

SESSION OF THE ZIONIST
GENERAL COUNCIL

THIRD SESSION AFTER THE 26TH ZIONIST CONGRESS

JERUSALEM
JANUARY 8-15, 1967

*Addresses, Debates,
Resolutions*

Published by the
ORGANIZATION DEPARTMENT OF THE
ZIONIST EXECUTIVE
JERUSALEM

Session of the Zionist General Council • January 8-15, 1967

1967
29
1967

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Blaustein Library

**SESSION OF THE ZIONIST
GENERAL COUNCIL**

THIRD SESSION AFTER THE 26TH ZIONIST CONGRESS

**JERUSALEM
JANUARY 8-15, 1966**

**Addresses, Debates,
Resolutions**

**Published by the
ORGANIZATION DEPARTMENT OF THE
ZIONIST EXECUTIVE
JERUSALEM**

THE THIRD SESSION of the Zionist General Council after the Twenty-sixth Zionist Congress was held in Jerusalem on 8-15 January, 1967.

The inaugural meeting was held in the Binyanei Ha'umah in the presence of the President of the State and Mrs. Shazar, the Prime Minister, the Speaker of the Knesset, Cabinet Ministers, the Chief Justice, Judges of the Supreme Court, the State Comptroller, visitors from abroad, public dignitaries and a large and representative gathering which filled the entire hall.

The meeting was opened by Mr. Jacob Tsur, Chairman of the Zionist General Council, who paid homage to Israel's Nobel Prize Laureate, the writer S. Y. Agnon, and read the message Mr. Agnon had sent to the gathering. Mr. Tsur also congratulated the poetess and writer, Nellie Zaks. The speaker then went on to discuss the gravity of the time for both the State of Israel and the Zionist Movement, and called upon citizens in this country and Zionists throughout the world to stand shoulder to shoulder to overcome the crisis.

Professor André Chouraqui, Deputy Mayor of the City of Jerusalem, welcomed the delegates on behalf of the City.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Levi Eshkol, in his speech stressed the powerful ties existing between the State of Israel and the Jewish people in all lands of their dispersion, underlining the close cooperation between the Government and the Zionist Executive. Mr. Eshkol recalled the commencement of the operations of the Mercaz Latefutzot, set up jointly by the Government and the Zionist Movement. He sent fraternal greetings to the Jews of Soviet Russia,

expressing the hope that in view of the statement of the Russian Premier regarding the re-union of families, immigration from that country would increase.

When Dr. Nachum Goldman, President of the World Zionist Organization, rose to speak, a group of young persons bearing slogans demonstrated against him and against his stand on the problems of ties with Germany. In his speech Dr. Goldman outlined the situation of the Movement and of Jewry in the international arena, dealing more in detail with the Neo-Nazi Movement and relations with Germany, and also with the problems of the Zionist Movement.

At the second meeting held on the following day Dr. Goldman concluded his address on the tasks confronting the Zionist Movement and the Jewish people voicing his hopes for the normalization of relations between Israel and the Arab countries. The General Debates on the speeches of the Prime Minister and the President of the World Zionist Organization then began, continuing into the third meeting.

On the afternoon of the same day Members of the Zionist General Council were the guests of the Knesset in its new premises. The Speaker of the Knesset, Mr. Kadish Luz, welcomed the delegates, stressing the mutual ties of the Knesset and the Zionist General Council.

The fourth meeting held on 9 January 1967 was addressed by the Chairman of the Executive Mr. L.A. Pincus, on the work, programme and budget of the Zionist Movement. He was followed by Mr. Yigal Allon, Minister of Labour, who spoke on Israel's economic problems.

The fifth meeting held on the following day saw the beginning of the General Debate on the problems of Immigration and Absorption. The Debate continued in the sixth and seventh meetings held on the same day.

In the afternoon Members of the General Council attended a reception tendered by the President of the World Zionist Organization.

During the eighth meeting held on 11 January the Debate on Problems of Immigration and Absorption was concluded and that on Activities in the Golah commenced, and continued into the ninth meeting. At this meeting the Chairman of the General Council paid tribute to Dr. Israel Goldstein on the occasion of his seventieth birthday while Mr. Baruch Weinstein congratulated other celebrants on their anniversaries.

Four Committees were elected, as follows: Political Affairs – Chairman, Dr. Max Nussbaum (Vice-Chairman, Mrs. Chaika Grossman-Orkin); Budget, Finance and Funds Committee – Chairman, Mrs. Fay Schenk (Vice-Chairman, Joseph Daleski); Immigration and Absorption – Chairman – Leon Kronitz (Vice-Chairman, Mr. Yosef Bankower); Organization and Activities in the Golah – Chairman, Rabbi Ts.M. Zambrowsky (Vice-Chairman, Najman Radzichowsky).

After the ninth meeting Members of the Zionist General Council attended a reception in honour of Dr. Israel Goldstein, held at the Goldstein Zionist Youth Farm.

At the tenth meeting the Debate on Activities in Golah was concluded and the President of the World Zionist Organization replied.

The various Committees sat on 12-13 January. On 12 January Members of the Zionist General Council attended a reception tendered by the President of the State of Israel.

During the eleventh meeting members of the Zionist Executive replied to questions put by Members of the Zionist General Council.

At the twelfth meeting the Chairman of the Zionist General Council eulogized departed Members. The

Chairmen of the Various Committes for Organization and Activities in the Golah, for Immigration and Absorption, for the Budget, Finance and the Funds, submitted their draft resolutions.

At the thirteenth meeting held on 15 January the Chairman of the Committee for Political Affairs submitted the draft resolutions of his Committee. The President of the World Zionist Organization, Dr. Nachum Goldman, delivered the closing address, and the Session was summed up by the Chairman of the Zionist General Council, Mr. Jacob Tsur.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

First Meeting

Opening Speech—J. Tsur, Chairman of the Zionist General Council	1
Greetings of the City of Jerusalem Prof. A. Chouraqui, Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem	6
Immigration and Absorption—Our Touchstone as a Movement and as a State—Mr. Levi Echkol, Prime Minister	7
Tasks of the Zionist Movement and the Jewish People—Dr. N. Goldmann	17

Second Meeting

Tasks of the Zionist Movement and the Jewish People—Dr. N. Goldmann (ctd.)	30
Debate on Dr. Goldmann's Address	37
I. Korn—37; B. Weinstein—40; E.Z. Shapiro—41; T.M. Zambrowsky—44; A. Levenberg—47; S. Friedrich—49; J. Hazan—52	

Third Meeting

Continuation of the Debate on Dr. Goldmann's Address	57
I. Avidor—57; Y. Tyberg—58; B. Janner—60; N. Radzichovski—62; W. Perry—63; A. Stern—66	

Fourth Meeting

The Activities of the Zionist Executive, L.A. Pincus	68
Israel's Economic Problems - Y. Allon	94

Fifth Meeting

Debate on the Activities of the Zionist Activities, its Plans and Budget	104
R. Halprin - 104; E. Neumann - 109; J. Torczyner - 117; A. Cygel - 119; A. Reiss - 123; Y. Bernstein - 125; Y. Bankower - 128	

Sixth Meeting

Continuation of the Debate on The Activities of the Executive, its Plans and Budget	131
M. Daniv - 131	
Nomination of Members of the General Executive without Voting Rights	133
D. Silk - 134; M. Vodvotz - 136; R. Arzi - 138; M. Kirshblum - 140; Z. Loubetkin - 145	

Seventh Meeting

Continuation of the Debate on The Activities of the Executive, its Plans and Budget	149
M. Kitron - 149; E. Dobkin - 151; R. Kotlowitz - 155; H. Miller - 159; R. Jaglom - 161; D. Rozin - 162; S. Feder - 165	

Eighth Meeting

Continuation of the Debate on The Activities of the Executive, its Plans and Budget	169
S. Kafri—169; M. Dworkin—171	
Greetings to the Israel Army and the Frontier Settlements	175
Continuation of the Debate on The Activities of the Executive, its Plans and Budget	175
I. Harkavi—175; S.Z. Shragai—178; Z. Lurie—182; Ch. Finkelstein—187; D. Biegun—190; B. Bergman—191; M. Syrkin—193; J. Orfus—195; J. Katzman—197	

Ninth Meeting

Election of Committees.	199
Continuation of the Debate on The Activities of the Executive, its Plans and Budget	199
J. Schmidt—199; I. Warszawski—200; S. Avizemer—202; H. Landy—203; Ch. Grossman-Orkin—205;	
Greetings to Dr. I. Goldstein	207
Greetings to Zionist Personalities on the Occasion of their Anniversaries	209
Continuation of the Debate on The Activities of the Executive, its Plans and Budget	210
L. Kronitz—210; Ch. Jacobson—212; I. Artzi—214; H. Hurwitz—218; B. Frymer—220; J. Mercer—221; A. Luis—223; S. Federbusch—225; A. Hason—226	

Tenth Meeting

Continuation of the Debate on The Activities of the Executive, its Plans and Budget	228
L. Ilutovich - 228; S. Greenberg - 229;	
Dr. N. Goldmann's Reply to the Debate . . .	233
Reply to the Debate - L.A. Pincus	246

Eleventh Meeting

Questions put to the Executive	258
--	-----

Twelfth Meeting

Jacob Tsur eulogizes Zionist Leaders	281
Proposals of the Committee on Organization and Activities in the Diaspora	283
Proposals of the Committee on Immigration and Absorption	284
Proposals of the Committee on Budget, Finance and Funds	287

Thirteenth Meeting

Proposals of the Political Committee	295
Assessment of the Session by Dr. N. Goldmann	307
Closing Speech by the Chairman of the General Council, Mr. J. Tsur	315

Resolutions	319
-----------------------	-----

List of Participants	339
--------------------------------	-----

List of Committee Members	344
-------------------------------------	-----

FIRST MEETING

Sunday, January 8, 1967 in the evening

Chairman: JACOB TSUR

OPENING SPEECH BY MR. JACOB TSUR (Chairman of the Zionist General Council)

At the very outset I must make mention of the great honour that has been afforded us and to Hebrew literature by the award of the Nobel Prize to Shmuel Yosef Agnon, who lives and writes in our own city of Jerusalem. We invited Mr. Agnon to be with us this evening but he is still fatigued by his journey to Europe. He is indeed in need of rest.

Mr. Agnon has sent me the following letter: "Thank you for your good wishes, and for your invitation to be present at this gathering of the World Zionist Organization. Your invitation is a great honour for me. But as a result of all my adventures in the course of three weeks, during which I did not sleep, night or day, and did not even rest, it is difficult for me to make an appearance in public. If you regard my greetings as important, please greet on my behalf all those attending this gathering."

All of us, citizens of Israel and delegates from the Golah, here together with us, share the feelings of pride at the recognition given by the nations to an artist who has added new dimensions to our national tongue, to a creative writer who has given voice to the spirit of our people. May God keep him and inspire him to continue to enrich our national treasury. And may the recognition given by the elect of the nations of the world to a Hebrew writer, open the hearts of our young men and women in the Diaspora to study their own national language and literature, and may they read the works of the writer of "Only Yesterday" in its original Hebrew.

Let us take advantage of this occasion to send our greetings to Agnon's co-prizewinner, Nellie Sachs, recognized by the Swedish Royal Academy as a Jewish poetess mourning the destruction of her people. Though she writes in an alien tongue, she has given voice to the grief and sorrow of the Jewish people, and it is for this expression of our suffering that she shares the Prize. From this Zionist gathering in Jerusalem we send her our heartfelt congratulations.

Members of the Zionist General Council! There are certain remarks I have to make preparatory to our discussion, which will open tonight with the speeches of the Prime Minister and the President of the World Zionist Organization. It is because of the gravity of the times through which we are passing that I wish in a few simple sentences to define and delineate this critical period.

We must bear in mind that the situation in Israel today is not as we were accustomed to see it in days gone by. Certainly the Zionist Movement cannot regard itself in the same light as in the past. In the current pattern of Israel it is difficult to fit in a phase requiring introspection and rethinking of our situation. Are we going through an economic crisis? We were used to crises before the establishment of the State, and also at various intervals during the years of statehood. We always proved capable of surmounting these hard times. Indeed the higher the obstacles, the stronger the Yishuv proved itself to be! The ranks of Zionists abroad grew closer. Never was our faith affected by our trials.

The present situation is the result of a slowdown in the rapid expansion of our economy since the creation of the State. We have grown so accustomed to constant expansion that we find it difficult to believe that brakes have had to be applied. And if they have the result has undoubtedly been suffering. Our plans have been upset, and cracks

have appeared in our economy. However, this was a stage that sooner or later, we had to reach. It obliges all of us, both citizens of this country and Zionists from abroad, to make a united effort. It gives us the right to call upon every self-conscious Jew in the Golah to give all he can, and above all himself, to combat the present difficulties, and enable us to march forward again.

But there is an evil spirit abroad today in Israel. Let this not be a small thing in your eyes. Individual suffering has become a banner. The shrinkage of immigration instead of inducing new thinking and concern for the future, has become a cause for self-accusation. Even re-emigration - yeridah - which is no new phenomenon in our midst, has become, among a section of our people, a sort of permissible protest. The impression gained from the statements made by the denigrators in our midst is that the Jewish people has built up a conditional homeland. When things go well, it is worthy of being fostered. But when the difficulties arise - there is no one to speak in its favour.

I know that such views are not held by a considerable section of our community. But it suffices to produce an evil spirit, distorting the character of our society.

We have woken up from the illusion of unending prosperity in the State of Israel and the result, at least, has been one sobering thought: It has never been so clear that the State of Israel cannot stand alone. It needs the impetus of mass immigration and the dynamism that is the result. The process of the upbuilding of the State is a prolonged one, and bestrewn with many obstacles. Its strength derives from its consciousness of being a country with a mission, the heart of the Jewish national movement. Never will Israel regard itself as devoid of an attachment to World Jewry. Today its citizens are becoming more and more conscious of our mutual dependence. Those who in the past did not find the time to take a look at the Diaspora, are coming to see the problems of our reciprocal ties between Israel and the Diaspora, as a question of life or death for the State.

Today people are beginning to ask: Where is the Jewish people? Why are thousands of young people not coming from the affluent countries? Today people are beginning to question: Where are the shlichim we sent? Where are the teachers? Where are the reserves we sought to train in the Golah?

It has been said that the Zionist Organization is not capable of giving any reply. That may be so, in view of the situation within our Movement today. We are all conscious of its defects, of its acts of omission. Much patience, much love of Israel is necessary to overcome the triteness and apathy that has taken hold of us. But ours is the only national Jewish movement bearing the banner of national unity and the upbuilding of our country. It is the instrument we have. We have no other, notwithstanding the many organizations that the Jewish people disposes of in the West. Criticism of the policies and actions of the Zionist Movement is desirable, even necessary. Nothing can be said against any effort to uncover weaknesses and deficiencies, but an honest balance sheet must be drawn. Our weaknesses must be placed against the achievements we have registered. If the Zionist Organization is in difficult financial straits – and much will be said about this matter in the course of our deliberations – let it be remembered that it brought one and a half million immigrants into the country, that it contributed towards the integration of these newcomers, that it helped in settling the wastelands, in the creation of a modern agriculture, in the emergence of an Israel society, and notwithstanding the criticism that may be voiced against its work in the Golah, it has had something to do with the expansion of Hebrew education, in the new status achieved by Hebrew language and culture in the Golah, in combating assimilation. Criticism will always be welcome. But rejoicing when the hard times come is not criticism. It recoils

on our own heads, makes our struggle more difficult than it need be, at a time when on the face of things there is general unity in favour of Israel.

We sat for several days, prior to the opening of this Session of the Zionist General Council, deliberating on the structure of the Zionist Organization. We reviewed our existing instruments, methods of organization, drafting proposals to remedy defects, considering ways and means of opening the Organization to new elements within the Jewish people, and particularly to the Jewish younger generation. It was clear to all of us, to all those who are close to these problems, that this organizational reform is closely bound up with a regeneration of the Zionist idea. Zionism must bring to the younger generation in the Diaspora the fundamentals of Jewish unity, of Jewish identity, of the centrality of Israel, the duty of Aliyah, expressing the personal participation of our youth in the battle that has not reached its conclusion, which indeed, is still at its height. And so we return to the issue: At a time when the burden of Zionist realization is being transferred from immigration from the countries of distress, set in motion by Jewish misery, to Aliyah impelled by the attractions of this country, the stamina and spiritual integrity of the State of Israel constitute a test and a challenge. A national society that is loyal to its mission, whose actions are gauged in the light of its contribution to national problems, will constitute the loadstone of vital forces in the Jewish dispersion. A society built upon doubt, that is self-centred, is doomed to isolation.

That is the challenge facing us in Israel. Delegates from abroad must appreciate the gravity of the times through which we are passing. This is the hour of trial of the Zionist Organization. It was easy enough to navigate the favourable tides, when admiration for Israel and for Israel's achievements was at its height. But our Movement must be conscious of its responsibilities in hard times no less. This is an obligation we all share. The problems of the State of Israel are the problems of the Jewish people, just as the

dangers threatening Jewish survival in all countries jeopardize our future in this country. It is our duty to disseminate a consciousness of this mutual responsibility throughout the Jewish people, to call upon the Jewish communities and institutions to lend us a helping hand. We must inspire the young people to see their mission and their own future in Aliyah. These are the aims of the Zionist Movement. In this spirit this Session of the Zionist General Council must commence its deliberations. This will be its test.

GREETINGS OF THE CITY OF JERUSALEM

From the Speech of Professor André Chouraqui
(Deputy Mayor of Jerusalem)

I hope and pray that your deliberations will be inspired by the lofty ideals symbolized by Jerusalem: peace, both near and far, peace in the Middle East, peace in the East, peace in the lands of the West — the ideals of justice for the hungry masses in Asia and Africa, justice for the poor in our own country and throughout the world, justice for the widowed and the fatherless — the ideal of unity, union between East and West in our country and throughout the world — the ideals of fraternity and love, without which there can be no peace, no truth, no justice.

Instead of looking back at the past Israel must rouse itself to ensure that the future conquer the past. It must liberate itself of the fetters of the ghettos, in which we shut ourselves and our Movement. We must widen our tents so that the barren once again become fruitful, so that the people in the Golah cease being shut-in and isolated and return to its onetime glory and triumph in the rebuilt Jerusalem.

The people that has been reborn must stretch out its arms to embrace the peoples of Africa and Asia, the Christians, and tomorrow, too, I am sure the people of Islam,

and the people of Arabia among them, of Lebanon, Egypt, Syria and Jordan. Our hands are full of modesty, of prayer, leading through History to the hopes of peace, justice and the promise made in this country that peace will triumph over war, justice over injustice, love over hatred, and light over darkness.

Let this blessing, the blessing of Jerusalem, be vouchsafed you, the blessing of Jerusalem's administration and Jerusalem's citizens, in order that your deliberations may truly advance the regeneration of the Zionist Movement, of a renewed spiritual Zionism in this country and in the Diaspora, for the redemption of our entire people.

IMMIGRATION AND ABSORPTION—OUR TOUCHSTONE AS A MOVEMENT AND AS A STATE

Mr. Levi Eshkol, Prime Minister

In the name of the Government of Israel and myself it gives me great pleasure to greet the Zionist General Council. Welcome to Jerusalem!

The subjects under deliberation on this as on previous occasions, are of vital importance to the State of Israel and the Zionist Movement. As a Movement and as a State, we shall be tested by our achievements in immigration and absorption, and we must exert all our powers, material and spiritual, in order to meet this test.

A Particular Challenge for our State and our People

It is the fate of the State of Israel that every year is a year of trial for us, but I believe that in these days State and nation have a particular challenge to face. I do not intend, at this particular moment, to go into our current security and political problems in any detail. I have no doubt that you are alive to these problems, and that you understand their nature and the fact that we sometimes have to

take steps that give us no particular pleasure and do not always meet with full understanding outside. But our primary responsibility is to safeguard the peace of the State of Israel and its citizens.

You are, no doubt, also well aware of the significance of our economic troubles. Today we are in the midst of a process of economic consolidation. For years we were borne on the waves of a rising flood of development and immigration; now we must consolidate, for the sake of further advances in the future. In this period, we must relentlessly cast the balance sheet of our situation, our prospects for the future and the measures we must adopt so that Israel may stand on her own feet economically.

It is only natural that this process should be sometimes difficult and, in part, even painful. Of that we are well aware. It strives towards greater efficiency, economy, higher productivity – even if that means drastic changes and retrenchment in administration and organization, the dismissal of superfluous employees in services and production. It means a certain slowing down in economic activity and development.

Above all, this process means disturbance and suffering for tens of thousands of workers, who regarded their positions as safe and stable, but suddenly find themselves out of work and compelled to seek new jobs and new forms of employment.

The Transition from Over-Employment and Inflation to Stability in Employment and Prices

It would be wrong, however, to exaggerate the dimensions of the problem, either in all sincerity or in imitation of the current fashion of barren criticism. It would be wrong to lower the spirits of our people and our friends. Similar economic and social difficulties are today the lot of larger and more well-established countries, richer than we in natural resources and working tradition, for example,

Britain and Germany. Even mighty America has faced, and is facing, problems of unemployment and inflation.

We are today in a transition period from over-employment and inflation to stability in employment and prices. It is only natural that a period of inflation and over-employment should have given rise to serious distortions in productivity, prices, wages, and labour morale. It is not easy to correct these distortions, and today we are engaged in this process of correction.

The Government is doing everything that has to be done to strengthen and consolidate the economy and increase efficiency. These efforts, I am glad to say, are already bearing their first fruits, as we are entitled to note with a certain measure of satisfaction. In the past two years the gap in our balance has dropped by 100 million dollars, and this year we hope to reduce the deficit by another 40 million dollars, if not more. This reduction in the deficit is due mainly to the growth of our exports, which we expect this year to pass the thousand-million-dollar mark for the first time. Productivity has been steadily growing, efficiency is improving and there has been a rise in labour morale. We are well aware that we have not yet exhausted the latent capacities of our people in all spheres of work: in agriculture and industry, science and administration, in tourism and trade. Great are the resources still untapped amongst this people which has been assembled from the four corners of the earth. Great is the as yet undeveloped strength of the economy we have built. I am confident that we shall continue to advance.

In adopting our new economic policy, we have also undertaken the heavy burden of ensuring that the period of transition between one type of work and another shall not be too long, and that, even during this period workers on the move shall suffer as little as possible. The Government has borne this burden that we have undertaken — in addition to the burdens of security, development and the ingathering of the exiles — as a matter of course, with pride and responsibility, since the first day of the State.

Drop in Immigration – The Main Cause
of our Economic Policy

This policy is the outcome of several causes. If the public only began to notice it at the beginning of 1966, although we started to work in this direction previously, there was one main reason for the fact: in this year there was a serious drop in immigration – and it is to this subject that I wish to devote the greater part of my remarks this evening.

