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, so that eventual comments could be made on both texts at the same time.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The Sixth Plenary Assembly reaffirms its commitment to the principles and purposes enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations;

pledges to continue to combat all forms of racial, religious, and ethnic discrimination wherever these may occur;

deplores the selective and politically motivated approach adopted by some member states to questions of human rights, and appeals to the United Nations to give proper attention to the denial of certain fundamental human rights to Soviet Jews and Jews in some Arab countries;

expresses its deep disappointment at the total failure of the General Assembly to address itself to the problem of international terrorism;

deplores the participation on the rostrum of the General Assembly of a representative of an organization which openly avows its intention of destroying a member state and invokes the right to use force and terror for that purpose;

considers that the resolution of the 29th General Assembly inviting the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the deliberations of the General Assembly on "the question of Palestine" in plenary meetings; the resolution granting it unlimited observer status; and other decisions in favor of the PLO are contrary to the UN Charter and to the principles of international morality and justice, and make more difficult the achievement of peace between the Arab states and Israel.

UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

The Sixth Plenary Assembly recalls the commitment of the World Jewish Congress, laid down in its Constitution, to cooperate with all peoples on the basis of universal ideals of peace, freedom, and justice;

endorses the resolution of the Executive Committee of the World Jewish Congress in June/July 1973, which, inter alia, welcomed on behalf of the World Jewish Congress the proclamation of the United Nations Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;

emphasizes that the implementation of the program for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be worldwide and not limited to any race or region;

reaffirms that any discrimination in human rights on the grounds of color, race, or religion is contrary to fundamental Jewish teaching, and proclaims its firm opposition to all forms and practices of discrimination and all policies based on racial theories;

pledges the wholehearted support of the World Jewish Congress for the program of the Decade and calls upon all member organizations to contribute, by all means at their disposal, to projects and actions undertaken in connection with the Decade;

confirms the willingness of the World Jewish Congress to cooperate with the United Nations in observing the priorities set forth in the program of the Decade;

authorizes the competent organs of the World Jewish Congress to initiate and to carry out activities on the international, regional, and national levels in accordance with the suggestions contained in the United Nations program for the Decade.

Mr. ANDREW OPPENHEIMER (*World Union for Progressive Judaism*): These two resolutions are key resolutions, because they are clearly intended for the consumption of the outside world, and especially for those in the United Nations. Throughout this Assembly our disillusionment with the United Nations has been evident, in particular our concern at the way international language is being devalued. I feel that these resolutions are totally inadequate because they simply repeat phrases which have become hollow. If we are going to express a resolution to the United Nations, it should explain that as Jews we have a fundamental interest in basic human rights, and that we stand by the principle that nobody's human rights should be conditional.

Personally, I would feel that the resolution on racism and racial discrimination should contain a statement that we look forward to the day when it will be possible for the Arabs who choose to live in Israel to live in complete equality with Jews.

There is only a statement of opposition to certain forms of discrimination, and I think the word *condemnation* is required. There is no mention anywhere of torture, although this subject was discussed at considerable length in the Commission. Neither is there any mention of a very important proposal made by Rabbi Soetendorp in which he called for endorsement by the World Jewish Congress of the immediate

aid program to help in disaster areas. This is a proposal which is under discussion in many different organs.

I would propose that the Plenary Assembly refer these two resolutions to a committee which will consider a way of making them more specific and meaningful, so that they may go some way towards achieving the purpose for which they were intended.

Mr. JONATHAN BENJAMIN (*World Labor Zionist Movement*): We had a considerable discussion in the Commission on the wording of this resolution. I think you should know that the wording has been made deliberately nonspecific; it is not an accident of drafting. We had close consultations with a number of delegates representing communities in countries where perhaps a nondiscrimination resolution, a human rights resolution, would be particularly relevant. There is no doubt that many of those present here may well feel that such a resolution ought to be specifically directed at particular countries. But we in the Commission universally felt that, having regard to the very delicate position of Jewish communities in those countries, having regard to their relation with Israel, and those countries' relations with Israel, it is all too easy to make a moral gesture. But a moral gesture has consequences, and the most valid consequences for us are the safety and the well-being of Jewish communities, for example in areas of southern Africa, who have to live with whatever resolutions we pass. It was with that and the realities of the situation in mind that the wording was made nonspecific.

The resolutions were adopted.

Mr. EINFELD then presented the draft resolution on the Third World. Rabbi AWRAHAM SOETENDORP urged the addition of a phrase pointing to the importance of this work and the involvement of the Jewish community in it. The resolution was adopted, and in its final form reads:

THIRD WORLD

The Sixth Plenary Assembly approves the decision of the outgoing Governing Council and Executive Committee to open and conduct a program creating bridges of communication and mutual understanding between the Jewish people and the peoples of the countries known as the Third World. It notes with approval the efforts and advances made so far in this field and determines that this work should be extended and intensified, in accordance with the suggestions and recommendations made by the Assembly's Workshop on this subject.

Mr. EINFELD next put forth the

RESOLUTION ON INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

The Sixth Plenary Assembly recalls that the World Jewish Congress took an active part in the immediate postwar period in the reform of the main instruments of international humanitarian law, the Hague and Geneva Red Cross Conventions;

notes with approval the role played by the World Jewish Congress, at the various conferences held under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross since 1971, in the development of international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts;

endorses the stand taken by the World Jewish Congress, jointly with forty-eight other international nongovernmental organizations in a memorandum submitted to representatives of governments attending the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts, held in Geneva in February/March 1974, calling, inter alia, for guarantees for an effective application of the provisions of the humanitarian conventions for the protection of civilian populations in all armed conflicts, and the banning of weapons and means and methods of combat which strike or affect indiscriminately the civilian population and combatants, or which are of a particularly cruel character or cause particularly severe suffering;

expresses the hope that the Diplomatic Conference will, at its resumed deliberations in February/March 1975, arrive at a satisfactory strengthening of the international humanitarian law in force at present.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. EINFELD then read out the

RESOLUTION ON ANTI-SEMITISM

The Sixth Plenary Assembly notes with concern that anti-Semitic forces are still operating in various parts of the world and that they represent a potential danger at a time of fundamental economic and social change;

draws attention to the fact that anti-Semitism today frequently appears under the cloak of anti-Zionism;

asserts that the right of the Jewish people to national self-determination consistent with Zionist objectives, and to its own state and identity, is an essential element of the equality of Jews with all other peoples;

urges all people to oppose anti-Semitism, whether appearing openly or in the guise of anti-Zionism.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. EINFELD next presented the draft resolution on the indemnification of victims of Nazism by the Federal Republic of Germany. On a suggestion from the floor, the word *welcomes* was replaced by *takes note of*. The adopted resolution reads as follows:

**INDEMNIFICATION OF VICTIMS OF NAZISM
BY THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY**

The Sixth Plenary Assembly takes note of the declared willingness of the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany to give consideration to the plight of victims of Nazi persecution who are not eligible to receive indemnification under existing legislation of the Federal Republic or who have received only inadequate indemnification, and expresses the hope that effective measures in this direction will be taken speedily.

The following resolution, on indemnification from the German Democratic Republic for victims of Nazi persecution, was also adopted:

**INDEMNIFICATION BY THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC
REPUBLIC FOR VICTIMS OF NAZI PERSECUTION**

The Sixth Plenary Assembly expresses its great concern that, in spite of many appeals by Jewish organizations and democratic governments, the German Democratic Republic has not yet accepted its share of the obligation of the German people to indemnify the Jewish victims of Nazi persecution;

urges the government of the German Democratic Republic to open negotiations with the appropriate Jewish organizations on the question of indemnification of Nazi victims without further delay;

calls upon all other governments to support this legitimate claim of the victims and bring the matter emphatically to the attention of the government of the German Democratic Republic.

Mr. EINFELD then read the

RESOLUTION ON WORLD PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

The Sixth Plenary Assembly reaffirms the resolve of the World Jewish Congress to give its unremitting support to the quest for universal peace and disarmament, in fidelity to our messianic ideal, and to secure the survival of civilized society;

is deeply conscious of its obligation in this respect, placed upon it by the tradition which the Jewish people has received from its Prophets and teachers;

appreciates the efforts which have been made in recent years to secure balanced and progressive partial disarmament, but notes with dismay

- a. that there has been no meaningful cutback in armament and*
- b. that the growing competition for sales by arms-manufacturing countries has added a new and menacing factor in the proliferation of deadly weapons;*

notes with particular disquiet the deterioration of the efforts of the world to contain the growth of nuclear capability and the spread of nuclear armament;

records with satisfaction that preliminary steps toward a relaxation of tensions have been undertaken by the principal powers, and urges a continuation of all efforts for the achievement of peaceful cooperation;

calls on the Executive of the World Jewish Congress to help carry forward the intent of this resolution, in collaboration with representatives of other traditions and religions, and to continue to intensify efforts to secure a revised approach to disarmament at the international level;

expresses its confidence that all national and international bodies associated with the Congress will take appropriate measures to support this effort.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. EINFELD then read out the draft resolutions on Christian-Jewish relations, which, inter alia, referred to the *Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration "Nostra Aetate,"* which had recently been published by the Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. ITZHAC SHMUELI (*Israel*): I was a member of the General Political Commission and would like to repeat a remark I made there.

In the Vatican *Guidelines* nothing is mentioned about the rehabilitation of Jewry as regards the accusation of the killing of Jesus. We do not need this rehabilitation, after 6,000,000 Jews have been crucified — not only one, 2000 years ago. But still, I think we have to mention that the *Guidelines* do not retract the accusation. They proclaim that the Jewry of today is not responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus, but it is still maintained that the Jewry of that time was responsible. Moreover, nothing is mentioned about the responsibility of the Christian world in creating an atmosphere, in creating the possibility, for the Holocaust to happen.

Dr. RIEGNER: The new *Guidelines* suggest how to implement the Declaration “Nostra Aetate,” which was adopted by the Second Vatican Council in 1965. The Vatican at that time adopted a line with regard to the deicide accusation which is not satisfactory but which, nevertheless, is new, and which in effect states that neither all the Jews at that time nor the Jews of today are responsible, thus leaving some Jews at that time who may have been responsible.

It is obvious that guidelines on implementation cannot change the basic theology of the Catholic Church. Personally, I do not feel that we cannot live without the withdrawal of the statement referred to above. The question is much deeper — whether the Catholic Church wants to adopt a new policy with regard to the Jewish people. It cannot and will not quickly change its doctrine, but, in time to come, it can interpret these old doctrines in a practical, more modern way. That is what the new *Guidelines* try to do, for a number of important reasons.

It is not for us here to criticize Catholic theology. We do not expect the Catholic Church to get good marks in Jewish religion and Jewish concepts. We should abstain from all theological discussions, since they are not the task of a meeting of the World Jewish Congress. The new development reflected in the *Guidelines* is most important from a political point of view, and for our relations with the Catholic Church. It would be self-defeating to engage in a theological criticism of the Catholic documents. In this spirit, I appeal to you not to go into details. Let us limit ourselves to general remarks about a certain new attitude which opens the way for new forms of cooperation.

The Very Rev. Dr. ISAAC COHEN (*Ireland*): I appreciate fully the remarks made by Dr. Riegner, and I am sure that the whole Assembly is most grateful to him for the tremendous work he has put into the achievement of the situation described in the resolution. But at the same time, I think that every Jew is concerned about the omission of any reference to Israel in the Catholic document. Jews living in Catholic countries, like myself in Ireland, have pointed this out to our Catholic friends, and they have accepted our argument. Therefore, I would like

to suggest that we add to the resolution an expression of our hope that these developments will lead to an appreciation of Jewish nationhood in Israel as a fundamental principle of Jewish belief and longing.

Mrs. SCHENK: If I may take a personal privilege, I have said very much the same thing to Dr. Riegner, because personally I too felt that it was a glaring omission not to mention Israel. Your proposal will be considered for introduction into the resolution.

Dr. RIEGNER: I think you should know that when the *Guidelines* were published, and the Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee was received by the pope, I made this point three times during the audience. I don't think that ever before at a papal audience were the attitude of the Jewish people and its link to the land of Israel stressed in such a clear and solemn way. Therefore, I certainly would not disagree with the proposal to incorporate this sentiment in some form into the resolution, but I would suggest that we use the wording that appeared in the WJC's official communique following the publication of the *Guidelines*. We should also mention that the Church has now accepted a principle originally proposed by the World Jewish Congress, namely that the Church should understand the Jews as they understand themselves. This recognition is a great success for us.

The Very Rev. Dr. COHEN: I am very happy this point was mentioned to the pope directly by Dr. Riegner. I mentioned this point to a very large gathering of priests and Catholic theologians in Ireland, and they accepted the idea that this ought to find a place in Catholic doctrine. Therefore, with further pressure from the World Jewish Congress, I think we shall succeed.

The resolution was amended in the light of the foregoing discussion, and in its adopted form reads as follows:

CHRISTIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS

The Sixth Plenary Assembly notes with satisfaction the development of Christian-Jewish relations in a spirit of mutual respect with due regard to the basic differences between both faiths, and notably the establishment of periodic consultations between representatives of world Jewry and representatives of the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church;

expresses appreciation for the efforts of the World Jewish Congress and its role in the establishment of the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations as the broadest united Jewish front for consultation with Christian bodies;

notes with satisfaction the establishment by the Roman Catholic Church, on October 22, 1974, of a Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, thus giving a proper and legitimate place to Catholic-Jewish relations within the framework of the Roman Curia;

welcomes the publication, on January 3, 1975, of the Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration "Nostra Aetate," addressed to the world Catholic community, for the application of the decisions of the Second Vatican Council in the area of Catholic-Jewish relations;

notes that the Guidelines contain some doctrinal affirmations which stem from the unavoidable divergences between Judaism and Christianity;

declares that there are several serious omissions in the document;

observes, however, that the Guidelines voice a timely and urgent condemnation of all forms of anti-Semitism and discrimination and reflect a desire for goodwill and understanding, a spirit of mutual respect, and the recognition of basic differences, and will thus serve to encourage better understanding and improved relations between Catholic and Jews;

expresses the hope that the admonition contained in the Guidelines "to learn by what essential traits the Jews define themselves in the light of their own religious experience" will lead to a better understanding of the central role of peoplehood and the land of Israel in Jewish self-understanding.

The Assembly takes note with approval and appreciation of the policies and actions pursued by the World Jewish Congress regarding this issue and authorizes the Congress to proceed on the same lines.

Mr. PERCY SASSOON GOURGEY, MBE (*Great Britain*): Turning to a related issue, will there be in any resolution a reference to Jewish-Muslim relations, a subject raised this morning by Mr. Avizemer? I wonder whether consideration could not be given to having an appropriately worded resolution on fostering Jewish-Muslim relations as such.

Dr. RIEGNER: I mentioned this subject in my speech on the activities of the WJC, but I think we are not yet ready for a concrete proposal. I would like to refer your suggestion to the incoming Executive so that it may examine the possibility of organizing a real ongoing consultation with the Muslim world. This is much more difficult than as regards the Christian world, because the organizational framework of the Muslims is not clear. We will have to study the possibilities very carefully before we can start this effort in a serious way. Therefore, let us not proclaim our desire now but let us make it known to the

Executive so that it should be given serious consideration in the right manner.

Mr. EINFELD read out the draft resolution on neo-Nazism and neo-Fascism, to which was added — on the proposal of Mr. HENRY BULAWKO (*France*) — a paragraph calling on all Jewish communities to mark appropriately the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of the camps and to teach its lessons to the postwar generations.

In its final form, the resolution read as follows :

NEO-NAZISM AND NEO-FASCISM

A few days ago the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz was celebrated. In May 1975 the thirtieth anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany will be marked throughout the world.

The Sixth Plenary Assembly calls upon all Jewish communities to mark appropriately the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of the camps and to teach its lessons to the postwar generations.

The World Jewish Congress and the Jewish people, together with the representatives of other nations, feel that the lesson of the Holocaust has not yet been learned and that there exist today neo-Nazi and neo-Fascist organizations and publications in many countries, and note that many Nazi war criminals have not yet been apprehended or brought to justice.

Some nations, and especially the young generation, are already forgetting this tragic chapter in the history of the Jewish people and of the world.

Organized Jewry, which in the main did not heed the dangers of the oncoming Holocaust, is obliged to make every effort to oppose any attempt to renew neo-Nazi and neo-Fascist activities anywhere.

The World Jewish Congress will further intensify its support for all action to punish Nazi war criminals.

Mr. ITZHAC SHMUELI (*Israel*): At the General Political Commission I registered my dissenting vote in connection with the sentences stating that "many Nazi war criminals have not yet been apprehended or brought to justice" and that "the World Jewish Congress will *further* intensify its support for all action to punish Nazi war criminals." I am presenting a *votum separatum* here, because I condemn the neglect and the lack of initiative by the president of the Congress and by the chairmen of the regional Branches in this struggle to bring to justice thousands of the most prominent Nazi criminals.

It is not enough to talk about many Nazi criminals at liberty. *Thousands* of them are alive today. They live in earthly paradises — in West and East Germany, in Austria, in many Latin America countries. The Assembly must express its deepest appreciation to Mrs. Beate Klarsfeld, that noble German woman, for her tireless devotion and self-sacrifice in this national and humanitarian struggle. I urge that the Assembly enjoin the new Executive to establish a separate and permanent department of the World Jewish Congress whose aim would be to take initiatives and to back all organizations and personalities who engage in the struggle to bring the Nazi criminals to justice.

Despite my disagreement with certain policies of the president of the World Jewish Congress, it is not with an easy heart that I express this censure of the Congress. Yesterday, Mr. Sapir extolled Dr. Goldmann for his achievements as regards indemnification. I do not want to return to a dispute dating back twenty years, in which the same arguments have been used then and now. The *sulcha* into which we have been sliding in our relations with Germany and the German people began with the indemnification agreements. I have in the past asked Dr. Goldmann why, if he devotes so much of his time to the indemnification agreements, he could not devote a fraction of that time to seeing to it that criminals pay by being punished. I have received no reply.

I aver once more that for twenty years the president of the World Jewish Congress and his Executive have not been active in the struggle for the punishment of Nazi criminals. What Beate Klarsfeld is doing now, the Executive must do too. I urge the president and the Executive of the Congress to be active continuously. When the president travels to Bonn, to Vienna, to the Latin American countries; when he meets Kreisky and others; he must bang on the table also in the matter of the Nazi criminals.

The World Jewish Congress talks a lot and on this problem does nothing.

Dr. RIEGNER: If there is any organization outside the Israel police which has done something to apprehend war criminals, it is the World Jewish Congress. It was the WJC that introduced into international law the whole concept of crimes against humanity without which international prosecution of war criminals would not have been possible. And it was our Institute of Jewish Affairs and our Atlantic City Conference which changed completely the concept of the prosecution of Nazi criminals in Nuremberg and in other places. The WJC British Section, in 1942, made the first representations about war criminals and prosecution of crimes against Jews, before the Allied Commission which was instituted to make the initial legal provisions for the whole process of prosecution of Nazi criminals. We helped in the preparation

of the major trials against the Nazi criminals, and Dr. Jacob Robinson, our expert, worked for months with the prosecution at the Nuremberg Trials, and was one of the major witnesses. And Alex Easterman was the only official Jewish observer at the trial of the Bergen-Belsen criminals. In the past thirty years we have helped at all international and national trials. We have had for fifteen or twenty years a special department concerned with Nazi criminals.

Year after year we are the only Jewish organization to spend 50,000 or 100,000 dollars for these investigations, to cooperate with hundreds of prosecutors in Germany. We have an office full of files of correspondence with the tribunals, with the prosecutors, trying to locate hundreds of witnesses all over the world.

We have had enormous financial difficulties in carrying on this work, and repeatedly we tried to interest other Jewish organizations in cofinancing this terrible effort. Not a single Jewish organization responded. There is also our role in the Eichmann case; the involvement of some of my colleagues is well known. If there is any organization with a record of constant action in this field, it is the World Jewish Congress.

I reject completely, and I ask the Assembly to reject completely, the allegations made by Mr. Shmueli, because not only do they disregard one of the finest pages of Congress history, they are also completely unjustified and disrespectful to those who for years have had the burden of carrying on this work.

Mr. Shmueli's *votum separatum* was put before the Assembly and rejected.

Mr. HENRY BULAWKO (*France*): In my capacity as president of the Amicale des Anciens Déportés Juifs de France, I deplore the dissent introduced here. The grave problem of the war criminals imposes unity among us. I pay tribute to Dr. Riegner and to his colleagues, whose efforts and work I know intimately. But I wish to note that German tribunals have scandalously acquitted criminals and perhaps tomorrow will have to judge other criminals and will acquit them likewise.

I ask that the editing committee try to introduce into the resolution an observation concerning the manner in which German judges scandalously acquit criminals and the manner in which they have recently condemned Beate Klarsfeld.

The resolution on neo-Nazism and neo-Fascism was adopted as proposed.

Mr. EINFELD then presented the

RESOLUTION ON THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

The Sixth Plenary Assembly notes the growth of the European Economic Community and the effect of Community legislation on its member states;

notes that potential legislation of this nature may affect Jewish communities in numerous fields, and in particular that of shechita;

instructs the Executive to take all appropriate steps where it deems necessary and advisable.

The resolution was adopted.

Finally, Mr. EINFELD read out the

RESOLUTION ON TERRORISM

The Sixth Plenary Assembly, noting the frightening growth of terrorism in the present era, is appalled at the various forms which terrorist violence has taken, including plane hijacking and the taking of hostages, and at the way in which it strikes at defenseless civilians, including women and children.

The Assembly notes that the civilized world, most governments, and international organizations have failed to react to the spread of terrorism, which endangers society.

It calls upon governments, international organizations, and world public opinion to condemn unequivocally acts of terrorism and to take urgent steps to punish the offenders and deny them refuge.

The resolution was adopted.

7. RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY MR. BENARI

Mr. YEHUDA BENARI (*Israel*) expressed the wish for a resolution aimed at the convening of an international conference which would coordinate action in defense of Soviet Jewry and of the Jewish communities in Arab countries. He explained that the World Jewish Congress had not assumed leadership in the struggle for Soviet Jewry.

Mrs. SCHENK ruled that the proposal was out of order because the Assembly had completed consideration of the report and resolutions

submitted by the Commission on Soviet Jewry. She suggested, however, that the proposal be referred to the incoming Executive.

Mr. BENARI asked that his proposal be recorded in the proceedings, and the chairman confirmed that this would be done.

8. REPORT AND RESOLUTION OF THE COMMISSION ON THE SOCIAL GAP IN ISRAEL

Mr. LEON TAMMAN (*World Sephardi Federation*): I had the privilege of chairing the Commission on the Social Gap in Israel, which was established by the Assembly's Presidium. In my capacity as a leader of the World Sephardi Federation, this problem has been my constant preoccupation.

The Commission heard statements by Dr. Israel Katz, who presided the commission appointed by Golda Meir to consider this matter when she was prime minister; and by Mr. Shalom Cohen, a former member of Knesset and a leader of the Black Panther Movement. With the exception of one or two participants, the Commission as a whole expressed concern about the social gap and the quality of life in Israel.

I would like to add a few words in this context. I have been in contact with the Black Panther Movement, and there are positive signs that the Black Panthers will discontinue future violence in return for the promise of large-scale support from the World Sephardi Federation. I believe that we are now at a turning point and I am soliciting your support as well.

While I am a Sephardi, I am the leader of the Ashkenazi community in my city in England and no differentiation is made there between the two. There are underprivileged Jews in Israel and we must help them. Many immigrants from North Africa, Iraq, Egypt, and other Afro-Asian countries live in slums. We cannot allow any Jews in Israel to feel like second-class citizens, and we must seek the support of world Jewry at large to better their lot. The World Jewish Congress and its Executive should do their utmost to this end, both with the Jewish communities in the Diaspora and through advice to the Israel government. There must be no division in our ranks, especially at this time of crisis.

Mr. Tamman then presented a resolution, entitled "The Quality of Life in Israel," which had been approved earlier in the day by the Assembly's Steering Committee. The second and last paragraph of the proposed resolution read:

The Assembly is of the opinion that world Jewry should make a contribution to the solution of these problems in cooperation with the Israeli government, the Jewish Agency, and other appropriate bodies, and refers to the Executive the means by which this contribution and cooperation can be best effected.

Mr. ALBERT GUEDJ (*France*) requested the restitution of the original wording of that paragraph, which had called for the establishment by the WJC of a standing commission in this regard.

Miss JUDITH RAYMOND (*India*): I wanted to ask what the World Sephardi Federation has done toward closing the social gap in Israel, but this seemed too provocative, so I will only state that I wish the Federation in future would do a lot more than it has in the past.

Mrs. LILIANE WINN (*USA*): I would like to pose to this Assembly a very simple question. Is the social problem in Israel, the problem affecting a large segment of Jews, a Jewish problem or a Sephardi problem? If it is a Jewish problem, then this Assembly should give it priority, or at least seek information. I travel throughout the United States and I can assure you that most American Jews are totally unaware of the situation.

Mr. PERCY SASSOON GOURGEY, MBE (*Great Britain*): I wish to underline the importance of the work of the World Sephardi Federation, which has received further impetus under the new leadership of Mr. Leon Tamman and Mr. Nessim Gaon. The gap in social conditions is one of the most important problems facing Israel as well as the world Jewish community, and every possible effort should be made to draw the attention of all concerned to this question. The establishment of a permanent committee as proposed in the resolution will serve this end.

Rabbi ELIE SABETAI (*Greece*): In the name of the Greek delegation, I would like to endorse the request for the establishment of a committee that will look into ways of eliminating the acute problem of the social gap, of the inequality of opportunity in Israel.

Mrs. BATSHEVA TUVIA (*Israel*): I am amazed at the question as to what the World Sephardi Federation is doing for closing the social gap in Israel. The inhabitants of Israel are citizens of the state and do not require any Ashkenazi or Sephardi federation. There should be no differentiation among Jews. It seems to me that the World Jewish Congress is paying more attention to Jews in Eastern Europe than to Jews in Arab states, and this should be corrected.

The Very Rev. Dr. ISAAC COHEN (*Ireland*): On this subject I think I am the only speaker so far who is an Ashkenazi. May I say that I have seen the deplorable conditions of many deprived Sephardi families in Israel. That such a situation should exist, that there are two nations in

Israel, is in complete contradiction to the Jewish ideal: *ve'ahavta lere'akha kamokha*. I would suggest that the proposed title of the resolution is misleading and should be "Closing the Social Gap in Israel" rather than "The Quality of Life in Israel."

Mr. TAMMAN: I think the establishment of a standing commission should be decided now by vote, because there will be a delay if we leave it to the Executive.

Concerning the question as to what the World Sephardi Federation has contributed, my reply is that this is not a problem of the Federation. About 65% of the Israeli population are Oriental Jews. They have paid the price of defending their country and have lost blood and have died. When they died they were not asked whether they were Sephardi or Ashkenazi. This is a Jewish problem, an Israeli problem.

I want to add that there has been a total renaissance within the World Sephardi Federation; and I am proud to tell you that I have donated a school in Safed, and myself paid \$500,000 toward improving education. Problems of housing and other social problems may be equally important but only through education for all will we further harmony and equality among Israeli citizens.

Dr. RIEGNER: I believe that our Sephardi friends have made a great contribution to this Assembly by asking for a Commission to discuss here the problem of the social gap. I can assure you that the leadership of the World Jewish Congress has full sympathy and understanding for the claims of those who want to overcome this terrible gap which is a heritage of history. I have told the Black Panthers that I do not accept their methods, but that I understand their aspirations.

If you are really asking the WJC to take this matter seriously, then it is not realistic to vote on the establishment of a standing commission here and now — before the mandate of such a commission is clearly defined, and before the Executive has discussed the matter with the other factors, who have much more to say and to do in this matter than we. The new Executive should be allowed to examine the matter — and do not forget that the Executive now includes top leaders of the WZO as well as Mr. Gaon.

Therefore, I appeal to you not to insist on a hasty decision here, but to accept our willingness to tackle this most serious problem in the WJC Executive at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. GUEDJ: We realize how delicate this problem is. I would just add that the World Sephardi Federation should participate fully in the further study of the problem.

Mr. TAMMAN: I accept what Dr. Riegner said. May I then propose that the resolution contain simply a recommendation that the Executive set up a committee to study the problem.

The Assembly voted to change the name of the resolution, as proposed by Rabbi Cohen, and the resolution was adopted in the following form:

CLOSING THE SOCIAL GAP IN ISRAEL

While appreciating the great strides made by the Israeli government and other authorities in their efforts to build a fair society with equality of opportunity for all the citizens of the country, the Sixth Plenary Assembly expresses concern that considerable sections of Israeli society still suffer from an inadequate standard and mode of life and are thus unable to enjoy their full rights of citizenship. The Assembly is worried that the continuation of this state of affairs and the widening social gap will create discontent among different sections of society in the country and contribute to a lessening of the cohesion and unity of the nation at a time when these concepts are demanded more than ever.

The Assembly is of the opinion that world Jewry should make a contribution to the solution of these problems in cooperation with the Israeli government, the Jewish Agency, and other appropriate bodies, and refers the matter to the Executive, with the recommendation that the Executive establish a committee to study the means by which this contribution and cooperation can best be effected.

9. RESOLUTION ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL AND THE GOVERNING BOARD

The Assembly was asked at this point to vote on the resolution on the composition of the General Council and the Governing Board, which had been proposed by the Committee on Organization and the Governing Council, and consideration of which had been deferred so as to allow further study by the delegates.

On the proposal of Mr. ANDREW OPPENHEIMER (*World Union for Progressive Judaism*), the Assembly agreed to amend the composition of the Governing Board to include four youth delegates.

Mr. DAVID SUSSKIND (*Belgium*) expressed the opinion that the importance of the European communities was underestimated, and suggested that six of the seventeen youth delegates on the General Council be from Europe. There was, however, no vote on this suggestion

on the understanding that the WJC Executive would consult with the various regional Branches and communities with regard to the makeup of the youth delegation.

The Assembly adopted the proposed resolution.

(For the text of the resolution, see Appendix II.)

CLOSING SESSION

Monday, February 10, 1975
(evening)

In the chair: Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN

1. ADDRESS BY MR. GIDEON HAUSNER COMMEMORATING THE THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

Mr. GIDEON HAUSNER (*Minister without Portfolio, Government of Israel*): In another three months, thirty years will have passed since the slaughter ended in Europe. I doubt that this date will be widely noted: new problems have since arisen in the world; yesterday's enemies have become friends; treaties have been torn up; the world prefers to ignore those past acts of violence. Many people affirm that the breach through which the Nazi disaster burst when it swept across Europe has been filled. They want to believe that what happened will not recur, and that in any case it does not provide a lesson for the future. This is a grave and dangerous error.

There are now even historians who are trying to rewrite the past with the object of proving that the Nazis were not all that bad, that Hitler was forced against his will into a war for which the West was no less responsible than Germany. In one publication after another, they try to pervert the historical truth.

We Jews cannot forget, and we shall not accept a falsification of history. We have never fled from the lessons of the past, we have never torn pages out of history books. We have learned to live with our past, even if it was a very grim one. To be concerned with history is one of our national characteristics. The command in Deuteronomy, "Remember the days of old," has accompanied us from the dawn of our existence. We have not accepted the view that the only lesson to be learned from history is that nothing can be learned from it. We have always made an effort to lay bare the roots of historical events, and to draw our lessons from them.

If this is our attitude toward history in general, how much more true is it of the period of the Holocaust — a calamity without precedent in

Israel's history that inflicted a trauma on our nation from which it is still suffering. For without the reserves of strength in Eastern and Central Europe, our people is no longer what it was, and it never again will be.

It is our duty, as citizens of the world and as Jews, to make the world face its recent past, for what happened then has a fateful significance for our time as well. I have come here before you tonight in order to urge that when you return to your countries, your organizations, and your communities, you should hold mass meetings in order to make these matters public and have people reflect on the recent past.

Too soon and too quickly have we allowed the world, and ourselves, to pass over Nazism and return to the daily routine. Some of the fundamental problems of the 30s continue to exist today, and are as serious and as acute as ever: violence, fear, and the desire to bypass these fundamental problems of our generation. The moral crisis which Nazism brought upon the world did not vanish with the victory over Germany. It is still with us, although under a different guise.

Everyone knows that the appeasement policy of the West hardened the Nazis' stand and led straight to war. The myopia of the world's leaders was frightening. There was craven panic in the face of power displays and threats. Even when German officers sent emissaries to London and Paris in 1938, warning not to give in to Hitler's blackmail, the kowtowing of English and French politicians did not cease. It was the German chief of staff, Ludwig Beck, who entrusted a German politician with a secret mission in order to open the eyes of the West to Hitler's projects. Beck said to his emissary: "If you bring me clear proof that England is going to fight if Czechoslovakia is attacked, I will put an end to the Nazi regime." But the appeasers had already taken the road of surrender to threats. They decided to give Hitler a chance of proving "that he was a good boy," as Henderson, Great Britain's ambassador in Berlin, put it. Chamberlain flew to Berchtesgaden and to Munich, Beck resigned, and one of those plotting against Hitler at the time, the mayor of Leipzig, Karl G rdeler, wrote in despair:

Because Chamberlain was afraid to take a small risk, war has become inevitable. Now the British and the French will have to defend themselves by force of arms unless they prefer to be enslaved.

There are various ways of enslaving nations. Surrender to economic blackmail, a general sellout of factories, banks, and real estate, standing aside while the free world is being bled white and made bankrupt — this is also an obvious road to slavery, and even more dangerous than surrender to threats of war. For when one is faced with threats, it is possible to pull oneself together again — as the Allied nations finally did, although too late. But economic disintegration brings irreparable

destruction. According to a World Bank publication, the oil-importing countries can expect a deficit of 680,000,000,000 dollars in another five years. What will remain then of the freedom of those countries which today bow to the oil extortioners in whose hands these funds will accumulate ?

Today, too, there are reports — most of them from inside the oil-exporting countries — that a firm stand will take the wind out of the blackmailers' sails. Nonetheless today, too, there is fear of taking a small risk. Once again, the price that will have to be paid is likely to be a high one.

In the 1930s, the disintegration of the West's united front strengthened Hitler's stand, both inside and outside Germany. While Chamberlain, with great self-satisfaction, waved the Munich agreement before a cheering crowd as the achievement of "peace in our time," his French colleague Daladier reacted with gloom, disdain, and condemnation toward the crowd demonstrating in Paris which believed that surrender would save the peace.

At the end of World War II the victorious Allies dictated to the vanquished nations — Germany, Italy, and Japan — clauses to be inserted in their constitutions, forbidding Nazi, Fascist, or militarist parties. But at the same time the Western nations give backing and support to countries with dictatorial regimes that openly preach military confrontation with their neighbors, and present this as a lofty national objective. If ever there was a justification for protecting the free world from governmental methods undermining the existence of human society as a whole, it is in our own day. For Hitler's political heritage has not vanished from the face of the Earth. He broke all conventions; he denied all human values; he stipulated that what had been considered holy was worthless, and what past generations had by common consent considered abhorrent could be presented as a supreme national aim. It became evident that civilization is a very thin screen of rules of behavior between individuals and peoples. If it is preserved and the rules are kept, then mankind can exist. If it is toppled, then there is nothing to prevent man from sliding backwards until he comes to the gates of Auschwitz.

The Nazi regime exploded everything that had been accepted as decent, overturned all the conventions of human society, presented the aggressor as the victim and the innocent as the object to be persecuted. Hitler never ceased to represent his country as the victim of the Treaty of Versailles, and he demanded that the burden be lifted which had, so it was argued, been put on Germany by the family of nations in that international instrument. By consistent propaganda methods he succeeded in instilling doubts in people about the justice of the Treaty

of Versailles, precisely as the Arab leaders attempt to convince the world that the international decision to establish a Jewish state was an error. The revanchists of our day, who demand a revocation of the establishment of Israel, are the Arab leaders, who represent themselves as the victims of the 1947 UN decision on partition. Those who set out to wage war against a member state whose establishment was sanctioned by the United Nations and were foiled in their plot to destroy that state, have not ceased to pretend that it is they who are the victims of the action taken by the family of nations.

These are the chapter headings to be memorized which we will present to the world on the thirtieth anniversary of its liberation from the Nazi horror. And we shall have one question to ask it: Have you been saved from Nazi enslavement only to be enslaved by the sheikhs of Kuwait and Abu Dhabi?

This is, however, not all we will have to say, for we have an account to settle with the free world as Jews, and thus as the ones first and foremost to have been affected by the Holocaust. In the first years after the Holocaust we were so shattered by the atrocity that we could only weep over the calamity and bewail the destruction. Only after some time had passed, after the State of Israel had been established, did we gather the courage to look at that vale of tears and attempt to draw lessons from the horror.

The problem with which philosophers are still struggling is why this dreadful misfortune came upon us and why the Jewish people was condemned to total annihilation. We know that Nazism and Judaism were two opposites and that no coexistence between them was possible. We know that the Jew was a convenient target for the murderous rage of the Nazi because he could not defend himself and because no one came to his aid.

All this, however, can only explain the circumstances but not the reason for the dreadful decision to pass a sentence of death on an entire nation. Researchers and philosophers seek the motive in the innermost soul of the non-Jewish world, in the fears that the Jews, the eternal wanderer, arouses in his neighbors' hearts. There is nothing new in the psychological explanations. Dr. Judah Leib Pinsker spoke decades ago about the fear of the Jew, who moves about the world like a ghost that should, according to all the rules, have been buried and laid to rest. As a result of the Holocaust, thinkers began once again to delve into the subject. A well-known scholar in psychopathology, Professor Norman Cohn — who, despite his name, is not a Jew — in recent years published his study on the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, entitled *Warrant for Genocide*. After lengthy research and numerous conversations with German personalities and SS commanders, he came to the

conclusion that the deep-seated belief in the existence of a worldwide conspiracy to unite Jews all over the world in order to undermine the character of non-Jewish society and to rule over some of its sectors, was the driving force behind the decision to free the world from the "Jewish danger." Professor Cohn states that there exists an invisible labyrinth of the soul in which such myths move, in which they settle and take root in various shapes and in various places, at times totally unexpected. The myth is most easily absorbed and has the greatest effect when it finds a ready social soil; in that case it is liable to cause the most frightful results. But it is not limited as to where it can find a home, and from time to time it settles on outstanding social organisms or personalities. Did we not hear an echo of this myth in de Gaulle's pronouncement about the "domineering people" or in what General Brown said about Jews dominating the American business world and the press ?

In the fight against Israel, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser openly defended the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. At the international Islamic Conference that met in Cairo, official religious backing was given to this vile forgery.

It does not matter at all whether clear and obvious facts support the myth or contradict it. It has a life of its own, without reference to proof or reason. Therefore it is difficult to counter this kind of libel by rational argument. But we must nonetheless uncover its sources, point out where it is likely to lead, and fight it with all the means at our disposal.

Professor Norman Cohn reveals the enormous influence the *Protocols* have had ever since they appeared under the aegis of the Okhrana — the czarist police — how they swept across the world, became a best-seller second only to the Bible — *lehavdil* ! — and how they shaped the thoughts and reactions of various heads of state and various regimes, among them Hitler and Stalin. The Stalinist: "Doctors' Plot" and the accusations against Rudolf Slansky were nurtured by the same source as "the final solution."

In this connection mention should be made of what was said after the war by one of the pillars of the SS, General Erich von dem Bach-Zalewski:

I must state the truth: contrary to the belief of the Nazis that the Jews are a wonderfully organized people, it has in effect been revealed that they have no organization at all. That negates the old slogan of the Jewish conspiracy. If they had been organized, millions could have been saved.

In a study of the new anti-Semitism which was published this year by Arnold Forster and Benjamin Epstein for the Anti-Defamation League, an attempt was made to expose the latest metamorphosis of

this anti-Jewish myth. Today it finds backing among the radical wing of both Right and Left, and wears the guise of opposition to the State of Israel, which serves as a target — a tangible expression, so to speak, of the international Jewish-imperialist conspiracy.

Another attempt to discover an intellectual explanation of the Nazi motivation for the Holocaust was made by George Steiner. Talking about the deep, almost instinctive hostility of the Christian world to Judaism, he links it to the fact that Jewish monotheism, which brought into the world the challenge of spiritual perfection and the messianic belief in a better future, was detested by those who wanted to return to a world of heathenish concepts. The uncompromising belief in absolute values became too difficult to hold on to. The Jewish people itself did not come to terms with monotheism at once, and the nation "returned to its evil ways" several times, as we are told in the Bible. For Christianity it was much more difficult to come to terms with this source from which it had sprung, when it was forced to compromise with the pagan reality. This compromise was very uncomfortable for Christianity, which knew that it was taking the pure faith by which only the select could live and degrading it to a level which was acceptable to the masses, who were in need of the material expression of a god which could be represented by a sculpture or a picture and could be touched with the hands.

The social vision of the Jews, even in the atheistic guises of Karl Marx and Ernst Bloch, represented the challenge of a society providing justice for all. All this was in total contradiction with the Nazi notion which taught that there is no equality between people and that there is a natural justification for oppressing inferior races.

Not for nothing did Hitler say that conscience was a "Jewish invention," and did Goebbels boast that Germany was returning to the concepts of the barbarians. The Nazis felt that in the materialistic and militaristic society they wanted to establish in Europe, it would be necessary to do away with the archaic and constraining factor which by the very fact of its existence recalled the discord between the Christian religion which they still kept, and the reality which they were creating. Since they had freed themselves from inhibitions of any kind, they went to the limit in this instance also. The removal of the Jew, who represented a sort of living reminder, provided the possibility of getting rid of the doubts that still hovered in the conceptual universe of Nazism.

These doubts certainly did not bother the murderous SS units. But they had an influence on the fashioners of Nazi ideology who stood behind the bloodbath. Adolf Eichmann gave it a simple expression: "We knew that one of two things would happen: either the German

people would live, or the Jewish people would live — there is no room for both of them in the world.”

The image of the Jew as the Antichrist, as Satan bestriding the world, is an ancient one, as old as the Catholic Church; because the sole explanation that the Church Fathers could provide for the fact that the nation from which Jesus came survived after it had rejected his teaching, was that the Jew was Satan’s messenger on Earth. Only Satan could deny God and survive. Hitler very cunningly made use of the primitive Christian notions: in the place of the father he put the state; in the place of the son, the leader; but the Jewish devil remained. In this way the new cosmogony could be more easily digested.

After the war the Church became aware of the dreadful possibilities to which the use of its doctrines could give rise, and it is no accident that only in the post-Nazi period were ecumenical steps taken to repair the terrible wrong contained in the accusation of deicide. It was no accident that a German cardinal, Augustin Bea, was the animating spirit in the new movement. He was, incidentally, also the one who requested to be supplied daily with the court protocol of the Eichmann trial. Unfortunately the Church went only halfway. It is not the Jews who need to be absolved from a wicked guilt; it is the Church that must clean itself from the historic evil which it has done to the nation of Jesus.

The physical annihilation of the Jews in the Holocaust would not have been possible if the Nazis had not been certain that the outside world would not react and would not punish them because of it. They repeatedly tested how far they could go in their bloodbath without encountering the furious reaction of the free world. Only when they realized that the free world did not care what happened to the Jews did they become sure of themselves and decide to carry out what they called the “final solution.”

The equanimity with which the free world accepted the fact of the Holocaust is an indelible stain in the annals of humanity. Even after the outbreak of the war and for two years after that, it was still possible to save millions. Germany still permitted Jews to emigrate. When it became clear that the world did not want any Jews and was not prepared to give them shelter, the curtain came down on the Jews of Europe. When Jewish leaders demanded in 1942 that some tens of thousands of refugees be taken out of the Balkan countries, the British foreign secretary, Anthony Eden, warned the United States government not to consider even a partial rescue program, because

world Jewry will then demand that something similar be done also for Polish and German Jews. Hitler might accept such a suggestion, but England is not able to deal with this.

A similar reply was given by the State Department in Washington to the proposal to bring 300,000 Jews from Rumania to Palestine and Syria as a temporary measure. The answer was: "We are not prepared for dealing with the whole of the Jewish problem."

In June 1942, the British Section of the World Jewish Congress published the fact that 1,000,000 Jews had been annihilated. The British radio gave publicity to this, and the secret of the mass murder was revealed to the whole world. But nothing was done to save the condemned or at least to reduce the dimensions of the disaster.

In October 1942, two Jewish emissaries met in great secrecy in Poland with a delegate of the Polish underground, Jan Karski, who was then going to London and Washington. They implored him to prevail upon the Allied governments to adapt their strategy to rescuing the Jews, to threaten Germany with bombardments in retaliation for deportations to concentration camps, to let refugees come out, to open their gates and give them shelter. "Why does the world allow us to die ? Have we not contributed our share to world civilization ? Why do they fight for everyone else and abandon us ?"

This message from a nation in agony was passed on to London and Washington, but nothing was done.

The total refusal of the Allies to adapt the war strategy to the rescue of the Jews was further brutally demonstrated when they refrained from bombing Auschwitz and the approaches to it. "Let the Allies demonstrate that they have declared war on the Nazi annihilation program," Weizmann and Nahum Goldmann beseeched the Western leaders at the time. After months of "looking into the matter" and red tape, both the Foreign Office in London and the State Department in Washington announced that it could not be done. Such action would hamper aerial support needed for military forces operating in vital battlefields — that was the answer. But the industrial installations around Auschwitz were bombed with great precision, sometimes even in daytime. Only the death camp and the approaches to it remained untouched.

The free world's disregard for the Jewish disaster and its refusal to stand by Jewry's side in its hour of great need constitutes a page of cynicism in the annals of mankind. No wonder the world no longer wants to recall what happened to the Jews in the period of the Holocaust. What should it recall ? What it did not do ?

We, the surviving few of the nation remaining after the Holocaust, have allowed the Holocaust to be relegated to books. The awareness that this dreadful act was carried out openly in the twentieth century has vanished from the free world. When, from time to time, I accompany

high-ranking personalities through the Yad Vashem Museum, I have the impression that what I tell these people, who today determine the fate of nations and of countries, is completely new to them. Either they never knew it or it completely escaped their minds.

No wonder the Arab leaders have succeeded in infiltrating into today's concepts talk about the "Palestine holocaust" and the historic evil which is supposed to have been caused to the Arab people.

We shall have occasion this year to proclaim once more to the world and to the young generation which has not known the Holocaust, our sentiments about that phenomenon and about the lessons to be drawn from it.

Our generation sees the results of the war and everything connected with it, and it has begun to doubt everything. No wonder it has lost faith in the existing social setup, which proclaims that God is dead and which looks for escape in drugs and permissiveness. We must once again point to the fundamental notions of what is forbidden and what is permitted, what is good and what is bad, what is moral and what is wicked.

From the abyss of the Holocaust we must raise aloft the human values which have been trodden underfoot, and we must reconsecrate them before all humanity, so that they can safeguard the existence of mankind.

And to the Jewish people we shall say that even Hitler, in spite of all his great might and all his desire to crush Israel, was not able to overwhelm this nation.

A number of years ago I went to Warsaw with an Israeli delegation – when we could still go there – to mark the twentieth anniversary of the ghetto uprising. On the Sabbath we assembled – Jews from all over the world – in the sole synagogue that has remained there for the surviving remnant, in Twarda Street. There were Jews there from Israel and from Russia, from Hungary and from the United States, from England and from Latin America – a great crowd that filled the synagogue from wall to wall. After the prayer recalling the fallen victims, we sang the songs of the ghetto, the underground and the battle songs, until the dance circle formed and a mighty song burst forth into the ruins of the ghetto: "*Am Yisrael Chai*" – "The Nation of Israel Lives."

In this manner let us, from the national disaster, raise high the belief in the eternity of Israel and the unquestioned faith in the future of our nation.

Dr. GOLDMANN then called on the Assembly to rise for a minute of silent tribute to the memory of the Warsaw Ghetto fighters and of all the victims of the Nazis.

2. EULOGIES OF THE DECEASED

Dr. GOLDMANN: I have the sad duty to speak of those who have died since we last met in 1966 – members of the Congress, friends of the Congress, great Jewish leaders who directly or indirectly were connected with us.