Since the establishment of the State – and even before, in the days of the Mandate – immigration has been the dynamic factor which moulded our society and economy. It dictated our policy in development, education and economic affairs. Perhaps there were some who wondered why a young State should be prepared to subjugate itself, as it were, to "dictation" by an "external factor". Why did we persevere with immigration even in times of unemployment? Why did we devote gigantic sums to apparently "unproductive" purposes like housing and the development of the economic infrastructure? But anyone who found this surprising showed that he did not understand the true character of the State of Israel, of the State which regards itself as the representative of the exiled and scattered Jewish people, of the State whose first basic law was the Law of Return. He did not understand the tremendous role of immigration in the long-term development of the economy – even if it gave rise to difficulties in the short term.

Can anyone imagine Israel without its mass settlement, its hundreds of new villages, its development towns, the new quarters and suburbs that surround our cities? Can anyone imagine our economy without our ramified agriculture, our extensive industries, transport network and economic services? All these were built by new immigrants with their own hands, for their own sakes, for all our sakes, for the sake of the State. It was they that gave the State the great impetus which has had such valuable results and endowed us with the strength to face the challenges of the future.

It is easy to understand that the reduction in immigration during the past year has inevitably led to a slowdown in the rate of development. If you travel to Jerusalem, to Ashdod, Beersheba and other places, you will see this for yourselves. An economy entirely organized for growth and development is naturally subject to pains and distortions if its growth is suddenly halted. It is these pains that we feel today.

The Close of One Phase and the Opening of the Next

For these reasons, Israel's central problem today, as ever, is immigration. Israel will not be able to develop and grow without continued immigration. It has already been our privilege to gather in the scattered sons of the Jewish people from the camps in Europe, the Moslem countries and from other areas of distress. Today we stand at the conclusion of one stage and the beginning of a new one: the determined attempt to breach the walls of governmental ill-will and the indifference of Jews in the prosperous lands.

For the present, a lull in immigration has been forced upon us and we are utilizing it to increase the efficiency of our economic enterprises and institutions. When a new wave of immigration arrives, we must be prepared for it with a large, efficient, modern and developing economy.

The Jewish people can help us in this endeavour by providing the financial resources for investment, the know-how and the network of commercial ties, so that Israeli exports and production may be able to expand, increase their efficiency and take on additional workers.

Our Vital Living Bond with the Jewish People

But there is another side to the coin of immigration. We have been able to build and maintain the State of Israel by virtue of the quality of its citizens. We have always known that it is not quantity that will enable us to confront challenges and threats. But this qualitative superiority -

the superiority of our Jewish men and women – is today in danger. The tasks facing a modern State are many – particularly in our country. We have not enough men with knowledge, education, scientific training and devotion to carry out all the tasks. We are, therefore, faced with the disturbing question: The pioneer of our day, the builder of the land, devoted, knowledgeable, diligent – where is he to come from? Hence it is our duty to train our manpower quickly and, at the same time, to bring in men and women endowed with know-how and education. If we can stand this test, we can ensure that Israel will meet the hopes of the Jewish people – and perhaps not hopes alone. This is the prior condition for the creation of a well-ordered society, with a modern culture, rooted in the heritage of the Jewish people and loyal to its mission.

From all these points of view the living bonds with the Jewish people are of vital importance to us. I am well aware that these considerations are only the outward expression of the bond of faith, the eternal mystic bond which unites all generations of the Jewish people and all its communities throughout the world. Obviously, it is only against the background of the unity and the vision of the entire Jewish people that the State of Israel was able to rise. Today it is clear to all that this bond is vital not only for ourselves but for the very existence of the Jewish dispersion. In many countries our people is threatened by decline, whether by the pressure of hostile rule or through indifference, assimilation and abandonment of Jewish culture and the Jewish heritage.

To these problems there is only one solution: the strengthening of the living, substantial, personal bond between Israel and the Diaspora.

Living Bond – the Jew who Settles in Israel

This bond is manifold. First and foremost, it is the bond of the Jew who comes to Israel to settle and live in it. Last year, only a few thousand immigrants came to Israel

from the affluent countries, but, despite the small numbers, they are a proof that they can be multiplied many times. It is of the most vital importance that we should begin this very day with large-scale preparations in the Diaspora for their departure for Israel. It is your duty to give yourselves and us an answer to the question: How can this immigration be increased? What must you do to that end? And, in the same way, it is our duty to ask ourselves what is the significance of our actions from the viewpoint of immigration and how we can increase it.

Young Students – Another Bond

Another bond is that of young people who will come to study and learn to love it. We want them to stay here for life, but even if some of them leave after a few years, there will remain in their hearts a substantial deposit of a fresh love of Zion. These young people, wherever they may be, constitute a real and living bond with our country, because they have known it and lived in it; they know its merits and faults, its flora and fauna, its hills and valleys, its rains and hot winds. I appeal to you: Bring many more like them. We will learn to understand them, take them in our hearts – and thus we shall create the scarlet thread that binds those who are already with us to those who are yet to come.

And so as long as the Diaspora needs them, we shall also try, to the best of our ability, to supply teachers, youth leaders, rabbis and educators who will bring to the Jewish communities the fruits of the land, its spirit, its love and pride in sovereignty and independence. We shall see to it that the standards of these emissaries from the land of Israel should be high, that they should carry out their tasks with sincerity, devotion, tact and wisdom, and bring the maximum advantage to the people and the State.

Ensuring Real Absorption

There is one more task with which we must grapple: How to ensure the real absorption of the immigrant in Israel. This problem cannot be solved by institutions alone, although they do much for the purpose, and the process of economic absorption is steadily improving. But there is no doubt that we, the Government and the Zionist Movement, can and should do more than we are doing today – no matter how much we are doing already. These are the central problems with which we are grappling and must continue to grapple. Permit me, friends, to ask, in brutal candour: What have we done and what are we doing to solve them? And above all, we need an awakening of the hearts; we must stretch out a fraternal hand to the newcomer – from whatever land he comes.

Two years have passed since the last Zionist Congress. Half the time until the next Congress has already gone. The previous Congress despatched the Zionist Movement on a long road, laden with excellent and important resolutions. Let every Congress delegate, every member of the Zionist General Council ask himself: What has been done to carry them out?

Implementing the Resolutions of the Last Congress

The Congress decided on measures to intensify immigration, to encourage immigration from the affluent lands. The immigration figures show that most of the immigrants have come from those very countries where it is not the work of the Zionist Movement that counts, but other factors – above all, the very existence of Israel. The dimensions of immigration from the affluent countries is very small – both from the viewpoint of Israel's needs and possibilities and also from the point of view of the Jewish potential in those countries.

The Congress decided to encourage pioneer training and youth movements, to operate among student youth, to

bring young people from the Diaspora to study in Israel. Today there are 400,000 Jewish students in the affluent countries. Less than 2,000 of them have reached Israel, including the universities, the yeshivot and the institutes. Can the Movement say that this all it could do in order to carry out its own resolutions? Can it say that even this little has been done by the Movement itself? I was glad to hear that all the world's Jewish youth organizations are cooperating with the Zionist Movement. This opens up many opportunities, but it is a tremendous challenge, which you must face.

It was decided to expand and intensify Zionist education and Jewish cultural activities in the Diaspora – what has the Movement done for that purpose? Have all the necessary resources – spiritual and material – been employed to introduce a Jewish and Zionist content into all types of Jewish communal education? There are Jewish day schools even in some small communities. What has been done to strengthen and expand this network? What has been done to expand the network of Jewish weekend schools? What has been done to give content to the studies in the schools that exist? Are the pupils being imbued with a new, fresh and living love for Zion?

The Jewish People Faces a Grave and Fateful Struggle

It seems to me that the active workers and leaders of the Zionist Movement would do well to devote their great energies and powers to this work for the implementation of their own resolutions. Then, perhaps, there might be more moral force in their advice and their analyses of Israel's position, policies and actions, and we would not be faced with a statement, often ill-advised, made almost from the gangway of a plane, as it were – without a true understanding of the situation, as my friend the Chairman of the Zionist Organization of America did on recent occasion.

As you know, I have never been in favour of abstract debate on the meaning of Zionism and the Zionist Organization's

right to exist. I have attached much greater importance to the implementation of its ideas. I would have been wholeheartedly in favour of giving it pride of place in our relations with the Jewish people. But rights imply duties as well. If there is a Charter between us – it obligates both parties to action. I believe the Government of Israel has met and is continuing to meet its obligations to the Movement – if not more. But there is no point in simply drawing attention to the Charter. If it is not backed by deeds, it loses all sense and purpose. The Government of Israel must re-examine from time to time its ties and undertakings towards the Zionist Movement on the basis of deeds – or the lack of them.

I am far from having any desire to provoke you. I have spoken from a grieving heart, and if I have hurt you, believe that these are the hurts of a friend. I have spoken in the consciousness of the responsibility we must bear for the fate of our people. The Jewish people today faces a grave and fateful struggle for its very existence as a living entity, as one people. We must mobilize all our forces to preserve and strengthen it, so that it may be able to face the revolutionary changes which are taking place in our world.

You are well aware that there is much criticism of the Zionist Movement and its Organization. It is in your power to refute that criticism, to demonstrate the vitality of the Movement. It is in your power to show that it does not intend to rest on the laurels of its glorious past, and that it is capable of grappling with the Jewish people's tasks of tomorrow.

May you summon up the courage, resourcefulness, devotion and capacity for action required to achieve our common aims, to increase immigration, to strengthen the ties between the parts of our people, and to bear this mission with pride.

These things are within our power – and we must do them.

TASKS OF THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT
AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Dr. Nachum Goldmann
(President of the World Zionist Organization)

We have gathered here this evening to open the annual Session of the Zionist General Council, at a time which is by no means an easy one in Jewish history. We are meeting at a time of many dangers and many problems for the Jewish people and for the State of Israel, and also for the Zionist Organization.

My task this evening is to review the more salient of those problems.

Among these problems there are some regarding which there is a consensus in the Movement; there are others about which there are differences, as is only natural seeing that within the Zionist Movement there are organizations with divergent points of view, policies and attitudes. Indeed it would be unnatural to expect no disagreement on problems, some of which are highly complex and even delicate.

I shall express my own views. I do not accept the attitude that every member of the Zionist Movement may express his personal opinion, excepting the President of the World Zionist Organization. I enjoy the same rights to say the least as every individual member of the Movement.

Non-Jews Tend to Forget

I will deal first with the state of our people today, the external situation. The factor that to a certain extent is new in our lives, and shapes the state of affairs today, is that more than twenty years after the conclusion of the Second World War there is a tendency among the non-Jews to forget what happened in the course of the War and what its outcome was. It is a trend towards some sort of normalization, as if

the War had never happened, certainly not what happened to the Jews. This process of normalization commenced the moment the Western Powers began to realize that Federal Germany could be a bastion in the war on Communism, and when the Eastern Powers began to appreciate that East Germany could serve as a bastion in their war on Western capitalism.

At that moment they began to liquidate – not for us but for themselves – the results of the European Holocaust and of German war crimes. There were times, in the early post-war years, when people, recalling the crimes of the Nazis, were ashamed to be anti-Semites. They were very careful about not being suspected of the Nazi philosophy, the despicable deeds of the Nazis. Today, twenty years after the War they are beginning not to be ashamed. There is practically no country in the world, in which Jews are today resident, where anti-Semitic movements are not beginning to re-appear, with anti-Semitic slogans. People now boast of being pro-Nazis, and even in the land of the French Revolution, in France itself, only a short while ago a poll was conducted and many of the participants stated frankly that they entertained anti-Semitic feelings.

I do not say that these manifestations constitute a danger to our people in the Diaspora, but as symptoms they are very ominous, and indicate what might come to pass if the present more or less buoyant economic situation in the Western world should not continue. And there will come times of economic crisis, social crisis, for example in a continent like South America with its grave unsolved social problems. Rapidly these symptoms can develop and constitute a real danger to Jewish survival, to important Jewish communities.

The most dangerous and the most dramatic manifestation of what I have called the normalization of the world twenty years after the Second World War, is, of course, Germany itself. The unexpected triumph at the polls of a

party which, while not officially in its programme, is anti-Semitic, but is so in all its style – and I have always held that the style adopted by a party is much more important than its theoretical programme – in its manner of speaking, its approach to problems, is very similar to the Nazi movement, in its early years. This movement does not constitute a problem at the present moment for it received no more than eight per cent of votes.

Our Sensitivity to Developments in Germany

I have said that we must not exaggerate the danger, but I have also said many times to the Germans that if there is one people in the world entitled to be more sensitive than others to what comes to pass in Germany, it is the Jewish people.

I do not regard this movement as constituting a serious danger to the Jewish people. There is no Jewish problem in Germany. There are thirty thousand Jews there who have returned of their own free will, and this number does not constitute a problem even under the worst of conditions. It would be easy enough for a community of this size to depart from Germany. There is no comparison whatsoever with the Nazi movement, there is no danger of Germany, be it nationalistic and anti-Semitic, conquering Europe and destroying the Jews, at a time when the Russians are ready in immense force on the Oder-Neisse border and Germany has no atomic weapons (and I certainly hope that they will never have any!).

The appearance of the National Democratic Party is a far greater threat for the free world and for European democracy. It is an extreme nationalistic movement. And seeing that Germany has tremendous organizational ability, and geopolitically it lies between the East and the West, it has far greater importance than it would otherwise have. So the democracies of the world have every reason to view this new nationalism in Germany with grave concern. Germany has always been anti-Semitic, and I fear that it

will always be anti-Semitic, but the threat is far greater today to the non-Jewish world than it is to the Jewish. Which does not mean to say that we should not be vigilant, for Germany can develop into a centre for anti-Semitic organizations throughout the world, irrespective of the number of Jews there are in Germany itself. For this reason alone we must be on the alert and regard with suspicion – not with hysteria – any such manifestations, especially in Germany.

Our Relations with the German People

But permit me not to confine myself solely to the current situation in Germany, which is not yet dangerous. It has a Government among whose members are friends of Israel and of the Jewish people. I would like to dilate a little on the question of relations between the Jewish people and the German people.

The Jews have three alternatives in their relations with the German people after the European Holocaust. Theoretically at least there was the alternative of revenge and destruction of the Germans. That was not feasible, neither morally nor realistically. There was another, of not taking the existence of the German people into account, not to recognize its existence, to refrain from all contact. I have the greatest respect for those who sincerely feel this way. When I had the courage, fifteen years ago, to advise the Jewish people and the State of Israel to enter into negotiations with Federal Germany, if they wanted restitution and compensation etc., there was strong opposition among the Jews. I am not convinced that if a poll had been taken at the time, that the majority would not have stated their opposition. At that time I said – and I repeated this statement several times later – that I respected those who felt that way, and I would have been ashamed to be a Jew if the entire people had accepted my counsel regarding negotiations with Germany. This reaction of not wishing to recognize an enemy who had done us what the Nazis did

to us is classic in Jewish history. And within the historic context what might be called within a more intimate Jewish domestic circle "being cross", to regard the adversary as non-existent, was one of the stratagems of the Jewish people, a stratagem of genius, which enabled it to survive in the Golah, with its discrimination, repression, humiliation. Whoever treated us in this fashion ceased to be a human being, he was a barbarian, a beast, who could do us harm, who could even kill us, but could not be an enemy in ordinary terms. As I have said it was a stratagem of genius which enabled us to live through two thousand years in the Golah, something that no other people could and did do.

But what the Jews could do then is not good for the Jews today. We have left the ghettoes, we have become masters – or wish to become masters – of our own destiny. We have established a State, the loftiest expression in history of national sovereignty. But it is not only the State. The Jews of the Diaspora have learned, through the Zionist Movement, and through other movements, through the World Jewish Congress and other organizations, to try to govern their own destinies, not to accept their fate submissively, not to accept what their enemies do to them, and to try and follow an independent policy. A people in these circumstances cannot use the methods of the ghetto. Germany exists, it is a great power, it is growing stronger, economically it is the strongest power in Europe. Tomorrow it may be so politically, especially now that it has been permitted to create a new army. This Germany can cause much harm, both to Jewish people and the State of Israel. It can be, as I have already say, a centre of anti-Semitic organizations.

This Germany has and can become a source of all sorts of interests and achievements for us. Fifteen years ago the State through the Knesset convened all the major Jewish organizations, which resolved – not unanimously and I am pleased that it was not unanimously – to recognize the existence of Federal Germany, and to come to this Germany with

all our demands – restitution and compensation, the restoration of property, normalization of relations with Israel, a special status and special obligations towards the State of Israel after the European Holocaust.

I am convinced that we must continue this policy which has accomplished much and which can accomplish still more.

There is another thing I wish to say. I will never subscribe, I have never subscribed to a thesis which certain of my colleagues find very convenient, that all this is permissible for the State but it is not permissible for the Jewish people. If you wish to destroy that sympathy among the Jewish people, about which the Prime Minister spoke in his address, underlining that this was the very foundation of the existence of the people, then permit the State to establish relations with Germany, precisely on this delicate question and demand that the Jewish people take up an entirely different position.

The Problem of Russian Jewry

And now permit me to say something at this public opening of our Session. I wish to make a number of remarks about a matter that is far more important. It is a problem affecting three million Jews, at least according to the census. I have heard from important Russian diplomats that the number exceeds three million. This is the second largest Jewish community, coming after that of the United States, and I need not tell you – many of you, after all belong to this Jewry, as I do too – what was the qualitative value of this Jewry in the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, down to the Russian Revolution.

This problem is not a Communist problem, it is a Russian problem, which is why we may permit ourselves to be hopeful. It is not true that a Jewish community cannot exist under a Communist regime. Communities exist in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, in Yugoslavia and Cuba. If they are small communities it is not the fault

of the Communists but of the European Holocaust. Not only do they enjoy Government assistance; even their Rabbis are paid by the Government. In Rumania a shochet is not permitted to leave without a certificate from the Rabbi that the community is not in need of one. Castro asked for the despatch of two shochetim, intimating that he was prepared to pay the expenses involved. In Poland, proportionately-speaking, the Government spends far more on the Yiddish Theatre which is half empty – there are few Jews who understand Yiddish – than they do on the Polish Theatre. Every child in a Yiddish School in Poland, I have been told, costs the Government four or five times as much as other pupils. In the non-Jewish schools there are thirty to forty children to a class in an ordinary school and only six to eight in a Jewish school. There are no Jews and text-books are being produced for this sorry remnant of the Jewish people in Poland.

All this proves that here we do not have a matter of Communist policy, not even Communist Russia. In the early years we know that the Habimah Theatre was founded there and there was a rich Yiddish culture. We cannot ask them to change the regime for our benefit. We cannot expect Castro to refrain from revolutionary measures, so that a Jewish community remain.

The problem, accordingly, is a Russian problem. It may not even be desirable to examine why the situation should be so in Russia, and not in other Communist countries in Eastern Europe. The problem is that this Jewish community, practically speaking, is not permitted to remain Jewish, not in the religious sense, not in the national sense, not in the cultural sense. The paradox is that in no other country in the world, other than Soviet Russia, are the Jews recognized as a national minority.

Ten years ago we resolved that we would combat this state of affairs. I was among the first to do so. I organized the first conference to be held on the subject, which convened in Paris. This was a gathering attended mainly by

non-Jewish intellectuals, coming from many countries. Since then we have done important work, but we were always concerned – that is to say I and my colleagues were concerned – not to become involved in the Cold War. As a people the Jews have no defined stand in regard to Communism or capitalism, or for that matter in regard to any other social regime. The individual Jew or even parties can take up whatever attitude they wish, even a Jewish group can do so. But not the Jewish people.

The Russian leadership must understand that we are not hostile to Soviet Russia. There is much to Russia's credit. It was instrumental in saving hundreds of thousands of Jews during the years of the European Holocaust, and if it were not for the positive stand taken up by Russia in the United Nations we should not have achieved the two thirds majority we required for the establishment of the State of Israel.

On the other hand, however, we must make it clear to the Russian leaders that even if they do not accede to our demands, they must understand our motives which compel us to take up this struggle. We cannot remain silent, when we see a body of three million Jews disappearing, not, God forbid, because of physical liquidation, persecution or pogroms, or even because of starvation, but nevertheless disappearing as an integral part of the Jewish people.

The Russian leaders are open to conviction. I believe that they are. They are signs that they even understand that it is in their own interest, under conditions of present-day politics. Millions of Jews are being angered and upset. So are millions of non-Jews. I believe that by this propaganda we can influence and convince Soviet Russia. Certain achievements have been registered, which should not be underrated. First of all we have succeeded in making this into an international problem, which is not easy, for we are not dealing with pogroms. It was easy enough to convert Nazi policy into an international problem. Jews were massacred,

there was Auschwitz, and there was Treblinka. Today when we come to states and to Governments and ask them to intervene they say that it is an internal problem. Jews are not being maltreated, Armenians are not being persecuted, there are no pogroms. What we have now is a matter of political policy. One of the leading Western diplomats said to me: "I understand your feelings, and in my heart I wish you every success, but for my country to intervene because there are no Jewish schools, no Jewish literature, no synagogues, in a country that is officially atheistic - is something we cannot do." But we have succeeded in rousing public opinion, not only among those who can easily be roused to curse Russia. It is precisely the latter whose aid we do not need. We have preferred progressive circles, leaders who are pro-Soviet, whom Russia cannot brand as agents of the Cold War. We have enlisted even the assistance of important Communist bodies in Europe and the United States. And I believe with all due circumspection, that we have brought this to the notice of the leaders of Soviet Russia. Today they know that such a problem exists. And to the best of my knowledge the problem is being studied. I do not know what the upshot will be. There are a number of symptoms which do not change the situation materially. There is a Jewish monthly which, so I am told by the people who know, is becoming more and more Jewish, not, of course, in the Israel sense. All this, we must bear in mind, is being done in Soviet Russia. Books are being published in Yiddish, previously primarily the works of writers who are already dead, Shalom Aleichem and Mendele, today even the works of living writers. An anthology of Hebrew poetry in Israel has been published, not only of writers of the Left. The attitude was very objective. There are many other symptoms but I do not wish to enlarge on the subject. Recently Premier Kosygin made his well-known statement in Paris. We do not know what the outcome will be. We must be patient. But the very fact that the Russian Prime Minister made a statement to the effect that in Russia they understand the problem of the unification of

families and will not put obstacles in the way of such unification, is something that has happened for the first time. We must hope that this statement will lead to practical results. There is no other alternative but much patience.

Israel has certain interests in respect of Soviet Russia. I do not think that any less cautious policy would produce better results. On the contrary it would only cause damage. We must be careful, responsible, patient. Today I may say, more than I could two or three years ago – I cannot prove what I wish to say – I have hopes that slowly the situation will improve.

The Situation in Israel

About the situation in this country. Millions of Jews are sharing the anxieties of the State. There is a complex of security difficulties. You know what is happening. There is tension on the borders, and there are economic difficulties. But, believe me, the main problems are psychological. Generally speaking I do not believe in absolute objective conditions. Everything depends on the reaction. There are people who are poor and happy and there are millionaires who commit suicide. A single objective fact tells you nothing at all. What is important is how one reacts. And without entering upon any discussion of the philosophy of Jewish history, we Jews have a special approach to facts. We continue to exist as a people because we have never accepted facts as they are. Our existence was faced upon a tradition of the past, upon the vision of the future, and whatever happened in between was some sort of transitory phase. The Jewish people never identified itself completely with any given situation, which is what gave them the nerve and the stamina to hold out. And you must excuse me if I say that there are sections of the Jewish community in this country who can learn a lot from the Jews who lived in the ghettos, with all their squalor and poverty.