The list is a long one, and includes some of the greatest figures of our generation. I shall recall their memory with only a few words, much less than could do justice to any one of them. I shall not read their titles or describe the positions they occupied: I think you all are aware of them.

In the few years since the Brussels Plenary Assembly, we have lost a president of Israel and one of the founders of the World Jewish Congress, *Zalman Shazar*, a good friend of mine ever since we first met in Berlin during the First World War, more than fifty-five years ago.

We have lost *David Ben-Gurion*, one of the truly great figures of our generation, who was of significance to every Jewish organization, to every individual Jew in Israel. His support for the UN decision on partition and for the reparations agreements with Germany – two of the most controversial issues of our generation – was decisive. If a name should be given to the last twenty or thirty years of Jewish history, it should be the “epoch of David Ben-Gurion.”

We have lost another former prime minister of Israel, *Levi Eshkol*, a very close friend of mine.

Yitzhak Gruenbaum, a founder of the World Jewish Congress, the undisputed and courageous leader of the Jewish community in prewar Poland, has left us after a long life.

We have lost in the last few years two vice-presidents of the World Jewish Congress, *Samuel Bronfman* and *Lord Sieff of Brimpton*. They were both outstanding Jewish personalities, in very different ways. Sam was one of the most powerful personalities I have ever met in the very large gallery of strong and great personalities, Jews and non-Jews, that I have been privileged to meet in the many years of my activities. What I admired most in this powerful man – powerful economically, powerful financially – was his inherent modesty. He was a man who knew his strengths and his limitations, a knowledge that many other powerful people do not begin to have. This modesty confirmed his great moral quality. And a few words about the lovable figure of Israel Sieff. I once told him he was a contradiction in terms: a perfect Jewish gentleman who might just as well have been born an English lord. He had a multitude of deep interests, art and literature, philosophy, he was an excellent businessman, a devoted Zionist. We are proud to have had men like Bronfman and Sieff as vice-presidents.

We lost a wonderful woman in *Eva, Marchioness of Reading*. Eva Reading came from a family alienated from Jewishness, but she had the courage to join the Zionist movement and the World Jewish Congress, at that time anathema to her circles, and had the courage to fight for her convictions. She was an aristocratic revolutionary, a difficult synthesis.

We lost that wonderful fighter, *Sydney Silverman*, one of the founders of the British Section of the World Jewish Congress, one of the outstanding figures of the British Parliament, a man who fought for his ideas and who had to fight against an overwhelming majority. He did a tremendous job for the Congress, especially during the very difficult war years and in the years after the war, with all the hunger and the thousands of Jews in displaced persons' camps under British administration in Germany. With his courage, honesty, and integrity, he was the pride of the World Jewish Congress.

We lost a chairman of the World Zionist Executive, whom I actually discovered – *Louis Pincus*, who took a very active interest in the problems of Jewish life in the Diaspora and who was one of those who promoted the changes in the Constitution adopted at this Assembly.

We lost *Zvi Lurie*, a very close friend of mine, who worked for years as my colleague in the American Zionist Executive in very difficult times of internal fighting.

We lost my dear friend *Marc Jarblum*, for years one of the best representatives of French Jewry, an immigrant with connections in the leadership of the French Socialist Party and with Leon Blum. Jarblum was one of the founders of the Congress and one of the creators of the French Section. During the war he worked underground and helped save many Jews during the Nazi occupation of France. He then settled in Israel, and I hope that the memoirs he was writing will be published, as they will be a source of invaluable information on events in France and in Europe in general.

We lost *Dr. Vidal Modiano*, originally from Salonika, who for decades was the president of French Jewry. He had human warmth, a tremendous talent for reaching compromises, for avoiding internal splits; he stood above parties and was a passionate friend of the World Jewish Congress and a member of the Executive. His loss will be deeply felt for a long time to come.

We lost a dear friend in *Baruch Zuckerman*, for years a member of the Zionist Executive who before the war worked hard to bring Eastern European Jewry, especially Polish Jewry, into the World Jewish Congress.

We lost *Horace Kallen*, a philosopher of great standing in America, a passionate believer in the unity of the Jewish people, a great moral and intellectual authority, one of the founders of the American Jewish Congress and later of the World Jewish Congress, and for me a teacher and a man whom I have never ceased admiring.

Also in America, we lost a dear friend of the Congress, *Maurice Eisendrath*, for many years a president of the Reform Movement, at one time a rabbi in Toronto, when he helped to bring Canadian Jewry into the World Jewish Congress. It is to a large degree to his credit that the Reform Movement has affiliated with the WJC.

We lost in America a man who for many years was an active member of our Executive, *Dr. Simon Federbusch*. He made many contributions to solving the problems of religious groups and other problems, and he was a great scholar.

Professor Fritz Feigl, one of the greatest Jewish scientists, for many years the president of the Jewish Confederation of Brazil, has left us. Also in Brazil, we lost *Dr. Vojtech Winterstein*, originally from Bratislava, who on behalf of the Congress succeeded in conquering the Brazilian Jewish community, to which he was utterly devoted.

We lost, during the past year, *Norbert Masur*, of the WJC Swedish Section, who played an important role in saving Jewish lives during the war, culminating in his meeting with Himmler toward the end of the war in order to prevent the destruction of the camps before the Allied armies arrived.

We lost *Dr. Hendrik van Dam*, the cofounder and for many years a director of the Central Council of Jews in the Federal Republic of Germany. He was a recognized expert on the very complex problems of reparations, one of our most important advisers in the more than twenty years of negotiations. He was a great friend of the World Jewish Congress, and he helped to strengthen the ties between the communities he represented and the Congress.

We lost a very dear friend of many of us, *Rabbi Max Nussbaum* of Los Angeles, one of the outstanding rabbinical figures of German Jewry before the Nazi period, who became a popular and brilliant rabbi and speaker in the United States. It was not long ago, in Montreal, that we discussed what kind of work he would do for Congress after resigning his rabbinate.

I must add one more name — *Berl Locker*, for many years my colleague as cochairman of the Zionist Executive, an outstanding leader of the Socialist Zionist Movement, and a brilliant debater in Jewish life.

There are many others on the list who deserve also to be eulogized but unfortunately the list is so long that we do not have the time. Mr.

Marcus Einfeld will read the names to you, but before he does I would like to conclude with one observation.

My vocation is sad in fulfilling this sacred but heavy task of eulogizing Jewish friends, comrades, people with whom I worked for years and decades. The quality of a people to a very large degree can be evaluated by the quality of its leadership. A people very often is as great as its leaders are. When we read the list of the leaders who took part in the World Jewish Congress since its inception, I think we have a right to feel that the Congress deserved to have these leaders, because they would not have served the WJC had they not thought it worthwhile.

Mr. EINFELD: We regret the loss of: *Mr. Marc Anisfeld*, secretary-general of the WJC Belgian Section; *Mr. Maurice Ashkanasy*, former president of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, a member of the WJC World Executive; *Mr. Lavy Bakstansky*, general secretary of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, member of the WJC World Executive; *Mrs. Irma Berda*, devoted member of the staff of the Paris office of the Congress; *Mr. Jacob Bercovitz*, member of the WJC Israel Executive; *Dr. Sigmund Bibring*, former president of the Central Jewish Committee of Mexico, and a former member of the World Executive; *Dr. Georges Brunschvig*, president of the Swiss Federation of Jewish Communities; *Mrs. Vera Bud*, member of the New York office of the Congress; *Dr. Joseph Burstein*, of Israel, chairman of the WJC Cultural Department; *Mr. Joel Cang*, member of the Executive of the WJC British Section; *Mr. Raffaele Cantoni*, president of the Union of Italian Jewish Communities and honorary member of the World Executive of the Congress; *Mr. Elchanan Chanan*, former treasurer of the WJC British Section, who died in Israel a few days ago; *Sir Karl Cohen*, provincial vice-president of the WJC British Section; *Dr. Ernst Feldsberg*, president of the Federation of Jewish Communities of Austria and member of the Congress' World Executive; *Mr. Shlomo Gal*, of the WJC Israel office; *Professor Morris Ginsberg*, distinguished sociologist and for many years editor of the *Jewish Journal of Sociology*; *Mr. Jacob Glatstein*, distinguished Yiddish poet and for many years editor of the Congress periodical *Folk un Velt*; *Mr. Sidney Goldberg*, member of the National Council of the WJC British Section and of the World Executive; *Mr. Paul L. Goldman*, a member of the WJC American Section and of Mapam in the United States; *Mr. Emilio Gutkin*, former president of Argentina's Va'ad Hakehilot and a former member of the World Executive; *Mr. Samuel Halprin*, of the United States; *Dr. Alfred Hirschberg*, one of the leaders of the Jewish Confederation of Brazil and its representative at many Congress conferences; *Mr. André Jabès*, former leader of the Jewish community in Egypt, who served the Congress for many years in various capacities, notably as assistant to the secretary-general in Geneva; *Mr. Monty Jacobs*,

executive director of the WJC North American Branch and the American Section; *Mr. Charles H. Jordan*, director-general of the American Joint Distribution Committee; *Dr. Oskar Karbach*, for thirty years a senior staff member of the WJC and Institute of Jewish Affairs in New York; *Dr. Wilhelm Krell*, former director of the Jewish community of Vienna; *Mr. Nesanel Lewkowicz*, longtime member of the WJC Belgian Section; *Dr. Samuel Margoshes*, of New York, member of the Inner Executive of the Congress during the war years; *Mrs. Annette Marquet* of the Paris office of the Congress; *Dr. Emil Maurer*, former president of the Federation of Jewish Communities of Austria and member of the World Executive; *Dr. Samuel A. Miller*, vice-chairman of the WJC British Section and a member of the World Executive; *Dr. Abraham Mittelberg*, former leader of Polish Jewry in Argentina, who died only a few days ago; *Mr. Umberto Nahon*, a very old friend of the Congress from Italy, and chairman of the Italian Zionist Organization until his *aliya* to Israel; *Mr. Isidore Noah*, former president of the Central Council of the Jewish Communities of Greece; *Mr. Wolfgang Pulverman*, longtime comptroller of the WJC in New York; *Dr. Oskar Rabinowicz*, of New York, former member of the World Executive; *Miss Ann Rheinhold* of the WJC New York office; *Dr. Joseph Reich*, of Lyon, member of the World Executive, who died only a few days ago; *Mr. Isaac Remba*, of Israel, a member of the WJC World Executive, where he represented the World Herut Organization; *Dr. Joseph Sagall*, of London, cotreasurer and member of the Governing Council; *Dr. Joseph Schechtman*, a member of the World Executive; *Rabbi Max Schenk*, of the United States, a close friend of the Congress, who worked for the affiliation of Australian Jewry when serving as a rabbi there; *Dr. Joseph J. Schwartz*, for many years head of the American Joint Distribution Committee in Europe; *Mr. Moshe Sneh*, for many years a member of the World Executive; *Mr. Aleksandar Stajner*, vice-president of the Federation of Jewish Communities of Yugoslavia, who participated in many Congress meetings on behalf of his community; *Dr. Hardi Swarsensky*, of Buenos Aires, a member of the World Executive; *Avv. Carlo Viterbo*, former president of the Zionist Federation of Italy; *Dr. Lev Zelmanovits*, former general secretary of the British Section of the Congress; and *Mr. Yaacov Zerubavel*, honorary member of the World Executive.

The Assembly rose in silent tribute to those who had passed away.

3. CLOSING REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT

Dr. GOLDMANN: Now I would like to pay tribute to a number of our professional co-workers who are at least as responsible for the

functioning and the existence of the Congress, in my experience, as the so-called lay leaders. This is a differentiation I have never accepted, and I think the time has come when we should occasionally ignore it.

I want to pay tribute to Myra Becker, now in her fourth decade with the Congress. She is contemplating retirement, but we are trying to keep her for as long as we can.

Fritz Becker is reaching his thirtieth year of work for us. His origins are in Austria and Yugoslavia, but he started his activity in the Italian Jewish community, and for two decades has been the Congress' link with Italy in all matters concerning international Jewry. During the last fifteen years he has shown great tact and efficiency in dealing on Jewish matters with the Vatican, with which, as you know, we have developed more than correct, almost cordial, relations, without giving in on any religious issue.

As regards the present Assembly, gratitude is due to a number of our officials. It has been one of the most difficult to organize, because in Israel everything is more complex, and many who are not Israelis had to adjust to the specific methods and procedures of Israel. In addition, we had many more delegates than we originally expected — I do not say this in criticism or to discourage you from coming next time — and this naturally creates much more work.

I shall not dwell on tributes to Gerhart Riegner, because it would be nearly insulting. Everybody knows his talents and efficiency in directing the Congress, and he does not need a special compliment.

My thanks go also to Dr. Natan Lerner, of the Tel-Aviv office, who has handled all matters relating to the Assembly in Israel, and also his assistants Chava Schiff and Avner Halak. To give you a small inkling of all the problems connected with such a large Assembly: Avner, who had left the Congress to go into private business, returned for the sole purpose of taking over all matters relating to local personnel, students, and the difficult supervision of the duplication of documents.

I pay tribute to Claude Lévy, one of our newer officials, who is assistant to Dr. Riegner and who, ever since the Assembly planned for The Hague, has prepared for this large meeting and organized the efforts of the staff from the various Congress offices — Geneva, London, New York, Paris, and Buenos Aires — who were needed to man the many posts at this Assembly.

We pay tribute to a volunteer, an old friend, Lavy Becker, who is our chief of protocol here.

I want to thank Sidney Gruber, of the Geneva office, for his great skill and persistence in keeping track of the vast documentation and records.

Thanks are due to Dr. Elizabeth Eppler, one of our most experienced Congress people, who was of such great aid in the overall planning and administration; to Richard Cohen and Itzhak Shargil, in charge of the press — and I know from personal experience how difficult it is to deal with the Israeli press — and to all those who worked with them; to Serge Cwajgenbaum, assistant to Mr. Kaplan in Paris, who dealt with all the matters of security, which is not a simple matter, and to all the local authorities in charge.

I want to thank Dr. Paúl Warszawski, of Buenos Aires, who, with Fritz Becker, was responsible for reception and registration, as well as Marcus Einfeld, who did a brilliant job a secretary of the Presidium.

I do not want to forget the translators and the typing pools and the students; the administration and staff of Binyanei Ha'uma, which is the property of the World Zionist Organization, without whose help we could not have had the Assembly here; and, last but not least, the members of the Secretariat, who worked unflinchingly on the difficult task assigned to them. I thank them all on your behalf.

You know, when people are tired it is very difficult to make brief speeches. I am very tired, but I shall try as briefly as I can and in an objective way to end this Assembly.

The first thing I want to stress may appear purely a matter of figures: the size of this Assembly. We did not expect as many delegates, and I am very happy that we had them, although it naturally makes it more difficult to run such an Assembly. I take it as an indication of two things. First, the growth of the World Jewish Congress; but what is more important is the fact that so many Jewish communities not only nominally belong to the Congress but have a deep interest in it, which was reflected by the large number of delegates, including those of relatively small countries. This indicates much more than loyalty to the Congress: it indicates a deep desire of Jews to come together in times of crisis, to feel that they belong to one people, to discuss their problems. It is obviously not possible to find all the solutions in seven days, but it is in itself significant and valuable that so many Jews were ready to come to this Assembly; and if it were technically feasible, we should try to hold it much more frequently.

This is the first Assembly we have had in Israel. You know that there was a long discussion, and I was among those who had their doubts about holding it in Israel. Part of the credit for our decision to come to Jerusalem goes to my friend Sapir; it is very difficult for me to say no

when Sapir asks me for something, and when he took over the chairmanship of the WZO and telephoned me to insist that we have the Assembly in Israel, I could not refuse. Fortunately, this is a mutual friendship and it is also very difficult for him to say no, which is of great help to the Congress. Well, we had the Assembly here and we agreed, as a compromise, to have at some time in the near future a very large meeting of the new General Council, possibly in Washington but certainly in America, which represents the largest Jewish community and the largest group within the World Jewish Congress and which has never had an Assembly on its continent. Our convening in Israel proved to be of great importance to the Congress, and I have the feeling that for the first time a large part of Israeli public opinion has become really aware of the importance of world Jewry as represented by the WJC — although part of the Israeli press, particularly *Ma'ariv*, was unfair to the Congress because they do not agree with my personal political opinions.

I think that the concept that what happens in history *must* happen is plain nonsense, and humanity would not have a vestige of dignity if it just sat down and accepted its fate. Individuals play an enormous role, especially in Jewish history. If the Jews have survived, unlike any other people, over 2000 years of Dispersion, it is to a very large degree due to such individuals — the Zaddikim, the Talmudists, the Halakhists, the Hasidim, and all the great figures who set an example for the people and who succeeded in securing our survival without an army, without a territory, without money, without wealth.

All my life, having presided over many, too many, organizations, I have been looking around for people to help me, to cooperate with me, to replace me when the time comes. At this Assembly particularly we brought in quite a number of people of standing, and I do not have to justify their coming in in a leading position. We have first of all my friend Phil Klutznick. I welcome Edgar Bronfman, who — I must say it here openly — to my pleasant surprise has inherited all the love for the Jewish people and for Israel of his late father. I had my doubts a little at the beginning, for the younger generation lacks the roots and tradition of its parents, which is one of the great problems in Jewish life today. With all these qualities and the importance he possesses, it is a great gain for the World Jewish Congress to have him as the new chairman of the North American Branch, succeeding his father.

We have men like Lord Fisher, Michael Fidler, Lord Janner, and others of the Board of Deputies, whose presence with us is important, not only because they represent this great and worthy old institution but because, as individuals, they are a great new gain for the WJC and its leadership.

I estimate as of great value the formal agreement with the World Zionist Organization signed yesterday in my home, in a very cordial though solemn atmosphere. I do not have to tell you what the Zionist Organization's close association to the Congress means; but it also brings in a new group of leaders who, though they were not inactive before, will now acquire much more responsibility and will, whether they want it or not, have to be more active in Congress matters: the chairman of the WZO Executive, my friend Pinhas Sapir; the acting chairman, L.A. Dulzin; Ezra Shapiro, the chairman of the Keren Hayesod and head of the important World Confederation of United Zionists; and all their colleagues who belong to one or another of the various Zionist parties affiliated with the World Jewish Congress — those who oppose me and those who do not. They all will, by their more formalized and responsible cooperation, make a great contribution.

In this connection I would like to mention that during the last year or so we have created a new unofficial body for the WJC; if it is not in the Constitution it should at least be mentioned at this closing session. I am referring to the International Advisory Council. It is a body which has not yet found the real form of its activities. It is made up of a mixture of politically and economically very important personalities and of intellectual leaders who, under the established democratic organizational procedures, would hardly be able to come into the Congress. They represent a kind of élite, what in France used to be called "the 200 families." In the normal process of elections and organization one cannot get to these people: they are too busy, they do not care for public positions, they have other positions of importance. So I found a way, without violating the democratic and representative character of the Congress, to establish a body which has no legal say, which can only advise, but whose members, once they begin, can shape the future of our activities. It is not easy for them to find the spheres of their activities but I hope that in the years to come, they will become of great moral and intellectual help, not to speak of other forms of assistance, for the World Jewish Congress. The chairmen of the Advisory Council are, in America, again Edgar Bronfman, and in England, Sir Marcus Sieff, who apologized for not being at this Assembly but who was at various other WJC meetings and is also a worthy successor to his late father, Israel Sieff, who was our vice-president. The group in Europe includes people like Mendès-France and Sir Siegmund Warburg, and the one in America counts among its members professors at Harvard, Brandeis, and other universities, and people of importance on Wall Street.

I am glad that we had at this Assembly representatives of B'nai B'rith and I am very hopeful that we will find forms of closer coopera-

tion in the coming year. I think the goodwill exists with them as with us, and now that we have a provision in our Constitution for special agreements with important international organizations, such as the agreement we reached with the World Zionist Organization, I hope — although it may not turn out to be easy — that we will find a way of cementing our cooperation with B'nai B'rith. We have already done a number of things together, within the Presidents' Conference, and I hope that our cooperation, in one form or another, will grow.

I express the same optimism with regard to the CRIF in France, which is not an international organization but the representative body of French Jewry. I hope that the CRIF will one day soon affiliate to the Congress, though I must say to the credit of the French Section of the WJC that it is probably the most dynamic Section we have in the WJC and represents, even if not formally, the vast majority of French Jewry today.

And now, as my last point, what are the urgent tasks before us, for the new Executive and for the other organs? Since I discussed this question in my opening speech, I will mention only one important aspect. The Congress has one main purpose: to represent the Jewish people and to create a united framework for the Jewish people. We have succeeded greatly in geographical terms. In the United States we have succeeded even far beyond my hopes — and I can say that I am not responsible for the progress we have made in America, except perhaps to a very small extent. With the exception of one or two important organizations, foremost among them B'nai B'rith, we now represent the great majority of US Jewry. In one country more, in another less — but formally we have succeeded in uniting the vast majority of the Jewish people, except for Eastern European and Soviet Jews, who for the time being are outside international Jewish life.

As regards coordination and unification in dealing with the issues — and I am speaking, as usual, very frankly — we have not been successful. In the last few years a certain fashion has developed in Jewish life: to create specialized organizations for each special issue. There are new committees for Russian Jews, Syrian Jews, etc. This is a very dangerous trend, because all Jewish problems are interdependent. You cannot, for instance, deal with Soviet Jewish problems isolated from the other Jewish questions, because the situation of the Jews in the USSR is related to the question of relations with Israel, the Soviet policy concerning Israel, and many other problems of the Jewish people. The whole method of creating special organizations is very dangerous, and we should stop this trend at the beginning, before vested interests are created, presidents elected, offices and budgets established, and so on. I think the World Jewish Congress will have to

resist and fight these trends more than we have done in the past, and I hope the new Executive will have the courage to do it.

Our number-one task, naturally — and I do not have to stress it — is to stand by Israel. Israel is entering a decisive period, which could be the beginning of a wonderful new era of peace or of a very dangerous one of political isolation and military threats. My friend Kissinger arrived in Israel three hours ago. Despite my doubts about the effectiveness of his policy, of which I spoke yesterday, I hope that he will succeed in achieving a real breakthrough and will begin to reach a real peace. In my opinion this is the first time that there is a real chance for it, and we should all pray that he succeeds. During the coming period, Israel will more than ever need the support of the Jewish communities. I am pleased to say that the record of the Jewish people in its financial support to Israel in the Six-Day War was splendid — Sapir and Dulzin are good witnesses to this — and politically it was the same. I hope it will continue. I am sure it will continue. With all the difficulties and risks involved, Israel may need political support more than any other support.

I can pledge, as president of the Congress, on behalf of all my colleagues, that we will stand by Israel and be available for whatever they expect us to do, and I hope that we will be able to help. In this connection, I think we can do a pioneering job, and I would regard it as one of the important achievements of this Assembly. I hope that what I am now discussing will indeed happen and that, especially now that the prime minister of Israel has urged us to do so — the first one to speak about it in such a way — we will take the initiative and begin to deal with the problem of the relations between Israel and the Diaspora in an organized way, within an institutional framework.

We have adopted a resolution on this matter, and we must consider it as one of the most urgent problems for Congress action, on which the Executive should begin to act. We will naturally cooperate with the World Zionist Organization, which is now part of us, and which already advises the government of Israel at every step. We will also coopt other Jewish bodies, which do not belong to the Congress — we do not claim any exclusivity — and if, within a few months or within a year, we have developed some sort of framework for mutual consultation and cooperation, we will have done a piece of work of real historic importance.

Congress will have to deal with the Soviet Jewish problem. I shall not go into it again, since I discussed this issue in my opening speech and, in more detail, in the Commission on Soviet Jewry, but here too we will have to begin a new chapter. I hope that if there is a stabilization in the political situation in the Middle East, this will be followed at

once by a normalization of relations between the Soviet Union and Israel, and the USSR will then begin to consider also the position of Jews in the Soviet Union — in addition to permitting emigration, which will naturally have to continue.