There are newspapers in this country. When I read some of them it is difficult to believe that this State brought one and a half million Jews, and even more to this country. That this State fought two wars and won both. That in its nineteen years it has won the respect of the nations of the world. All that, it seems, just does not exist, never happened. One of my friends, sitting here at this table, told me that if you keep on reading certain newspapers, you became convinced that there are only two alternatives for you – either to leave the country and settle elsewhere or to commit suicide. All that there is is public scandal and trouble. I am very much in favour of criticism, I even like criticism, if it is not ill-mannered, however impertinent it may at times be. But all criticism, if it is to be legitimate, ethical, must be endowed with a sense of proportion. Are all the big things that have been done in this country not worth anything at all? How many other examples have you of a State set up in the course of nineteen years, which is no worse than many other small countries, which has brought immigrants to a number four times its own population, which is regarded by most nations of the world with admiration, respect, sympathy? Is this all nothing? Is this not on the credit side of the balance-sheet? Are there no other countries with their setbacks and their defeats? Do you think that one can introduce almost two million newcomers into a new country without setbacks? This country was built up by people who knew many things. They knew Gemarah and God knows what else, but we never learned, in our Chadarim and our Yeshivot, how to build up a State. Here we have set up a Jewish economy, created by a people, who always lived on the outskirts of an economy developed by others. Here we had to create an economy to employ thousands who came without a penny in their pockets. Setbacks under such circumstances are unavoidable. I am no economist, I am not familiar with the Government's economic policy, I cannot say whether it is the right one or not. But I was convinced that a day must come when we must pay for all this rapid development. Can

we continue with a national growth of a magnitude of 10-12 per cent every year for a long time? What country has done such a thing? There are much bigger countries today, with economic slowdowns that are far more serious. England is one of these, Germany is beginning. These are countries with reserves. How can one compare Israel with them? The press there, too, is full of criticism, but do they fill their columns daily with reports of new scandals, as if nothing else important was being done in the State? This situation is causing much concern in the Golah. The normal state of affairs is for Israel to constitute a source of inspiration and encouragement for the Golah. I fear the day when the Golah will have to encourage the State, when they will tell you not to be alarmed because of the economic recession, which will soon pass. They will tell you to look at this phase in its historic context. We agree that the situation is becoming worse not better and I can understand how you feel. But all those in responsible positions must view the situation with a sense of proportion.

Israel's Political Fragmentation Causes Jewry Concern

I do not wish to blame the press for all this. Behind the present situation is that bane of the State and the Zionist Movement (I will deal with this tomorrow), which is the terrible political fragmentation in the State of Israel. A struggle between parties is normal, even good. God forbid that we should have one dominant party. And certainly I appreciate that in the political struggle means are used which are not absolutely fair. But there is a limit to everything. The hostility between the parties, the lust for power, the intolerance! Rivalry is a good thing provided it is not motivated by such terrible hatred, which once before destroyed a Jewish State. It can destroy countries far stronger, far more flexible than the State of Israel. Lacking peace, with tension on the borders, with economic difficulties, with the need to integrate all these hundreds of thousands of newcomers into the life of the country! I speak in the

name of the Jewry of the Golah. That is what is causing us so much concern. The Jews abroad are far more optimistic than the critics in this country. I have discussed this matter with many economists and Jewish financiers. Has America not known crises, unemployment, poverty, suffering? America is the richest country in the world. In the entire history of mankind there has never been a country so wealthy. It is necessary for people here to learn to maintain some degree of unity, despite the political competition which is good and necessary. There must be limits to criticism, to attacks, there must be an atmosphere in this country, suitable for the great achievements we have registered. Study the situation, do something about it, introduce the necessary improvements. In what era of history have there been created what we have created here in the course of nineteen years? There is suffering, there is trouble, but you can console yourselves with the fact that the people is conscious of the greatness of these accomplishments, which have few parallels in Jewish, or for that matter, in human, history.

SECOND MEETING

Monday, January 9, 1967, in the morning

Chairman: Mrs. SIEGFRIED KRAMARSKY

TASKS OF THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT
AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE

Continuation of the Address of Dr. Nachum Goldmann
(President of the World Zionist Organization)

I wish to say a few words about the external political situation as I have got the feeling, on the basis of talks with various people in the few weeks since I came to this country, that there is exaggerated concern about this aspect.

I belong to those, who, as many of my friends and opponents know, appreciate – perhaps more than others – the importance of a normalization of Israel-Arab relations. For many years I have insisted that this is the paramount problem of Israel's foreign policy, even more important than her relations with Washington or with Paris. Israel must live here and I am convinced that time is on her side. I have had long talks with Ben Gurion, who was on the contrary opinion, that time was working for Israel for which reason a more passive policy was advisable. Now I have read a press report to the effect that Ben Gurion has said that Arab strength would grow in ten years, and that within ten years Israel's relations with the Arabs could become a very grave problem. Which seems to indicate that he, too, has changed his views.

I say all this, because notwithstanding the importance I attach to the normalization of relations with the Arabs, I believe the present pessimistic mood is out of proportion.

I do not belong to those, like Moshe Dayan, who feel that if we were given an opportunity to be alone with the Arabs there is a chance that we should be able to settle things. Such an attitude is not realistic. There is no part of the world in which the Great Powers are not involved, and the Middle East is an important part of the world. Within the geopolitical context the importance of the Arabs is growing, and it is a delusion to believe that one day America, or the West, or the East will say: We wash our hands of the whole affair, let the Jews and the Arabs settle their differences themselves, face to face. This entire approach - I must crave the pardon of my friend Dayan - is a little naive. Normalization will take a long time. It will be a long process because the problem, basically, is psychological. Objectively, there is no reason why the Arabs should regard the existence of Israel in such a tragic light. They are not short of territory, they have all the deserts they want, they have so much space that within a hundred years they will not have settled all of it. If the question were regarded rationally then peace could come in a very short time. But as I have said it is a psychological problem, and psychological problems take time. You can't handle psychology with resolutions and statements.

But I have always felt that by the application of pressure by the Powers the Arabs could be made to understand that there is not the slightest chance of their being able to destroy Israel. And when I speak of the Great Powers I am referring specifically to the two Blocs. I have often said - and I have been attacked for saying so - that the road to peace with the Arabs leads more through Moscow than through Washington. Not because Moscow is stronger than Washington but because Washington can exercise less pressure on the Arabs than Moscow.

And from precisely this point of view, I am today rather more hopeful than I was several years back. Why? Because as I see the situation, both America and Russia are more

interested than previously in a rapprochement. Some of you may have read the memoirs of Adenauer and recall his account of his talks with Khrustchev when he visited Moscow eight years back. Khrustchev then told him that there must be a rapprochement with the West because one day Russia and the West would have to present a common front to China. That was eight years ago. And in the meantime Russo-Chinese relations have not become better, in view of the new radicalism and obsessions at present in China.

It is common knowledge that this is what the Russians want and also what the American Government wants. The obstacle is Vietnam. But the present situation in Vietnam will not continue for ever. Personally I am optimistic, but my own assessment of the situation is not important. I believe that the Russians are interested in ridding themselves of the Vietnam affair; certainly Johnson would like to do so. Both are operating under pressure. One because of internal politics the other because of external politics. The way out remains to be found, but when goodwill is present, some solution can be found. It can last a year, perhaps another year, but the moment that the Vietnam problem is liquidated, I believe that an era of rapid understanding and of mutual recognition between the Soviets and America will set in.

Then the time will come when we shall be able to talk seriously about both Blocs guaranteeing peace and stability in the Near East, which is the first step towards getting the Arabs to understand that Israel is a fait accompli.

Our world is a world of two-super-Powers. Within twenty years I am afraid there will be a third — China. If the two Powers were ready to ensure permanent peace in the world, they could secure stability in the Near East. Then the conditions would be created for the slow process of regularization of relations with the Arabs. I stress this because I feel that there are a lot of people in this country who do not know how we are ever to get out of this situation.

The terrorists are active, the Syrians are shooting, Israel is retaliating, and there are debates in the United Nations. What will the end be? As you know, on many matters in the past I have been pessimistic about Israel's foreign policy, today I am more optimistic.

I have considered it my duty to say so, not in order to comfort you, which is an easy and cheap thing to do, but because it is my conviction that the horizon in the next two or three years, not after the Messiah comes, presages the possibility of some sort of agreement between the Eastern and the Western Blocs, which will affect the Near East, too.

And now the final problem with which I wish to deal – the situation in the Zionist Movement. If there were people in the Golah, particularly in the early years after the establishment of the State of Israel, when there was such great enthusiasm and everybody thought that the problems could be solved easily enough, and that what Israel could not handle itself the Jews abroad would help in solving – the present crisis has shown once again how necessary an organization like the Zionist Movement is.

The debate whether we need a Zionist Organization is superfluous. The present situation in Israel, indeed, indicates that this country stands in need of far greater support from the Jewish people.

We have not even begun to concern ourselves, neither we nor the Jewish people generally, about the situation that must arise when mass immigration will no longer be possible, because the great reservoirs of immigration, those in Morocco and the Yemen and elsewhere, which needed no Zionist propaganda to set them in motion, have been emptied. No reserves of immigration have remained, and the question of the future of the State has come forward. Shall the status quo be maintained with Israel's population growing only through natural increase, while the neighbouring Arab states have a natural increase two or even three times as high –

I do not know the exact figures? While in regard to the ratio between Jews and Arabs in Israel, the position must become more and more unfavourable for Israel, for the same reason, if there is no new wave of immigration. Needless to say Israel stands in need of precisely the type of immigrant the West can provide to maintain its standards, without which Israel loses much of its meaning, both for the Jews and for the non-Jewish world.

We have constantly proclaimed our desire to absorb immigrants, and indeed this was a major plank of the Zionist programme, but what we are faced with today is a difficult problem. Programmatic demands alone will not take us very far. Our task now is to launch a campaign within the Jewish people. The Jewish people is obligated to ensure the future and security of the State of Israel, not only by contributing money, or by political resolutions and demonstrations, or even investments. They must give what is the greatest pride of the nation. It is not impossible though I am fully aware of the difficulties. I have lived for many years in America, and I am familiar with the West and the free world.

The great Zionist question is not whether Zionism is necessary but whether the Zionist Movement can fulfil the tasks devolving upon it. We are living in a period when the greater part of the Jewish people is potentially Zionist. But this is not expressed in the Zionist Organization. Never before has the atmosphere within the Jewish people been so Zionist potentially - with the possible exception of the time when the State was established - and never before has the Zionist Organization been so weak as it is today.

The test of our strength, of our position within the context of the Jewish people, is whether we constitute a central force in the communities, if we are organizing the Jewish people, if no important decisions can be taken without our cooperation. That is the test of the Zionist Movement.

Let us admit the truth. There have been important exceptions. There was an important decision in English Jewry, which could not be passed without the Zionists. The same is true of South Africa and also of Australia, perhaps, and another two or three countries. But generally speaking, in American Jewry, in which to a great extent the history of our generation is being resolved, are decisions taken through Zionism? Many Zionists play an important role, both on the local and the national stage in American Jewish life, but it is not because they are Zionists, but because they are important personalities in their own right.

It is for this reason that I am of the opinion that the radical reconstruction of the Movement is absolutely necessary. As long as Zionism is based primarily on political parties it will not be able to carry out its functions. For me this is a dogma insofar as there are dogmas at all in potential life. The closer I look at Jewish life the more I am convinced that this is the case. Zionist parties have a *raison d'être* in Israel. It is obvious that parliamentary democracy cannot operate without parties. (Too many parties is entirely another problem. That is an internal problem of Israel's political life.) In the Diaspora, however, eighty per cent of the differences between the parties are artificial. Once a party is found necessary one must produce a programme. In American Zionist work, what is the difference between Poalei Zion and Hadassah? All seek to enlist aid for Israel and funds for Israel, and carry on political work and encourage Aliyah, and foster work among the youth and in the field of education. But what are the differences between them? In the sphere of education there is a difference between the Mizrachi and ourselves. In the State we have solved this problem as we have in the Zionist Organization. Here, too, we can find a solution. The difference of opinion between Herut and other parties on the question of Germany—what has that to do with Zionist politics in America?

The same applies to other countries. The artificial differences are destroying the national federations, and what

is worse, they are estranging a large number of Jews, whom I estimate at one hundred thousand, from membership in the Zionist Organization, and prevent them from expressing their love for Israel, within a Zionist framework. They will not enter the Zionist Organization via the parties, and this obstacle must be removed — the parties have already agreed to this, in the Committee, at any rate. But as long as the other feel that the power, the leadership of the Movement remains in the hands of the parties, they will not enter the Zionist Organization. They have no need of it. They have so many other avenues in which to express their interest in Israel.

I wish to hope that it is still not too late, but it is just before zero hour. If we prove incapable of undertaking our historic task some other body will be found to do so. I am not talking about existing organizations. You need have no fear that I am hinting that the World Jewish Congress will say: "We are ready to do the job!" New organizational forms will be found to help the State. And if the Prime Minister declared yesterday that it is the obligation of the Government from time to time to review the Charter, the hint was very broad. It was also absolutely justified. I fought for the Charter, and it was not easy to secure it from Ben Gurion. But if any believes that thereby we have won a privileged position, the State of Israel would be irresponsible if from time to time it did not ask itself: Does the Zionist Organization carry out the functions imposed upon it by the Charter as the privileged, recognized representative of the Jewish people in its cooperative effort with the Government of Israel?

DEBATE ON DR. GOLDMANN'S ADDRESS

Itzhak Korn

(Union Poalei Zion – Hitachdut – Israel)

Last night and today we listened to major speeches – from the Prime Minister and the President of the World Zionist Organization. For years we have not faced such a clear and dramatic change of attitude on the part of the Government of Israel. Last night the Premier, Mr. Levi Eshkol, spoke to us as a friend, as a Zionist leader who had grown up in the Zionist Movement, and his address was perhaps more difficult than the addresses of those who voice opposition and criticism. We witnessed a courageous approach, and we heard a stern warning. I heard a grave charge against myself and I believe against other Members of the General Council, that we do not devote sufficient attention to the matters confronting us. I wish we had the courage to discuss basic problems, not to evade the truth. Aliyah is not in the centre of Zionist life and we must not rest content with the situation as it is. A change is essential and the reply is abundantly clear. The Zionist Movement, even the expanded Movement about which Dr. Goldmann told us, must make up its mind that within the Zionist Movement we must have a movement of realization, a movement of Aliyah.

Of course among the five thousand immigrants who came from the free countries a high proportion were young people. How much time, how much money, how much effort do we, the veteran Zionists, devote to this problem which is so vital and urgent? A reply must be given to Levi Eshkol from this rostrum, and it must be a real and convincing reply. Within the Zionist Movement we must create an Aliyah movement, within which the Chalutz youth movements and the students must be the chief of our concerns.

One of the major concerns of the Zionist Movement must be its attitude towards world Jewish problems. One of

the major elements of the external policy of the Zionist Movement must be how to exercise influence on diverse manifestations in Jewish life. How can we isolate ourselves and remain indifferent to what is happening among the Jews elsewhere?

Two nations are developing: one in Israel and the other in the Golah. It is not true that the Jewish organizations are Zionist in spirit. The larger Jewish organizations which have the deciding voice are favourable to Israel but they do not possess any Zionist or Israel content. Such content must be introduced. The masses of the Jewish people are favourable to Israel, and the individual Jew wishes to be sincere with himself and his conscience. Some of this is expressed in the form of monetary contributions or in various forms of aid, but there is no Israel or Zionist orientation. The Zionist Organization must assume the task of infusing Zionist content into Jewish life. It must contribute to the construction of a Jewish unity, by infusing Jewish values.

Can we argue that the Jewish masses are Zionist when we have the problem of the strong trend toward assimilation to deal with, when there is no national Jewish élan? Can we make Israel an integral part of the training of people active in the larger Jewish organizations? Their education must be such that in the centre Israel is placed. Let the religious parties not be offended for they know how highly I think of Jewish religious values and Jewish tradition, and regard them as an important element for our continued national existence. But tell me, my religious friends, what are you doing to ensure that religious schools are permeated with a Zionist and an Israel spirit? The truth of the matter is that together with religious education we must concern ourselves with national values. There are some Jewish schools which come within the influence of the larger Jewish organizations. I have dilated on the matter of education in order to underline that we are still far from the situation in which all Jews are Zionists and all that we need is to open our doors for them to recognize our programme.

On the other hand how are we to prevent this process of division into two peoples? It is important in regard to the proposal at present under discussion to strengthen world Jewish frameworks, such as the World Jewish Congress together with other major bodies, particularly in North America, for Zionism can play an important role and introduce into these organizations Jewish content and Jewish values. The Zionist Organization cannot remain neutral towards world Jewish frameworks. It must occupy a central position within them and constitute the motive power. This calls for the Zionist Movement to assume a more belligerent character with a clear plan of action. In itself it is not bad that we may be a minority within the Jewish people, provided we are an active minority conscious of our own aims.

I do not accept Dr. Goldmann's thesis that the root of all evil is the Zionist parties, and that by abolishing them we shall achieve an ideal state. I am opposed to the monopoly of the Zionist parties within the Zionist organization, and I believe that we must reach some common language, as we are interested in new circles joining us, but it is a mistake to believe that the solution can be found by thrusting the parties aside.

We say, with justice, that Zionism swims against the current. Will such a Zionist Movement, without any parties, have the inner force to realize its own programme? The fact of the ideological differences between the diverse Zionist groups provides the Movement with an aggressive spirit. This is an important element in Zionist vitality. There is a difference between the Jew in the street who accepts the Zionist programme and a Zionist identified with a definite policy. A member of the Poalei Zion in New York or London identified with a certain way of life in Israel and in the up-building of the country is closer to Israel and has closer ties with Zionism. The Zionist Organization, in which the parties will be thrust into a corner, will develop into a movement of sympathizers, weak and incapable of achieving its goals.

Baruch Weinstein
(World Confederation of General Zionists, Israel)

With all due respect I can only describe the speech of the Premier as a pathetic appeal to the Zionist Organization to intensify Aliyah from the affluent countries and to strengthen the Aliyah consciousness. I heard nothing of the Government's policy capable of creating the conditions for such a hoped-for Aliyah. The content of that speech does not constitute a subject for discussion. On the other hand in both speeches of Dr. Goldmann a number of hypotheses were formulated and three of these I wish to discuss.

Why is Zionism not popular? In what respect is it not popular? From the point of view of its ideas, its methods, or arithmetically? When did the Zionist Movement include the masses? Only in the two historic phases. In the time of the Balfour Declaration, when there were "Balfour Zionists" and when the State was established, when the masses were caught up in a fervour and many of them joined the Zionist Movement, without examining the nature of the Zionist ideal, its significance and the duties it implied. Essentially and ideologically the Zionist Movement was always a vanguard movement, swimming against the current, fighting the opposition of all sorts of Jewish organizations, which did not share its wealth of ideas and ideals. So if we wish to understand the cause of the severe crisis that has overtaken the Zionist Organization we must seek it not in the numerical sphere but in the ideological sphere.

Today we were told by Dr. Goldmann that the majority of the Jewish people are Zionist. Perhaps we should ask the question: What is the nature, what is the content of Zionism? The Jewish people is a free people and may give vent to its feelings, to its emotions about Germany, express its opinions and formulate its policies.

And the third question: How is the Zionist Organization to be expanded? Every Jewish organization recognizing the Jerusalem Programme, even in its vague form, can join the Zionist Organization. How are we to assess the strength of this new organization? Will the prospective federations be based upon democratic elections or on the division of spoils and honours in the Zionist Organization? Dr. Goldmann has stressed that all sorts of psychological approaches exist and such approaches have their special significances and influences. Only a trial of strength between such approaches and programmes can determine the character of the Zionist Organization. It may be that the defined Zionists will constitute the majority, may be these organizations, which are not so integral from the Zionist point of view will constitute the majority. But without such a trial of strength what have we to offer the younger generation? What is the bold new thinking which will attract the young people into our ranks? This programme seems to me to be illusory. At the same time I say: the weak Zionist Movement must be closely knit in its ideas, political in its character. It must infiltrate into all cells of Jewish life and no longer remain cut off from the congregations. Zionists heading the congregations and institutions as individuals must be guided by the Zionist Organization, provided it has its own consistent policy and method. It must put to the people and the younger generation maximal and extreme demands. We must have a Zionist maximum though it cannot be achieved forthwith. But that Zionist maximum must be stimulating, the guiding factor. It will attract the youth who are seeking something uniquely Jewish.

Ezra Z. Shapiro

(World Confederation of General Zionists - USA)

We must continue to speak on the subject of Soviet Jewry upon every appropriate occasion, for two reasons:
1. We must never let Soviet Russia forget that World Jewry

is concerned about the problem. 2. Even more importantly, the Jewish community in the Soviet Union should be aware of the fact that Jews throughout the world, and Zionists especially, are concerned about their fate as Jews, and will continue to speak and do all they can about this problem.

On the matter of the security of Israel, I regret very much that I feel impelled to state I am ashamed of the behaviour in this country of the President of the Zionist Organization of America who stated in a published interview that "Many American Jews concurred with the 'New York Times' view that the Samua operation came to serve not military but internal political aims". This statement was unwarranted, offensive and irresponsible and should be characterized as such. The heart of the American Jewish community beats in unison on this life and death struggle with the hearts of Israel's citizenry. American Jewry was most unhappy with the attitude and action of the United Nations in this matter. It is very unfortunate that any impression should have been given which characterized the Jordan incident as a political act involving the strife between the political parties in Israel.

I come now to the problems of the World Zionist Organization. A few years ago, the Zionist General Council adopted the slogan of "panim lagolah"— Our faces to the Diaspora. For a long time it was "panim la'aretz" and correctly so. A few years ago, noting a certain sense of well-being and great progress in Israel, we said we could afford the luxury of turning to the Golah to deal with its problems. In the Golah we had witnessed a tremendous deterioration, an unceasing process of assimilation and intermarriage. Since then, things have changed considerably, and I have the feeling that we must rapidly go into a new period of "panim la'oomah", which in no way negates the position of "panim lagolah" or "panim la'aretz", but is basically the more accurate and comprehensive Zionist position. There is indeed a greater realization prevalent now in this country

of the need for building this bridge, these ties between this community and the communities in the Golah.

Last night we heard from the Prime Minister some pretty strong language, but by and large some fair and correct attitude. He emphasized the fact that he was the first to recognize the glory of the World Zionist Movement in the creation of the State of Israel. He said "I walked among you in those days", and indeed he did. He had a right to challenge us and we have a duty to challenge ourselves, not to live and survive only on the record of the past.

No Zionist Movement is worthy of its name that isn't concerned with Aliyah. However, I think we would be dishonest if we deluded you and ourselves into thinking that in the present day on the American scene we could make of Aliyah the end all and be all of our Zionist operations. It is unfortunate, but I think this is the true situation. I repeat, to eliminate the concept and work of encouraging Aliyah would be a tragic mistake and would be unworthy of an American Zionist Movement. What then should be done? At our meetings of the Reorganization Commission Dr. Goldmann offered a suggestion and I trust he will pardon me if I mention it. He suggested that what can be the "plus", the Zionist extra, on the American scene was the insistence on "the centrality of Israel" in Jewish life. I shall not define this concept at this time except to emphasize that involved in this concept is Aliyah, and yet it is another way of stating it.

While I am on this subject I should add that when we talk of Aliyah on the American scene, I think it will come principally from the young. When we look at the Americans who are in Israel today, we find that these are people who came thirty, twenty and ten years ago, when they were young people. It is much more difficult to transplant middle-aged and older people. Basically we should aspire to have a "young" Aliyah.

I hope that somehow we could succeed in bringing to Israel annually, for Shnat Sherut or even shorter periods of study, not two thousand, but ten thousand young people, because out of these, some will inevitably remain. It is the best avenue of Aliyah that I know. I would also hope that some day we could afford to bring annually, a thousand young Israelis to the Golah. This we must do carefully, so that we don't encounter the danger of "Yeridah". These young Israelis should learn to know the young people of the Golah, so that we can strengthen the ties between them.

Rabbi Tsemach Menachem Zambrowsky
(Mizrachi - Hapoel Hamizrachi - Canada)

I record with deep regret, the return to the discussion on parties, which I had hoped had ended at the last General Council. In 1952, addressing this assembly, we stated that it was infinitely clear in our mind, that the crisis in Zionism to the extent that it exists, will not be solved by the re-organization of our structure. The problem is a much deeper one, a much more significant one. Even as we warned against the premature assertions that Zionism has reached fulfilment with the rebirth of the State of Israel. The problems are essentially spiritual and educational. Problems that were forced upon us as a result of the Hitler Holocaust, where we have not only lost six million Jews, but also the reservoir of Jewish leadership, Jewish knowledge and the sources of Jewish inspiration. But this debate has nevertheless continued. It was started by the first Prime Minister, Mr. David Ben-Gurion, and picked up by Zionist leadership continuously. What were the results? We have lost valuable years in fruitless, damaging debates, that brought confusion among the Jewish masses. We have lost years, that should have and could have yielded the greatest inspiration for a revival of Zionism, such as we have never experienced before. Because in these years, we have witnessed the greatest miracle, the greatest victory; the Zionist ideal was vindicated. Never before had we had such a

psychological opportunity to mobilize the Jewish masses to our cause. We missed the moment. Moments like these a reborn people can ill afford to miss. Now what truths are there in all these denunciations of the parties? I deny most emphatically, that the groupings in the World Zionist Organization, who represent ideologies and philosophies may be classified as merely parties. The mere re-establishment of the State of Israel was never the aim and goal of historic Zionism. To us, Mizrachi, Zionism has always been regarded as a spiritual offensive. It meant personal fulfilment, not only in the national sense, but in the total Jewish sense. It meant the full revival of the Jewish way of life. Its civilization, its culture, social order and all its spiritual values. In one sentence, it meant a revolutionary re-creativity of Jewish life and thought, action and commitment. The Jewish State was meant to provide an atmosphere of peace and dignity. The type of Jewish atmosphere, that could not be created elsewhere. It meant becoming the tools in the hands of God for the total salvation of His people. It was another confrontation with historic tasks, and a challenge to measure up to them.

There are still, to be sure, so-called Zionists, who believe that the re-birth of the State of Israel, without a commitment to true Jewish living, spells already Zionist fulfilment. A Zionism without ideology and without a philosophy will not fire the imagination of our young or old. Historic Zionism has a covenant with the Jewish people. It is part of the covenant that Israel has with God. Remove that covenant and you have no Zionism. No Zionism and there is no future for the State of Israel. These are the facts of Jewish life and history. Historically speaking, there is even a contradiction between secularism and Zionism. Is not Zionism an outgrowth of Judaism? Everyone admits that the State of Israel must be made strong, in order to guarantee the survival of the Jewish people on a global basis. We are all concerned and speak of Jewish survival. But may we ask survival for what? Merely to become a nation like all other nations?

Many are they who ask— why is it that our particular generation had the great z'chut of witnessing the restoration of Jewish statehood? Didn't we have generations that worked as hard, hoped as much and prayed as hard, but it did not come about? Why at this particular time? The answer is not only because of what happened as a result of the Second World War, and because of Hitler. It is much deeper. It is because the edifice of statehood which the nations have reared has remained a miserable jumble in cultural history. The inner struggles between rich and poor, the wars between nations, have resulted in rivers of blood. Mankind failed to devise a peaceful, let alone a happy, existence. Upon the unfailing laws of nature, representing the Divine Creator, rests securely the structure of humanity. Where the perfection of God's laws are ignored, lies the tragedy of the world. This is the attestation of the covenant of Israel and the Holy Land. It is enough to take one look at the world scene as we find it today. Today, the 20th century, an age that is so advanced, almost reaching a scientific utopia, and at the same time on the brink of nuclear annihilation, full of tensions. The air is filled with confusing voices shouting their violent messages. Nations are unable to find any moral certainties to which to render their loyalties and upon which to build a positive tranquil life. Mankind has failed because they put their trust in science and technology only. But a science that is God-less, a science without morals, a science without ethics and justice, cannot bring salvation. Shall we therefore not assume that the rebirth of our State came at such a time, because this is part of the Divine Purpose that the historic land and people have a mission to perform in this period of confusion?

I do not believe for one moment that Israel's covenant with God, was meant for the salvation of the Jewish people alone. I do not believe that timeless message of our Torah and Prophets and Sages was exclusively for the Jewish people. I believe that this covenant was that through Jewish people, by following the covenant, would set an example to

bring salvation to all mankind. Since a people cannot give expression to its full creative spiritual powers without being on its own soil, the State of Israel had to come into being in this generation of international chaos. In such times of tribulation, it is certainly not for Israel to follow the pattern of modern society.

I do not belong to those who worship tradition for tradition's sake. I worship it for the values it has. Therefore if one form of organizational structure does not prove to be the best, change it. But let us not deceive ourselves into believing that organizational changes, will bring salvation. Continue to attack ideologies and you will have no Zionism. Why should Jews join a Zionist Movement that is devoid of the spirit that we speak of? Why should not Bnai Brith and the World Jewish Congress be enough for such Jews? Our people will embrace Zionism only if it retains its historical values. Its visions, its aims and its inspiration, the Zionism that is imbedded in traditional Judaism.

Dr. Shneur Levenberg
(Union Poale Zion-Hitachdut - Great Britain)

There is much talk about the crisis in the Zionist Movement, but we do not render to ourselves a sober reckoning, that one of the main reasons for this crisis is the fact that today we have a different Jewish people, with which we are not sufficiently familiar. Today we must confront new Jewish realities. We must study this new Jewish people if we wish to comprehend the problems of Aliyah and immigration, which are debated here today and will be debated tomorrow. If we do it will help us to reach the right conclusions. We must not talk in static terms, because the present day conditions are very dynamic.

In Soviet Russia a titanic struggle is in progress between two powerful forces - those of Stalinism, which are harking back to the past, and the forces of Russian liberalism,

inspired by the best traditions of the Russian intellectuals and Russian literature. It is a mighty struggle indeed, and I regard the present Russian regime of Brezhnev-Kosygin, as a transitional stage. The question is which of these forces will emerge triumphant. The victory of one or the other will have the most far-reaching consequences for Russian Jewry, and for international relations generally.

The statement on the reunion of families, made by Kosygin in Paris, is, I am convinced, extremely important. It would be a mistake on our part to think that the statement is worthless. A sensible policy would be to say: "We welcome the statement. Now show us the way in which you propose to implement it." It makes no sense merely to belittle it.

Kosygin's declaration marks a victory for the liberal forces in Russia. The question is only how long we must wait for the practical implementation. A statement can be made, and a statement can also be retracted. The situation in Russia is not static. It is dynamic. At all events I consider it the duty of the Zionist Movement to make it clear to the Jewish people that here we have a chance. Immigration from Russia will not increase suddenly, but we must educate Jews in Israel and in the world generally towards the prospect of immigration from Russia and the responsibility it involves.

What we need today in Zionism is an historic perspective. This year is an historic year in the Zionist Movement. I am surprised that this was not mentioned yesterday. This year marks seventy years of Political Zionism, from the First Zionist Congress convened by Theodor Herzl: fifty years from the Balfour Declaration and twenty since the United Nations passed the momentous resolution to set up a Jewish State in Palestine. And if you take the trouble to read the proceedings of the Zionist Congresses, as I do from time to time, you will find that Zionists constantly complained about the crisis in Zionism, about the lack of progress, about the stagnation that has overtaken the

Movement. The truth of the matter is that more could have been achieved in these years, but one should also not forget what advances were made. Seventy years ago there were in what is today the State of Israel no more than fifty thousand Jews, old Jews, Chalukah Jews. And even twenty years ago there were no more than 650,000. Zionism has accomplished something. These accomplishments are first and foremost to the credit of the chalutzim and the builders of the Jewish State, but they were supported and aided by the entire Movement.

I wish to underline the need for a little historic perspective, for a little faith, a little confidence. I should like to tell Prime Minister Levi Eshkol, that I do not entirely agree with his criticism, that the Zionist Movement does not come with empty hands to public opinion in Israel and in the world generally. As a representative of British Zionism I should like to say: We may not have done much, we should perhaps have done more, but our hands are not empty, not in the fields of Aliyah, nor in that of the youth, nor in that of Jewish education, nor in that of Zionist leadership of the Jewish communities, nor even in the political sphere.

The moral of what I have said is: we must learn more from history, we must study the Jewish people, we must have greater recourse to the source of Zionism.

Salomon Friedrich
(Herut-Hatzohar - France)

The present Session of the Zionist General Council has convened at a very difficult time for the State, both politically and economically. It will not, accordingly, be superfluous if we solemnly declare from this rostrum our complete solidarity with the State. The solidarity of the Jewish people with the State of Israel can be expressed not only through Aliyah, the study of Hebrew or the contribution of money. We could wish that these duties, too, were properly fulfilled. Figures for immigration into Israel are quite small,

few people study Hebrew — even Zionists — and the money contributed is not sufficient. There remains one instrument which can serve to rouse the Jewish people, through which it can express its solidarity with the State of Israel: an extensive political information campaign carried out by the Zionist Organization.

The trouble, however, is that people do not want such a campaign to be launched. Zionist leaders and workers have been deprived of the content, the vision of Zionism, and the leaders and workers, find themselves at the mercy of a mass of contradictions. There are Zionist leaders who issue political statements, exaggerating certain problems to such an extent that the situation becomes dangerous for the State of Israel. At the same time these same leaders say to us: You must not engage in politics.

I am certainly not in agreement with a certain statement issued by a leader of American Zionism. It was a very dangerous statement to make. Just as I did not agree with the statement made in 1956 by another Zionist leader who criticized the Sinai Campaign, I do not agree with the recent statement made by the President of the World Zionist Organization to the effect that "the proclamation of the State of Israel should have been delayed". It was not necessary under present-day conditions, in the difficult situation in which Israel finds itself, to declare that the State of Israel should not have been proclaimed when it was. It was an unnecessary statement. I do not wish to enter into the controversy about the denials: whether it was merely a matter of delaying the proclamation of the State for a fortnight or for four months. The thought alone, that a vacuum should have been permitted after the exit of the British, is dangerous. The President also declared that agreement should have been reached with the Arabs beforehand. In other words, in the nineteen years that have passed we have not succeeded in coming to terms with the Arabs, but in the short period of that vacuum we might have done so. Even more: It implies that we needed the

consent of the Arabs to proclaim the State. Such a statement is both ridiculous and dangerous. It was superfluous and I am happy that my friend Mr. Orfus immediately replied in Paris to the President: "Thank God we did not listen to you then! "

The Jews throughout the world live all the victories and – Heaven forbid – all the defeats of the State of Israel and of Israel's policies. They wish to be active, and are unconcerned about the casuistry of a handful of Zionist leaders about dual loyalty. A Jew who is not loyal to the State of Israel and does not live with all the problems of the State, is not accepted as loyal by others. The nations of the world understand that the Jews must share the joys and the sorrows and the problems of the State of Israel. And sincere Jewish leaders throughout the world identify themselves with the Israel Army and the Israel Government, even though many times they are opposed to its policies. But insofar as Israel's security is concerned and the operations of the Israel armed forces we give our full support and solidarity.

The Government of Israel has entered into diplomatic relations with Germany. Parliament took the necessary decisions. We are a democratic people and the majority decides. But that does not mean to say that leaders of a people must give vent to further declarations and make positive gestures towards Germany. Israel and the Jewish people must not serve as the instrument for convincing the world that today there is a different Germany.

A dialogue between Jews and Germans was not necessary today. The Jewish people did not vote whether any such dialogue should or should not be held. Nobody asked the people. The fact remains that all parties in Israel were opposed to the dialogue in Brussels and the Jewish community in France was unanimous in its opposition to the dialogue. The dialogue should not have been forced and we should not have witnessed the applause given to a German speaking from a Jewish platform.

It was also unnecessary for a Jewish leader to be the first to go to Kiesinger even before Ministers of other States had met him. When the entire world press underlined that the present German Chancellor had been among the leading Nazis the President of the World Zionist Organization hurried to be the first to meet him. It was equally unnecessary to make declarations that the revival of Nazism in Germany must not be exaggerated. We Jews, in that respect, will never be guilty of exaggeration. Whatever we say will be too little.

The statement made by Mr. Kosygin in Paris about the reunion of families is highly positive. It was not something routine and, believe me, not only through the pressure of Communist Parties in the Western world. The Communist parties in the West, which regard the Jews as poor relations, are themselves poor relations in Moscow, for the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party in Moscow. They have very little to say there. But it is very good that they pass resolutions and are occupied with this problem of Soviet Jewry. But other important statesmen throughout the world should also take an interest in this problem. Under current political conditions, you can believe me, if France were to take up a stand on the matter, it would prove far more important than the efforts of all other intermediaries. Everything possible should be done to induce the French Government to take an interest in the matter. We shall do our best.

Jacob Hazan
(Mapam - Israel)

I have always been counted among those who regarded the political activity of the Zionist Movement favourably. I have always argued that the Zionist Movement must be a political ally of the State of Israel and not merely its emissary, to be mobilized whenever Israel is in trouble. But if it said today that the main problem of the Zionist Movement, the panacea which will solve all its ills, is political activity,

I must declare with sorrow that this is mere escapism, a flight from reality. Both the State of Israel and the Zionist Movement are in the throes of a crisis. It is a common crisis, for today one cannot draw a clear line of demarcation between the State of Israel and the Zionist Movement. One cannot solve the crisis in the State of Israel, without solving the crisis in the Zionist Movement. And vice versa.

The reason for the crisis in the State is the cessation of immigration. This cessation is not the fault of the Zionist Movement. An era has come to an end. It was the era of the ingathering of the exiles, of the concentration of Jews who wanted to come or had to come to Israel. It was the immigration of Jews from lands of distress, of poverty and persecution.

Within the Zionist Movement there have always been two forces operative: The attractive force of Israel and the repulsive force of the Golah. The mass immigration was generated by both of these forces. When a Golah community was repelled by the Golah but not attracted to Israel – I am referring to the Jewry of Algeria – ninety per cent of its members remained in France. They did not come to Israel though they left Algeria. This immigration of suffering and persecuted Jews has come to its end. Now we are confronted with a sated Golah, confident of its own future, which likens itself to the Golah aforetime in Babylon, which is even fostering an ideology that such is the destiny of the Jewish people throughout the generations: the co-existence of a Jewish State in Israel and a far-flung dispersion, supporting the State. But the present trickle of Aliyah must be built up on one basis – the attractive force of the State of Israel. We Zionists, who see the future of the Golah in gloomy terms, do not wish that gloomy prospect to be realized. We wish the Jews of the world to live under the best conditions, secure, though we do not believe that this will be the case. We, do not build on catastrophes. We must be prepared to meet them.

And precisely in this period the State of Israel is losing much of its attractive force. This is the result first of all of the crisis which it is experiencing and its social image which has suffered. How can one go out to the Jews of the Diaspora today and say to them: Come to Israel! How can one call upon a Jewish doctor, a Jewish professional man, to come to Israel — at a time when members of these professions are losing their positions? In this respect I do not think that Dr. Goldmann fully appreciates the effect of unemployment in the State of Israel, for the Jewish people. What we have is not a crisis like everywhere else. It cannot be compared to the crisis in America. America experienced a crisis in 1929 which shocked the entire world. But America exists. The Americans had nowhere to go. They were forced to restore their economy and they had the ability to do so. Other countries, too, which undergo crises overcome them, sometimes by revolutionary measures and at the cost of much suffering. For us employment has a special significance: Israel has ceased to be a country absorbing newcomers; it is losing its national constructive force. It is something that undermines its national mission.

The campaign against unemployment in Israel is a Zionist campaign, and not only a class struggle. The main reason for the crisis is the stoppage of the influx of immigrants. Israel is not capable of absorption, but the immigration that fails to come intensifies the crisis. We must take the bull by the horns. Simultaneously we come to grips with the crisis in Israel and the renewal of the flow of immigration. We must prepare in the Golah, we must prepare for absorption here. This is something that cannot be evaded. The lever for the renewal of immigration lies primarily in the intensification of chalutz Aliyah.

We are told that Jewish youth in the sated and complacent communities is also sated and complacent. I deny it. I deny it, first of all in respect of our friends, the Jews of the United States. The Jewish youth in the United America

is of excellent quality. But you parents, veteran Zionists, do not permit these young people to be consistently excellent. There is a sad poem by Itzik Manger about "A child who wants to fly". A Jewish child wants to be like a bird, but his loving mother says: It is cold outside take a thick coat. There is mud outside, put on your boots. The child does as he is bid but is no longer capable of flying. He remains below, down on the ground. That is what you are doing with Jewish youth. You are concerned about the future of your sons and daughters, and on the other hand you, Zionists, do not allow them to express the storm of their young souls, to realize their pioneering Zionist ideals. I have no complaint to make about ordinary Jews. I have about the Zionists. You do not do the first thing you should do in the interests of your children and of the Jewish people for its future in the State of Israel.

The answer cannot be evaded. You cannot avoid the conclusions. For if we wish the Jews of America and the Jews of France to participate actively in the campaign against the crisis and to prepare for a new era of immigration from the affluent countries, the only way to do so is to encourage chalutz youth to come here, influenced by the pioneering Zionist ideals.

The Zionist parties may be bad but they are the only bodies that still believe in something, that still carry on the struggle. If they disintegrate what will follow? We must endeavour to rehabilitate the parties, we must renew their political ideological content. But we must not try to abolish them, to cast them out of the Zionist Movement. Does this run counter to our desire that good Jews, who believe in Zionism, should enter the Zionist Movement? Certainly not! Does it contradict the possibility of Jewish organizations reviewing the road they follow, should join us? Certainly not! All this upon one condition. That some sort of chairman should not come and say that he has a large movement behind him which he wants to attach to us. If it really exists let it join us. And there is no conflict between

this and the fact that the parties constitute the basis upon which the Zionist Movement rests.

This debate, this unfortunate debate, which continues without end, causes only bitterness for the Zionist Movement, distorts the path it follows, without adding anything positive.

THIRD MEETING

Monday, January 9, 1967, in the afternoon

Chairman: JACQUES TORCZYNER

CONTINUATION OF THE DEBATE
ON DR. GOLDMANN'S ADDRESS

Israel Avidor

(Representative of the Ichud Habonim movement)

Chalutz immigration today accounts for some ten per cent of the influx into Israel. This immigration has continued without cessation to this day, coming not from countries in which Jews are in distress, but from the affluent countries. It is a selective immigration, the members of which know what is waiting for them in Israel and are ready to integrate themselves as well as they can. We are convinced, accordingly, that our task has not come to an end; on the contrary, we must intensify our work in the Golah. Our numbers, it is true, are not large, but at the same time we can be proud of the make-up of this section of the Aliyah coming to Israel. We know that the members of our movements united the Zionist periphery, and those of them who do not come to Israel will constitute the future leadership of Golah Jewry, seeing they have received a deeper education, and accept Love of Zion in a far more natural and tangible fashion. When we speak of extending the periphery of practical Zionist work, we must recall that for the Zionist youth movements such concepts already exist in fact. The basis of our educational work is the study of Judaism, and it is a fact that even those of our members who remain behind are more Jewish than those about them.

The Zionist Movement is in a state of crisis, ideological, organizational and financial crisis. You must not cut off one of the most important branches of Zionist work - the

youth movements. Without the youth movements I personally do not know what the function of the Movement is. If we cut off these movements from Golah realities we shall sever a source of both Zionist and Jewish inspiration. They are the only bodies which from the very foundation of the Zionist organization have implemented practically Zionist doctrines. They came to this country and settled here. They remain in the country. And they have served as the example, not only for their own members, but for the Zionist federations, no less.

One remark about the shlichim. Unfortunately up to the present day we have not invented any other instrument for carrying on educational work in the Golah other than by sending shlichim from this country. We would be happy indeed if the Zionist youth movements abroad could continue to operate without the aid of the shlichim coming from Israel. But the situation is different. We need these shlichim and the better they are the more capable of tackling the problems of the Jews in the countries in which they have to work. Thus the importance of shlichut remains undiminished and every effort must be made to ensure that it continue.

Members of the Zionist General Council have an extremely important task in one field and that is in exercising influence in regard to the importance of the work being done in the Golah. This work can be intensified provided the necessary funds are forthcoming. One Department may have to make concessions in favour of some other Department, to ensure that activities continue in due proportion.

Yehuda Tyberg
(Achdut Ha'avoda U.S.A.)

The statement published in the "New York Times" to the effect that the retaliatory raid into Jordan was prompted by internal political tension in Israel and not by considerations of national security is not subscribed to by the

Jews of the United States. The operation itself had a profound effect on American Jewry, giving rise to feelings of disquiet, regarding the dangers to which the Jewish State is still exposed. Generally speaking the attitude of American Jewry towards the State of Israel can be summed up as one of love and concern for its welfare, and I am deeply convinced, it also involves a readiness to extend aid whenever that is necessary.

If any nation in the world has any right whatsoever to exaggerate its national feelings and its national aspirations, even, indeed, to indulge in hysteria when the vital interests of the Jewish people are concerned, it is the Jewish people, and we do not have to apologize about this state of affairs. On the contrary we have every right to expect others to understand us and to take into account our unique situation after the conclusion of the Second World War.

It is perfectly true that today we are confronted with a crisis in Jewish life. There is the general crisis of moral values, which has not excluded our own Jewish youth. By the abolition of the Zionist parties as has been proposed such a crisis cannot be solved. Dr. Goldmann is grievously in error if he thinks that the moment the doors of the Zionist Movement are thrown open, and individuals will be enabled to join its ranks - without being affiliated to any party organization queues will form of those eager for membership in the Zionist Organization. The non-Zionists, or the anti-Zionists, do not want us. They would like to see our decline, but they are not prepared to undertake any of the duties we fulfil at present, because we have given the Jewish people something that the anti-Zionists fought against, and which the people welcomed in the final phase despite them. In the course of the past two centuries, indeed since the beginning of the emancipation of the Jews, since the decline of religious influence in Jewish life, there was no single focus for Jewish eyes and hearts until the establishment of the State of Israel, which from the very first moment was cherished by the entire Jewish people. For this the anti-Zionists cannot forgive us.