On this issue too we have not yet developed a real program, because we did not think that the Soviet Union would be ready to talk. In my view, it may come quicker than we expect. Like everything else in Jewish life, it all depends to a large measure on what happens in Israel. If things progress here, then we may, in some near future, have to present our program for action to the Soviets, which we have never really had an occasion to do. Dealing with this problem was for many years a specialty of the World Jewish Congress, ever since I first met Mr. Litvinov in 1936. In these almost forty years we have not achieved too much, but I have always believed that to speak with people is better than to be *broiges*, and our lack of success indicates how difficult it is to deal with this issue. Recently we have had a few meetings of experts, both Jewish and non-Jewish, under the auspices of the Institute of Jewish Affairs. One of them, Professor Leonard Shapiro, was good enough to be here for the Commission on Soviet Jewry. Another great Soviet expert, from Columbia University, is on our International Advisory Council.

The problem of Soviet Jewry will have top priority for the new Executive, and we should not give up hope that we can obtain more facilities for Jewish life in the Soviet Union, for the millions who, for the time being, will remain there. We may have to send a delegation to discuss our program with the Soviets, or at first talk to some of them outside the Soviet Union.

A word should be said about the fight for securing Jewish identity, which I often express as the right to be different. In most countries of the world we have gained equality of rights, and I do not think it is in danger, even where Jews are attacked for being so attached to Israel. This question is one of the most important and delicate issues nowadays. In nearly every interview I have had with foreign press and television during this Assembly, one of the first questions concerned this so-called double loyalty of the Jews. I do not see any danger ahead for our right to be equal, but I see dangers for the right to be different. Not because of anti-Semitism, but because of the overpowering strength of the state. For a number of reasons, financial and other, states become more and more powerful and, without bad intentions, this trend represents a permanent potential menace for minorities in their attempt to maintain and develop their own character while at the same time remaining equal with all other citizens.

This applies to many others, but to no minority more than to the Jews, and we should begin to think about it and maybe to plan some coordinated action with other minorities. After the First World War I had a small share in dealing with this matter, when Leo Motzkin was head of the Comité des Délégations Juives and minority rights were guaranteed by the Versailles Treaty and were then very fashionable. Today the question does not concern political minority rights, which are out of the question. Our aim today should be to get cultural rights, rights to education with the help of the state, and so on. Many Jews, by the way, doubt that we should insist on this, but I shall not discuss the issue in detail here. In my opinion we must start to be active in this field. While it is relatively easy to organize political groups and struggles in parliaments, this is in a way more complicated and more delicate, because it represents intellectual and cultural activities. Apart from *aliya*, which we have to support in all communities, the Congress must help to create the consciousness and the atmosphere for the tremendous and decisive importance of Jewish education for all the hundreds of thousands of Jewish children in the Diaspora. The WJC has neither the means nor the manpower to engage directly in education, and we will have to work together with the Jewish Agency, which can do a hundred times more than we can, as well as the religious groups of all trends. We can help through our influence in the communities to strengthen the understanding that this is the number-one problem of Jewish life if we want at least part of the coming generation to remain loyal and interested in the Jewish people.

I could cite other problems, but we should not overdo it. Our absorptive capacity for work is limited, not to speak of our budgetary limitations, and if the new Executive, with the help of the Governing Board, begins to deal with the problems I mentioned, it will have enough to do in the coming weeks and months and years.

One last word, my friends, before I close this session. Our Assembly has met in Israel for the first time. We have met in Israel perhaps during the worst crisis in its short history, and it is good that we met at this moment, because everybody will go home knowing more about the crisis, from having seen and experienced it emotionally and intellectually, which is ten times more poignant than reading about it from afar.

I want to close this session with the hope that when we have our next session in Israel, it will be in an Israel at peace, and I make a solemn pledge, which I am sure my colleagues on the Executive will not disavow. The moment Israel has peace — it may be in a year or two, it may take ten years (though personally I am more optimistic than many of the leaders of Israel, despite certain differences of opinion on the tactics of Israeli policies) — the moment Israel has peace I pledge that

we will have an Assembly here in Israel immediately. And celebrate on behalf of the Jewish people, with the people of Israel, that glorious day when Israel will not have to worry about its defense as a central, primary element or have to fight for its survival, but will be able to concentrate its tremendous resourcefulness, its loyalty, its passion, its readiness for sacrifice, on creative achievements, on continuing the great line of Jewish creativity.

On that glorious day, which I — not the youngest among you — hope to see and to experience and to witness, I pledge you we will come back, not to help in a critical situation, but to be your partners and co-workers in the creative great new future that will then be opened by Israel at peace.

APPENDIX I.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SIXTH PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Art. 1

Delegates

- 1) The Plenary Assembly shall consist of delegates elected by member organizations and of the members of the Executive Committee.
- 2) The number of delegates allotted to each constituent member organization 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 organization shall be determined by the Executive Committee.

Art. 2

Alternate delegates

- 1) Constituent and associate member organizations 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.

Art. 3

Fraternal delegates, observers

The Executive Committee may invite organizations not affiliated with the Congress to send fraternal delegates or observers to the Plenary Assembly.

Art. 4

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 organization represented.

Art. 5

Credentials Committee

- 1) A Credentials Committee shall be appointed at the beginning of each Plenary Assembly. It shall consist of five members, who shall be appointed by the Plenary Assembly on the proposal of the officers of the organization.
- 2) The Committee shall examine the credentials of the delegates and report to the Plenary Assembly without delay. The final decision about the admission of a delegate rests with the Plenary Assembly.

Art. 6

Provisional admission of delegates

Any delegates to whose admission objections have been made shall be seated provisionally with the same rights as other delegates, until the Credentials Committee has reported and the Plenary Assembly has given its decision.

Art. 7

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.

Art. 8

Presidium

- 1) The Presidium shall consist of (a) the officers, (b) the chairmen of the principal commissions as defined in Article 34, (c) the chairman of the Nominations Committee, and (d) forty 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 coordinate the proceedings of all commissions and committees of the Plenary Assembly. It shall assist the president of the organization 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.

Art. 9

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 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.

Art. 10

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.

Art. 11

Quorum

A majority of the delegates to the Plenary Assembly shall constitute a quorum.

Art. 12

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 explaining the conclusions arrived at by their commission or committee.
- 3) Officers and heads of the departments of the organization may be accorded precedence in order to make a statement to the Plenary Assembly concerning any questions under consideration.

Art. 13

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 overruled 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.

Art. 14

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.

Art. 15

Closing of list of speakers

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, 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.

Art. 16

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 favor of, and one against the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote.

Art. 17

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 favor of the closure, the presiding officer shall declare the closure of the debate.

Art. 18

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.

Art. 19

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 item under discussion;
- (d) for the closure of the debate on the item under discussion.

Art. 20

Proposals and amendments

Proposals and amendments which are not of a procedural character shall normally be introduced in writing and handed to the Secretar-

iat of the Plenary Assembly, which 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.

Art. 21

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.

Art. 22

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.

Art. 23

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 reintroduced by any delegate.

Art. 24

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.

Art. 25

Voting rights

Each delegate shall have one vote.

Art. 26

“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.

Art. 27

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 100 delegates.

Art. 28

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.

Art. 29

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.

Art. 30

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, 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.

Art. 31

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.

Art. 32

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 100 delegates.

Art. 33

Commissions and committees

The Plenary Assembly may set up such commissions or committees as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

Art. 34

Principal commissions

The principal commissions of the Plenary Assembly are :

- (1) the Commission on Israel and the Middle East;
- (2) the Commission on Soviet and Eastern European Jewry;
- (3) the General Political Commission;
- (4) the Cultural Commission.

Art. 35

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 organization 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 commissions by alternate delegates with full rights.

Art. 36

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, authorize persons who are not delegates to attend commission or committee meetings if their presence seems to him desirable in the interest of the organization.

Art. 37

Rules applicable

The rules for the conduct of business at meetings of the Plenary Assembly are applicable at meetings of the commissions or committees.

Art. 38

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 a draft resolution adopted by a commission or committee, it shall refer the decision or draft resolution to the commission or committee and inform it of the nature of the objection.
- 5) If the commission or committee maintains its original position, the Plenary Assembly shall decide.

APPENDIX II.

RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS OF THE SIXTH PLENARY ASSEMBLY OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

A. POLITICAL RESOLUTIONS

1. ISRAEL

The Sixth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, held in Jerusalem from February 3 to 10, 1975;

salutes the government and people of Israel as they prepare to celebrate the twenty-seventh anniversary of the creation of the Jewish state, the fulfillment of the millennial Jewish dream that kept Jews faithful to Zion throughout their dispersion;

recalls that the restoration of a sovereign Jewish state in the land of Israel has been consistently supported by the Jewish people and constantly reaffirmed during the difficult years of its existence;

is deeply conscious of the close ties between Israel and the Jews of the Diaspora and of their shared concern with the problems and pride in the achievements of the State of Israel. This unity was manifested once again in 1973, when the Jewish people stood firmly by the State of Israel, then compelled, as in the past, to defend itself against the aggression of those seeking its destruction.

The Assembly reaffirms the solidarity of world Jewry with the State of Israel at this critical stage of its development and pledges to aid in strengthening its foundations.

The Assembly emphatically rejects the call for the establishment of a so-called secular state in Palestine, which would only result in the abolition of the State of Israel.

The Assembly resolves to use every available means to have the decision isolating Israel from the regional groupings of Unesco rescinded, and to try and ensure that such decisions do not occur in any UN or other international agency in the future.

The Assembly emphasizes the continuing need to use all possible means to support Israel in the fight against terrorism.

It further expresses the hope that in the near future a mutual understanding will be reached between Israel and all the peoples of the region.

The Assembly reaffirms its support for Israel in its continuing search for a just and lasting peace negotiated freely between Israel and its Arab neighbors, based on legally binding treaties and embodying secure and recognized boundaries.

It expresses again its confidence that such a peace agreement, based on the mutual desire for cooperation, will usher in a new era of prosperity and creativity for all the peoples of the Middle East.

2. DECLARATION ON JERUSALEM

We, the representatives of Jewish communities in all six continents, have come to Jerusalem not only to participate in the deliberations of our Sixth Plenary Assembly, but as pilgrims to renew our irrevocable commitment to this Holy City as the immemorial center of the spiritual life and aspirations of the whole House of Israel.

We revere this city, as do adherents of other traditions, for what it has given mankind in the past. But as Jews we look also to the future. For we are not wayfarers who pass through the city and are content to remember what once was. We believe with a perfect faith that Jerusalem will yet fulfill its vocation in human history as the city of peace and reconciliation, of social justice and human brotherhood. We hear the voice of the Prophet as clearly today as did our fathers twenty-five centuries ago: "I will bring my people from the East country and from the West country. And they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem... And Jerusalem shall be called the city of truth."

In the name of this ideal we stand steadfast with the people of Israel in the resolve to maintain the unity and integrity of Jerusalem as the capital of the State of Israel.

The government of Israel and the authorities of this city have brilliantly and conclusively demonstrated that they provide effective guarantees of free access to, and the reverent safeguarding of, the holy places of other faiths; and there can today be not even the shadow of a doubt that freedom of worship for all religious communities will be protected by all the powers of the state.

We salute Jerusalem, the city of fulfillment, the city of the future. Neither time nor circumstances can shake our loyalty to this ideal. Our fathers remembered Jerusalem in joy and in sorrow, in freedom and under oppression. Through all the Jewish centuries they affirmed the hope for which it stands in a daily liturgy, and it found expression in the writings of our greatest poets and teachers.

We have come to Jerusalem to make the solemn pledge that we shall remain faithful to this heritage.

3. ISRAEL-DIASPORA RELATIONS

Whereas the prime minister of Israel in his address to this Sixth Plenary Assembly called for the establishment of some appropriate form of effecting a close, workable, and continuing relationship between Israel and the Diaspora, and

whereas the president of the World Jewish Congress has urged that this proposal be treated as a matter of great urgency, and

whereas the Workshop and Commission concerned with Israel-Diaspora relationships and communication, representing the overwhelming desire expressed by so many participants in the Plenary, unanimously urged the development of an appropriate and established institutional method to achieve this desirable end, and

recognizing that questions of representation, as well as legal and technical aspects of the proposal, require careful analysis;

Now therefore be it resolved by the Sixth Plenary Assembly that :

1. We enthusiastically endorse the general objectives as expressed herein and the need to establish with all possible speed a mutually acceptable institutional means for the consideration of the legitimate interests and concerns of Israel and the Diaspora which are now irrevocably and inextricably interwoven and interactive.

2. We direct the incoming Executive to take immediate steps to consider the best ways and means of giving effect to this overwhelming need and to give it a high priority on its agenda.

3. We authorize the Executive to involve such technical and expert assistance as may be necessary to aid it to expedite the preparation of a report to and action by the Governing Board at the earliest possible date.

4. CLOSING THE SOCIAL GAP IN ISRAEL

While appreciating the great strides made by the Israeli government and other authorities in their efforts to build a fair society with equality of opportunity for all the citizens of the country, the Sixth Plenary Assembly expresses concern that considerable sections of Israeli society still suffer from an inadequate standard and mode of life and are thus unable to enjoy their full rights of citizenship. The Assembly is worried that the continuation of this state of affairs and the widening social gap will create discontent among different sections of society in

the country and contribute to a lessening of the cohesion and unity of the nation at a time when these concepts are demanded more than ever.

The Assembly is of the opinion that world Jewry should make a contribution to the solution of these problems in cooperation with the Israeli government, the Jewish Agency, and other appropriate bodies, and refers the matter to the Executive, with the recommendation that the Executive establish a committee to study the means by which this contribution and cooperation can best be effected.

5. SOVIET JEWRY

While noting that numbers of Jews have in recent years been permitted to leave the Soviet Union, this Sixth Plenary Assembly views with serious concern the forty-percent reduction in 1974 of the number of Jews permitted by the Soviet authorities to emigrate to Israel, as compared with 1973.

The Assembly condemns the deliberate and continued policy of harassment and trials of Jews for expressing their desire to go to Israel, and of the widespread refusal of applications by Jews for exit permits. It further condemns the continued and particularly harsh incarceration of Jewish Prisoners of Conscience, who languish in Soviet prisons for having struggled for the right to leave the Soviet Union for Israel in spite of persecution and of Soviet policy to do everything possible to deter them from applying for exit visas. The Assembly reaffirms its strong support and admiration for their great heroism and inspiring courage.

The Assembly places on record the appreciation of the Jewish people for the continuous action of governments, national and international organizations, and distinguished citizens in many countries, as well as of all our affiliates, in favor of our fellow Jews in the Soviet Union.

The Assembly notes with regret the recent repudiation by the Soviet Union of its 1972 trade agreement with the United States and rejects the attempt to attribute this repudiation to the clauses of the agreement concerning the liberalization and cessation of harassment previously accepted by the Soviet authorities after prolonged negotiations.

The Assembly declares its wholehearted support of genuine détente and the most needed improvement of relations between Western nations and the Soviet Union, but feels impelled to underline that the right of every person to emigrate is a fundamental, universally

recognized right which transcends all commercial, economic, or political considerations.

I. The Assembly therefore calls upon the Soviet authorities :

- a. to permit free emigration and to cease harassment of all Jews who desire to leave for Israel, in accordance with international and Soviet law and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
- b. to liberate all Jewish Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR;
- c. to halt the anti-Jewish campaign in official organs of the Soviet Union which stimulates anti-Semitism, including trials of Jews on spurious charges and the meting out of unjust and harsh sentences, completely out of proportion to the severity of the alleged offences;
- d. to stop interference with postal and telephonic communications between Jews in the Soviet Union and their relations and friends abroad and with broadcasts directed to Jews in the Soviet Union;
- e. to restore to the Jews of the USSR their national, cultural, and religious rights, as permitted by the Soviet Constitution, and to grant them the right — which exists in many of the Socialist countries — to maintain regular contact with other Jewish communities and organizations in the world.

II. The delegates to this Assembly pledge themselves and their communities and organizations to continue the campaign for the freedom of Soviet Jews by all lawful means and with utmost energy until our above demands are accepted and implemented by the Soviet authorities. We look forward to the continued and valued support of enlightened opinion and people of goodwill everywhere in this struggle.

III. While appreciating the efforts made by the government and people of Israel to integrate and to absorb Jews from the Soviet Union, the Assembly calls for such efforts to be intensified.

IV. The Assembly calls on the Executive of the World Jewish Congress to consider as a matter of urgency the means whereby Soviet Jews may be given a voice and participation in the work of the World Jewish Congress.

6. POLAND

The Sixth Plenary Assembly calls upon the government of Poland :

- a. to take all appropriate steps to preserve and where necessary to restore all Jewish cemeteries and to prevent desecration of the graves;
- b. to give to the World Federation of Polish Jews and interested bodies and individuals free access to all historical records of Polish Jewry now in the possession or under the control of Polish authorities;
- c. to recompense representative organizations of Polish Jews for all real and personal property appropriated from Polish Jewish communities;
- d. to honor its undertaking to hand over to surviving Polish Jews one of the prison barracks in the former Auschwitz concentration camp for use as a memorial to Jews martyred in that camp;
- e. to resume social insurance and other pension payments to Jews who had to leave Poland because of the anti-Semitic campaign that began in 1967.

The Assembly further calls upon the Executive to consider whether arrangements could appropriately be made through the WJC or a representative body of Jews from Poland for the collection and exhibition of relics from the great Polish Jewish community.

7. JEWS IN ARAB COUNTRIES

The Sixth Plenary Assembly expresses its full solidarity with Jews still in some Arab countries and its grave concern at the continued discrimination and oppression to which they are subjected, particularly in Syria, and deplores the inhuman conditions imposed upon its Jewish community, whose 4500 members are denied all elementary human rights, including the right to move beyond a limited distance from their homes and the right to leave the country;

pays tribute to the fortitude and courage of these Jews in danger and adversity;

records its appreciation of world public opinion, governments, parliaments, international and national organizations, and leading personalities all over the world, as well as of the continued humanitarian efforts of the member organizations of the WJC on behalf of Jews in Arab countries, and takes note that these efforts have already brought some positive and encouraging results;

calls upon all those who cherish the ideals of human dignity and liberty to intensify their efforts on behalf of Jews in Arab lands, to

impress upon the governments involved the urgent need to cease the oppression of the Jewish communities, to prevent further deterioration of their precarious situation, and to respect their right to leave the country in accordance with elementary principles of international law as proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

8. INDEMNIFICATION OF VICTIMS OF NAZISM BY THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The Sixth Plenary Assembly takes note of the declared willingness of the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany to give consideration to the plight of victims of Nazi persecution who are not eligible to receive indemnification under existing legislation of the Federal Republic or who have received only inadequate indemnification, and expresses the hope that effective measures in this direction will be taken speedily.

9. INDEMNIFICATION BY THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC FOR VICTIMS OF NAZI PERSECUTION

The Sixth Plenary Assembly expresses its great concern that, in spite of many appeals by Jewish organizations and democratic governments, the German Democratic Republic has not yet accepted its share of the obligation of the German people to indemnify the Jewish victims of Nazi persecution;

urges the government of the German Democratic Republic to open negotiations with the appropriate Jewish organizations on the question of indemnification of Nazi victims without further delay;

calls upon all other governments to support this legitimate claim of the victims and bring the matter emphatically to the attention of the government of the German Democratic Republic.

10. ANTI-SEMITISM

The Sixth Plenary Assembly notes with concern that anti-Semitic forces are still operating in various parts of the world and that they represent a potential danger at a time of fundamental economic and social change;

draws attention to the fact that anti-Semitism today frequently appears under the cloak of anti-Zionism;

asserts that the right of the Jewish people to national self-determination consistent with Zionist objectives, and to its own state and identity, is an essential element of the equality of Jews with all other peoples;

urges all people to oppose anti-Semitism, whether appearing openly or in the guise of anti-Zionism.

11. NEO-NAZISM AND NEO-FASCISM

A few days ago the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz was celebrated. In May 1975 the thirtieth anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany will be marked throughout the world.

The Sixth Plenary Assembly calls upon all Jewish communities to mark appropriately the thirtieth anniversary of the liberation of the camps and to teach its lessons to the postwar generations.

The World Jewish Congress and the Jewish people, together with the representatives of other nations, feel that the lesson of the Holocaust has not yet been learned and that there exist today neo-Nazi and neo-Fascist organizations and publications in many countries, and note that many Nazi war criminals have not yet been apprehended or brought to justice.

Some nations, and especially the young generation, are already forgetting this tragic chapter in the history of the Jewish people and of the world.

Organized Jewry, which in the main did not heed the dangers of the oncoming Holocaust, is obliged to make every effort to oppose any attempt to renew neo-Nazi and neo-Fascist activities anywhere.

The World Jewish Congress will further intensify its support for all action to punish Nazi war criminals.

12. UNITED NATIONS DECADE FOR ACTION TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

The Sixth Plenary Assembly recalls the commitment of the World Jewish Congress, laid down in its Constitution, to cooperate with all peoples on the basis of universal ideals of peace, freedom, and justice;

endorses the resolution of the Executive Committee of the World Jewish Congress in June/July 1973, which, inter alia, welcomed on

behalf of the World Jewish Congress the proclamation of the United Nations Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination;

emphasizes that the implementation of the program for the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination should be worldwide and not limited to any race or region;

reaffirms that any discrimination in human rights on the grounds of color, race, or religion is contrary to fundamental Jewish teaching, and proclaims its firm opposition to all forms and practices of discrimination and all policies based on racial theories;

pledges the wholehearted support of the World Jewish Congress for the program of the Decade and calls upon all member organizations to contribute, by all means at their disposal, to projects and actions undertaken in connection with the Decade;

confirms the willingness of the World Jewish Congress to cooperate with the United Nations in observing the priorities set forth in the program of the Decade;

authorizes the competent organs of the World Jewish Congress to initiate and to carry out activities on the international, regional, and national levels in accordance with the suggestions contained in the United Nations program for the Decade.

13. THE UNITED NATIONS

The Sixth Plenary Assembly reaffirms its commitment to the principles and purposes enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations;

pledges to continue to combat all forms of racial, religious, and ethnic discrimination wherever these may occur;

deplores the selective and politically motivated approach adopted by some member states to questions of human rights, and appeals to the United Nations to give proper attention to the denial of certain fundamental human rights to Soviet Jews and Jews in some Arab countries;

expresses its deep disappointment at the total failure of the General Assembly to address itself to the problem of international terrorism;

deplores the participation on the rostrum of the General Assembly of a representative of an organization which openly avows its intention of destroying a member state and invokes the right to use force and terror for that purpose;

considers that the resolution of the 29th General Assembly inviting the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the deliberations of the General Assembly on "the question of Palestine" in plenary meetings; the resolution granting it unlimited observer status; and other decisions in favor of the PLO are contrary to the UN Charter and to the principles of international morality and justice, and make more difficult the achievement of peace between the Arab states and Israel.

14. INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S YEAR

The Sixth Plenary Assembly notes that 1975 has been designated International Women's Year by the United Nations, with the basic aims and purposes of the International Year being equality, development, and peace.

The Assembly calls on all member communities and associate member organizations of the World Jewish Congress to give full support to the activities of the Year on the international, regional, and national levels and to cooperate in this respect with the organizations of Jewish women belonging to the World Jewish Congress.

The Plenary Assembly further recommends that the World Jewish Congress initiate and encourage actions of its participating communities and organizations for the improvement of the status of Jewish women within the framework of the communities.

To achieve these goals the Assembly urges :

- a. greater participation of women in the communal structure, including positions of leadership;
- b. particular attention to the Jewish education of women and the image of women in Jewish education;
- c. improvements of the legal status of women within the traditional framework.

15. UNESCO

The Sixth Plenary Assembly recalls the fruitful cooperation of the Congress with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization during almost three decades, and reaffirms its continued belief in the ideals and purposes of the organization;

expresses dismay and indignation at the resolutions adopted by the 18th session of the Unesco General Conference, accusing and condemning Israel of altering and defiling the historic character of the city

of Jerusalem, withholding assistance from Israel in the fields of education, science, and culture, and denying her request for inclusion in the European Regional Group of Unesco;

recognizes that these resolutions were politically motivated and totally without foundation, and regrets that a great number of member states allowed these resolutions to be adopted;

records with appreciation that numerous prominent non-Jewish and Jewish personalities all over the world have strongly protested against these vindictive resolutions and declared their unwillingness to cooperate with Unesco until these decisions have been rescinded; and looks forward to even wider support for this stand;

notes with satisfaction the action taken by a number of governments and parliaments to withdraw or reduce their financial contributions to Unesco in protest;

strongly urges that Unesco reconsider the anti-Israel resolutions at the earliest opportunity and return to its fundamental principles and aims. Failure to rescind these resolutions would change Unesco's character, would do irreparable harm to its work, and might even endanger its very existence.

16. INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

The Sixth Plenary Assembly recalls that the World Jewish Congress took an active part in the immediate postwar period in the reform of the main instruments of international humanitarian law, the Hague and Geneva Red Cross Conventions;

notes with approval the role played by the World Jewish Congress, at the various conferences held under the auspices of the International Committee of the Red Cross since 1971, in the development of international humanitarian law applicable in armed conflicts;

endorses the stand taken by the World Jewish Congress, jointly with forty-eight other international nongovernmental organizations in a memorandum submitted to representatives of governments attending the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts, held in Geneva in February/March 1974, calling, *inter alia*, for guarantees for an effective application of the provisions of the humanitarian conventions for the protection of civilian populations in all armed conflicts, and the banning of weapons and means and methods of combat which strike or affect indiscriminately the civilian population and combatants, or

which are of a particularly cruel character or cause particularly severe suffering;

expresses the hope that the Diplomatic Conference will, at its resumed deliberations in February/March 1975, arrive at a satisfactory strengthening of the international humanitarian law in force at present.

17. TERRORISM

The Sixth Plenary Assembly, noting the frightening growth of terrorism in the present era, is appalled at the various forms which terrorist violence has taken, including plane hijacking and the taking of hostages, and at the way in which it strikes at defenseless civilians, including women and children.

The Assembly notes that the civilized world, most governments, and international organizations have failed to react to the spread of terrorism, which endangers society.

It calls upon governments, international organizations, and world public opinion to condemn unequivocally acts of terrorism and to take urgent steps to punish the offenders and deny them refuge.

18. EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

The Sixth Plenary Assembly notes the growth of the European Economic Community and the effect of Community legislation on its member states;

notes that potential legislation of this nature may affect Jewish communities in numerous fields, and in particular that of *shechita*;

instructs the Executive to take all appropriate steps where it deems necessary and advisable.

19. CHRISTIAN-JEWISH RELATIONS

The Sixth Plenary Assembly notes with satisfaction the development of Christian-Jewish relations in a spirit of mutual respect with due regard to the basic differences between both faiths, and notably the establishment of periodic consultations between representatives of world Jewry and representatives of the World Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church;

expresses appreciation for the efforts of the World Jewish Congress and its role in the establishment of the International Jewish Committee for Interreligious Consultations as the broadest united Jewish front for consultation with Christian bodies;

notes with satisfaction the establishment by the Roman Catholic Church, on October 22, 1974, of a Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews, thus giving a proper and legitimate place to Catholic-Jewish relations within the framework of the Roman Curia;

welcomes the publication, on January 3, 1975, of the *Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration "Nostra Aetate,"* addressed to the world Catholic community, for the application of the decisions of the Second Vatican Council in the area of Catholic-Jewish relations;

notes that the *Guidelines* contain some doctrinal affirmations which stem from the unavoidable divergences between Judaism and Christianity;

declares that there are several serious omissions in the document;

observes, however, that the *Guidelines* voice a timely and urgent condemnation of all forms of anti-Semitism and discrimination and reflect a desire for goodwill and understanding, a spirit of mutual respect, and the recognition of basic differences, and will thus serve to encourage better understanding and improved relations between Catholics and Jews;

expresses the hope that the admonition contained in the *Guidelines* "to learn by what essential traits the Jews define themselves in the light of their own religious experience" will lead to a better understanding of the central role of peoplehood and the land of Israel in Jewish self-understanding.

The Assembly takes note with approval and appreciation of the policies and actions pursued by the World Jewish Congress regarding this issue and authorizes the Congress to proceed on the same lines.

20. THIRD WORLD

The Sixth Plenary Assembly approves the decision of the outgoing Governing Council and Executive Committee to open and conduct a program creating bridges of communication and mutual understanding between the Jewish people and the peoples of the countries known as the Third World. It notes with approval the efforts and advances made so far in this field and determines that this work should be extended

and intensified, in accordance with the suggestions and recommendations made by the Assembly's Workshop on this subject.

21. WORLD PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

The Sixth Plenary Assembly reaffirms the resolve of the World Jewish Congress to give its unremitting support to the quest for universal peace and disarmament, in fidelity to our messianic ideal, and to secure the survival of civilized society;

is deeply conscious of its obligation in this respect, placed upon it by the tradition which the Jewish people has received from its Prophets and teachers;

appreciates the efforts which have been made in recent years to secure balanced and progressive partial disarmament, but notes with dismay

- a. that there has been no meaningful cutback in armament and
- b. that the growing competition for sales by arms-manufacturing countries has added a new and menacing factor in the proliferation of deadly weapons;

notes with particular disquiet the deterioration of the efforts of the world to contain the growth of nuclear capability and the spread of nuclear armament;

records with satisfaction that preliminary steps toward a relaxation of tensions have been undertaken by the principal powers, and urges a continuation of all efforts for the achievement of peaceful cooperation;

calls on the Executive of the World Jewish Congress to help carry forward the intent of this resolution, in collaboration with representatives of other traditions and religions, and to continue to intensify efforts to secure a revised approach to disarmament at the international level;

expresses its confidence that all national and international bodies associated with the Congress will take appropriate measures to support this effort.

B. CULTURAL RESOLUTION

The Sixth Plenary Assembly expresses its satisfaction at the transfer of the Cultural Department to Jerusalem and at the fact that the Department, in keeping with the tradition of "From out of Zion shall go forth the Law," will continue its fruitful activities in cultural leadership for Jewish communities the world over.

To this end the Assembly resolves to intensify Jewish cultural activities in conjunction with existing Jewish cultural and educational institutions and directs the Department to concentrate its efforts on :

1. the strengthening of Jewish consciousness through the teaching, at all levels of education, of Jewish values and traditions and of the history of the Jewish people in Israel and the Diaspora;
2. giving its particular attention to the small communities throughout the world as well as to Jewish communities in Eastern Europe;
3. the establishment of a cultural clearing house under the auspices of the Department, for the purpose of avoiding duplication and insuring maximal utilization of Jewish cultural resources throughout the world;
4. sending teams of qualified young professionals to reside in the smaller communities throughout the world for extended periods of time, the purposes thereof being guidance and assistance for these communities, the training of local lay personnel and the launching of new cultural programs for these communities;
5. the appointment in each regional Branch of the WJC of a cultural liaison officer for the purpose of helping to fill the cultural needs of the communities within the region and of establishing ongoing ties with the Cultural Department in Jerusalem;
6. the establishment in cooperation with WJC member organizations and communities of a worldwide network of regional cultural activities for the entire family, the purpose thereof being the need to contribute to the meaningful survival of individual Jews and Jewish communities, especially the smaller communities;
7. the encouragement of and cooperation in the establishment of chairs of Jewish studies at universities and institutes of higher learning, and their interaction with Jewish institutes of learning and with Jewish academics and intellectuals;

8. continuing close cooperation with the WZO in the promotion of Jewish culture and especially joint endeavors to accelerate the successful integration of immigrants in Israel;
9. the convening of annual meetings in Jerusalem to be attended by Jewish writers throughout the world to exchange ideas;
10. the continuation of such welcome initiatives as the first colloquium on the methods of teaching Yiddish at the university level, which was held in New York;
11. close cooperation with the Brit Ivrit Olamit in its devoted work for the spreading of the Hebrew language in the countries of the Diaspora;
12. the commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the publication of the first Jewish newspaper in Amsterdam, in conjunction with the World Federation of Jewish Journalists, by the recognition of August 1975 as Jewish Press Month, as a means of strengthening and encouraging the Jewish press of the world;
13. cooperation with the WZO and the Israeli Ministry of Education and Culture in the provision of information on Jewish life abroad to schools in Israel and in the conducting of workshops and the organization of seminars on Judaism for young Israeli teachers, students, and intellectuals;
14. the establishment, following the decision by the Governing Board, of a Standing Commission on youth and young adults and the definition of its program and scope;
15. the establishment of a world center for the training of young leadership on a regional basis in cooperation with all interested member organizations and communities;
16. continuing support of and cooperation with appropriate institutions for the promotion of Jewish cultural endeavor in all its aspects, especially in the area of publications, so successfully achieved in the past.

For the implementation of these programs of the Cultural Department, the Sixth Plenary Assembly strongly urges the consideration of a substantial increase in the budget of the Department.

C. REVISED WJC CONSTITUTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL RESOLUTIONS

1. CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

(as revised by the Sixth Plenary Assembly,
February 6, 1975)

Article 1. Nature of organization

The World Jewish Congress is a voluntary association of representative Jewish bodies, communities, and organizations throughout the world.

Article 2. Purposes

a. The World Jewish Congress is organized to foster the unity of the Jewish people, to strive for the fulfillment of its aspirations, and to ensure the continuity and development of its religious, spiritual, cultural, and social heritage, and to that end it seeks :

- (1) to intensify the bonds of world Jewry with Israel as the central creative force in Jewish life and to strengthen the ties of solidarity among Jewish communities everywhere;
- (2) to secure the rights, status, and interests of Jews and Jewish communities and to defend them wherever they are denied, violated, or imperiled;
- (3) to encourage and assist the creative development of Jewish social, religious, and cultural life throughout the world;
- (4) to coordinate the efforts of Jewish communities and organizations with respect to the political, economic, social, religious, and cultural problems of the Jewish people;
- (5) to represent and act on behalf of its participating communities and organizations before governmental, intergovernmental, and other international authorities with respect to matters which concern the Jewish people as a whole.

b. The World Jewish Congress strives to cooperate with all peoples on the basis of universal ideals of peace, freedom, and justice.

Article 3. Autonomy

Participation in the World Jewish Congress shall in no way affect the autonomy of Jewish communities and organizations with regard to their respective internal and religious affairs nor imply any authorization of the World Jewish Congress to intervene in the domestic political affairs of their countries.

Article 4. Composition

a. The World Jewish Congress consists of :

- (1) (i) National Jewish representative communal bodies. Admission of such bodies is effected by the Governing Board. Only one such national body shall be admitted for any country.
- (ii) In the absence of a generally recognized or acknowledged representative Jewish body in a country, or the failure of any such body to join, or in the event of its disqualification, the Governing Board may accept for such country that body which in its view is best qualified. Under special circumstances, other Jewish organizations may be admitted by a two-thirds vote of the General Council on such terms and conditions as it may prescribe.
- (2) International Jewish organizations which may be admitted in associate status by a two-thirds vote of the Governing Board on such terms and conditions as it may prescribe.

b. Only bodies, communities, and organizations formed and acting in accordance with democratic principles and which subscribe to the purposes of the World Jewish Congress and agree to abide by the provisions of this Constitution may be admitted.

c. The Governing Board, by a two-thirds vote and subject to ratification of the General Council, may enter into special relationships with major international Jewish organizations and provide for representation of such organizations on various organs of the World Jewish Congress.

Article 5. Organs of the World Jewish Congress

The organs of the World Jewish Congress shall be :

- a. the Plenary Assembly;
- b. the General Council;
- c. the Governing Board;
- d. the Executive.

Article 6. The Plenary Assembly

a. The Plenary Assembly is the supreme authority of the World Jewish Congress.

b. The Governing Board shall summon the Plenary Assembly to a regular session every fourth year.

c. When extraordinary circumstances render it necessary, the Governing Board may, by a two-thirds vote, postpone the regular session of the Plenary Assembly for not more than one year, except that a further postponement may be directed by a three-fourths vote of the Governing Board.

d. The Governing Board may, by a three-fourths vote, summon an extraordinary session of the Plenary Assembly. The business of such session shall be limited to those matters proposed by the Board.

e. The Plenary Assembly shall consist of delegates of Jewish bodies, communities, and organizations comprising the World Jewish Congress.

f. The number of delegates allotted to each community or national organization shall be determined by the Governing Board with due regard to the size of the Jewish population of the respective country. No country shall be entitled to more than two fifths of the total number of delegates. Each delegation shall reflect the composition of its Jewish community.

g. The number of delegates allotted to international organizations in associate status shall be determined by the Governing Board but shall not exceed one fifth of the total number of delegates.

h. The validity of the election or designation of the delegates shall be subject to confirmation by the Plenary Assembly.

i. The members of the Governing Board shall have the right to take full part in the proceedings of the Plenary Assembly but without voting rights unless they are elected delegates.

j. The proceedings of the Plenary Assembly shall be conducted by a Presidium elected by the Assembly for its duration.

k. The proceedings of the Plenary Assembly shall be conducted in accordance with rules of procedure to be proposed by the Governing Board and approved by the Plenary Assembly.

l. Every delegate shall have one vote in the Plenary Assembly.

m. Decisions of the Plenary Assembly shall be by a simple majority of those present and voting unless otherwise provided in this Constitution.

Article 7. The General Council

a. The General Council shall receive and may review reports from the Governing Board and/or the Executive and shall determine the general policies of the organization between sessions of the Plenary Assembly. It may by a two-thirds vote convene an extraordinary session of the Plenary Assembly.

b. The General Council shall meet in regular session biennially but shall not meet in the year in which a session of the Plenary Assembly is held.

c. An extraordinary session of the General Council may be summoned at any time by the Executive and shall be summoned by the Executive upon the request of two thirds of the members of the Council.

d. There shall be three categories of members of the General Council : full, associate, and honorary.

e. Full members of the General Council shall be :

- (1) the members of the Governing Board;
- (2) holders of offices so designated by the Plenary Assembly or the General Council;
- (3) members so nominated as its representatives by a national or international body, according to a key fixed by the Plenary Assembly, which shall take into account the representation of such bodies on the Governing Board.

f. Associate members of the General Council shall be :

- (1) holders of offices so designated by the Plenary Assembly or the General Council;
- (2) members so nominated as its representatives by a national or international body, according to a key fixed by the Plenary Assembly.

g. Honorary members of the General Council shall be such persons as may be elected by the Plenary Assembly or the General Council.

h. Associate and honorary members shall have the right to take full part in meetings of the General Council but without voting rights.

i. Members of the General Council nominated by a national or international body shall serve at the pleasure of such body but in the case of representatives of national bodies only so long as such member shall be a resident of the country in which such body is located.

j. The number of members of the General Council and the key for the election of its full and associate members shall be fixed by the Plenary Assembly.

k. The number of full or associate members representing a national body shall be determined with due regard to the size of the Jewish population of the respective country but no country shall be entitled to more than two fifths of the total number of such members.

l. The total number of members representing international bodies in associate status shall be not more than one fifth of the total membership of the Council.

m. The General Council shall have the right, by a two-thirds vote, to increase the total number of full members and/or associate members by one fifth and designate the national or international bodies entitled to elect such additional members.

n. The General Council shall establish regional Branches for Europe, Israel, Latin America, and North America and for such other areas as it finds appropriate, consisting of all the members of the General Council located in the respective areas, and determine the responsibilities thereof.

Article 8. The Governing Board

a. The Governing Board shall govern the World Jewish Congress between meetings of the General Council, in accordance with policies laid down by the Plenary Assembly or the General Council. The decisions of the Governing Board shall be reported to the next meeting of the General Council.

b. The Governing Board shall meet in regular session twice a year at a time and place to be designated by the Executive.

c. An extraordinary session of the Governing Board may be summoned at any time by the Executive. An extraordinary session of the Governing Board shall be convened upon the request of one third of its members, provided that not more than one such extraordinary session shall be called in this manner in any one twelve-month period.

d. The Governing Board shall have the power to establish, as subsidiary organs, standing commissions on international, cultural, organizational, and other affairs, shall elect their chairmen, and shall determine the responsibilities of such commissions and the frequency of the meetings thereof.

e. The Governing Board shall consist of :

- (1) the members of the Executive;
- (2) the chairmen of the standing commissions;
- (3) the directors of the departments of the World Jewish Congress;
- (4) the directors of the regional Branches;
- (5) members appointed by various national bodies of the World

Jewish Congress, in accordance with a key fixed by the Plenary Assembly;

- (6) members appointed by international bodies in associate status designated by the Plenary Assembly to receive such representation;
- (7) the Governing Board may, by a two-thirds vote, grant representation on the Governing Board to new bodies joining the World Jewish Congress between sessions of the Plenary Assembly.

f. The Executive, the president, or the chairman of the Governing Board may invite other persons to participate in meetings of the Governing Board but without voting rights.

Article 9. The Executive

a. The Executive shall conduct the affairs and act on behalf of the World Jewish Congress, in accordance with the decisions of the Governing Board, between meetings of the Governing Board. The decisions of the Executive shall be reported to the next meeting of the Governing Board.

b. The Executive shall consist of :

- (1) the president;
- (2) the vice-presidents;
- (3) the chairman of the Governing Board;
- (4) the chairman of the General Council;
- (5) the treasurer or treasurers;
- (6) the chairmen of the regional Branches;
- (7) the secretary-general.

The Executive may establish a smaller committee from among its members to conduct the day-to-day activities of the World Jewish Congress between meetings of the Executive.

c. The Executive shall meet at least four times a year, provided that two of such meetings each year shall be held in conjunction with a meeting of the Governing Board, a meeting of the General Council, or a meeting of the Plenary Assembly. The Executive may also be convened in special session on the call of the president or upon the request of one third of its members.

Article 10. Officers, Elections

a. The officers of the World Jewish Congress shall be :

- (1) the president;

- (2) one or more vice-presidents;
- (3) one or more honorary vice-presidents;
- (4) the chairman of the Governing Board;
- (5) the chairman of the General Council;
- (6) the chairman of each regional Branch;
- (7) one or two treasurers; in the event of one, a co-treasurer or deputy treasurer may be elected;
- (8) the secretary-general.

b. The Plenary Assembly shall elect the officers of the World Jewish Congress, who shall continue in office until the next Plenary Assembly, except that chairmen of regional Branches shall be elected by the Plenary Assembly on the recommendation of the respective Branches and hold office at the pleasure of the Branches only as long as they reside in their respective areas.

c. Heads of departments of the World Jewish Congress shall be appointed by the Governing Board subject to the approval of the General Council.

Regional directors will be appointed by the Governing Board in consultation with the respective Branch, subject to the approval of the General Council.

d. In the event of a vacancy in the office of president, the Executive shall within three months call a special meeting of the Governing Board and propose to it the designation of an acting president. The Governing Board shall thereupon elect an acting president, who shall exercise all the powers and duties of the president until the next meeting of the General Council, which shall elect a new president, who shall hold office until the next Plenary Assembly.

e. A vacancy in any other office shall be filled by the Governing Board, subject to ratification by the General Council, except that vacancies in the office of chairmen of regional Branches shall be filled by the Governing Board upon the recommendation of the respective Branch and subject to ratification by the General Council.

f. Any officer elected by the Governing Board shall assume the duties and privileges of such office but only until the next meeting of the General Council, at which the election of such officer shall be ratified or a new person elected in his place.

Article 11. Budget and Finance

a. The revenue of the World Jewish Congress shall include :

- (1) contributions of participating communities and organizations to be determined in accordance with a key to be adopted by the Plenary Assembly and/or the General Council;

(2) other voluntary contributions from organizations or individuals or other sources.

b. The Plenary Assembly shall establish a Budget and Finance Commission and elect its chairman. The Assembly may designate its members or authorize the Governing Board to do so and to name additional members. The treasurers, co-treasurer, and deputy treasurer shall be ex-officio member of the Budget and Finance Commission.

c. The annual budget shall be submitted to and approved by the Governing Board. Whenever, for any reason, the Governing Board is unable to adopt the annual budget, the Executive may adopt a provisional budget, which shall be in effect until the next meeting of the Governing Board.

Article 12. Amendments

This Constitution may be amended by a Plenary Assembly at which no less than half of the national bodies comprising the World Jewish Congress are represented. Amendments require a two-thirds majority vote.

Article 13. Registration or Incorporation

If necessary for the effective operation and conduct of the World Jewish Congress and its affairs, the Executive is empowered to take appropriate measures for registration or incorporation in any country or countries and with any authority or organization and to establish any foundation, trust, tax-exempt corporation, or not-for-profit corporation to receive voluntary contributions from any sources.

Article 14. Procedural rules

a. The quorum for any meeting of any organ of the World Jewish Congress shall be a simple majority of all those entitled to vote at that meeting, except as to Article 12.

b. In determining whether or not sufficient votes have been cast to constitute the specified majority, only the votes of those present and voting, exclusive of abstentions, shall be counted.

Article 15. Effective date

The Constitution, as amended by the Sixth Plenary Assembly, held in 1975, shall come into force immediately.

2. FUNCTIONS OF THE REGIONAL BRANCHES

Pursuant to Article 7n of the Constitution, the Plenary Assembly, acting for the General Council, provides :

- (1) The regional Branches now existing in Europe, Israel, Latin America, and North America shall continue.
- (2) In the event of any doubt or dispute as to which regional Branch a community or national organization shall belong to, that community or organization shall itself choose the appropriate regional Branch.
- (3) Each regional Branch shall nominate a chairman and recommend his election to the first Plenary Assembly held after such nomination.
- (4) A chairman of a regional Branch elected by a Plenary Assembly shall continue in office until the next Plenary Assembly but shall hold office at the pleasure of the Branch and only as long as he resides in the geographical area of such Branch.
- (5) If a regional Branch nominates a chairman explicitly on the basis of the office he holds in a community or national organization affiliated with that Branch, such person shall serve as chairman only so long as he retains that office in such community or organization.
- (6) A vacancy in the office of chairman of a regional Branch shall be filled by the Governing Board upon the recommendation of the Branch, subject to ratification by the General Council.
- (7) A regional Branch may elect other officers, fix their term of office, and determine their duties and privileges.
- (8) Each regional Branch shall meet periodically but at least once a year.
- (9) Each regional Branch shall take such action as it deems appropriate regarding any problem of concern to the region, as long as such action is not in contradiction to the aims and purposes of the World Jewish Congress or its general policies as laid down by the Plenary Assembly or the General Council. Wherever a regional Branch wishes to change an established policy of the World Jewish Congress or where no such policy exists and the matter appears controversial to the regional Branch, it may recommend action to the governing

organs of the World Jewish Congress. On all other issues the regional Branches are free to take action implementing the policies of the World Jewish Congress.

- (10) At the request of a regional Branch, the Governing Board will place an item for discussion or decision on the agenda of its next meeting.
- (11) A regional Branch may adopt bylaws governing its procedures and, for regional purposes only, may co-opt as members, affiliates, or observers of that Branch any individual or organization. It may also establish permanent commissions.

3. ELECTION OF HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS AND REGIONAL DIRECTORS

The incumbent heads of departments and regional directors will be elected by the Plenary Assembly.

Article 10c of the revised Constitution will apply to their successors and to positions which may be created in the future.

4. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE COMPOSITION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL AND THE GOVERNING BOARD

- I. In application of Article 7e (3) and f(2) of the Constitution, the Sixth Plenary Assembly determines, for the period until the next Plenary Assembly, the key of representation of national and international bodies on the General Council, as indicated below. Also taking into account Article 7e (1) and (2), f(1), and g, and Article 4c of the Constitution, the General Council will therefore be composed of :

- 1. Members of Governing Board
- 2. Other ex-officio members of the General Council
- 3. Honorary members of the General Council

4. Representatives of national organizations :

		Full	Associate
Argentina	(in Gov. Board 2)	4	5
Australia	(in Gov. Board 1)	2	1
Austria		1	1
Belgium		2	—
Bolivia		1	—
Brazil	(in Gov. Board 1)	2	2
Canada	(in Gov. Board 2)	2	2
Chile		2	1
Colombia		1	—
Costa Rica		—	1
Cuba		—	1
Curaçao		—	1
Denmark		1	—
Dominican Republic		—	1
Ecuador		—	1
El Salvador		—	1
Ethiopia		—	1
Finland		—	1
France	(in Gov. Board 2)	5	6
Germany		2	—
Great Britain	(in Gov. Board 2)	4	5
Greece		1	—
Guatemala		—	1
Honduras		—	1
Hong Kong		—	1
India		1	1
Iran	(in Gov. Board 1)	1	1
Ireland		1	—
Israel	(in Gov. Board 4)	16	4
Italy		2	—
Jamaica		—	1
Japan		—	1
Kenya		—	1
Luxembourg		—	1
Mexico		2	1
Monaco		—	1
Netherlands		1	1
New Zealand		—	1
Nicaragua		—	1
Norway		—	1
Panama		—	1
Paraguay		—	1
Peru		1	—
Philippines		—	1
Portugal		—	1
Rhodesia		1	—

Rumania	(in Gov. Board 1)	1	—
Spain		1	—
Surinam		—	1
Sweden		1	1
Switzerland		1	1
United States	(in Gov. Board 7)	27	12
Uruguay		2	1
Venezuela		1	1
Yugoslavia		1	—
Zaire		—	1
Zambia		—	1

5. Representatives of associated international organizations :

Brit Ivrit Olamit		1	—
Federación de Comunidades Judías de Centro América y Panamá (FEDECO)		1	—
Independent Zionist Movement		1	—
International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists		1	—
International Council of Jewish Women (in Gov. Board 1)		3	—
International Union of Mapam Parties		1	—
Skandinavisk Jødisk Ungdoms-Forbund (SJUF)		1	—
Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO) (in Gov. Board 1)		3	—
World Confederation of United Zionists		1	—
World Federation of Hungarian Jews		1	—
World Federation of Jewish Fighters, Partisans, and Camp Inmates		1	—
World Federation of Jewish Journalists		1	—
World Federation of Polish Jews		1	—
World Labor Zionist Movement		1	—
World Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi Organization		1	—
World OSE Union		1	—
World Sephardi Federation (in Gov. Board 1)		3	—
World Union for Progressive Judaism (in Gov. Board 1)		3	—
World Union of General Zionists		1	—
World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS) (in Gov. Board 1)		3	—
World Union of Poale Agudat Israel		1	—
World Union of Tnuat HaHerut-Hatzohar		1	—

6. Representatives of international organizations with special relationship :			
World Zionist Organization			
(in Gov. Board 4)	5	—	
7. South Africa (by special invitation)	(in Gov. Board 1)	2	2
8. Youth delegates	(in Gov. Board 4)	17	—

II. In application of Article 8e (5) and (6) of the Constitution, the Sixth Plenary Assembly designates, for the period until the next Plenary Assembly, the national and international bodies that will be represented on the Governing Board, in the numbers stated below. Also taking into account Article 8e (1), (2), (3), and (4), and Article 4c of the Constitution, the Governing Board will therefore be composed of :

1. Members of Executive

2. Chairmen of standing commissions :

International Affairs	1	
Cultural	1	
Organization	1	
Budget & Finance	<u>1</u>	4

3. Heads of departments and directors of regional Branches	6
--	---

4. Representatives of national organizations :

United States	7	
Israel	4	
Argentina	2	
Canada	2	
France	2	
Great Britain	2	
Australia	1	
Brazil	1	
Iran	1	
Rumania	1	
Rotating members from small communities	<u>8</u>	31

5. Representatives of associated international organizations :		
Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO)	1	
World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS)	1	
World Sephardi Feder- ation	1	
World Union for Progressive Judaism	1	
International Council of Jewish Women	1	5
6. Representatives of international organizations with special relationship :		
World Zionist Organization		4
7. South Africa (by special invitation)		1
8. Youth Delegates		4

5. RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING YOUTH DELEGATES

The Sixth Plenary Assembly recommends that a subcommittee be set up to consider the selection and the financing of representation of youth and their participation in the General Council.

6. BUDGET

The Sixth Plenary Assembly decides the following procedure for the preparation of the annual budget of the World Jewish Congress :

The Executive shall prepare annually, for budget purposes, a series of programmatic and priority guidelines. Thereafter, the treasurer(s), in consultation with the Budget and Finance Commission, shall prepare a detailed budget for the coming year, which shall also contain measures to ensure compliance therewith and authorization for transfers from one budget item to another.

D. ELECTIONS

1. EXECUTIVE

President :	Dr. Nahum Goldmann
Vice-Presidents :	Dr. Nessim D. Gaon Rabbi Dr. Arthur Hertzberg Mr. Samuel Norich Rabbi Dr. Joachim Prinz Mr. Ezra Z. Shapiro
Chairman, Governing Board :	Mr. Philip M. Klutznick
Chairman, General Council :	Mr. Leon A. Dulzin
Chairman, World Zionist Organization :	Mr. Pinhas Sapir
Regional Chairmen :	
North America :	Mr. Edgar M. Bronfman
Latin America :	Mr. Gregorio Faigón
Europe :	Lord Fisher of Camden
Israel :	Mr. Itzhak Korn
Treasurer :	Mr. Sol Kanee
Secretary-General :	Dr. Gerhart M. Riegner

2. HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

Dr. Moisés Goldman
Rabbi Dr. Israel Goldstein
Prof. Aryeh Tartakower

3. CHAIRMAN, BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMISSION

Mr. Edgar M. Bronfman

4. HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

International Affairs Department :	Mr. Armand Kaplan
Institute of Jewish Affairs :	Dr. Stephen J. Roth
Cultural Department :	Mr. Itzhak Harkavi

5. REGIONAL DIRECTORS

North America :	Mr. Max Melamet
Latin America :	Mr. Marc Turkow
Europe :	Dr. Stephen J. Roth
Israel :	Dr. Natan Lerner

6. HONORARY MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

Mr. Monroe Abbey
Mr. Aba Bornstein
Mr. Alexander L. Easterman
Mr. Jacob Halévy
Mrs. Rose L. Halprin
Mr. Izhak Nathani
Prof. André Neher
Dr. Maurice L. Perlzweig
Mr. Shad Polier
Dr. Aaron Steinberg
Mr. Hilel Storch

7. EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

Director,	
Rome Office :	Mr. Fritz Becker
Associate Director,	
Paris Office :	Mr. Jacques Lazarus
Legal Adviser :	Dr. Friedrich L. Brassloff

APPENDIX III.

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSEMBLY

I. OFFICERS

Leadership Group

GOLDMANN, Dr. Nahum	– President.
PRINZ, Dr. Joachim	– Chairman, Governing Council.
SAPIR, Mr. Pinhas	– Chairman, Executive, World Zionist Organization.
RIEGNER, Dr. Gerhart M.	– Secretary-General.

Other Officers

GOLDENBERG, Dr. Isaac	– Chairman, Latin American Branch.
GOLDSTEIN, Dr. Israel	– Honorary Vice-President.
KORN, Mr. Itzhak	– Chairman, Israel Branch.
LEVENBERG, Dr. Schneier	– Chairman, International Affairs Commission.

II. HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS, REGIONAL DIRECTORS, AND EX-OFFICIO AND HONORARY MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE

Heads of Departments and Regional Directors

HARKAVI, Mr. Itzhak	– Head, Cultural Department.
KAPLAN, Mr. Armand	– Director, International Affairs Department.
LERNER, Dr. Natan	– Executive Director, Israel Branch.
MELAMET, Mr. Max	– Executive Director, North American Branch.
ROTH, Dr. Stephen J.	– Executive Director, European Branch; Director, Institute of Jewish Affairs.
TURKOW, Mr. Marc	– Executive Director, Latin American Branch.

Ex-Officio Members of the Executive

BECKER, Mr. Fritz	– Director, Rome Office.
BRASSLOFF, Dr. Friedrich L.	– Legal Adviser.
LAZARUS, Mr. Jacques	– Associate Director, Paris Office.

Honorary Members of the Executive

EASTERMAN, Mr. Alexander L.
PERLZWEIG, Dr. Maurice L.

III. DELEGATES

A. Representatives of National Member Organizations

ARGENTINA :

DELEGATION OF ARGENTINE JEWISH ASSOCIATIONS (DAIA)

Delegates

CAMJI, Mr. Moisés
EDENBURG, Mr. Simón

ELBAUM, Dr. Pedro

EPSTEIN, Mrs. Catalina
FUCMAN, Dr. Jaime

GEIMANAS, Mr. Salomón

GESANG, Mr. Herzl
HILLER, Mr. Abraham

HORBACOVSKY, Mr. Andrés

JAIMOVICH, Mr. Luis
MENASCE, Dr. José

MILMANIENE, Dr. José E.
ONIK, Mr. Moisés

PALUCH, Mr. León

RAJCHEMBERG, Ing. Chaim

RESNIZKY, Dr. Nehemías
ROFMAN, Mr. Jacobo
ZUGMAN, Mr. Natán

Alternate

BESNOSOFF, Mr. Ruben

- Deputy Secretary, DAIA.
- Representative, Argentine Zionist Organization.
- Secretary, Jewish Community, La Plata.
- President, WIZO Argentina.
- Board Member, DAIA; Member, Executive, Argentine Zionist Organization.
- Member, Presidium, Argentine Zionist Organization.
- Vice-President, DAIA.
- Representative, Latin American Student Zionist Federation (FUSLA).
- Representative, Argentine Jewish Youth Confederation.
- President, DAIA Branch, Córdoba.
- Board Member, DAIA; Secretary-General, Sephardic Zionist Movement, Argentina.
- Deputy Secretary, DAIA.
- Treasurer, Jewish Community, Buenos Aires (AMIA).
- Secretary, Cultural & Information Department, Jewish Community, Buenos Aires (AMIA).
- President, Jewish Community, Buenos Aires (AMIA).
- President, DAIA.
- Board Member, DAIA.
- Secretary-General, Argentine Zionist Organization.
- Vice-President, DAIA Branch, Santa Fé.

AUSTRALIA :

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIAN JEWRY

Delegates

COOPER, Mr. Harry
FALK, Mr. Gerald Y., OBE, JP

GOOT, Mr. Robert M.

JACOBSON, Mr. Nathan, OBE
LEVI, Rabbi John

SCHNEEWEISS, Dr. Joachim

Alternate

COOPER, Mrs. Hadassa

- Youth Chairman, ECAJ.
- Member, Executive, ECAJ; Acting President, New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies.
- Secretary, New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies; Youth Delegate.
- President, ECAJ.
- Chairman, Anti-Defamation Sub-Committee, Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies.
- Councillor, ECAJ.

- Youth Delegate.

AUSTRIA :

FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF AUSTRIA

Delegates

ACKERMANN, Mr. Ernst

CHARIM, Dr. Daniel

PICK, Dr. Anton

- Representative, Jewish Community, Vienna.
- President, Association of Jewish Students in Austria.
- President, Jewish Community, Vienna.

BELGIUM :

WJC BELGIAN SECTION

Delegates

GOLDSCHMIDT, Me Alexis
GUTMAN, Mr. Abraham Henri
SUSSKIND, Mr. David
WEINBERGER, Miss Simone

Alternate

KATZ, Mr. Roger D.

- President.
- Secretary-General.
- Vice-President.
- Youth Delegate.

- Board Member.

BOLIVIA :

CENTRAL JEWISH COMMITTEE OF BOLIVIA

Delegate

HUN, Mr. Elias

- Former Chairman, JCCB; Former Chairman, Zionist Federation, Bolivia.

BRAZIL :

Executive

MILNITZKY, Dr. Benno

Delegates

BANACH, Miss Celia Eliza

BURLA, Mrs. Anita

BURLA, Dr. Eliezer

HAMAOU, Mr. Nessim

KATZ, Mr. Heinz Leo

LEON, Mr. Claudio

ORENSTEIN, Mr. Jojchem

PORTNOI, Mr. Abram Idel

PORTNOI, Mrs. Ida Gruman

SOBEL, Rabbi Henry I.

ZALCBERG, Mr. Chaim

Alternates

SCHECHTMAN, Mr. Aron

SCHECHTMAN, Mrs. Esther

CANADA :

Delegates

ABBEY, Mr. Monroe, QC

BECKER, Mr. Lavy M.

EISNER, Mr. Jack

HARRIS, Mr. Sydney M., QC

KRONITZ, Dr. Leon

LAZARUS, Mr. Berl

MEYER, Prof. Perry, QC

ROSE, Mr. Alan

TEITELBAUM, Mr. Leon

Alternates

ABBEY, Mrs. Minnie

JEWISH CONFEDERATION OF BRAZIL

— President, JCB.

— Representative, Latin American Student Zionist Federation (FUSLA).

— Vice-President, WIZO, Rio de Janeiro.

— Vice-President, JCB; President, Jewish Federation, Rio de Janeiro.

— Vice-President, Board, Congregação Israelita Paulista, São Paulo; Youth Delegate.

— Vice-President, Jewish Federation, São Paulo.

— Vice-President, South American Sephardic Federation.

— Vice-President, Zionist Organization, Brazil.

— Treasurer, Zionist Organization, Brazil.

— Representative, JCB.

— Rabbi, Congregação Israelita Paulista, São Paulo.

— President, Chevra Kadisha, Rio de Janeiro.

— Board Member, Chevra Kadisha, Rio de Janeiro.

— Representative, JCB.

CANADIAN JEWISH CONGRESS

— Honorary President.

— Former Chairman, National Executive Committee.

— Secretary-General, Canadian Union of Jewish Students.

— National President.

— Immediate Past Chairman, National Executive Committee.

— National Chairman, Canadian Union of Jewish Students.

— Chairman, National Executive Committee.

— National Executive Director.

— Chairman, Eastern Region.

— Member, National Council.

BECKER, Mrs. Augusta
NACHSHEN, Mr. Israel

- Representative.
- Vice-Chairman, Canadian Friends of Pioneering Israel (Mapam).

CHILE :

**REPRESENTATIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY
OF CHILE**

Delegates

MOIS, Mr. Alberto

- Vice-President, RCJCC; President, Sephardic Jewish Community, Santiago.
- President, RCJCC.
- Vice-President, RCJCC; Vice-President, Círculo Israelita.

SINAY, Mr. Gil
WURGAFT, Mr. Samuel

Alternates

ARENSBURG, Mr. Isidoro

- Former Consultant, RCJCC; Former President, Maccabi Chile.
- President, WIZO Chile; President, Council of Jewish Women's Organizations, Chile.

COGAN, Mrs. Renée

COLOMBIA :

**FEDERATION OF JEWISH
COMMUNITIES OF COLOMBIA**

Delegate

RABINOVICH, Dr. Boris

- Member, Executive.

COSTA RICA :

**JEWISH ZIONIST CENTER
OF COSTA RICA**

Delegate

BARUCH, Lic. Bernardo

- Vice-President.

Alternate

BARUCH, Mrs. Eva

- Representative.

CURAÇAO :

JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Delegate

ACKERMAN, Dr. Paul

- Co-President, JCC; President, Congregation Shaarei Tsedek.

DENMARK :

**THE JEWISH COMMUNITY
OF COPENHAGEN**

Delegates

FOIGHTEL, Prof. Dr. Isi
LEXNER, Mr. Michael

- Former President.
- Board Member; Youth Delegate.

EL SALVADOR :

**JEWISH COMMUNITY OF
EL SALVADOR**

Delegate

FREUND, Mrs. Lea

— Representative.

FINLAND :

**CENTRAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH
COMMUNITIES IN FINLAND**

Delegate

HASAN, Mr. Faivel Schraga

— Vice-Chairman.

Alternate

KAHAN, Mr. Josef

— Board Member, Jewish Community,
Helsinki.

FRANCE :

WJC FRENCH SECTION

Executive

ABIHSSIRA, Mr. Jack

— President, Zionist Movement of Jews
of North African Origin (Siona).

AMAR, Prof. André

— President, United Jewish Appeal of
France.

BULAWKO, Mr. Henry

— Member, Bureau Restreint, WJC
French Section.

HADDAD, Me Charles

— Member, Bureau Restreint, WJC
French Section.

LAMBERT, Me David

— Member, Bureau Restreint, WJC
French Section.

LAZARUS, Mr. Jacques

— Member, Bureau Restreint, WJC
French Section.

SZEJNER, Mr. Sender

— Member, Bureau Restreint, WJC
French Section.

Delegates

BANNER, Mr. René

— Board Member, Consistoire Israélite,
Haut-Rhin.

BERAHA, Mr. Isy

— President, Consistoire Israélite,
Marseilles.

EHRlich, Mr. Charles

— President, Consistoire Israélite, Bas-
Rhin.

ERLICH, Me Sasia

— Head, Cultural & Information
Department, WIZO France.

FRANK-FORTER, Mr. Isidor

— Chairman, Mizrachi France; President,
Jewish Community, Troyes & l'Aube.

GERSCHEL, Mr. Jean-Pierre

— President, Jewish Community, Lille.

GREILSAMMER, Mr. Marcel

— Vice-President, Fonds Social Juif
Unifié; Honorary President, Union
Libérale Israélite de France.

GRYNFOGEL, Dr. Maurice

— President, Jewish Community,
Toulouse.

GUTKIN, Mr. Marc	– Chairman, Executive Committee, Herut France.
KORENHANDLER, Mr. Chaskiel	– Secretary, Yiddish Sector, Cultural Commission, WJC French Section.
LERMAN, Mr. Mordechaj	– Secretary-General, Federation of Jewish Societies of France.
MELMAN, Mr. Israël	– Member, Executive, Cercle Bernard Lazare.
ORFUS, Mr. Jacques	– Delegate, Consistoire Israélite du Rhône; Member, WJC World Executive.
OUAKNIN, Rabbi Jacques	– Chief Rabbi, Consistoire Israélite de la Moselle.
ROZANOWICZ, Mr. Guy	– Chairman, Union of Jewish Students, France.
SAFIRSTEIN (CAROL), Mr. Abram Wolf	– Secretary-General, Union of Jewish Societies of France.
WARSZAWSKI (VARSAT), Mr. Izak	– Secretary-General, European Confederation of United Zionists; Associate Member, WJC World Executive.
WEILL, Prof. Robert	– Representative, Consistoire Israélite de la Gironde.
<i>Alternates</i>	
BARSZCZEWSKI (KORMAN), Mr. Julian	– Member, Presidium, Union of Jewish Societies of France.
CYTRON, Mr. Alain	– President, Jewish Community, Roanne.
DEIFT, Mr. Adolphe	– Vice-President, Jewish Community, Nancy.
DREYFUS-SCHMIDT, Me Michel	– WJC Representative, Jewish Community, Belfort.
GLUCK, Mr. Ernest	– President, Jewish Community, Nantes.
GUEDJ, Mr. Albert	– President, Jewish Community, Antibes – Juan-les-Pins.
HALIMI, Me Rolland	– President, Jewish Community, Perpignan.
HONIGBAUM, Mrs. Rachel	– Board Member, WIZO France.
LAZARE, Mr. Jean-Claude	– President, Jewish Community, Mulhouse.
MASSIAH, Mr. Albert	– Chairman, Union of Jewish Students, Bordeaux.
PARTOUCHE, Mr. André	– Secretary-General, Jewish Community, Valence.
SAUL, Mr. Albert	– Secretary-General, Jewish Community, Limoges.
SOFFER, Mr. Elie	– Secretary-General, Federation of Jewish Ex-Servicemen and Volunteers.
WOLF, Mr. Bernard	– Representative, Jewish Community, Thionville.

ZARD, Mr. Roger

- President, Jewish Community, Angers.

GERMANY :

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF JEWS IN GERMANY

Executive

NACHMANN, Mr. Werner

- President, Board of Directors.

Delegates

AUGAPFEL, Mr. Shlomo

- Youth Delegate.

GINSBURG, Mr. Alexander

- Secretary-General.

NEUWALD, Mr. Kurt

- Board Member.

WEICHSELBAUM, Mr. Alfred

- Board Member, Central Welfare Agency of Jews in Germany.

WILLNER, Mr. Max

- Director, Central Welfare Agency of Jews in Germany.

GREAT BRITAIN :

(With the approval of certain constitutional changes by the Assembly on February 6, the Board of Deputies of British Jews succeeded the WJC British Section as the representative of British Jewry in the WJC. Full delegations from both bodies participated in the Sixth Plenary Assembly.)

WJC BRITISH SECTION

Executive

BORNSTEIN, Mr. Aba

- Vice-President, Mizrahi-Hapoel Hamizrachi Federation, Great Britain.

GOLD, Mr. Sidney Walter

- Vice-President, WJC British Section; Member, Board of Deputies.

HALEVY, Mr. Jacob

- Chairman, WJC British Section; Member, Board of Deputies.

LEDERMAN, Mr. Morris

- Member, WJC World Executive; Member, Board of Deputies.

LEVENE, Mr. Mordecai

- Vice-Chairman, WJC British Section; Chairman, Brit Ivrit Olamit, London.

MADANES, Dr. Edward Simon

- Vice-President, British Poale Zion; Vice-President, Zionist Federation Great Britain.

NATHANI, Mr. Izhak

- President, Mapam Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.

ORBACH, Mr. Maurice, MP

- Member, WJC World Executive.

SHIPTON, Mr. Sidney L.

- Vice-Chairman, WJC British Section; General Secretary, Zionist Federation, Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.

SILK, Mr. Donald, CC

- Vice-Chairman, WJC British Section; Member, Board of Deputies.

Delegates

BAUM, Mr. Karl	- Chairman, National Council of Jews from Czechoslovakia; Member, Board of Deputies.
BENJAMIN, Mr. Malvyn	- Vice-President, Herut Movement, Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.
EVNINE, Mr. George Alexander	- General Secretary, Herut Movement, Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.
FRYDMAN, Rabbi Meyer	- Executive Vice-President, Mizrahi-Hapoel Hamizrachi Federation, Great Britain; Vice-President, WJC British Section; Member, Board of Deputies.
GERTNER, Mr. Levi	- Director, Education Department, Zionist Federation, Great Britain.
GOURGEY, Mr. Percy Sassoon, MBE	- Joint Honorary Treasurer, WJC British Section; Member, Board of Deputies.
KLAUSNER, Mr. Menny	- Chairman, Mizrahi-Hapoel Hamizrachi Federation, Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.
LEDERMAN, Mrs. Rita	- Member, Executive, WJC British Section.
LEW, Rabbi Maurice A.	- Vice-President, Zionist Federation, Great Britain.
MARCUS, Mr. Solli	- Chairman, Mapam Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.
MOONMAN, Mr. Eric, MP	- Vice-Chairman, WJC British Section; Chairman, British Poale Zion; Member, Board of Deputies.
PETRIE, Mrs. Hedva F.	- Honorary Secretary, Brit Ivrit Olamit, London.
TROMPETER, Mr. Nysen	- Vice-President, WJC British Section; Treasurer, Association of Jews of Polish Origin, Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.

Alternate

SEBBA, Mr. Samuel	- President, Association of Baltic Jews in Great Britain.
-------------------	---

BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS

Delegates

FIDLER, Alderman Michael M., JP	- Chairman, Foreign Affairs & Soviet Jewry Actions Committees.
FISHER OF CAMDEN, The Rt. Hon. Lord	- President.
FISHMAN, Mr. Asher	- Chairman, Shechita Committee.
GOURGEY, Mr. Percy Sassoon, MBE	- Chairman, Aliens Committee.

JANNER OF LEICESTER, The Rt.
Hon. Lord

JANNER, The Hon. Greville E.,
QC, MP

LEDERMAN, Mr. Morris

LEVENBERG, Dr. Schneier

LINDEN, Mr. Andrew

MITCHELL, Mrs. Eva

ROTH, Dr. Stephen J.

SAVITT, Mr. Martin

SILK, Mr. Donald, CC

TACK, Capt. David

WINSTON-FOX, Mrs. Ruth, JP

Alternates

BRAUDE, Dr. Jacob

DUNITZ, Mr. Alfred

HALEVY, Mr. Jacob

JACOBS, Mrs. June

NATHANI, Mr. Izhak

- Chairman, Eretz Israel Committee.
- Senior Vice-President.
- President, Federation of Synagogues, Great Britain.
- Vice-President.
- Israel Officer, Union of Jewish Students, Great Britain.
- Chairman, Reform Synagogues of Great Britain; Member, Foreign Affairs Committee, Board of Deputies.
- Vice-Chairman, Foreign Affairs & Soviet Jewry Actions Committees; Member, Executive Committee.
- Chairman, Jewish Defence & Group Relations Committee.
- Member, Executive & Foreign Affairs Committees.
- National Chairman, Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen and Women (AJEX); Member, Foreign Affairs Committee, Board of Deputies.
- Chairman, Education & Youth Committee.
- Vice-Chairman, Law & Parliamentary Committee; Member, Executive & Foreign Affairs Committees.
- Member, Foreign Affairs Committee.
- Member, Foreign Affairs Committee.
- Member, Foreign Affairs Committee.
- Member, Foreign Affairs Committee.