The solution for the Zionist crisis must be sought in more Zionism, in a call to the Zionist Movement to take up a stand against the wave of assimilation that is threatening us, by showing the youth a road to a renewed chalutzit.

In the final resort there is no question of the decline of the Jewish people. There is only a state of crisis. The crisis is transient. In both the Golah and in the State, values have been replaced—the moral values which constituted the very foundations of the reconstruction of Israel community. We can come to the Jewish youth in the Golah and persuade them to emigrate to Israel, to take part in the development and consolidation of the Jewish commonwealth, which is different from all other states in the world, because of its pioneering social character; but we cannot come to the youth and call for personal sacrifice at a time when reports are published of the emergence of hundreds of new millionaires in the State of Israel.

It may seem to be old-fashioned, perhaps even melodramatic but the best remedy for the crisis in both Zionism and the Jewish people is a return to the old values, which led to the establishment of the State of Israel.

Sir Barnett Janner

(Confederation of General Zionists - Great Britain)

We have come together today in order once again to examine what is essential for us in the circumstances that prevail to build up the image of the Zionist Movement. That's what, in fact, the position actually calls for. It isn't that Zionism has failed; it isn't that the Jewish people aren't Zionists—whether they know it or whether they don't. It isn't that people don't realise on reflection that the Zionist Movement was instrumental in creating the State of Israel which was acclaimed by practically every Jew throughout the length and breadth of the world. Let us look at the situation fairly and squarely. Zionism has succeeded, but our public relations have been bad—and that's where we

have failed so far: we have failed in putting the whole of the position forward in such a way as to make it clear that we have the goods to sell and they're excellent goods; but we are bad salesmen! And if I were to say that this doesn't apply everywhere in the world I think I am entitled – and I hope you will forgive me – to say that we haven't done too badly in Britain in this field. No Jewish aspirant in Britain for any Jewish office will say, today, that he's an anti-Zionist. He'll lean backwards in order to convince electors that he's a Zionist and to try, if he wasn't one year ago, to hide the fact that he hadn't been a Zionist throughout. In England, the Zionist Movement has done a job which has evoked the respect of the authorities for the Jewish people and for Zionists. It has done a job in which the Zionist leaders, and those who have been active in the Zionist Movement, are the leaders in collecting funds for Israel and rendering services to the Jewish community in practically every branch of life.

It may be of interest for you to know what happens in the work of Public Relations by the Zionist Federation in our country. The general situation in the Middle East, coupled with the specific problems of Israel, resulted in an increased demand for speakers from amongst many organisations up and down the country: Jewish, non-Jewish, and general. As in previous years, most of the meetings arranged included the showing of Israel films and the Zionist Federation supplied films for over four hundred shows during the year 1966. The Anglo-Israel Friendship Leagues are flourishing in every part of the country: they visit Israel, there is no party issue raised at all; they come as individuals who belong to Friendship Leagues which we've created without any party bias of any kind – and the image that has been created in consequence of all this is an image that Zionism is not a dirty word but a very clean one! And I'm hoping that this will be followed in other parts of the world.

In consequence of this, we have faced up to the political issues that confront us at the present time by having the community as a whole working in a way which we would want:

on the German issue, on the Russian issue – In view of the non-party or all-party approach on these two issues respectively 180 Members of Parliament have signed a motion on the Order Paper of the House of Commons against Russian treatment of the Jews; and that's the third in number on the list of over 220 motions. Ninety-four M.P.'s have already signed a motion on the Order Paper against the recrudescence of the German National Democratic Party asking Russia, France and England and the United States to make approaches to Germany on the highest level.

I hope that what I've said will help us to realize that Zionism is not what some people think it is, but, on the contrary, that with good public relations we should be able to have it accepted in its proper image which is that Jewish people want Zionism, are Zionists and, if Zionism is properly presented to them, will continue to be Zionists.

Najman Radzichovski

(World Union of General Zionists - Argentine)

Zionism must give the answer to the crises – political, security and economic – which have overtaken the State of Israel. Quite simply, I am convinced that if the influx of immigrants which came to an end in 1966, were continued by a voluntary Aliyah – to foster which is the main task of the Zionist Movement – then the crisis would have been solved.

What is the problem affecting the Aliyah that should come here voluntarily? Such immigrants, there is no doubt, would change the economic, the moral, the political and the defence aspects of Israel. And in the current year Zionism has given no answer, because in this year the immigration coming from the countries of distress has come to an end. These influxes intoxicated us for we thought that thereby we were fulfilling the great Zionist obligation of Aliyah. This must be the central point of our deliberations in the Zionist General Council.

If we review the events of the eighteen years which have elapsed since the formation of the State, not what has come to pass in the State, but the developments outside Israel, in the Golah, then we must appreciate that nothing has changed. It is not true that the main problem of the Golah is assimilation. The problem is both assimilation and physical rescue.

I myself, coming from a Zionist continent, a Zionist country, have the impression that there is not a Jewish home in which there has not been intermarriage. It is unnecessary accordingly to belabour the meaning of assimilation and integration in the countries in which Jews reside. The reply to this can be furnished, can only be given by a sincere and serious Zionist Movement, but not by a Movement, constructed from the top downwards, as so many members active in the committee on reorganization take it so seriously. Zionism must obligate every Zionist in the same way as religious faith obliges every religious Jew to observe the mitzvot. Adulterated Zionism, suitable for the present day, would be a crime against our history.

Woolf Perry

(Member of the Executive, Jerusalem)

I find myself in a particularly ambivalent situation. On the one hand I find that I can agree with and endorse and support almost everything which our distinguished President said last evening and indeed I was proud when my eighteen-year old soldier daughter, after the meeting, said to me, I now understand what it is to be a Zionist: A Zionist is somebody who serves the Jewish people even though it may be unpopular, even though he may have to swim against the stream of Jewish complacency, even though he may be personally disenchanted with the things that he does.

My ambivalence stems from the fact that in the same measure that I found myself in agreement with our President last evening, I find myself diametrically opposed to his

concept as enunciated today, and for precisely the same reasons. We are living in a time when, according to him and I think that he's right, it is relatively easy to associate oneself with a type of vegetarian and emasculated Zionism. To be pro-Israel, to want to be associated with Israel, to invest in Israel, to give financial support to Israel, to go on a tour to Israel, these are not particularly difficult things for any Jew eighteen years after the proud Statehood which we have witnessed. And therefore it is a relatively simple panacea to suggest that because, at this time, the organized Zionist Movement appears to be at its lowest ebb, the easiest way to improve our situation is to give easy entry, free admission, supported association to each and every person who makes a declaration "that we're for Israel and prepared to accept the Jerusalem Programme". I believe the whole concept of a monolithic movement, an umbrella organization which, by taking the lowest common denominator, encompasses the largest number of organizations, is not the way for the future of our movement. I recognize that the Jewish world has not developed uniformly in all the countries. I recognize it to be a fact that our main and prime consideration has to be the largest Jewish community in the world, namely the United States. It may well be that in that great Jewish community the organizational concept of a resuscitated Zionist Movement may be the only and final possibility of salvation. But even if this is so, and there are voices, and significant voices, who avow that even where it is not so, it is certainly not so in the majority of the countries outside of the United States. And I know of no reason which makes it mandatory on any movement, and particularly on a unique and revolutionary movement such as the Zionist Movement, that we have to encompass organizationally the problems of the whole world by one uniform organizational framework.

I will not speak about Britain because Sir Barnett Janner has more than adequately done so. But I will refer to the situation there in one sentence. The Zionist Movement in Britain is not the largest movement. It does not

encompass within its framework all the variety of Jewish institutions and organizations. It exerts its influence there because Zionists are directed to capture, in the best and most benign interpretation of the word, the significant areas of Jewish life in that country. In the political, in the communal, in the educational, in the sociological spheres, Zionists qua Zionists occupy crucial and decisive positions. And for this reason, Zionism has some dynamic meaning in Britain. Is there any reason for us to say that in every country of the world the only salvation for our movement is to take in organizationally people who, because their leaders, perhaps not even they themselves, believe that it is a good thing to pay lip service to the Jerusalem Programme, that ipso facto they have become the new Zionist Movement.

I believe that the time has come when we should do ourselves and the Jewish people a service by stop being our own greatest detractors. There are enough ill-informed critics of the Zionist Movement in the Jewish world without our own leaders and we ourselves constantly denigrating the largest, the most influential, and still the most meaningful movement that exists in the Jewish world—with all the difficulties, with all the problems, with all the deficiencies and with all the weaknesses of which we are all very well aware.

I do not suggest that there is no room for a movement, a development, a reorganization, even in organizational terms if not in philosophical terms, in the Zionist Movement. I do not contest the thesis that the Zionist Movement is on its last legs and will die unless artificial palliatives or organizational gimmicks are applied. I do maintain that if, tomorrow, the Zionist Movement were to go out of business, we would need to recreate the Movement, even with the weaknesses and the deficiencies and the limitations of our present one, in order to meet the acute problems which face the Jewish people in the Diaspora.

Avraham Stern
(Delegation of the Youth Movements in Israel)

This is the first occasion upon which the Zionist General Council has permitted the direct participation of the youth in its deliberations, in keeping with a resolution passed by the Zionist Congress. That resolution constituted the recognition, by the Zionist Organization, of the importance of the work done by the youth and among the youth in the Golah and in Israel. More than that: It expresses the concern felt for the future and destiny of the Jewish people and the Zionist idea, if, God forbid, the work of the Zionist Organization become detached from the younger generation, growing up in this country and in the Diaspora. A generation has grown up "which knew not Joseph" which does not know the Torah, does not appreciate the importance of Jewish unity and is ignorant of the great principle of love of Eretz Israel. Who, if not the generation which studied, lived and absorbed these values can transmit them to a new generation? These values must be inculcated from an early age. It is the Zionist youth movements in Israel and the Golah which have taken up themselves this onerous task. The youth movements in this country, whose membership exceeds two hundred thousand members in the old and the new settlements are constantly labouring, endeavouring to instil the principles of love of Israel, to train towards a readiness to undertake national duties, to settle on the land and to observe our ancestral traditions.

The Israel youth movements are contributing towards the social and educational integration of immigrant youth. The Jewish Agency cannot rest content with physical absorption, with a concern with enabling the newcomers to support themselves. It must create a basis, a climate, for educational and social integration, and it is this that is being done by the youth movements, which are active in the new settlements and in the development towns as well. To carry out these tasks we need the means and the tools. There is

talk about an overall cut of fifteen per cent in the budgets of all Departments of the Jewish Agency. In my modest opinion a scale of priorities must be agreed upon. You must know where and what to cut. We must decide what is more important and what less. Any retrenchment in the allocation to youth implies cutting off the branch upon which all of us are sitting. We call upon the Zionist Movement at least to refrain from reducing the allocation to the youth and even to try to increase it.

The youth movements in the Golah constitute a dyke against the encroachments of assimilation. They prepare the way for immigration and implementation of Zionist ideals. The youth movements in this country constitute a guarantee for the acclimatization of immigrant youth in Israel.

FOURTH MEETING

Monday, January 9, 1967, in the afternoon

Chairman: ANSELM REISS

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE ZIONIST EXECUTIVE,
ITS PLANS AND BUDGET

L.A. Pincus

(Chairman of the Executive)

Permit me several remarks at the outset. I hope the members of the Zionist General Council have read the report on the Executive's activities since the last session, so that I do not have to give you these details here. We have experienced a difficult year, but one in which we tried to meet difficult challenges. In so doing we have had quite a number of achievements, but there were also omissions and, at times, disappointments. I shall try to touch upon the problems resulting from both the achievements and the omissions.

There is another point that I think right to stress at the outset. The Zionist General Council is not divisible between members who demand and an Executive that is challenged. We are all in the same boat, we are all being challenged and what I am going to say here, and it will include quite a considerable amount of demands, is directed at all of us for we shall succeed only if we all join forces to fulfil the tasks ahead of us.

The year that has passed was one of self-scrutiny for us, of every efforts to correct things, to adapt media and methods of work, to search for new ways and to define our activities and aims. I should stress at this juncture that we did not look upon the organizational changes as an end in themselves. Not for one moment did we believe that

organizational changes could take the place of content and programme. But we thought it essential to adapt the organizational media to the conditions and needs of the Jewish people, to the challenges of the Zionist Movement and to the situation of the Jewish Agency.

We have set up in Israel and in the United States Executive Committees for the purpose of bringing more members to take a practical share in certain fields of activity, for the purpose of improving and introducing greater efficiency in the work of the Executive, by removing matters of principle from the exclusive scope of any particular department and by making a number of members responsible for policy. I cannot say that all the committees are already functioning to our full satisfaction. But it is no exaggeration to say that considerable progress has been registered and that some of the committees have entered upon their current work. I am particularly happy to note that the non-party members who have been co-opted on the Executive in the United States are taking part in the work of the Executive and Committees at the New York branch.

We initiated the establishment of the Ben Aharon Committee for the examination of the situation, status and future of the Settlement Department. The Committee did its work with laudable thoroughness and efficiency and we are now in the process of carrying out the Committee's decisions.

We decided to re-organize the structure of the Executive and to reduce the number of its departments to nine, confident that the new structure would lead to greater efficiency as well as a saving of expenditure. Underlying our approach was the assumption that the immigration facing us nowadays, the immigration we are looking forward to, is of such a nature that the handling of the immigration itself and the absorption of the immigrant are a single process. Our assumption further was that there ought to be one body dealing with the immigrant from his very first hesitant steps to enquire about the possibilities of immigration up to his actual arrival and settlement.

The Structure Committees of the Zionist Organization have this year done a very thorough job. Only this week we met for four days, all the sub-Committees, and reviewed the work done in the current year. A special committee of this General Council is to receive a report on the meetings of the World Committee and on the work to be done by the Committee in the coming year. I shall not go into detail and will say only this: The new structure, recommended almost unanimously, enables non-party individuals, non-party Zionist Organizations and general Jewish Organizations that accept the "Jerusalem Programme", to join the Zionist Organization and its institutions as of right and not on tolerance.

Last year we carried out a basic overhaul both with regard to the number of our employees, our administrative expenditures and our general fiscal policy. We have cut the number of the Jewish Agency's personnel by many hundreds and have considerably reduced our administrative expenses. I wish to take this opportunity to express my esteem and appreciation to the staff of the Jewish Agency in Israel and abroad for the enormous work they have done and are continuing to do with faith and devotion. We have adopted numerous measures of economy and efficiency and have placed our fiscal policy on the basic premise that the Jewish Agency's debts are not to be increased and that a beginning should be made with liquidating these debts.

Settlement

I am surely absolved from the duty of telling the members of the Zionist General Council what settlement means to the Zionist work of upbuilding. I need not go into detail about the immense contribution made by Settlement to immigrant absorption. The values contained in this work have been part and parcel of the Jewish Renaissance Movement from the very beginning of its days. We have been privileged to see this enterprise which holds so

many Jewish and human values, which stands for all that is beautiful and exalted in the Renaissance Movement, this enterprise which has become an inexhaustible source of inspiration for many nations near and far in Asia, Africa, South America and so forth. However, you will certainly agree with me that the Zionist Executive Settlement policy and the extent of the department's activities cannot be determined by the glory of the past. It must be determined by the needs of the present and the future. We have stated that a Public Committee must be set up, composed of public personalities familiar with the problems of Settlement and its history. Let them meet, study the problems and let them tell us then what should be handed over to the State of Israel and what should still remain under the care of the Department. Let them also tell us which duties should be assigned to the Department in future. I have already paid tribute to the thorough and speedy work of the Ben Aharon Committee. After we had approved the Committee's conclusions we removed 116 settlements, which had already reached a state of consolidation and independence, from the direct care of the Settlement Department, and transferred them to the routine care of the Ministry of Agriculture. We shall soon be able to remove another 100 settlements from our direct care. The Training Administration has also been handed over to the Ministry of Agriculture. The Department re-organized itself, reduced the number of its staff to a considerable extent, introduced new methods of efficiency and economy and re-shaped itself in accordance with the aims outlined by the Ben Aharon Committee. The Committee will deal with settlements which are still far from consolidation. It will do all it can to make these settlements independent. The Settlement Department will bear the burden of new settlement activity. There are large areas in Galilee, in the Negev and in the Arava which it is imperative to populate. It is vital to establish three new points of settlements inhabited by both new immigrants and veteran settlers. I call upon you all to travel to the Mountains

of Galilee and observe the great work of settlement that is in progress there. This is an undertaking that amounts to re-fashioning nature, a vast project which we are carrying out together with the Jewish National Fund. The importance of the Jewish National Fund's work along Israel's borders and in the Arava cannot be over-estimated. Go out and visit the new villages that have sprung up in the Arava. There are already spots of scenic beauty in the midst of the desert that call to mind the biblical verse:

"The Wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them. . ." (I. XXXV, 1)

which for them is no a mere phrase.

Surveying the needs of the State and taking into account our situation, I think I can state without any shadow of a doubt that our settlement policy has been vindicated. The demand for the settlement of Galilee and for the establishment of further settlements in the Arava and Negev is deeply rooted in Israel's reality and interwoven in the web of the Zionist Movement's values. I can think of no other time when we were more in need of fostering of Zionist values than the present day. The Mountains of Galilee and the expanses of the Negev are a challenge to Israel's youth and to the pioneering youth throughout the Diaspora. This is a challenge to which the Zionist Movement must find a response. Settlement and its values must re-ignite the flames of enthusiasm of the youth in Israel and abroad. It seems to me that we have become too much used to the routine of the matter and that we no longer sufficiently sense the exaltation and the uniqueness of the settlement enterprise.

Immigration and Absorption

I should now like to deal with a problem which, we are all agreed, is the principal problem facing the State of Israel and the Zionist Movement, namely immigration

and absorption. It sometimes seems to me that we have never rendered ourselves an account of what it means to bring in one million, three hundred thousand immigrants, to integrate them and to make them strike root in the country. I am not guilty of exaggeration if I say that this means one million three hundred thousand problems. We are often being criticized for one or another detail; of course, everything has to be done to correct mistakes. But we shall do well to view the picture as a whole. For this purpose it will suffice if, rather than talking about the million three hundred thousand, I shall confine my discussion to the quarter of a million that arrived in the recent years. The process of absorption of these immigrants is not yet completed. A very great deal still remains to be done in all areas to make their integration complete. I am now speaking about matters that concern hundreds of thousands of immigrants. There are some who live in homes that must be repaired. These homes are located in the cities, in development towns and in farming villages. There are many who must be assisted in matters of education be it the advancing of the date for compulsory kindergarten attendance be it, special schooling, admission to high schools, establishment of youth centres etc. There is a shortage of social services in the wide sense of the term. In the period of retrenchment and unemployment now prevailing, all these problems are converging upon one focal point; sometimes I fear they are approaching boiling point with most severe results. I have felt it was necessary to begin my review of absorption by emphasizing these points in order to bring home the vital need for expanding the work of the Appeal, and extending the operations of the Keren Hayesod, to make you realise that this is your task. This is your duty in your countries. You Zionists have an obligation to be in the forefront of those who work for those aims; it is your duty to set an example and not to leave the job to those who are called "non-Zionists".

It is important that from this very rostrum the call should go out to the Jews of the world: The process of absorption is not yet finished. You cannot and you must not impose this burden only on the Israel tax-payer. This is a joint responsibility which you are called upon to share.

Social Absorption

I have felt it necessary to tell you these things because we must view matters as they really are. It is precisely these difficulties which place social absorption at the centre of our absorption problems. I am often being asked what social absorption means. No short and simple definition is possible. But social absorption means endowing the term integration of the exiles with meaning and content, turning all the tribes of Israel that have gathered in this land into one nation, raising the educational and cultural level of backward groups. The latter purpose includes many different fields of activity, beginning with youth centres, youth clubs and adults clubs. I should like to add here that today we have some classes of immigrants for whose complete integration the club is an essential instrument. Social absorption means arranging for good theatre performances, first-rate music and good books in immigrants' settlements. It means developing in immigrants' settlements literary circles, reading groups, discussion drama, art and other groups. This further means strengthening the Immigrants' Associations so as to turn them into instruments for absorption. The points I have just enumerated are not just theory. We are doing a great deal in all these fields, and last year we extended it very much. But this is still not enough. It is not enough under ordinary circumstances, still less so in our present serious situation.

Youth Aliyah

In this context I should like to stress the importance and the essential character of Youth Aliyah, which at present is doubly important from the points of view of economy, education and society. Ten thousand youngsters are now being looked after in Youth Aliyah institutions. They include children who arrived only last year. I do not know if I can explain how important it is in these days for thousands of families that we can free them of the care for one or two children by admitting them to Youth Aliyah institutions. Demand is great and our possibilities are limited.

Absorption in Depth

When I speak of extending our activities, I mean not only expanding it (which is imperative and vital), I also mean deepening it. We have to approach this problem with heart and mind. The immigrant must be made to feel that we have opened our hearts to him. We also have to do our work more and more on a scientific basis, to extend research and follow-up, to learn from the experience of others, to induce ever wider circles of the population to share in this work and to make absorption a general concern of the community. I hope that the Israel Zionist Council which we hope to establish, will place this matter at the top of its agenda. Certainly, this time it is our first duty to assure a livelihood for the immigrants. But let us remember that man does not live by bread alone. If we want to build a uniform society, we have to devote a great deal of effort to it. The full integration of a person, making him an equal member of the community, the building of this community, all these amount to much more than accommodation and employment. I fear that unless we act with speed and on the proper scale, we shall not only be faced with the danger of creating a "Second Israel" but there are places where we can already see the beginnings of a "Third Israel" sprouting from the ground. I have the feeling that this realization is

slowly penetrating into the consciousness of the public. A few days ago I met with the Immigration Committee of the Knesset and was able to see how this concern is now shared by all not matter to which party they belong. I meet with public organizations which are alive to the enormity of the danger and are willing to share responsibility. It is obvious that we cannot carry this burden alone, but it is important that the Zionist Movement in Israel and throughout the Diaspora should make social absorption one of its central tasks. This requires very much money. It also calls for special man-power. In securing these two I see Zionist challenges.

It is interesting to note that while the problem of social absorption and the fight to prevent a "Second Israel" and a "Third Israel" has found willing ears within non-Zionist Kehillah circles, we have not succeeded in infecting the Zionist Movement with the realization of the danger. Nor have we succeeded in making the Zionist Movement conscious of the practical obligations arising from this challenge from within.