GREECE :

Delegates

LEON, Miss Rachel Kelly

LOVINGER, Mr. Joseph

SABETAI, Rabbi Elie

Alternates

AROUH, Miss Alice

ELIEZER, Mr. Lazaros

**CENTRAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH
COMMUNITIES OF GREECE**

- Member, Youth Council.
- President.
- Representative.
- Member, Youth Council.
- President, Rehabilitation Organization of the Greek Jewish Communities (OPAIE).

GUATEMALA :

See FEDECO.

HONDURAS :

See FEDECO.

INDIA :

**CENTRAL JEWISH BOARD
OF INDIA**

Delegates

CYNOWICZ, Mr. Hersh

— President, CJBI; Chairman, United Jewish Appeal, India.

KOLET, Mr. Ezra

— President, Jewish Community, New Delhi.

RAYMOND, Miss Judith

— Youth Delegate.

IRAN :

CENTRAL JEWISH COMMITTEE

Delegates

ABIR, Mr. Avraham

— Youth Delegate.

AGHAI, Dr. Soleiman

— Treasurer.

COHEN, Mr. Youssef

— Vice-President.

ELGHANAYAN, Mr. Habib

— President.

KERMANIAN, Mr. Moussa

— Secretary.

NAHAI, Mr. Khalil

— Board Member.

TOOMARI, Mr. Chanoviz

— Youth Delegate.

ZARINI, Mr. Shahriar

— Youth Delegate.

Alternates

AGHAI, Miss Zohara

— Board Member.

BENYAMIN, Mr. Shammuel

— Member, Central Fundraising Committee.

IRELAND :

**JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE
COUNCIL OF IRELAND**

Delegate

COHEN, The Very Rev. Dr. Isaac

— Chief Rabbi, Ireland.

ISRAEL :

WJC ISRAEL SECTION

Executive

ZABAN, Mr. Yair

— Chairman, Political Committee, Maki.

Delegates

ABRAMOV, Mr. Shneur Zalman

— Member of Knesset; Representative, Liberal Party.

AGMON, Mrs. Gisa

— Representative, Labor Party.

ARZI, Mr. Reuben

— Member, Secretariat & Political Committee, Mapam.

AVIZEMER, Mr. Shimon

— Member, Executive, Histadrut.

BENARI, Mr. Yehuda

— Director, Jabotinsky Museum.

BEN-DOV, Mr. Shabetai

— Member, WJC Israel Executive.

BERMAN, Dr. Adolf Abraham

— Member, Central Committee, Maki.

- BERNSTEIN, Mr. Zvi
- BIEGUN, Mr. Dov
BORTENSTEIN, Mr. Avraham
COHEN, Mr. Aharon
- DUNSKY, Mr. Israel
EISENBERG, Mr. Izaak
- EREM, Mr. Moshe
GORDON, Mr. Uri
- GOREN, Dr. Dina
- GOTHELF, Mr. Yehuda
GROSMAN, Mrs. Chaika
- GUEZ, Mrs. Mathilda
- HARKAVI, Mr. Itzhak
HIRSCH, Dr. Richard G.
KAHANA, Dr. Shmuel Zanwel
- KAHN, Mr. Chaim
- KATSAV, Mr. Moshe
- KERLER, Mr. Josef
- KESSE, Mr. Yona
KLEINER, Mr. Michael
KOHLMANN, Mr. Nachum
KORN, Mr. Itzhak
LANGNAS, Dr. Saul
- LANKER, Mr. Ygal
- LEV-RAN, Dr. Arie
MILIKOWSKI, Mr. Ron
NITZAN, Mr. Hayim
- PAZ, Mr. Yehuda
- POLLAK, Mr. Israel
RABINOWITZ, Rabbi Dr. Louis
Isaac
- REISS, Ing. Anselm
SHAMIR, Mr. Bunim
- SHEFFER, Mr. Eliezer
- Secretary-General, National Religious Party.
 - Representative, Labor Party.
 - Representative, Liberal Party.
 - Youth Delegate, National Religious Party.
 - Mayor, Kfar Shmaryahu.
 - Member, Central Committee, Liberal Party.
 - Member, WJC Israel Executive.
 - Chairman, Dor Hahemshech Department, World Zionist Organization.
 - Member, Secretariat, Citizen's Rights Movement.
 - Former Editor, *Davar*.
 - Member of Knesset; Representative, Mapam.
 - Member of Knesset; Representative, Labor Party.
 - Head, WJC Cultural Department.
 - Member, WJC Israel Executive.
 - Representative, National Religious Party.
 - Member, Secretariat, Poale Agudat Israel.
 - Vice-Chairman, Local Council, Kiryat Malachi.
 - Chairman, Yiddish Writers' Association, Jerusalem.
 - Member, WJC Israel Executive.
 - Chairman, Young Herut.
 - Youth Delegate, Liberal Party.
 - Chairman, WJC Israel Section.
 - Member, Central Committee, Liberal Party.
 - Vice-Chairman, National Union of Israel Students.
 - Member, WJC Israel Executive.
 - Member, WJC Israel Executive.
 - Member, Executive, National Religious Party.
 - Acting Director, Van Leer Jerusalem Foundation.
 - Representative, Labor Party.
 - Member, Executive Council, Jerusalem Municipality; Editor, *Encyclopaedia Judaica Year Book*.
 - Member, WJC Israel Executive.
 - Secretary-General, International Union of Mapam Parties.
 - Member, Executive, National Religious Party.

SHILANSKY, Mr. Dov
 SHMUELI, Mr. Itzhac
 SHOFMAN, Mr. Joseph
 SIMON, Mr. Jean
 STEIN, Prof. Gabriel

TARTAKOWER, Prof. Aryeh
 TUVIA, Mrs. Batsheva
 YOSEFI, Mr. Dov
 ZACKLER, Mrs. Esther P.

ZARMI, Mr. Meir
 ZILBERFARB, Mr. Shalom

Alternates

BAR-LAVIA (BALVASHVILI), Mr.
 Rafi

COHEN, Mr. Jean
 DAIAN, Mr. Mordechai

EVERCOHEN, Mr. Iosef

GREGO, Mr. Zeev

KIKOZASHVILI, Mr. David
 LANDAU, Dr. Rita

MEGRALASHVILI, Mr. Haim
 MOTZKIN, Dr. Aryeh Leo

TEITELBAUM, Mr. Raul

- Member, Executive, Herut.
- Journalist; Representative, Herut.
- Representative, Herut.
- Youth Delegate, Labor Party.
- Representative, Independent Liberal Party.
- Former Chairman, WJC Israel Section.
- Representative, State List.
- Representative, Herut.
- Member, Presidium, World Pioneer Women.
- Secretary-General, Labor Party.
- Member, Executive, National Religious Party.

- Secretary-General, Association of *Olim* from Georgia.
- Representative, Liberal Party.
- Secretary, World Union of General Zionists.
- Representative, Independent Liberal Party.
- Head, Arab Department, Liberal Party.
- Representative, Labor Party.
- Member, Central Committee, Liberal Party.
- Representative, Labor Party.
- Member, Council, Citizen's Rights Movement.
- Chairman, Central Committee, Maki.

ITALY :

Delegates

BAUER, Mr. Riccardo

BLAYER, Dr. Pietro
 SACERDOTI, Prof. Giorgio
 STEINHAUS, Dr. Federico

- Secretary-General, Italian Jewish Youth Youth Federation (FGEI).
- Vice-President, UIJC.
- Board Member, UIJC.
- Board Member, UIJC.

LUXEMBOURG :

Delegate

BULZ, Dr. Emmanuel

CONSISTOIRE ISRAELITE DE LUXEMBOURG

- Chief Rabbi, Luxembourg.

MEXICO :

**CENTRAL JEWISH COMMITTEE
OF MEXICO**

Delegates

BENBASSAT, Mr. José

JENO, Mr. Fernando

KRAUZE, Mr. José

NANKIN, Mr. Abraham

NUDELSTEJER, Mr. Sergio

Alternate

POLTOLAREK, Mr. Max

- Board Member, Sephardic Community of Mexico.
- President, CJCM.
- Board Member, CJCM.
- Board Member, CJCM.
- Secretary-General, CJCM.

- President, Jewish Community, Puebla.

NETHERLANDS :

**NETHERLANDS JEWISH
COMMUNITY**

Executive

ZADOKS, Mr. Izaak

- President.

Delegates

FINK, Chief Rabbi Menahem

VAN DER HAL, Dr. Josef Salamon

HEYMANS, Dr. David

SANDERS, Dr. Yochanan

SCHAAP, Mr. Eliezer

- Chief Rabbi, The Hague.
- Vice-Chairman.
- Board Member.
- Secretary-General.
- Chairman, Youth & Students Group, Holland.

Alternate

SOETENDORP, Rabbi Awraham

- Rabbi, Liberal Congregation, The Hague / Amsterdam.

NICARAGUA :

See FEDECO.

NORWAY :

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF OSLO

Delegate

KOKLIN, Mr. Charles

- Representative.

PANAMA :

**CENTRAL JEWISH COMMUNITY
COUNCIL OF PANAMA**

Delegates

GROBMAN, Mr. Aron

MIZRACHI, Mr. Moisés A.

- Treasurer, United Jewish Appeal, Panama.
- Vice-President, Shevet Ahim Congregation.

Alternate

LEVY, Rabbi Sion

- Rabbi, Panama Community.

PERU :

JEWISH ASSOCIATION OF PERU

Delegates

ACKERMAN BEHAR, Mr. Mordi

- Chairman, Council of Peruvian Jewish Youth.

ROSLER, Mr. León

- President, JAP.

TOPF, Mr. Eric

- President, Zionist Federation, Peru.

Alternates

HASSON, Prof. Yaacov

- Executive Director, Human Relations Office, Jewish Community.

WALLACH, Mr. Izak

- President, B'nai B'rith Lodge "Lima 1994".

PORTUGAL :

JEWISH COMMUNITY OF LISBON

Delegate

LEVY, Ing. Michel

- Representative.

RHODESIA :

**CENTRAL AFRICAN JEWISH
BOARD OF DEPUTIES**

Delegate

WAGNER, Mr. Maurice

- General Secretary.

RUMANIA :

**FEDERATION OF JEWISH
COMMUNITIES OF RUMANIA**

Delegates

BALUS, Mr. Martin

- Vice-President, Jewish Community, Bucharest.

CAUFMAN, Dr. Simon

- President, Jewish Community, Iasi.

ROSEN, Mrs. Amalia

- Representative, FJCR.

ROSEN, Chief Rabbi Dr. David
Moses

- Chief Rabbi, Rumania; President, FJCR.

RUSU, Mr. Victor

- Editor, *Revista Cultului Mozaic*.

SECHTER, Mr. Emil

- Secretary-General, FJCR.

SEGAL, Mr. Daniel

- President, Jewish Community, Bucharest.

Alternate

SECHTER, Mrs. Mina

- Representative, FJCR.

SPAIN :

Delegates

BENOLIEL, Mr. Albert

CARCIENTE BENARROCH,

Mr. Salomón

HALIOUA, Mr. Philippe

COUNCIL OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF SPAIN

- Board Member, Jewish Community, Madrid.
- Youth Delegate.
- President, Jewish Community, Madrid.

SWEDEN :

Executive

STORCH, Mr. Hilel

Delegates

JAKOBSON, Mr. Hirsch

KOKLIN, Mr. Charles

MEISELS, Mr. Stefan

WRONKOW, Mr. Wolfgang

WJC SWEDISH SECTION

- Member, Executive Committee, WJC Swedish Section.
- Secretary, WJC Swedish Section.
- Member, Executive Committee, WJC Swedish Section; Board Member, Jewish Community, Stockholm.
- President, Jewish Student Association, Stockholm.
- Member, Executive Committee, WJC Swedish Section; Vice-President, Zionist Federation, Sweden.
- Member, Executive Committee, WJC Swedish Section; President, Mapai Sweden.

Alternate

TANKUS, Mr. Tommy

SWITZERLAND :

Delegates

GUENZBURGER, Mr. Bertin

NORDMANN, Mr. Jean

ROSENSTEIN, Ing. Georg

UNGAR, Mr. Jacques

SWISS FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES

- Chairman, Swiss Union of Jewish Students.
- Chairman, FSJC.
- Member, Executive, FSJC.
- Editor in Chief, *Jüdische Rundschau*.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA :

Delegates

ANNES, Mr. Paul

BAUM, Mr. Phil

WJC AMERICAN SECTION

- Honorary Vice-President, American Jewish Congress.
- Associate Executive Director, American Jewish Congress; Director, AJC Commission on International Affairs.

BAUM, Rabbi Shepherd Z.	– Vice-President, Bnai Zion.
BOB, Mr. Kenneth	– Chairman, American Zionist Youth Council; Secretary, Habonim.
BOCHER, Mr. Solomon	– National Vice-Chairman, Americans for Progressive Israel.
BRAFMAN, Mr. Morris	– Chairman, Political Action Committee, United Zionists-Revisionists of America.
BRENNGLASS, Mr. Samuel L.	– Chairman, Communal Relations Commission, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.
COHAN, Miss Teri	– Representative, North American Jewish Students' Network.
COHN, Mr. Zane	– Member, National Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
COOPER, Mrs. Anne G.	– Representative, Pioneer Women.
DEANIN, Ms. Sonya	– National Board Member, Pioneer Women; Member, Fundraising Committee, PW.
DRESNER, Rabbi Israel	– Vice-President, American Jewish Congress.
EISENSTEIN, Rabbi Ira	– President, Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation.
EISENSTEIN, Mrs. Judith	– Professor, Hebrew Union College, Institute of Religion.
ERSHOW, Mrs. Helene	– Member, National Governing Council, American Jewish Congress; President, Greater Newark Women's Division, AJC.
FELDMAN, Mrs. Beatrice	– Chairman, Youth Aliyah Department, Hadassah.
FRAM, Rabbi Leon	– Honorary President, Michigan Council, American Jewish Congress.
FREUND-ROSENTHAL, Dr. Miriam	– Chairman, Education Department, Hadassah.
GILONI, Mr. Morris	– Vice-President, American Zionist Federation.
GOLD, Mr. Robert	– Representative for Student Affairs in Israel, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
GOLD, Mrs. Sandra	– President, Shirley Gettlin Chapter, American Jewish Congress.
GOLDIN, Mrs. Helen	– Representative, United Zionists-Revisionists of America.
GOLDIN, Mr. Steven	– Head, Detroit Chapter, United Zionists-Revisionists of America.
GORDON, Rabbi Harold	– Executive Vice-President, New York Board of Rabbis.
GRAD, Mrs. Rosalie	– National Board Member, Pioneer Women.
GREENBERG, Rabbi Simon	– Vice-Chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
HALPRIN, Mrs. Rose L.	– Past Chairman, WJC American Section;

HARKAVY, Mr. Bernard	Past National President, Hadassah.
HERTZBERG, Dr. Arthur	— Vice-Chairman, WJC American Section;
HESS, Mrs. Marjory	National Chairman, Americans for Progressive Israel.
HESS, Mr. Nathaniel	— President, American Jewish Congress.
	— Member, Executive Committee, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
	— Vice-President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Chairman, Israel Commission, UAHC.
HOLLANDER, Rabbi David	— President, Poale Agudath Israel of America.
JACOBS, Ms. Rachel	— Executive Secretary, Americans for Progressive Israel.
KAGAN, Mr. Moshe	— Past National Chairman, Americans for Progressive Israel; Chairman, Policy Committee, API; Treasurer, American Zionist Federation.
KARASICK, Rabbi Joseph	— Past Chairman, WJC American Section; Board Chairman, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.
KATZMAN, Mrs. Hinda	— Representative, Pioneer Women.
KATZMAN, Mr. Jacob	— Chairman, Executive Committee, WJC American Section; Executive Vice-President, Labor Zionist Alliance.
KELMAN, Mr. Levi	— Member, Steering Committee, North American Jewish Students' Network.
KELMAN, Rabbi Wolfe	— Executive Vice-President, Rabbinical Assembly of America.
KEYFITZ, Prof. Sara Feder	— Past President, Pioneer Women.
KLUTZNICK, Mrs. Ethel	— Representative, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
KLUTZNICK, Mr. Philip M.	— Former President, B'nai B'rith; Former US Ambassador to UN Economic and Social Council.
KRONISH, Rabbi Leon	— Vice-President, American Jewish Congress.
KUSIEL, Ms. Sylvia	— Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
LEEMON, Mrs. Frieda S.	— National Vice-President, Pioneer Women.
LEFKOWITZ, Mr. Jack	— National Treasurer, Zionist Organization of America.
LEVIN, Mrs. Helen	— National Board Member, Hadassah.
LEVINTHAL, Judge Louis E.	— Member, General Zionist Council.
LEVITT, Mrs. Norma U.	— Vice-Chairman, WJC American Section; Former President, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods; Co-Chairman, North American Board, World Union for Progressive Judaism.
LINDENBERG, Rabbi Joshua	— President, Brooklyn Region, Zionist Organization of America.

LIPSCHITZ, Rabbi Max	– President, Florida Division, American Jewish Congress.
MANN, Prof. Seymour	– Member, Executive Committee, American Jewish Congress; Member, Commission on Law, Social Action, & Urban Affairs, AJC National Governing Council.
MASLOW, Mr. Will	– General Counsel, American Jewish Congress.
MATZKIN, Mrs. Rose E.	– Vice-President, WJC American Section; National President, Hadassah.
MOCH, Ms. Judy	– Member, Steering Committee, North American Jewish Students' Network.
MOWSHOWITZ, Rabbi Isarel	– Member, National Executive Committee, Zionist Organization of America.
NAVIS, Ms. Annette	– Chairman, Eastern Area, Pioneer Women.
NOBEL, Ms. Naomi	– President, Hamagshimim, Hashachar.
NORICH, Mr. Samuel	– Chairperson, Governing Board, Jewish Student Press Service.
PERLMAN, Mrs. Florence S.	– Ya'al Liaison, Hadassah.
PESIN, Mr. Meyer	– President, Jewish National Fund of America.
PILCHIK, Rabbi Ely	– Vice-President, Central Conference of American Rabbis.
POLISH, Rabbi David	– Past President, Central Conference of American Rabbis.
POLLACK, Prof. Allen	– Past Chairman, American Professors for Peace in the Middle East; Member, Executive, World Zionist Organization.
ROSENSTEIN, Mr. Irving	– President, Jewish Student Union, Brooklyn College.
ROSENTHAL, Mr. Harry	– Representative, Zionist Organization of America.
RUBENSTEIN, Rabbi Byron	– Representative, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
RUBENSTEIN, Mrs. Suzanne L.	– Representative, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
SAGE, Dr. Maurice S.	– President, Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi of America.
SALOMON, Mr. Abram	– Executive Vice-President, Jewish National Fund of America; Vice-President, Zionist Organization of America.
SALPETER, Mrs. Bernice	– National Vice-President, Hadassah.
SCHENK, Mrs. Faye L.	– Past National President, Hadassah.
SCHINDLER, Mrs. Sali	– Representative, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
SCHWARTZ, Mrs. Rose	– National Vice-President, Women's Division, American Jewish Congress.
SCHWARTZ, Mr. William	– Past President, Masada, Zionist Organization of America.
SILVERSTEIN, Mr. Abraham	– Secretary, Executive, United Zionists-

SOLOMON, Judge Gus	Revisionists of America.
SOLOMON, Mrs. Libby	— Honorary Vice-President, American Jewish Congress.
SONDHEIM, Mrs. Evelyn	— President, Portland Chapter, Women's Division, American Jewish Congress.
SPECTOR, Mrs. Dorothy B.	— In charge of US Government Grant Purchases, Hadassah.
SPICEHANDLER, Rabbi Prof. Ezra	— In charge of Wills & Bequests, Hadassah.
STERNSTEIN, Dr. Joseph P.	— Member, Executive, World Labor Zionist Movement.
STOLARSKY, Mr. Israel	— National President, Zionist Organization of America.
STRAUSS, Mrs. Marion	— Representative, Labor Zionist Alliance.
SUKENIK, Mr. Chaim E.	— Member, National Board, Hadassah.
TELLER, Mr. Benjamin	— National Chairman, Intercollegiate Council of Young Israel.
TEMKIN, Mr. Maxwell	— Member, National Executive, Labor Zionist Alliance.
TORCZYNER, Mr. Jacques	— President, Jersey City District, Zionist Organization of America.
TULLER, Ms. Judith	— Chairman, WJC American Section.
TYBERG, Mrs. Chana	— Member, Executive Committee, National Women's Division, American Jewish Congress; Member, Governing Council, AJC.
TYBERG, Mr. Yehuda	— Representative, Labor Zionist Alliance.
WILSON, Mr. Lee	— Member, National Executive Committee, Labor Zionist Alliance.
WINN, Mrs. Liliane	— Member, General Council, American Jewish Congress.
WOLPE, Mr. Jeffrey A.	— Executive Vice-President, American Sephardi Federation.
ZACKLER, Dr. Jack	— Past President, Masada Youth Movement.
	— Member, National Executive, Labor Zionist Alliance.
<i>Alternates</i>	
COHN, Mrs. Leslie	— Representative, Women's Division, American Jewish Congress.
DRESNER, Mrs. Toby	— Representative, Women's Division, American Jewish Congress.
HARKAVY, Mrs. Judith	— Member, National Council, Americans for Progressive Israel.
HERTZBERG, Mrs. Phyllis	— Representative, American Jewish Congress.
LIPKIN, Mr. Leo	— Representative, American Jewish Congress.
MELAMET, Mrs. Evelyn	— Representative, American Jewish Congress.
MOVCHINE, Mr. Harry	— Treasurer, Americans for Progressive Israel.

NACHSHEN, Mr. Israel	— Vice-Chairman, National Council, Americans for Progressive Israel.
SINGER, Mrs. Evelyn	— Representative, American Jewish Congress.
STAVIS, Mr. Morton	— Member, National Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
TEICHMAN, Mr. Sherman	— Representative, North American Jewish Students' Network.

VENEZUELA :

CONFEDERATION OF JEWISH ASSOCIATIONS OF VENEZUELA

Delegates

ALMOSNY, Dr. Paulina	— Deputy Secretary.
CZENSTOCHOWSKI, Mr. Walter	— President, Zionist Federation of Venezuela; Vice-President, Central Committee, Jewish Community.
SULTAN, Mr. Abraham	— President.

Alternates

BRENER, Rabbi Pynchas	— Chief Rabbi, Venezuelan Jewish Community.
SZNAJDERMAN, Mrs. Clara	— Member, Executive, CJAV; President, Union of Hebrew Ladies.

YUGOSLAVIA :

FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES IN YUGOSLAVIA

Delegates

FRANCUSKI, Miss Sonja	— Member, Youth Board.
KADELBURG, Dr. Lavoslav	— President.
SARAFIC, Dr. Samuel	— Board Member.

B. Representatives of International Organizations with Special Relationship

WORLD ZIONIST ORGANIZATION

Executive

BAR-ON, Mr. Mordechai	— Head, Youth & Hechalutz Department.
DULZIN, Mr. Arie L.	— Treasurer.
JACOBSON, Mrs. Charlotte	— Chairman, American Section, WZO Executive.
KIRSHBLUM, Rabbi Mordecai	— Co-Chairman, Aliyah Department.
KLARMAN, Mr. Josef	— Head, Youth Aliyah Department.
SCHENKER, Mr. Avraham	— Head, Organization & Information Department.

Observers

FINKIELSTEJN, Mr. Chaim

— Head, Education & Culture Department.

KRONE, Mr. Moshe

— Head, Torah Education Department.

NARBONI, Me André

— Head, Department for Sephardic Communities.

NAVON, Mr. Yitzhak

— Chairman, Zionist Actions Committee.

RIVLIN, Mr. Moshe

— Director-General.