Immigration

There has been a great deal of talk lately about "the immigration that is not". No one's pain is greater than ours. But the pain and the need to find ways and means to increase immigration must not make us forget that even now, in the past year, while we are all talking about the lack of immigrants, many thousands have arrived, in numbers that were by no means inconsiderable. And I have reason to believe that the numbers will increase in the near future. The immigrants who came in the past year are to a large extent of a kind that needs special efforts for integration. These are immigrants in whose absorption major amounts of money must be invested in addition to not inconsiderable human and social efforts. The extent of this immigration was never in the past nor is it now, dependent only on us. Last year immigrants came of a category which we all most

heartily would like to regard as harbingers of a great vision, of a great dream. Here too, of course, the numbers do not depend on us, but I am convinced that this depends not a little on us as well. There is talk of the reunion of families, but a great deal depends on what happens to these families when they reach the hoped-for time of reunion. Certainly, we all hope that Kosygin's announcement on the reunion of families will be honoured. But let us not pin too many hopes on this announcement coming true. Let us do all we can to give the immigrants, wherever they may come from a feeling of being at home, let us open our hearts to them and let us do all we can to make their adjustment easier.

One more thing, it is pointless to talk today about immigration from areas of distress. The immigrants who are arriving now, irrespective of their origin, require individual treatment. In other words – we are now dealing with immigrants whose outstanding characteristic is individual treatment.

Immigration from Western Countries

The real, central and principal problem facing the Zionist Movement is the question of immigration from the Western countries. This is no longer a question of defining who is a Zionist. This is much more than a Zionist duty. The problem of this immigration has become a matter of life and death for the Jewish State. It has become a question which must be positively solved to make the Zionist Movement meaningful. Yesterday you heard the Prime Minister discussing the problems of the State of Israel. Do I have to repeat what he said? Can we not sense his words? How many are we here? Two and a quarter million faced by tens of millions of people filled with hatred against us and being by no means idle. Anyone who can count should look at Israel's demographic situation, compare the birth-rates here and in our neighbouring countries and see the dangers we shall have to confront in a future that is not too

distant. So far from the point of view of the State of Israel. But I also have to look at the question from the point of view of the Jewish people as a whole. Unless we see to it that an ever increasing stream of immigrants arrives from the affluent countries, from the great Jewish centres, unless we build such a living bridge, we shall be exposed to the danger of an abyss opening between us and Diaspora. At the bottom of the crisis that is now sweeping over the State of Israel, there is the fact that no such large-scale immigration is now coming in. At the bottom of this crisis there is the nagging fear deep in the Israeli's heart that Jews are not prepared to come to the Jewish State of their own free will, to build it, strengthen it, shape and assure its existence. I do not know whether words can express the depth of feeling in this matter. Nor do I know whether words are adequate to imbue you, representatives of the Zionist Movement in the world, with the realization that immigration is vital for the continued existence of the State of Israel. This is the test for the Zionist Movement! With it it will rise to new and lofty heights of glory. Without it, God forbid, it will fall.

New Approach to Immigration and Absorption

There is no doubt that this immigration requires a new approach, new methods of operation and new tools. Last year we devoted much thought to these problems. In September we submitted to the Co-ordinating Committee a detailed memorandum regarding the improvement of organizational methods for financial assistance. The memorandum covered all the problems concerned such as exemption from custom duties, licensing, housing conditions, education, old-age grants, employment, insurance and even the actual promotion of immigration. As I have already pointed out, part of these matters are already being implemented. We have decided to set up a single Department for Immigration and Absorption and an Authority within the Executive for Immigration and Absorption. This was a step

towards the establishment of a joint authority for Immigration and Absorption between us and the Government. I hope that the sub-committee composed of the Minister of Labour Yigal Allon and myself will be able in the next few weeks, to present to the Co-ordinating Committee a detailed plan for the work of a joint Authority which will cover all problems of immigration and absorption with emphasis on the promotion of immigration from western countries. It is our purpose to make it easier for the immigrant, to save him the run-around and to ensure that his absorption should be complete from every point of view.

Preliminary Arrangements for Immigration and Absorption

Last year we made a great deal of progress in all that concerned preliminary arrangements for immigration. This applied mainly to housing. Yet, with all the facilities in this respect (and they are most impressive), I believe that eventually and in spite of all difficulties the solution to this problem will be the provision of a sufficient number of homes for rent. We have expanded the various hostels and are in the midst of further expansion. We have begun granting assistance for the establishment of immigrant's clubs. And again, permit me, Members of the Zionist General Council, to invite you to the immigrants' club in Tel Aviv and to see for yourselves how it is a beehive of activity and how great is its contribution to social absorption. We have established such a club in Jerusalem and we are planning to continue. We have expanded co-operation with the Immigrants' Associations. We have been meeting with them in Joint Committees and have been encouraging them to carry a larger share of the practical problems of handling the immigrant, helping him through the customs and giving him advice in the matter of licences and other matters, including social absorption. We have helped thousands of immigrants to become economically integrated by giving them advice and loans and helping them with other arrangements necessary for immigrants who are looking for independent economic integration.

These steps which are aimed at avoiding duplication and unnecessary calls on authorities require a unification of the services concerned in the Diaspora. By this I mean the Department of Immigration, the Economic Department, PATWA and COMOI. The entire procedure which includes promoting immigration, and assuring the immigrant's integration, must be done in a centralized manner with a maximum of efficiency. Certainly, every kind of immigrant needs a different approach, each individual has problems of his own, but I should like to hope that under the new unified structure there will be a proper, speedy and efficacious solution for everything. Unfortunately, there are some who are trying to blame the retrenchment for the lack of immigration. It is clear that the retrenchment creates many problems of employment, and the Government of Israel is doing a great deal to overcome these problems. Together with us they had to find an answer to the problem of immigrant employment. Perhaps we should at this time pay more attention to the suitability of the immigrants and vocational make-up to the needs of the country. For, in spite of the retrenchment there are trades and there are regions where more people are needed, people with knowledge and skills. Moreover, a large immigration provides to a major extent an answer to the retrenchment. We must never say that there is no room for immigrants. Immigration from the West is a long and continuous process, and it must not be stopped or interrupted because of difficulties in Israel. Furthermore, it is precisely Israel's difficulties that should serve as a new challenge in the matter of immigration as well.

The Question of Immigration Today

Material assistance and organizational arrangements are very important things, but they will be pointless unless there is an urge to immigration, unless there is a Zionist spark that impels people to come here, to contribute their share to the upbuilding of the State and to become part of this great historic endeavour of creating a free Jewish

society. If the Zionist Movement wants to justify its existence, it must begin to adopt immigration not as a subject for discussion by some Committee or other, but as content of life. The Zionist Movement must inspire the whole people with enthusiasm. It must raise the banner of our national oneness and accept the duty which this situation imposes upon the Jewish dispersion. Let every one of us consider in the depth of his heart what he can do within his own organization, his neighbourhood, his home, for the purpose of immigration. It is not easy. Sometimes it is difficult, complex, it may even be unpopular, but it is imperative and vital. This is the touchstone of the Zionist Movement. I hope that the Zionist General Council will devote some of its time and thought to this problem. But we shall sin against ourselves if our debate touches only on organizational matters, on facilities or arrangements. This session has to give thought to the question how to set alight the torch of vision for immigration, how to convey to every Jew the simple concern, the worry in which the State of Israel lives. I repeat what I said: Immigration is a matter of life and death for the Jewish State. The Zionist Movement must spearhead the fight for increased immigration. But it is my profound conviction that not only the Zionists, but every Jew who recognizes Israel's shape as a determinant value for his own life as a Jew, is obliged to regard the question of immigration as a principal concern, for it is the immigrants that will shape the State and form its society.

The Zionist Movement, as a Movement has never enjoyed a majority within the Jewish people. But because it was aware of the way it had to go and because it brought with its vision a solution to the Jewish problem, it was able to rally the Jewish masses, it marched at their head and it managed to gather the entire Jewish people in the fight for the establishment of the State. I am certain that if we describe things as they are, and if the Zionist Movement succeeds in conveying these things with their simple and penetrating truth into every Jewish home in the Diaspora, it will

re-ignite the flame of Zionist faith whose light will shine within in its own camp and beyond it.

The Image of the State of Israel

I think that here I also have to devote a few words to Israel and the people that dwell in Zion. The image of Israel is a most influential factor in the promotion of immigration. Immigration from the West is based on Israel as a force of attraction and it depends on us, the inhabitants of Israel, whether Israel shall indeed be such a force of attraction. The country must live in a consciousness of mission and an awareness of destiny. With all due respect to the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech, hallowed rights which I have no wish to infringe, we must remember our situation and aspiration. Sometimes I get the impression from newspapers and speeches that everything is bad. This kind of reading material obscures the light that shines forth from our work. Failures must be criticised, but within the right proportions. Everyone fosters the failure, gives it publicity, dances around it, as if this was our whole life. Why don't we tell about our enormous achievements, about the gigantic enterprise that has been undertaken here and under what difficulties? We are sinning against ourselves, against our children; create a distorted picture in the minds of the Diaspora. This determines to a large extent the Diaspora's attitude to Israel, which in turn may become a decisive factor in our efforts to increase immigration.

Let us for instance take emigration. Of course there is emigration, but all the talk, the figures about emigrants, are exaggerated. I am much more worried and depressed by the atmosphere of emigration that has taken hold than I am worried by the number of emigrants, although it worries me as well. The talk about emigration, the fact that part of the emigrants are native-born Israelis, that they were brought up here and make no secret of their emigration -

this worries me. The emigrant has many reasons. There may be economic, family or social reasons but sometimes when I listen to conversations between young people in the country, at students' symposia, I feel that partly this is the price we are paying for our attitude to Zionism and the Zionist Movement, for putting Zionism between inverted commas, and for our failure to give sufficient attention to a thorough Zionist education. We should impart to the child and to the youth the simple Zionist philosophy of our being one people, of this country being the centre of the Jewish people and that the people is responsible for its fate. I must acknowledge that a change has taken place in this respect. Perhaps the very fact that there is an Israeli structure committee, its discussions and results, are part of this change. But the change can be felt among young people, among officers of the Israel Defence Forces, among high school students, among teachers and educators; all of them express consternation at the gap that has opened up; they are all looking for a bridge to the Jewish people as a whole. The concern for the Zionism of the State of Israel must be our central concerns.

Our Work in the Diaspora

I wish to concentrate now on the other level upon which our work proceeds, namely our work in the Diaspora. I am not doing this as a separate chapter, as it were, something different, but I am treating it as something closely connected to the first part. Call it, if you will, the other side of the coin. It is connected directly with what I have been discussing up to now, that is to say immigration from the West. In our approach to work in the Diaspora, we must take into account the situation of the Jewish people, the processes at work within it, the dangers facing it, and the duties devolving upon us against the background of this situation.

The main problem of the Jewish people today is the fight against assimilation. This is by no means a simple matter.

The problem is how to devise ways and means in a situation which has no parallel or precedent in Jewish history. In most countries the Jews live in complete freedom. They are subject to no restrictions, political, economic, or social. There is an egalitarian society, a society of plenty with a highly conspicuous trend of the Jewish people becoming a people of professionals. This is one situation. On the other hand there is the State of Israel, an independent Jewish State, responsible, as it were, for the strengthening of the Jewish people's national unity—both in a spiritual sense and in many places and cases in a physical sense. We are not alone in this fight against assimilation. Great Jewish public forces are dealing with this and we have to act with them and within them. This is a widespread fight, a spirited effort to develop Jewish education. It involves increased work among youth, great efforts among students on the campuses, great informational and educational efforts among intellectuals and so forth and so forth. The common denominator of all these projects is that it gives vitality and reality to the concept of one Jewish people. This concept is meaningless unless it places Israel in the centre. I have said that this fight has many facets, but every one of them necessitates a special approach, different instruments, other methods of information and organization. Through the structure committees and by various other means we are trying to shape ourselves in such a way that we shall be able to equip ourselves with the right tools for each sector of the front. This means strengthening the Zionist Federations, and arranging properly unified operations of all departments within the Federation. This has not always been successful. In France, for instance, I do not think that we are out of trouble yet. I should like to point with satisfaction to the success we have scored in Canada where a single Zionist Federation has been set up. I hope this will be an active Federation which will become the central force within Canadian Jewry. I appeal to all the parties in all the countries: Do not fear that the strengthening of a unified Federation may adversely affect the parties.

It is only within a strong Zionist atmosphere and a vigorous and unified Zionist body that there is any hope for the parties to increase their own strength.

Work Within the Kehillot

In recent years we have expanded the work in the Kehillot. We can already point to several achievements in this sphere of close co-operation with the Kehillot in matters of education, youth, clubs, bringing seminars to Israel and arranging seminars overseas. We are now perhaps on the threshold of a great enterprise of close co-operation in matters of youth with the Fonds Social in France. Looking at the seminars for workers of the Kehillot bureau, I must point out another most pleasant fact, namely that more and more young people are taking part in these seminars. We must become a decisive force in the work of the Kehillah with more and more going to education even if at the expense of other items such as hospitals etc. More and more for youth work, more and more for the deepening of Jewish culture within the Jewish masses. This is the duty that binds all the Zionist parties together and it ought to be done jointly. However, the funds for these purposes must on no account be allowed to come from the funds earmarked for immigration and absorption. Money that was collected for immigration and the consolidation of integration must not be used for educational work. The one must not be done at the expense of another; this would be an easy way, but eventually it would defeat itself. The fight for Jewish education must be a Zionist fight in every single Kehillah. In education there has been a major advance in our work. The work of our Departments for Education has been praised in all countries of the Diaspora and by all Jewish Organizations. We are now in contact with over 600 schools in 30 countries. We have become a centre for the compilation and distribution of text books for schools. The lack of such a centre has been most acutely felt. There is no Jewish body that is not willing to co-operate with us in the field of education. We are

increasing to a considerable extent the number of students at two schools for the training of teachers, the Haim Greenberg School and the Rabbi Gold School. Today already hundreds of teachers study there every year. The Memorial Fund for Jewish Culture which, in fact, comprises all Jewish organizations has decided to give considerable assistance to the consolidation and extension of these schools. Also, the World Council for Jewish Education last year entered a regular working programme and it is clear to all that the Council's work is unthinkable without close contact with our Departments of Education. We could do much more. The possibilities today are almost unlimited; we only need more means. This is not only a question of money, it is also a question of creating an atmosphere in the Kehillah conducive to raising the social status of the teacher and maintaining an attitude of respect towards the men who have been entrusted with the future of the nation. We must also concern ourselves with the content of Jewish education and raising its level. We are bound to see to it that Jewish education is based on the historic continuity of the Jewish people, that it should be anchored in Jewish values, that it should foster the idea of the purity of the Jewish people and should recognize the centrality of Israel as the mainstay of Jewish education.

The Education Crisis in the Diaspora

In my view the most serious crisis that is affecting Jewish education is the teachers' crisis. There is an enormous shortage of teachers. We are doing a great deal both by sending teachers from here and training teachers from the Diaspora. We are also assisting teachers seminars in the Diaspora but all this still falls short of solving the problem. Nor is it conceivable that the State of Israel could solve the problem entirely by sending teachers to the Diaspora. What is imperative is a fight to raise the prestige of the teacher and his status within the

Kehillah so as to attract young people to the teaching profession and to explain to the younger generation that teaching is a sacred service. The Kehillah should regard those who engage in teaching as performing sacred work. I wish to make it clear that when I ask for "more means" I don't mean only more funds from the Central Zionist budget, but the raising of more funds from local sources for these purposes. This fight is a strictly Zionist fight.

Last year we launched work on the campuses, among professors and intellectuals on a more methodical basis, mainly in the United States, but not only there. We developed a Research Department in the United States, whose work serves the network of our contacts with professors and thinkers. The conversion of Midstream into a monthly proved worthwhile. In the current year we have doubled the number of its subscribers, and it is our duty to increase this effort and to make Midstream a Zionist ideological mouthpiece for tens of thousands of Jews in the United States. We have intensified information activities in the country, but did not confine ourselves to current affairs but also touched on basic matters. The preparatory work for the publication of the Zionist Encyclopedia is in an advanced stage. The Zionist Library in Jerusalem and Herzl Press in New York have continued a publication of basic books. The Bialik Institute is approaching the final stages of two great basic projects – the Biblical Encyclopedia and the Educational Encyclopedia. There has also been progress in the preparation of the Hebrew Bibliography. This whole field of activity still calls for expansion and intensification.

Youth Movements

I believe there is no need for me to explain the importance of youth work. This is an investment in the Jewish future, the Zionist future, the future of the State of Israel. When I discuss briefly our activities in this field I wish to state that notwithstanding all the welcome efforts that are

being made to strengthen and intensify co-operation with general Jewish organizations, the centre and the basis must be the encouragement and fostering of the pioneering youth movements among which, I am glad to say, I noticed last year signs of awakening and of an effort to take the field. This is our reserve of pioneering immigration for which we are longing so much and which we need so badly. It is only regrettable that this wonderful work of the pioneering youth movements is not being done on a united basis. I don't think that the party barriers to joint work are dictated by reality. On the contrary, reality shows that united much more can be done. I am glad to see that the emissaries of the pioneering youth movements in the United States have taken the initiative in this matter, and are still searching, for a way towards joint work. I should like to hope that this attempt of the emissaries should meet with the greatest goodwill of the parties. The Youth and Hechalutz Department quite rightly does not confine itself to activities among the pioneering and Zionist youth movements; it also tries, with success, to encompass all the Jewish youth organizations. We are today in contact with more than half a million members of youth organizations throughout the world. Only this year the American Jewish Zionist Youth Council was established. It comprises 24 Jewish Youth Organizations in the United States and Canada and numbers 300,000 members. Today, there is hardly a single Jewish Youth Organization that does not send its members to the Summer or Winter Institutes of the Department or to the Overseas Instructors Institute. Incidentally, the Institute for the Training of Teachers from abroad will mark at the end of this month its 20th Anniversary. In the course of these 20 years, the Institute has trained 3,500 instructors for dozens of countries and dozens of Jewish Youth Organizations. It is interesting to note that 1,500 graduates of the Institute emigrated to Israel after completing their years of activity as instructors in the Diaspora. I should like to point to our work at the community centres in the Diaspora both in the U.S. and in

Europe. The attempt to send central emissaries from here to the community centres proved to be a pronounced success. If I may be allowed to quote what the people of the community centres say about this work, here is an extract:

The influence exerted by the Israel Youth Leaders on the community centres where they served was very impressive. There is no doubt that they instilled their enthusiasm into young and old, in every educational activity they undertook. Their influence was so favourable that the organizers of the programme decided to turn the 2-year experimental programme into a permanent feature. There was another, most successful experiment with many and varied implications. I refer to the "Oded" Movement which last week held its conference in Jerusalem. The 240 students who immigrated under the auspices of the Movement and are now studying in Jerusalem and Haifa, are a valuable contribution to the integration of the exiles and to social integration.

We also began on an experimental basis the National Service (Sherut La'am) project. But this is only a beginning. There were two groups with about 250 participants. It is worthy of note that of the first group which numbered 100 participants 24 decided to immigrate.

I think that what I have mentioned in the fields of organization, education, information, and youth and hechalutz (and they are only a few examples chosen from these great, still growing, developing and expanding operations), affords us a picture of a wealth of great deeds. But here too I have to emphasize, we could have done more, and more has to be done, if only we had had sufficient means at our disposal.

The Centre for the Diaspora – Hamerkaz Latefutsot

Before passing on to discuss the problem of funds, permit me to say a few words about the Centre for the Diaspora, sponsored jointly by us and the Government of

Israel. A large part of the activities I have mentioned were carried out with the assistance of and in full co-operation with the Centre. The principle underlying the Centre is the healthy idea that it is imperative to let the Government of Israel share in the concern for the continued existence of the Jewish people and in the large amount of work in the fields educating the younger generation and encouraging immigration etc. It is a good idea, and in my view it was imperative, that the Government should give its attention, thought and energy to these matters. The Centre is only at the beginning of its work. Much has been done but much is still in a stage of experimentation. There are many things which, if they are not done, there are no problems about them. There are also things which create problems when they are being done. Of course, we have not yet found a clear way for our work with the Centre, a way in which the Centre could launch its work. The Executive is still discussing the problem and I hope that we shall find the right way to let the Government share in the concern, and in which we can jointly work for the strengthening of the Zionist Movement and the promotion of activities in the Diaspora. We are now dealing with establishing the permanent institutions jointly with the Government. These institutions will plan and determine the methods of operation.

Budget

I shall now pass on to the means for the implementation of the programme which I have tried to outline before you. When discussing the budget for the coming fiscal year I have to point out that this concerns something that is much more than the drafting of an annual budget. If we sincerely want to continue our operations, we have to lay in the coming year a serious groundwork for a fiscal policy that is designed to lead to the gradual recovery of the financial situation of the Jewish Agency and the Zionist Organization. Such a policy should eventually place us on a sound financial footing. Unless we have the daring to do this, we shall face

a situation in which we have wonderful plans, a clear ideology, an exemplary organization, but no means to translate any of these things into reality.

Throughout all these years we have been conducting a justified policy according to which it was not the budget that determined the number of immigrants but vice versa. We rescue as long as rescue is possible without regard to the budgetary difficulties. We brought a million three hundred thousand Jews to the country. We dissolved entire Kehillot and transferred them to Israel. We searched for ways and means to rescue even though it meant going deep into debt. We have indeed gone into debt but it was worthwhile. History would have condemned us had we acted differently. But debts, Ladies and Gentlemen, have a strange habit: they must be repaid and with interest too. The day of reckoning has come and we have to pay what is due. We are asking the Government to contribute next year even more than hitherto to our Settlement budget.

We are now beginning an essential process which will with effort and with the help of important factors lead to a solution of the problem of our indebtedness. But a condition for the success of this process – a failure would be terrible – is to adhere to the principle that the debts must not be increased. This is a principle which we must adopt as an unalterable law. All the efforts we are making for the solution of the problem of indebtedness will come to nought if at the same time we increase our debts.

All this means that we have to adopt difficult decisions, sometimes even cruel decisions. It means curtailing activities. I should like to hope that we shall be able to continue with the main body of our activities. At any rate we shall make an effort to see that the cuts – inevitable though they may be – should not affect the vital innards of our work. We are making supreme efforts to economize, to increase efficiency and reduce personnel so as to devote more money to operations.

I am submitting to the Zionist General Council a draft budget for the fiscal year 1967/68 totalling IL.310,137,000, i.e. about 14 per cent less than in the current fiscal year. The details of the budget and its breakdown will, of course, be discussed in the competent committee of the Zionist General Council.

I said at the beginning of my address that I don't regard you, Members of the Zionist General Council, as challengers and the Executive as the challenged. We are all being challenged. It is not enough to bemoan the situation. We should see how much can be done. We must also see where the money should be taken from.

The Zionist Movement and the Appeal

It is up to you to increase the means at our disposal. You Zionists ought to be the central force, the active and activating force of the Appeal. In many countries we do not do that which is incumbent upon us. In many places the Zionist Movement does not adequately perform its duty in the matter of Appeals. I could offer you numerous examples of places where we could have changed the situation of the Appeals if key members of the Zionist Movement had taken an active part in the Appeals. The Zionists in the communities – as a Movement and as individuals must set shining examples.