TSUR, Dr. Jacob

— Chairman, Board of Directors, Keren Kayemeth Leisrael.

WEITZ, Dr. Raanan

— Head, Settlement Department.

C. Representatives of Associated International Organizations

BRIT IVRIT OLAMIT

Delegates

HARPAZ, Mr. Nissan

— Treasurer.

KUPERSTEIN, Mr. Leib

— Member, Executive.

LEVANON, Mr. Chaim

— Vice-Chairman, Executive.

ORMIAN, Dr. Haim

— Member, Executive.

RAZ, Mr. Simcha

— Director.

FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF CENTRAL AMERICA AND PANAMA (FEDECO)

Delegate

FREUND, Mr. Ernesto

— President.

INDEPENDENT ZIONIST MOVEMENT

Executive

KALCHHEIM, Mr. Moshe

— Member, Executive.

Delegate

PORTNOY, Mr. Cemaj

— Member, Executive.

Alternates

BAUMINGER, Dr. Arie Leon

— National Superintendent, Ministry of Education & Culture, Israel.

GLUCKSMAN, Mrs. Hanna

— Member, Executive.

MAYAN, Mrs. Clara

— Member, Executive.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF JEWISH LAWYERS AND JURISTS

Delegates

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| COHN, Justice Haim | — President. |
| NATHAN, Mr. John A., | — Executive Secretary. |
| TORY, Mr. Avraham | — Honorary Secretary-General. |

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

Delegates

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| HERZOG, Mrs. Prina | — President, Council of Women's Organizations, Israel. |
| WINSTON-FOX, Mrs. Ruth, JP | — Vice-President, ICJW. |

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MAPAM PARTIES

Delegates

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| COHEN, Mr. Chanan | — Representative (Israel). |
| KOREN, Mr. Efraim | — Representative (Israel). |
| MARCUS, Mr. Solli | — Chairman, Mapam Great Britain. |

Alternates

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| EPPEL, Mr. Michael | — Secretary, Young Mapam, Israel. |
| DE FRECE, Mr. John | — Secretary, Young Mapam, Great Britain. |

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ZIONIST ORGANIZATION (WIZO)

Executive

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| JAGLOM, Mrs. Raya | — President, World WIZO. |
| NORDMANN, Mrs. Blurette | — Representative on WJC European Executive. |

Delegates

- | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| BERNARD-KAHN, Mrs. Denise | — Member, World Executive. |
| BLOOMFIELD, Mrs. Neri | — President, Hadassah-WIZO Canada. |
| EPSTEIN, Mrs. Catalina | — President, WIZO Argentina. |
| JACOBSON, Mrs. Martha | — President, WIZO Australia. |
| WEBBER, Mrs. Carmel | — President, British WIZO. |

Alternates

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| ABRAHAM, Mrs. Elly | — President, Swiss WIZO Federation. |
| BALINSKI, Mrs. Clara | — Vice-President, Hadassah-WIZO Canada. |
| BARUCH, Mrs. Anna | — President, ADEL-WIZO Italy. |
| BRAUDO, Mrs. Shulamit | — Chairman, WIZO Israel. |
| BURLA, Mrs. Anita | — Vice-President, WIZO, Rio de Janeiro. |
| ETTLINGER, Mrs. Charlotte | — President, WIZO Sweden. |
| JAMITOVSKY, Mrs. Anita | — Director, Latin American Department, World WIZO. |

RAPOPORT, Mrs. Rachiel	– Vice-President, Women's Zionist Council, South Africa.
SCHWARTZ, Mrs. Iride	– Vice-President, ADEI-WIZO Italy.
SZNAJDERMAN, Mrs. Clara	– President, WIZO Venezuela.

WORLD CONFEDERATION OF UNITED ZIONISTS

Executive

SULTANIK, Mr. Kalman	– Executive Vice-President.
----------------------	-----------------------------

Delegates

GREENBERG, Dr. Simon	– Vice-Chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
JACOBSON, Mrs. Charlotte	– Treasurer.
KAHN, Mr. Shmuel	– Member, Executive.
SHAPIRO, Mr. Ezra Z.	– President.
SHIPTON, Mr. Sidney L.	– Vice-President.
TOPIOL, Mr. Michel	– Vice-President.
DE VRIES, Mr. Izak S.	– Member, Executive.

WORLD FEDERATION OF HUNGARIAN JEWS

Delegates

FARKAS, Mr. Tibor	– Director, Israel Branch.
KERTESZ, Mr. Paul	– President, Israel Branch.

WORLD FEDERATION OF JEWISH FIGHTERS, PARTISANS, AND CAMP INMATES

Delegates

GRAIVER, Mr. David	– Chairman, Uruguayan Section; Former Chairman, Zionist Organization, Uruguay.
GRAYEK, Mr. Stefan	– President.
MOSKOVITS, Mr. José	– Vice-President, World Executive Committee; Chairman, Argentine Section.
SOKOLOWICZ, Mr. Aron	– Chairman, Australian Section.

WORLD FEDERATION OF JEWISH JOURNALISTS

Delegates

RON, Mr. Moshe	– Member, Secretariat.
ZIMUKY, Mr. Arie	– Secretary-General.

WORLD FEDERATION OF POLISH JEWS

Executive

GOLDSTEIN, Mr. Mosze	– Member, Presidium.
----------------------	----------------------

Delegates

DROR, Mr. Nathan	– Representative (Israel).
GORE, Mr. Bernard	– Member, Presidium, Great Britain.
HOCHERMAN, Mr. Jehiel	– Member, Presidium, USA.
ROTENSTREICH, Mrs. Amalia	– Member, Presidium, Israel.
STOLARSKY, Mr. Israel	– Member, Presidium, USA.

Alternates

BARZYLAI, Mr. Jakow	– Member, Presidium, Israel.
BEN-JOSEF, Mr. David	– Representative, <i>Landsmanschaftn.</i>
GORGIEL, Mr. Moche	– Representative, <i>Landsmanschaftn.</i>
WERBA, Mr. Aharon	– Member, Presidium, Israel.

WORLD LABOR ZIONIST MOVEMENT

Delegates

BENJAMIN, Mr. Jonathan	– Representative (Israel).
CUKIER, Mr. Binem	– Secretary, Belgium.
DROR, Mr. Nathan	– Representative in German-Speaking Countries.
FISHMAN, Mr. Hertzel	– Representative (Israel).
GOLDFARB, Mr. Zvi	– Secretary, Dror.
LEWIS, Mr. Jerry	– Representative (Great Britain).
MARCUS, Mr. Mario	– Representative (Germany).
RADZINSKI, Mr. Michel	– Representative (Israel).
SULKLAPER, Mr. Rachmil	– Representative (France).
SZWARC, Mr. Ojzer	– Representative (France).
WAINTRATER, Mr. Meir	– Youth Delegate.
WIDETZKY, Mrs. Judith	– Youth Delegate.

Alternates

WAICHE, Mr. Yossi	– Representative (France).
WISMUNSKY, Mr. Yaacov	– Member, Secretariat.

WORLD MIZRACHI-HAPOEL HAMIZRACHI ORGANIZATION

Delegates

ASSAEL, Mr. Zwi	– Member, World Executive.
DRORI, Mr. Yaacov	– Treasurer.
DUVDEVANI, Mr. Yehiel Baruch	– Member, World Executive; Chairman, Center for Religious Education.
ELINSON, Rabbi Yehuda	– Member, World Executive.
SHAPIRA, Mr. Yosef	– World Secretary, Bnei Akiva.
ZAMBROWSKY, Rabbi Seymour M.	– Chairman, World Executive.

WORLD OSE UNION

Delegates

MAHLER-WOLF, Mrs. Rachel	– Board Member, Association "OSE," Israel.
WOLF, Dr. Nisen Leib	– Member, Executive.

WORLD SEPHARDI FEDERATION

Executive

- | | |
|------------------|---|
| TAMMAN, Mr. Leon | — President, British & Commonwealth Branch; Head of Delegation. |
|------------------|---|

Delegates

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| CANIAS, Mr. Nessin Nelson | — President, Latin American Sephardi Federation. |
| COHEN, Mr. Edward | — Member, Executive, British Branch. |
| ELKAYAM, Mr. Mordekey | — Vice-President, Israel Branch. |
| FEDIDA, Me Betsalel | — Executive Director, French Branch. |
| SITTON, Mr. David | — Co-Acting President, Israel Branch. |

Alternates

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| KASHANY, Mr. Reuben | — Member, Executive. |
| MEVORACH, Mr. Mordechai | — Member, Executive, WSF; Director, Department for Sephardic Communities, World Zionist Organization. |
| ROUMANI, Dr. Maurice | — Director for English-Speaking Countries, Department for Sephardic Communities, World Zionist Organization. |

WORLD UNION FOR PROGRESSIVE JUDAISM

Delegates

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| HIRSCH, Rabbi Richard G. | — Executive Director. |
| OPPENHEIMER, Mr. Andrew | — Field Director, Youth Section. |
| SOETENDORP, Rabbi Awraham | — Rabbi, Liberal Congregation, The Hague / Amsterdam. |
| SPICEHANDLER, Rabbi Prof. Ezra | — Dean, Hebrew Union College, Jerusalem. |
| WEILER, Rabbi Moses Cyrus | — Chairman, Rabbinical Council of Progressive Judaism, Israel. |

Alternates

- | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| SCHAALMAN, Rabbi Herman E. | — Representative (USA). |
| ZAOUI, Rabbi André | — Rabbi, Harel Synagogue, Jerusalem. |
| ZEMER, Rabbi Moshe | — Rabbi, Kedem Synagogue, Tel-Aviv. |

WORLD UNION OF GENERAL ZIONISTS

Delegates

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| AVIDOR, Mr. Arie | — Chairman, Youth Committee. |
| HOFFMANN, Adv. Akiba | — Chairman, Liberal Party, Tel-Aviv. |
| MALDAVSKY, Dr. Miguel | — President, Zionist Federation, Chile. |
| SAVIDOR, Mr. Menahem | — Honorary President, World Maccabi. |
| STRAUCH, Adv. Zerach | — Member, Executive. |
| WEINSTEIN, Mr. Baruch | — Member, Presidium, Zionist Actions Committee. |

WORLD UNION OF JEWISH STUDENTS (WUJS)

Delegates

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| BEN-YEHUDA, Mr. Hanan | – Chairman, National Union of Israeli Students. |
| FINKEL, Mr. Ron | – Chairperson. |
| OKONOWSKI, Miss Martine | – Former European Chairman. |
| PRICE, Mr. Thomas L. | – Education Officer. |
| TURGMAN, Mr. Samuel | – Representative, University Zionist Movement, Venezuela. |

Alternates

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| BEN-SHALOM, Miss Miri | – Representative, North American Jewish Students' Network. |
| BOTSCHKO, Miss Rivka | – Representative (Switzerland). |
| COOPER, Mrs. Hadassa | – Representative (Australia). |
| RUDENSKI, Mr. Ephraim | – Secretary-General, WUJS Israeli Center. |
| SENKMAN, Mr. Leonardo | – Representative, Latin American Student Zionist Federation (FUSLA). |

WORLD UNION OF TNUAT HAHERUT-HATZOHR

Delegates

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| ARON, Adv. Jaime | – Chairman, Latin American Department, World Executive. |
| FRIEDRICH, Mr. Salomon | – Member, World Executive. |
| KOTLOWITZ, Dr. Raphael | – Chairman, World Executive. |
| TAVIN, Dr. Yaacov Eliezer | – Vice-Chairman, World Executive. |

Alternates

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ALEXANDROVICH, Mrs. Rivka | – Representative (Israel). |
| BERGMAN, Mrs. Ellie | – Secretary, World Executive. |
| LAIB, Mr. Mario | – Representative (Israel). |

IV. FRATERNAL DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS

ALLIANCE ISRAELITE UNIVERSELLE

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| ELMALEH, Mr. Elie | – Representative in Israel. |
| ISRAEL, Mr. Gérard | – Deputy Secretary-General. |

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

- | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|
| RESNIKOFF, Dr. Bernard | – Director, Israel Office. |
|------------------------|----------------------------|

B'NAI B'RITH

BLUMBERG, Mr. David M.	– President.
EDELSBERG, Mr. Herman	– Director, International Council.
GROSS, Mr. Shlomo	– President, Israel District.
PEIREZ, Mr. Lawrence	– Member, Board of Governors.
SCHELITZER, Mr. Walter	– Vice-President.

EUROPEAN COUNCIL OF JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES

ELZAS, Mr. Tsvi	– Secretary-General.
ROSEN, Chief Rabbi Dr. David Moses	– Vice-Chairman.

MEMORIAL FOUNDATION FOR JEWISH CULTURE

HOCHBAUM, Dr. Jerry	– Acting Executive Director.
REISS, Ing. Anselm	– Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL OF THE JEWISH INSTITUTIONS OF FRANCE (CRIF)

KAUFFMANN, Mr. Pierre	– Director-General.
ROSENTHAL, Mr. Jean	– President.

SOUTH AFRICAN JEWISH BOARD OF DEPUTIES

ABRAMOWITZ, Dr. Israel	– Vice-Chairman.
BRADLOW, Mr. Frank Rosslyn	– Vice-President.
BURMAN, Mr. Harris John	– Secretary, Northern Transvaal Zionist Council; Youth Delegate.
CAINER, Mr. Paul	– National Chairman, South African Federation of Student Jewish & Zionist Associations.
DIAMOND, Mr. Denis	– Executive Director.
KAPLAN, Mr. Mendel	– Member, Executive Council.
KLEINMAN, Mr. Gerald	– Chairman, Cape Council.
ROSETTENSTEIN, Mr. Julius	– Chairman.
TOBIANSKY, Mr. Martin	– Representative, Zionist Youth Council.

TAIWAN JEWISH COMMUNITY

BRANDWEIN, Mrs. Sarah	– Representative.
-----------------------	-------------------

UNITED HIAS SERVICE

HALACHMI, Mr. Haim	– Director, Israel Office.
KLEMENTYNOVSKI, Dr. Zvi	– Member, Israel Board.

WORLD ORT UNION

- HERZOG, General Chaim — Vice-Chairman, Executive Committee; President, ORT Israel.

V. SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS AND STAFF

Secretariat-General, Geneva

- LEVY, Mr. Claude — Special Assistant to the Secretary-General.
BECKER, Miss Myra — Assistant.
GRUBER, Mr. Sidney H. — Assistant.
MORITZ, Miss Hella — Assistant.
ALCHEH, Miss Ruthy — Secretary.
DATTEL, Mrs. Marguerite — Secretary.

New York Office

- SINGER, Prof. Israel — Consultant on the Academic Community.
ABRAHAMSEN, Miss Joy — Assistant, UN Department.
ALPERIN, Mr. Aaron — Information Service.
ROSENCRANTZ, Mrs. Sylvia — Secretary.

London Offices

- EINFELD, Mr. Marcus R. — Director for African, Asian, and Commonwealth Affairs.
EPPLER, Dr. Elizabeth E. — Senior Research Officer, Institute of Jewish Affairs.
HIRSZOWICZ, Dr. Lukasz — Senior Research Officer, Institute of Jewish Affairs.
FRAENKEL, Mr. Josef — Assistant, Information Services.
KASS, Miss Drora — Assistant, African, Asian, and Commonwealth Division.
KRAFSOFF, Miss Nora — Administrative Assistant.
ALLEN, Miss Pauline — Secretary.
CRAVEN, Miss Helen — Secretary.
LEAVY, Miss Freada — Secretary.

Paris Office

- CWAJGENBAUM, Mr. Serge — Assistant.
NAHMANI, Mr. Albert — Administrative Manager.

Buenos Aires Office

- WARSZAWSKI, Dr. Paúl — Assistant Director.

Tel-Aviv Office

- SCHIFF, Mrs. Chava — Assistant.

FERBER, Mr. Moshe
HALAC, Mr. Avner
RAVID, Mrs. Liora
ISRAELI, Mr. Chaim

- Administrative Assistant.
- Administrative Assistant.
- Secretary.
- Clerk.

Jerusalem Office

KOLITZ, Mrs. Zelda
NIV, Mrs. Naomi

- Administrative Director.
- Secretary.

INDEX

- Abbey, Mr. Monroe, QC, 214
 Avizemer, Mr. Shimon, 270, 278
- Bar-Lavia (Balvashvili), Mr. Rafi, 299
 Bar-On, Mr. Mordechai, 128
 Bauer, Mr. Riccardo, 147
 Bauminger, Dr. Arie Leon, 94, 268
 Becker, Mr. Lavy M., 265
 Begin, Mr. Menachem, MK, 204
 Benari, Mr. Yehuda, 223, 295, 324, 325
 Benjamin, Mr. Jonathan, 314
 Benjamin, Mr. Malvyn, 189
 Biegun, Mr. Dov, 127, 279, 300
 Botschko, Miss Rivka, 142
 Brafman, Mr. Morris, 184
 Brassloff, Dr. Friedrich L., 273
 Bulawko, Mr. Henry, 93, 321, 323
 Bulz, Dr. Emmanuel, 91
 Burla, Dr. Eliezer, 75, 310
- Chalfont, The Rt. Hon. Lord, 29, 54
 Cohen, The Very Rev. Dr. Isaac, 90, 318, 319, 326
 Cooper, Mr. Harry, 145
 Cynowicz, Mr. Hersh, 187
- Diamond, Mr. Denis, 92
 Dresner, Rabbi Israel, 295
 Dreyfus-Schmidt, Me Michel, 73
- Eban, Mr. Abba, MK, 44, 56
 Einfeld, Mr. Marcus R., 284, 310ff., 341
 Eisenstein, Rabbi Ira, 71
 Elghanayan, Mr. Habib, 121
 Eppler, Dr. Elizabeth E., 288
- Falk, Mr. Gerald Y., OBE, JP, 123
 Fidler, Alderman Michael M., JP, 72, 281, 284, 305
 Fink, Chief Rabbi Menahem, 197
 Finkel, Mr. Ron, 148, 199
 Fisher of Camden, The Rt. Hon. Lord, 227
 Foighel, Prof. Dr. Isi, 76
 Friedrich, Mr. Salomon, 294, 311
- Gemeinas, Mr. Salomón, 77, 271
 Gold, Mr. Robert, 142
 Gold, Mr. Sidney Walter, 280, 295
 Goldmann, Dr. Nahum, 1, 8, 149, 159, 204, 223, 230, 258, 337, 338, 342
 Goldschmidt, Me Alexis, 75
 Gordon, Mr. Uri, 62, 143
 Gore, Mr. Bernard, 300
 Gothelf, Mr. Yehuda, 74
 Gourgey, Mr. Percy Sassoon, MBE, 92, 200, 283, 308, 320, 326
 Grosman, Mrs. Chaika, MK, 88, 301
 Grynfogel, Dr. Maurice, 197
 Guedj, Mr. Albert, 326, 327
 Guez, Mrs. Mathilda, MK, 271
- Haddad, Me Charles, 94
 Halévy, Mr. Jacob, 226
 Halpérin, Prof. Jean, 274
 Halprin, Mrs. Rose, 295
 Harkavi, Mr. Itzhak, 288
 Harris, Mr. Sydney M., QC, 102
 Hausner, Mr. Gideon, 330
 Hertzberg, Dr. Arthur, 79, 89
 Hiller, Mr. Abraham, 147
 Hirsch, Rabbi Richard G., 87
 Hollander, Rabbi David, 94
 Horbacovsky, Mr. Andrés, 145
 Horn, Mr. Phil, 262

- Israel, Mr. Gérard, 195
- Jacobson, Mrs. Charlotte, 296
- Jacobson, Mr. Nathan, 214, 222ff.
- Jaglom, Mrs. Raya, 290, 296, 299
- Jamitovsky, Mrs. Anita, 125
- Janner, The Hon. Greville E., QC, MP, 122, 294, 296
- Janner of Leicester, The Rt. Hon. Lord, 185, 232
- Kahana, Dr. Shmuel Zanwel, 190
- Karasick, Rabbi Joseph, 121, 124
- Katsav, Mr. Moshe, 140
- Katzir, Prof. Ephraim, 2
- Katzman, Mr. Jacob, 257ff., 295ff.
- Kayfetz, Prof. Sara Feder, 272
- Kesse, Mr. Yona, 280
- Klarman, Mr. Josef, 252
- Klarsfeld, Mrs. Beate, 302
- Kleiner, Mr. Michael, 309
- Klutznick, Mr. Philip M., 62, 78
- Koklin, Mr. Charles, 201
- Kolet, Mr. Ezra, 93, 192, 267
- Kollek, Mr. Teddy, 233
- Korn, Mr. Itzhak, 6
- Kotlowitz, Dr. Raphael, 257
- Kronitz, Dr. Leon, 267, 272
- Lambert, Me David, 171
- Langnas, Dr. Saul, 195
- Levenberg, Dr. Schneier, 112, 296
- Levene, Mr. Mordecai, 190
- Lexner, Mr. Michael, 193
- Madanes, Dr. Edward Simon, 193
- Marcus, Mr. Solli, 198
- Massiah, Mr. Albert, 147
- Matzkin, Mrs. Rose E., 297
- Mayan, Mrs. Clara, 189
- Meyer, Prof. Perry, QC, 75
- Milnitzky, Dr. Benno, 109
- Milmaniene, Dr. José E., 143
- Moonman, Mr. Eric, MP, 188, 307ff.
- Mowshowitz, Rabbi Israel, 300
- Neher, Prof. André, 242
- Nobel, Ms. Naomi, 141
- Nordmann, Mrs. Bluetie, 196
- Norich, Mr. Samuel, 90
- Okonowski, Miss Martine, 140
- Oppenheimer, Mr. Andrew, 146, 313, 328
- Prinz, Dr. Joachim, 28, 54, 247
- Rabin, Mr. Yitzhak, 150
- Raymond, Miss Judith, 326
- Resnizky, Dr. Nehemias, 127
- Riegner, Dr. Gerhart M., 59ff., 171, 223, 318, 319, 320, 322, 327
- Rosen, Chief Rabbi Dr. David Moses, 117
- Rosenstein, Ing. Georg, 223
- Rosenthal, Mr. Jean, 195
- Rosettenstein, Mr. Julius, 274
- Roth, Dr. Stephen J., 224, 277, 281
- Rozanowicz, Mr. Guy, 139
- Sabetai, Rabbi Elie, 326
- Sacerdoti, Prof. Giorgio, 77
- Safirstein (Carol), Mr. Abram Wolf, 199
- Sage, Dr. Maurice S., 126
- Salpeter, Mrs. Bernice, 297
- Sapir, Mr. Pinhas, 159, 256
- Savidor, Mr. Menachem, 78
- Schenk, Mrs. Faye L., 306, 319, 324
- Schneeweiss, Dr. Joachim, 194
- Shilansky, Mr. Dov, 309
- Shmueli, Mr. Itzhac, 201, 317, 321
- Shtiglitz, Ms. Natasha, 299
- Silk, Mr. Donald, CC, 200, 202, 223
- Sinay, Mr. Gil, 125
- Soetendorp, Rabbi Awraham, 127, 188, 262, 297, 314
- Steinhaus, Dr. Federico, 90
- Sternstein, Dr. Joseph P., 85
- Storch, Mr. Hilel, 191
- Susskind, Mr. David, 328
- Talmon, Prof. Shemaryahu, 235
- Tamman, Mr. Leon, 87, 325, 327, 328
- Teichman, Mr. Sherman, 77

Torczyner, Mr. Jacques, 96, 252,
262ff.
Turkow, Mr. Marc, 270
Tuvia, Mrs. Batsheva, 326

Vernon, Prof. Raymond, 37, 56
Vishnitzer, Mr. Israel, 269

Warszawski, Dr. Paúl, 134
Warszawski (Varsat), Mr. Izak, 184

Weinberger, Miss Simone, 144
Winn, Mrs. Liliane, 86, 326
Winston-Fox, Mrs. Ruth, JP, 310

Yosef, Chief Rabbi Ovadia
(*message*), 28
Yosefi, Mr. Dov, 86

Zaban, Mr. Yair, 186

*Achevé d'imprimer en janvier 1981
sur les presses de
l'Imprimerie Avenir S.A.,
10, rue de l'Avenir,
1207 Genève (Suisse)*