One more remark: there are many Members who ask that we should bear the financial duties, whereas by every token of fairness we could ask that these activities should be covered by those funds. I think that the Zionists in the communities should fight for the principle that the Kehillah contribute to the bringing of its own young people to the country, to institutes, courses and training seminars. Introducing the Kehillah to sharing this burden means not only relieving our financial obligations – although this is very important. It also amounts to a Zionist educational activity. Such examples can be found in large numbers. We are called upon to increase, expand, intensify and foster

Jewish education, and the Zionists in the communities have to fight for the principle that the communities Kehillot should allocate more and more for Jewish education and culture, for children, youth and adults. It is quite impossible for us to bear the burden of this expense from here. I think this is neither fair nor educational.

Such activities will fill Zionist work in the Kehillah with content. At the beginning this may run into difficulties, it may be unpopular. But I am convinced that eventually it will strengthen the status of Zionism, will give it added prestige and, what is more, will fill Zionist work in the Kehillah with content.

I don't know whether I have enough strength to describe to you our financial difficulties, or to tell you what means we have to use to honour our financial commitments. The credit situation in the world, the economic situation in the country, and the enormous burden of debt, are placing us in a unique position. You have no idea of what we are facing day by day in the Treasury in our effort to finance our activities. Five years ago we undertook to make an effort not to increase our indebtedness. Welcome waves of mass-immigration forced us to increase our debts nevertheless. We have, without any exaggeration, reached the very limit.

If we want to see the light again – and we have every chance to do so – we have to watch our steps so that what we do should serve as a basis for the expansion of our work in the future. We are facing a difficult period, a year of great effort. I think that we are beginning to get out of trouble; I mean with regard to our financial situation. We can manage it if we understand that this requires efforts and sacrifices from us all.

I should like the entire Zionist General Council to know and to feel that we are submitting a reduced budget, actuated by our concern for the Zionist future. The Zionist future will be assured if we adopt the method of economy and efficiency, if we do not increase our debts, if we launch an

effort to solve this depressing problem and if we all join forces to increase our work, to increase our means and to introduce the Jewish Kehillot into the great projects we are carrying out.

The Prime Minister said in his speech last night that the "Covenant" between us and the Government must pass the test of action. It is not only the covenant that has to pass the test of action but also the Zionist Movement as a whole – its test today is the test of action. We do not lack a programme. Our problem is not the absence of a programme. The problem is whether we, who are sitting in this hall have the strength to carry this burden, whether we have the strength to carry out that which has been imposed upon us. The tasks before us are vast and numerous. The question is not whether there is today a need for a Zionist Movement. The People and the State today need a strong Zionist Movement more than ever before. The problem is whether we have the strength to face the challenges which our Jewish and Zionist fate has in store for us.

The Zionist Movement must be the bearer of the idea of Israel's centrality in the life of the Jewish people. Above all it must be the standard bearer of mass-immigration. It has to embrace all the classes of the people, all age groups, and to become again an ideological force within the Jewish people. If we will it, there are chances to turn this vision into reality, for our sake, for the State of Israel and for the entire Jewish people.

Address by Yigal Allon
Minister for Labour

ISRAEL'S ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

When, just about a year ago, the present Government headed by Mr. Levi Eshkol and resting upon a broad parliamentary basis, was formed, it was clear that in the first

two years of the Sixth Knesset, we must expect, contrary to our own wishes, an influx of immigration so small that it would give rise to concern. But in addition to this main concern, stemming from the decline in immigration and also because we know that there are hundreds of thousands of Jews who wish to come here but cannot – and I endeavour to share the robust optimism of the President of the World Zionist Organization – we know what this country can expect if the roads to Zion prove lonesome. But the decline in immigration also has its economic projections. It was clear that when the influx shrank there would be created a surplus of new apartments and other structures generally, far beyond the needs of the market, even though we would not stop building because of the recession. We are aware that reduced immigration would not only cause unemployment among the building workers, but, also, because of the chain reaction involved, in industries associated with construction and even in other branches of the economy, in all fields of our social and economic life. The Government was faced with two difficult alternatives – one to recognize the facts of the recession in Aliyah, forced upon us by external factors, and as a result to reduce investment in construction, making at the same time unremitting efforts to divert investment capital, manpower and energy to the further development of industry, agriculture, tourism and the export of know-how. We had to adopt this policy notwithstanding the suffering that would be caused in the transitional period. The other alternative was to ignore the decline in immigration, and to continue to invest in building, irrespective of the demand for housing, to maintain an artificial economic boom – and thereby to win considerable popularity.

The first alternative was a difficult one, and involved the suffering that results from unemployment and temporary need. In the end, however, it would consolidate the national economy upon a more stable and a sounder basis. The second alternative that was before us would have enabled us to maintain excellent public relations within the

Government – though it might have halted to some extent the flow of Jewish humour, if not that of sarcasm – and we might have succeeded, with difficulty, in maintaining the boom until after the elections to the Seventh Knesset. All it needed was an effort on the part of the printing workers in Holland, who print our Israel pounds, to continue with a more affluent way of life, a crazy way of life, but then after the next elections, even a recession would not have been of any use. For the economy would have collapsed. There is nothing we can do about the peculiar character of the Jewish people, which gives us no rest even in the State of Israel. In another country when there is a recession, there is a crisis, suffering; it is overcome, and the people continue to live their lives. But here, with us, because things are so integrated, economics with national sovereignty, and national sovereignty with independence in security, we cannot permit, because of the public relations of the Government and the Prime Minister, to take the risk of a real economic crisis, and to jeopardize our independence and our capacity to defend ourselves. The recession which we have accepted is difficult, but it is not an economic crisis. Its purpose is to prevent an economic crisis. It is intended to take the bull by the horns, to enable us to steer a new course.

It needed some realistic thinking, and permit me to say, considerable civic courage, on the part of the Government, of all parties in the Government, to resolve in the midst of an economic boom, however unreal it was, to embark upon a difficult policy, which called for sacrifice on the part of the people. After all none of you suspect that one bright day eighteen Cabinet Ministers, coming from different parties, suddenly because of some whim, resolved to make things hard for the people. We went through a difficult time, we had our doubts and hesitations, there were bitter debates between us, but I do not believe that many months must pass before even the doubters will be forced to admit that this Government, headed by Levi Eshkol, is to be commended for its courage and its sense

of responsibility. In a period of almost nineteen years no step so drastic, so bold, so far-reaching, in Israel's internal policy has been adopted, as that adopted by the present Government. There is a recession, but we hope only in branches that cannot increase our exports. There is not and will not be any recession in investments, or in economic activities and enterprises which can increase our exports, or replace imports. We must pay for our imports in hard currency, and hard currency is hard to get, even if we ignore for the moment imported goods of secondary importance. Suffice it to recall the main items of imports, which we cannot do without, in production, in consumption, in services and in defence. I need only mention five: wheat, oil, raw materials, means of production and materials for defence. For all of these we must pay. And the reduction of our international payments deficit will increase our capacity to pay with the fruits of our own labours for these vital imports, in addition to consolidating our political and security independence, which indeed are mutually connected. Thanks to the fact that over a period of a decade and a half we have developed a strong economy in the State of Israel and consequently have a strong foundation to build on – which of course has its weak spots – and from which we can advance in the years ahead. Quantitatively, the existing economy can absorb all the unemployed. But unfortunately, neither industry nor tourism are operating at their full capacity, for they have not found the markets and the customers for the goods and services they can produce. There have not been enough tourists to fill all the hotels that have been built and so a substantial portion of our investment capital, our means of production, the services we can provide are not utilized. The market is very cruel. It is the consumer who is king, it is he who decides what goods to choose, and his choice is decided by his taste and budget, the quality of the goods he buys and manner in which they are packed. We have learnt something that in fact we were aware of for many years but which as long as there was a boom thanks to the building activity people refused to accept. It transpired

that a large part of our industry and agriculture were directed towards the domestic market, principally to the local market, which indeed possessed much purchasing power. Today realities are forcing themselves on the public. And now we bear witness to a highly positive trend in the direction of saving, towards higher standards of efficiency, greater productivity, and resourcefulness in capturing overseas markets. These trends have already produced very favourable results. Over the past two years work efficiency in Israel has grown by fourteen per cent. This is an achievement. It also shows how laggard we were in the past, and how much remains to be done in the future. In our balance of trade there is also a great advance, though there are differences of opinion about the time needed to reach economic independence, or a favourable balance of payments. I believe that if all goes well we shall reach this stage some time in the middle of the next decade. In 1965 our exports and the services for which we were paid in foreign currency rose by 14.7 per cent, compared to the preceding year. In 1966 the growth was of a magnitude of fifteen per cent. According to a conservative estimate production will reach 980 million dollars in 1967 – almost one billion dollars – that is a further increase of 13.3 per cent. But we must confess the truth and here there is no escape even from Zionism. Here we must build an economy under special conditions both in this country and in our widespread dispersion. We are compelled to do practically everything at one and the same time. It is only with the greatest difficulty that it is possible to set up a scale of priorities at all. We want mass immigration, we want demographic growth wherever possible. We are ready for mass immigration, but if there is no other alternative we shall have to slow down the rate of other development in order to construct housing and such like. We have already accumulated reserves of apartments and have developed methods of construction that even if the mass immigration is renewed we shall not necessarily have to revert to the disproportion that existed in investments,

in housing construction and productive branches of the economy for export. We wish to reach a favourable trade balance. We wish to achieve a standard of living which will reflect both social justice and rising standards for both the individual and the community, so that the American, or British, or South African or Argentinian Jew will not enjoy any advantage over us. They may have more money, but a standard of living, a cultured standard of living, is not gauged merely in monetary terms. And I believe that the Jewish community in this country wishes to maintain a great measure of unity, not merely on the basis of tradition and history, not only on the basis of sentiment, but on a scientific and cultural basis, there there is no alternative for us but to try and achieve a high standard that does not fall short of that obtaining in the most developed countries, without, of course, becoming involved in expenditures that it is beyond our capacity to bear, or go in for luxuries which are not necessarily cultural necessities.

We also need a strong army. We speak of our army as a deterrent, for it is the Government's policy to avoid war. Our official policy is to work for peace and cooperation between ourselves and our neighbours and if, regrettably peace is beyond our reach, then we must reach such arrangements as will prevent the outbreak of war. The Armistice Agreements are not effective in this respect as is evidenced by what is happening on the Syrian border. And if they are not ready to come to agreement, even of a transitional character, to prevent the outbreak of war, then at least we must deter those who regard themselves as our enemies from carrying out their threats. And so only an army capable of forcing a decision can serve as a deterrent. In the last resort in all the wars in which invaders have been defeated, the latter were convinced at the outset of their victory. If they had not been they would not have embarked upon the invasion. Hence it is our paramount moral and national duty to persuade our neighbours over the border that there is no chance of their proving

victorious. For them war is not the test of survival, for we are not threatening their existence. They can permit themselves to put off the war from one year to the next and we must welcome every year in which we do not have to fight a major war. Without this unique burden in the sphere of defence we should have been much closer to the economic independence. But national independence takes precedence and to build up an economy we must ensure the defence of our borders. We must do this in a country which is not overblessed with wealth. We have no iron, we have no coal, we have only a little oil, about eight to ten per cent of what we need.

Our population is small. Previously I mentioned the local market. When a country is rich and big, not necessarily like the United States, but one of the smaller countries, it can base its production to a very considerable extent on the local market. Sometimes, even, it exports only a marginal proportion and at marginal prices. Production on a large scale means lower prices. We must consume the marginal qualities ourselves, not necessarily at marginal prices, in order to export the bulk of our production.

I am convinced that despite a certain lag in the past year or two in our industry we are making progress and there are prospects that after July of this year, that is in seven or eight months time, there will be gradual decline in unemployment, in the direction of full employment, which must not be confused with over-employment. We shall achieve this by more effective utilization of the means of production in existing plants, together with intensification of efforts, saving and efficiency, and the conquest of new markets, on our way to economic independence.

But until that day comes, we have no alternative but to fight unemployment in the difficult period of transition. We have in all no more than 31,000 workless in this country, and 11,000 are already employed on relief works.

But we believe that we must provide relief works for both adults and juveniles, veteran residents and new immigrants, by advancing the date of public works and strengthening the infrastructure of our economy and developing essential services, by instituting relief works and expanding the network of vocational training, by increasing, without permitting budgetary considerations to influence us in anyway, the youth groups, for there is no reason why a youngster whose parents are ready to send him to a settlement should not go there. In this last respect, indeed, economy can involve actual loss, and not the other way round. In addition in the national budget a sum has been earmarked for the payment of unemployment grants to those for whom work cannot be provided.

We are being told, not without a modicum of truth, that when employment is at the ebb it will prove difficult to persuade people from the affluent countries to settle in Israel. Psychologically this is true, but it would be just as well to remember that even during the years of prosperity we did not witness a mass immigration, or for that an influx of any major proportions, into this country. Moreover, if the standard of living that beleaguered Israel building up its economy, can ensure in comparison with that prevailing in the United States or Western Europe is to be the criterion for the prospective immigrant, be he a Zionist or a sympathiser of Zionism – what prospects are there for immigration from these countries? However much progress we make, whatever achievements we register, there will always be a disparity in our respective standards, between the income of the average Israeli and that of his counterpart in America, Britain, South Africa or the Argentine. Without a true Zionism, without Zionist values, however much we try to do by way of customs exemptions and similar facilities – which are important in themselves – we must evoke a new Zionist spirit, both in the Jewish world generally as well as in this country, with a view to setting in motion Aliyah, to induce greater aid, to inspire political identification with Israel and with other countries of the Diaspora.

Zionism is essential in Israel, among both adults and youth, to foster love of the country, to stimulate greater identification with our people still in the Golah, in order to create identification with the total unity of the Jewish people. There is a need for Zionism in this country so that its citizens, and particularly the native-born Sabras, do not leave to settle elsewhere. There is a need for Zionism to prevent assimilation in Israel. Assimilation is a danger not only in other countries; we need Zionism here to ensure that Canaanitism does not strike root, even marginal root, among our Sabras.

Unemployment and immigration are cause and effect. It is said that when unemployment is rife there is the prospect that immigrants will not come to Israel, and that if immigration does not set in unemployment will continue and even grow. This is a vicious circle. We have chosen a difficult economic policy, not because it has brought about unemployment, but notwithstanding our foreknowledge that unemployment would result. But this unemployment is necessary for employment, more secure employment, that is also more stable.

When that same American or British or Argentinian Jew asks me today: How can I settle in Israel today when there is unemployment? I shall not tell him – for reasons of politeness – how my grandfather came here and there was no one to welcome him when he disembarked. That is not the answer, just as one must not preach Zionism in the United States on the basis of German or Italian models. We must distinguish the different historic conditions in each country and in each community. We must come to them, and not try to frighten them. We must stress the positive aspects of Aliyah. I remember a statement made by the late Moshe Sharett at a gathering of youth organized by E. Dobkin: It was a statement that only a gentleman of the stature of Sharett could have made. He said: "Of course we want you to come to this country. But do not come here to help us, but because you feel you have to."

We must develop into a qualitative and quantitative national entity capable of supporting itself. By remaining a small community we constitute a temptation for all sorts of aggressive forces to try their luck in war. We must keep on growing. Previously I referred to capital investments, to industry, to the development of tourism, to the export of know-how. In World Jewry, both in the West and in Soviet Russia, we possess an immense reservoir not only of means but also of know-how, of genius, of capacity. Let there be a steady, not-very-large influx. Let us compromise on fifteen to twenty thousand immigrants from the West every year. This would be an influx of the highest possible quality.

We shall cause you unease, disquiet, for we shall always regard Aliyah as a major task. I have never accepted the theory, and I do not accept it today, that a Zionist who is not prepared to come to the country immediately should leave the ranks of the Movement. I would have been happy indeed had Professor Einstein settled in this country, if Judge Brandeis had settled here. Will anyone say that Brandeis was not a Zionist? Or that Hillel Silver was not a Zionist? But I repeat. Aliyah is at the very top of our priorities. And we shall give you no rest. We shall not allow you to live your lives quietly. But while there may be a Zionist who identifies with Israel in his own fashion but does not come to settle here – and each Zionist must ask himself why he does not come to settle – there cannot be a Zionist Movement that does not engage in the promotion of Aliyah. A Zionist Movement that does not promote Aliyah will cease to be a Zionist Movement.

The Jewish people needs Israel and Israel needs a strong Zionist Movement. The Zionist Movement must be revitalized; so to speak, we must destroy those inverted comas in which it is enclosed by the cynics, and if I may be permitted to conclude on the note with which the Premier began his speech yesterday: The Zionist Movement must intensify the love for the people, the consciousness of the duty to serve the people.

FIFTH MEETING

Tuesday, January 10, 1967, in the morning

Chairman: LEON GELMAN

DEBATE ON THE ACTIVITIES
OF THE ZIONIST EXECUTIVE, ITS PLANS AND BUDGET

Mrs. S.W. Halprin

(Chairman: American Section of the Executive - New York)

The moment has come for us to look at the American Jewish community within the context of the American community as a whole. I don't think that you can understand the American Jewish community or evaluate what it does or does not do unless you place it where it is, geographically, culturally and practically.

What does the American scene look like today? What does the American community look like today? It is a community quite different from that of even a decade ago. It is a community in turmoil. In certain aspects of life it shows distress, and it is indeed a divided community. Take Vietnam - there is nobody who reads that does not know that the American community is divided and disturbed by it and the foreign policy of which it is a part. Take the Civil Rights Programme as a whole. It represented a moral challenge. Today there is division even on this. The Negro community is divided in itself and there are those that shout "black power", and those who preach moderation and chant "We Shall Overcome".

A word about our college youth, and in this category, of course, is our Jewish youth. Never before in the history of the United States have we witnessed students organizing "sit-in" strikes, necessitating the calling-in of the police. It was not the pattern of university life that

students become involved in political and sociological demonstrations. Those of us who went to the colleges of the United States in decades past, were in sheltered areas when we were there. Now this turmoil on the campus is part of the American scene, and of this scene American Jewish youth is a part. The American Jewish community faces all these problems and the additional one arising out of the need to maintain its Jewish identity. Whatever the situation is for the American citizen generally, there is an extra duty, an extra obligation, an extra challenge to the American Jew. How to maintain his Jewishness; how to perpetuate his Jewish values; how to maintain separateness in a community of which he is a part, and whilst he is working with that community for a better way of life for the United States and for the world. This, then, is the challenge. But if you charge yourself, as we must now charge ourselves, to perpetuate Jewish values, then we come at once to the problem of youth. Not only because youth is the future – that is a cliché – of course youth is the future, but because youth today presents a problem to the Jewish community which it did not present ten years ago, or twenty years ago.

I think that 80 per cent or so of our Jewish youth is on the college campus – a part then, of the general struggle of a free society. It is involved in this changing world and its readily changing values. It is part of the free society and the free life of the college campus, since that is so, there is inevitably a part of it that assimilates and inter-marries. That would not be so dreadful a thing – Jewish life has always had a fall-off, has always had some sector prone to assimilation – it would be allright if against this assimilatory sector there stood a solid phalanx of committed Jewish youth, knowing what it is and where it is going. That is not the case. We have on the one hand the rising assimilationist trend and, on the other, a small group which either by religious training and conviction or national secularist ideology is committed Jewishly. In between stands the bulk of American Jewish youth. You cannot talk to it.

It is not interested; it is completely apathic. If youth were to say "No"; if it argued with you; if it said "I don't accept what you are saying, I have my own point of view", there would already exist common ground. But the sad fact is that there is little inter-generation discussion and this comes in part from the way we live. The family – the Jewish family – is no longer deeply rooted, but even where it is, a boy or girl studies a thousand miles away from home during long formative years. Job opportunities after graduation are often not available near home, so that the family tradition breaks down even when it exists, at an early stage in the life of the young woman or the young man. How did transfer come of Jewish values in my generation and in the generation of most of you who sit here? It came through the home; it came because the family remained intact during years of study. This situation no longer prevails and any attempt to deal with our youth merely through clichés will only lead us into a blind alley. What we need is a thorough analysis and then answers to guide us in dealing with our young people. Millions of words have been spoken and written about our youth – about the assimilationist tendency. Some people have proposed organizational changes as the answer. I believe that is no answer at all. The answer has to be given to the questions that are asked by youth and these are clear. You told us, they say, that we have to remain Jewish. Is not the whole world, is not the American community seeking peace in the world – do we not all stand for peace – do we not all stand for the dignity of the human being – do we not all say that every man is entitled to equal opportunity – do we not deny discrimination because of colour, race or religion – do we not want the "great society" not only for ourselves but for the whole world? And if this be true – they say – you must tell us, first, why we have to separate ourselves in pursuit of these things; why we cannot espouse these causes as part of the new cultural, philosophical spiritual upsurge – at least in thinking – in the world of today? Then they say, explain our Jewish values to us and tell us wherein they are different, better, worse,

or the same as the general ethical posture of our times. What are these values that you ask us to maintain and for which we must struggle and for which we must constitute ourselves as an enclave within the larger framework of society? Give us the relevance of Jewish thinking and Jewish morals and Jewish ethics to the world in which we live today and the world which we will surely face tomorrow. Relevancy is the thing which you must establish for them because youth lives and must act and serve in the world in which it finds itself and not in the world of yesterday.

We have failed—I say all of us, not only the Zionist Movement—because we have neglected to do in our generation what other generations did in the past when they lived in a free society—in Spain or various parts of Europe, where the culture attracted the Jew; where the Jew was not confined to the ghetto but free to express himself. Then the leaders, the thinkers, the teachers helped the Jewish community to synthesize, to find relevancy, to make the present and the past meet, and Judaism be meaningful in terms of its daily life. This we have not done. Instead, we hear voices to the effect that youth is not with us because of some organizational lack. Youth will not be with us if hundred organizational changes take place unless we give them that which they must have as answers to their questions.

I don't think this is the job of the Zionist Movement, but surely in this room—and I can pick them out man by man—are men in the field of education, men who are spiritual leaders in the American Jewish community, men who are connected with the great institutions of learning—the Yeshiva University and the Theological Seminary. Who, if not they, should be sitting together, devoting a year, two if necessary, not to re-organization but to answering the questions involved in 20th century living and the maintenance of Jewish values. Leave re-organization to us, not because we will do it better, but we will do it no worse than you. You, however, can give the answers to the

questions which youth asks. We will do the implementation — we shall be the hands, the feet — you the brain-power. Every year that passes we lose another percentage of our youth.

Let me say a few words about re-organization. I think we need re-organization and that Dr. Goldmann was right when he said that perhaps more important than the details, is the mere projection of re-organization and the psychological aura which surrounds it. If you mention re-organization, you are applauded even by the press in this country. The mere concept is hailed as if change for its own sake means anything. But let's accept the fact that we do need re-organization. Nothing can be worse, however, and I think no greater harm can be done, than for leaders of our movement to say that this is the be-all and the end-all of our efforts and that without re-organization and the federation format we will be lost. If that is the case, my friends, we are lost. Why this exaggeration? I say that we should open the doors and admit groups and organizations who are pro-Zionist. I think it is futile to talk about individuals coming into the federations in any great numbers. Dr. Goldmann said that there are hundreds of thousands of potential Zionists. Hundreds of thousands never were standing in line actually or potentially. In Hadassah, there exists an organization which knows that its growth was spurred in the days of Hitler by what happened to the Jewish people and affected the American Jew as part of that people. Some of those dealing with re-organization believe in individual membership, some do not. Is that going to make or break the Zionist Organization? I repeat, we have to open our minds to change, but more important than organizational change is the need to tell the Jewish community what the Zionist Movement has to offer — what makes it different — what makes it the movement in Jewish life.

I believe that the speakers were right who said that without immigration from the West, there can be no great Zionist Movement. Yet I have pointed out the difficulties

that face us because American youth cannot respond to such concepts as the centrality of Israel, which has no meaning for it, until it is educated Jewishly to know what Jewish life means – what Jewish values are, and what its contribution to the survival of Jewish values can be.

Emanuel Neumann

(Member of the Executive - New York)

I want to address myself first to the last part of Dr. Goldmann's address the other night. He spoke of what has troubled many of us coming from abroad: the psychological climate prevailing in Israel at this moment. There is little, I suppose, that we can do from abroad about it – at least in the immediate sense. But one can hardly avoid being affected by what one hears and reads about the feeling of great depression that one senses here, even expressions bordering on despair, which in my opinion are not justified by the objective circumstances. It is true that Israel is now passing through one of its most serious trials from various point of view: from the point of view of its external relations – the military or security situation on its frontiers – the critical economic situation. There is a convergence of adverse factors and circumstances, such as we have not seen in years; and this may explain the darkly depressing climate. But those of us who have grown old in the Movement will recall other occasions and circumstances equally difficult and even more perilous through which we came through safely in the past.

However, I do not know whether Dr. Goldmann's analysis of the cause of the present atmosphere in Israel, and where he places the blame for what appears to be a psychosis, is completely accurate. When he criticizes the Israel press for overdoing its treatment of negative manifestations, I am inclined to agree with him. The press could and should learn to moderate its tone and its reactions. It is certainly depressing for one residing

in New York to open the pages of an Israel newspaper and find daily sensational accounts of some new scandal or some new unstrained personal denigration, involving even people in high places. But I don't think that it is all a matter simply of personal antagonism or hatred. There are parties, of course, that have their political quarrels and contests. My experience has been that on the personal level there is not really that amount of hostility; on the contrary: I have found a great deal of comradeship and mutual respect and friendship between people belonging to altogether different camps. But whatever the normal personal relationships and personal decency, I have observed that the situation is quite different when it comes to party interests and party struggles. Then there are no holds barred. Then the contest is conducted, at times, with a ruthlessness — almost with a ferocity — which should cause us all a good deal of concern.

So far as we in the Diaspora are concerned, we owe it to ourselves, as well as to the Movement and the State of Israel to be doubly careful of what we say or do, lest we contribute to the creation of a miasma. At this point I must refer to something which happened in the past few days, in the hope of clearing up a misunderstanding. My good friend, the President of the Z.O.A., gave an interview to the official organ of Rafi, Mabat Hadash, which gave colour to the notion that he was injecting himself unduly in a painful and delicate situation, in a manner of which most of us, I think? do not approve. I have never believed and do not believe today, that Diaspora Zionists must not criticize matters in Israel, whether in the field of external policy or domestic affairs. I still believe that it is our right and at times even our duty to voice our opinions. But in the past we, of the Z.O.A. at least, have generally observed two rules: one is the rule that military and defence matters are beyond such discussion on our part; and that is a rule which it would be wise to observe in the future and certainly at a moment like this, when tensions are high.

The second rule we have tried to observe was to avoid purely personal criticism, certainly any denigration of outstanding personalities, of people who stand at the head of the State or the head of the Government. I am afraid that the impression created is that these two rules have not been strictly observed in this instance.

I have read and re-read the interview in Mabat Hadash. Now it is not true that Mr. Torczyner there stated that the recent action against Samua in the Kingdom of Jordan was undertaken, not for military reasons, but for reasons of domestic politics. He did not say that. What he did, was to quote an editorial of the New York Times to that effect, adding his own view that Israel was not prepared to attack Syria and therefore attacked Jordan. Be that as it may, it was an unfortunate occurrence. Regardless of my long friendship with Mr. Torczyner and my appreciation of what he has done and is doing to build Zionism and the Z.O.A. since assuming its presidency, I am nevertheless forced to dissociate myself from either of those views.

He has also had some unkind things to say about Prime Minister Eshkol, and one may question their propriety. Some of us have had our quarrels at times, with the Government of Israel or at least with some persons in the Government. I well recall my own response to some of Mr. Ben-Gurion's actions and statements in the past, while he was Prime Minister. Indeed, for a few years I conducted a running battle with him. But it was his views and policies that I sharply criticized; and all that has not affected our purely personal relations. Only recently he told me that he keeps telling people that I am "the only Zionist in America" - to which I replied: "Yes, I know that you have been scandalizing my name." Never, in the heat of battle, did either he or I descend to personal recriminations.

At this point I would like to add that in the World Union of General Zionists, of which I have the honour of being President, we have also observed an unbroken rule.

We have banded together as Zionists; and, as a World Union, we are concerned strictly with Zionist affairs. Whether it be considered a virtue or a fault, we do not concern ourselves, as a World Union, with the seething domestic politics of Israel. There has not been a single instance, a single meeting of our international Executive, at which matters concerning internal Israel politics were on the agenda; the more so today, since our World Union includes and embraces both the Liberal Party and the Independent Liberals – the former in the Opposition – and the latter sitting in the Government of Israel. I consider it a wise rule, for we have sufficient problems confronting us within the framework of the Zionist Movement. Nor do I believe that my friend, Torczyner, really intended to plunge into the changing currents and whirlpools of the domestic political scene. I can only say that he is a younger man; and if that is any fault, it is sure to be corrected by time and experience. In any case, he has expressed his own personal position and not necessarily the position of the Zionist Organization of America. I have attempted to explain the situation and I hope that he will also clarify his position so that misunderstandings may be cleared up and this matter removed from our agenda.

In this connection I would also like to say a personal word about the Prime Minister. Mr. Eshkol, who honoured us with his presence and participation at the opening session, may not qualify as a spell-binding orator, but that is by far not the most important qualification for leadership. And when I think of Mr. Eshkol, I think of him not simply as the Prime Minister of Israel to whom honour is due, by virtue of his office. I think of him first of all as a veteran Zionist, which he has been and continues to be. During his years as Prime Minister he has demonstrated by his words and by his acts, both of omission and commission, how deeply he is concerned for the success of our Zionist endeavour and for the welfare of the Movement. Above all I see in him the man who, for so many years devoted his tireless energies, his best thoughts and talents, to our

agricultural settlement, to establishing new Jewish villages by the hundreds, all over the country, in its hills and valleys. I recall his last address to us, his colleagues, when he resigned his seat in our Zionist Executive, and his moving review of what had been accomplished in that immense constructive enterprise. While our Israel friends may naturally think of him primarily in his capacity as Prime Minister, I see in him, first and foremost, a great builder of Israel; and for that he has earned forever our gratitude and admiration.

Our President, in his opening address, reviewed the international situation as it affects the Jewish people. He spoke on Germany, on Soviet Russia, on the situation in the Middle East, with his usual incisiveness. But I was struck by one element which ran through the whole of his analysis: He was careful to point out that the situations he described were not necessarily frozen, but subject to change. That thought is worth bearing in mind. Indeed, nothing is so unchanging as change itself.

My point is that we, the Zionist Organization, on our part ought to be constantly on guard and always prepared for new developments, for good or for ill, not only once a year at a meeting of the General Council or its Political Committee when we adopt certain resolutions of a political nature – and then go home. I believe, as I have always believed, that such problems, international in their scope, should be a continuing and ongoing concern of the Movement and our World Executive in one form or another. We have given our assent to the policy we have adopted in support of the World Jewish Congress. I subscribe to its importance, its great importance – but from time to time I do feel that in some way and to a disturbing extent we are relinquishing what has been one of the most important aspects of our responsibility as a Movement. I cannot reconcile myself to the thought when it is publicly expressed by anyone of importance that "the Zionist Movement is no longer a political movement."

If we adopt that attitude, we help to create a certain vacuum which others – and not just the Jewish Congress – rush in to fill.

Who, nowadays, does not concern himself with Jewish international problems, not only the problem of Israel and the Middle East? They run here and there: to the Vatican, to Franco, to the German Government, hoping to enhance thereby the importance of their own respective organizations. But we, who have been concerned with world Jewish problems from the beginning, we Zionists who created the World Jewish Congress, whether through the efforts of Stephen Wise or Dr. Goldmann, or before them going back to Leo Motzkin in the Comité des Délégations Juives, we, I say, have no right to sit in a corner and cherish the role of anonymity or low visibility. We should find an appropriate method of keeping in close and virtually daily touch with situations as they develop. We should be able to give clear guidance and inspiration to our following and constituents throughout the world.

I am not now repeating my proposal for merging the World Jewish Congress with the World Zionist Organization, a suggestion which Dr. Goldmann has repeatedly opposed as premature. Nor am I repeating my suggestion of establishing a Political Department which most of the Israel Governments have opposed in the past, when it was hypersensitive on that point. I believe that that period is behind us; and in any case I have reason to believe that today neither the Foreign Office on the one hand, nor the President of the World Jewish Congress on the other, would oppose some well-considered step on our part to develop our own activity in the political sphere, or as some may prefer to call it, in the sphere of international affairs. I intend to go into the matter more fully at a meeting of the Political Committee and perhaps submit a resolution or a formula, by which the Executive will be empowered to take positions on the problems which confront us in this area, and to offer guidance to our constituents while

maintaining close contact with the World Jewish Congress, as well as with Israel's Foreign Office.

A word regarding our internal affairs and the ever recurring subject of "re-organization" which has been on our agenda for years. While I have not attended any of the meetings of the Re-organization Commission or the Commission on Structure, from reports of the discussions which have come to us thus far, I have failed to note much that is either startling or original in the proposals which seem to be in the making. Neither the emphasis on federation nor the talk about individual membership affiliation are new. We have thought and talked about many good things and have taken certain initial steps toward reforming or improving our structure, and as a matter of fact we have begun to move. When, for example, the leadership suggested that we co-opt non-party members into the Executive, I thought we should do so if for no other reason than to demonstrate that the parties so often condemned, are actually not so eager and determined to hold everything in their hands or to keep out persons who are not directly responsible to party organizations. It has been done. We have already co-opted seven such members: two in Europe and five in the United States. Personally I do not regret that I helped to persuade some of those five to join the Executive. And while it is too early to appraise the benefit derived from this change in structure, I think I can testify from experience that it was no calamity and no harm has come to the Zionist Movement by this innovation.

It was further proposed by the leadership that we re-organize, internally, the work of the Executive. We went along with that too and though not all details have been ironed out, there is a definite decision which I hope will be carried out and result in improving the efficiency of our departments.

But now, when we go on to this matter of re-organization in the World Movement, on the regional and local level, I am still puzzled and somewhat at sea. Let us as an example,

regard for a moment the idea of individual membership in the proposed federations, over and above – or apart from – the affiliation of organized Zionist bodies. We can, of course, decide and proclaim that any individual Zionist can affiliate with a federation directly by signing a document or by paying a few dollars in dues. But just what does that accomplish? How will the individual functions as a Zionist unless such individual members have a common denominator, a common outlook, and actually join together in order to give effect to their common point of view, which would mean forming some kind of a party that may be described as a "non-party party". The only alternative, if they want to be effective, is to go into one of the existing organizations.

And one final word: Prime Minister Eshkol, the other night, hinted at a possible change in the attitude of the Government towards the Zionist Movement or towards the Jewish Agency, if we fail to accomplish what is expected of us in the Diaspora. There might be other ways – possibly other instrumentalities – for reaching the Jews of the Diaspora. No doubt there are those who entertain such thoughts. There are, in fact, two requests or demands that are directed to us from Israel. The one and perhaps most insistent demand, is that we produce a Western Aliyah as the real test of our Zionist commitment. The second is that we bring into the Zionist Organization, Jewish groups and organizations which have not as yet been affiliated with the Movement. I have pondered these matters, but to the present day I am not sure how the two desirable goals can be successfully combined: How to bring in or drag in, if we can, Jewish organizations and groups that shrink from declaring themselves as Zionists, while we insist at the same time that the primary concern of organized Zionism must be Aliyah. I claim to know something about some of the organizations which we have in mind, and I have the gravest doubt that we can expect them to join a Movement that is centered on the

concept of Aliyah and "Hagshamah Atzmit". I wish our Israel friends would ponder this problem as some of us are doing. To the Zionists you may at least present a demand for Aliyah. You can argue with them. You may criticize them; but there are others with whom you can't even argue on this basis. My conclusion therefore is that we should give serious consideration to any and all organizational reforms that appear reasonable and practicable; but let us realize that our first and primary concern must be to retain the loyalty of those who are Zionists, who proudly declare themselves to be Zionists, in order to activate them, to strengthen the Zionist Organizations such as they are, and then proceed, if possible, to add to their strength. Let us move to rebuild and reform, but to do so carefully and cautiously so as not to undermine that which we have built up with so much effort and travail over the years.

Jacques Torczyner

(World Union of General Zionists - U.S.A.)

I have the greatest respect and admiration for the President of the World Zionist Organization. There are many matters on which I agree with him and support him. But, there is one problem which I find very painful and that is the relationship of the Jewish people with Germany. The establishment and maintenance of relations between the State of Israel and West Germany is something that concerns Israel. However, if twice in your lifetime your home has been destroyed by the Germans, if twice in your lifetime the young Germans in the new Germany became the aggressors and instigators of wars, if only so recently millions of our brethren were murdered, I cannot agree that it is correct for the Jewish people to re-establish friendly relations with Germany. I see in the renaissance of the Nazi Movement, no matter what its name, no matter what form it takes, a danger - not for 30,000 Jews in Germany, who play no role and are not a factor and are free to leave tomorrow - I see in this a danger for the world.

Much has been said about the re-organization of the Zionist Movement. It is too easy to say: abolish the parties. But they do exist. Instead of destroying what has been established, let us build on what we have, whether it be little or much — we have it and let us build on it. Let us strengthen the Zionist Movement. If we have a programme and know what we stand for, we should not dilute the Movement, not reduce it to the lowest common denominator — perhaps we would then have a chance!

On September 1st, 1967 the first boarding school for American high school students, an academic high school, will be opened in Kfar Silver and the children will be coming there, starting with a small freshman class the first year, to spend four years living and learning with Israel boys and girls. I am convinced that when completing their education in high school they will either continue to study here or they will return to their homes, but wherever they go they will serve as the spokesmen of this relationship, of this integration between Jews of Israel and Jews of the Diaspora. We have a summer camp for American teenagers at Kfar Silver. It had a hundred last year. We are now building sufficient dormitories to be able to accommodate 500 teenagers every summer in Kfar Silver. When they return home they become Israel's goodwill ambassadors. The alumni of Kfar Silver become the leaders of Young Judaea and other youth groups throughout the United States.

We are most grateful for the help we have received from the Mercaz Hatfutsot and for the assistance of the Jewish Agency. We have organized numerous Public Affairs Conferences in the United States. Dr. Neumann spoke about political activities — which we call public affairs. In all major cities, representatives of the Israel Consulates and the Israel Embassy, and the United States State Department, experts on attacking Arab propaganda, meet with Z.O.A. leaders throughout the United States. We have invited an expert on the Arab problem from Great Britain to visit university campuses in the United States

and we try to present our point of view wherever we can by inviting guest speakers of all trends, representing all points of view in Israel to visit our districts.

I want to say a word about a matter which has been referred to here by many speakers and blown out of all proportion. Israel undertook an action in Samua. No statement was issued in the United States by any Zionist or Jewish leader; but I did issue a statement which I wrote myself – it was not written by a journalist in an interview – and I said that I was shocked at the harsh tone employed by the United States in censoring Israel's retaliatory action. I went further and said that it was the failure of the United Nations to act which forced Israel to defend itself. And I said that if the Soviet Union had not vetoed the mild resolution by the Security Council two weeks before that this situation could have been avoided. I stand by that statement. We have defended Israel and the Israel Army – and we will continue to defend them and will continue to stand by them. I noted in that interview what appeared in a newspaper in the United States. It has never been nor will it ever be my point of view; I have made that clear. I said, there and then, that it was not my point of view. Let those who wish to believe it is, believe it. My conscience is clear because I know how I feel and I know what I do.

Avraham Cygel

(Member of the Executive – Tel Aviv)

We are meeting, it is true, at a time of a recession in the dimensions of immigration, but I am strong in my faith that just like after the years 1952-53 in which the influx declined there came a change, in the not-distant future, too, we may expect a greater wave of immigration, which will differ in its character from most of the waves which reached us after the establishment of the State. In 1966 in effect we went over from mass absorption to a more individualized treatment of the new comers, taking into account

the countries from which the immigrants came. To a decreasing extent we find that we have to deal with the "traditional" type of immigrant, that is of the category that came from countries in which Jews live in distress, accompanied by hardly more than a little bundle of luggage, and a great readiness to meet the difficulties of the transitional period. The newcomers reaching us today cannot be classified in accepted categories, as if they were compelled to come by force of humiliation and discrimination in their countries of origin. They come more as a matter of choice, because they wish to live full Jewish lives.

The Absorption Department is today in a state of constant change in respect of methods of dealing with the newcomers, and I consider it my duty to explain these changes both to Government institutions and to the general public, which indeed constitute the basis for what we call "social integration". Together with the Employment Service of the Ministry of Labour, this year, notwithstanding the current recession, we made joint efforts to absorb the newcomers in employment. But there are still not a few, including people with a university training, who have not yet been suitably placed. Obviously non-absorption in suitable employment can serve as a deterrent to their desire to settle in this country. We, for our part, have spared no effort to make things easier for the immigrants. I need merely mention here the training course for teachers coming from the affluent countries held in Beersheba, the course for a group of over one hundred and fifty lawyers, who could not engage in their profession without undergoing a course lasting ten to eleven months. Now that they have passed the necessary examinations they can engage in their profession.

In the course of the current year we have encountered a lack of suitable housing in precisely the larger urban areas where newcomers in this category can find their niche in the economy. Fortunately the Ministry of Housing was able to place at their disposal apartments in the central

district and to ensure that the rent be within their means. A not inconsiderable section of these immigrants have been placed in hostels and Ulpanim. At the beginning of 1966 we had at our disposal ten hostels with a total of 1383 beds. Within a few months this will be increased by another three hostels bringing the total number of beds up to two thousand.

The process of immigration is thus entering upon essential changes in this last third of the twentieth century. Western immigration, contrary to the previous wave coming from the countries in which Jews lived in distress, will not imply the severance of the newcomers' ties with their countries of origin, but will involve constant movement and bonds between the Diaspora and Israel. Planned activity will enable us to increase the dimensions of tourism, by encouraging prospective immigrants to come here.

We must find a solution to the problems of employment, to the construction of suitable housing in all parts of the country, to ensure secondary and higher education under easier conditions, the grant of scholarships to students. The immigrants in 1967/68 will pass through the hostels which have been adapted for their purpose. They will be equipped with everything necessary to ensure smooth absorption in the initial period in this country. With the conclusion of the construction plans we will have twenty absorption centres, and we may be able to place both the hostels and the Ulpanim in the same areas. Teams to deal with the immigrants, and speaking their language will also be stationed there to ensure efficient handling. Only when a job has been found for the newcomer in his particular occupation or profession will he be given housing. The determinant today is employment.

We speak a lot about social absorption. The idea is slowly penetrating deeper into wider and wider circles of our community, especially among the youth. A meeting today with the younger people, either those born here or who came with previous waves of immigration, is encouraging.

Today already we are receiving applications from young people who are prepared to operate in the field of social absorption, and to try and bring the newcomers closer. We have not yet forged all the necessary instruments but important initial efforts have already been made.

The Ulpanim in the collective settlements and in the cities have become the main channel for the absorption of this new wave of immigrants. Indeed I may say that the joint initiative of the Ministry of Labour and the Jewish Agency in the establishment of Ulpanim has already achieved international recognition and commendation. Study of Hebrew constitutes a factor inducing newcomers, and especially young people, to settle here.

We propose to expand these enterprises to enable the Ulpanim to make an ever greater contribution in the years ahead. As stated some of the Ulpanim will be integrated with the hostels and will be made the venue of vocational courses. This will enable us to establish comprehensive centres of absorption and thereby to ease the process for the newcomer.

I trust that the creation of an Immigration and Absorption Authority of the Jewish Agency, and the establishment of a joint authority with the Government will facilitate our work. This authority must have the power to make decisions, to plan and to execute its policy through both Government and national institutions. The authority must seek shorter cuts in handling the immigrants. It must simplify processes, make them more effective both in the economic and the social fields. But over and above all this we must make the people of Israel and in the Diaspora immigration and absorption conscious. The entire Jewish people must enlist all its intellectual, spiritual and material resources in this effort to set in motion considerable wave of immigration, for failing such a wave, failing effective absorption of newcomers, we jeopardize the future development of the country, and the consolidation of its economy and national defence.

Anselm Reiss
(Union Poale Zion-Hitachdut - Israel)

We must rid ourselves of certain conventional lies if we are to put the question of Aliyah in its right light. The first of these conventional lies is that Jews came here to settle only because they were forced to do so by persecution, need and distress. That is not true. What distress drove those tens of thousands of young men and women, high school pupils and students, who came to this country after the First World War from Poland and Galicia? They were not even mature enough; they did not have the opportunity to find out for themselves what prospects they had for their own future, for living where they had been born, as was the case, in other Eastern European countries. They did not even give the matter any thought. They set out only because they wanted to come here, only because they were saturated with Zionist ideas. Did they set out to improve their material situation? They came from established families, and went to build the Tiberias, the Haifa-Nazareth roads, or settled in Ein Harod and Mishmar Ha'Emek and Kfar Yeheskel. They became masons and building workers and learned other trades, too. Was their position in this country better materially than what they had known at home?

Now I come to what I consider to be a second conventional lie. We are told that we must become competitive with the free countries in order to be able to attract Jewish young men and women, that we must be able to give the Jews of those countries, what they are used to. How can the problem be put in such a light, how can anyone compare the potentialities in this country with those of the United States, France or England? Or even with the situation prevailing in the Latin American countries? I am prepared to lend my own support to all proposals to improve conditions of absorption, to give the newcomers the maximum, but this will still be far from being competitive with other countries. An end must be put to this talk about competition if we are thinking seriously about intensive work on behalf of Aliyah.

I wish to recall one thing which I am sure we all regard as important. In the history of Aliyah, both before the establishment of the State, and afterwards, young people from the free countries, both children and adults, played an important role. Tens of thousands of immigrants came from these countries and inscribed a golden chapter in the annals of the Yishuv. They did not come here because of their distress in their home countries, they did not improve their material status by Aliyah. They came because they were Zionists, because they wanted to take part in the work of the national reconstruction, in creating a new future for the Jewish people. They came here because they knew that true national liberty, the self-respect of the freeman, could be theirs only in this country.

We, members of the Zionist Socialist movement, called groups of young people in the Golah, called the Jewish workers, to the fight for national and social freedom. We taught them that this could only be achieved through the realization of Zionism. And it was for this reason that thousands came and settled in this country, without making any reckoning of their own future. They knew that they were building their own future here, the future of their children, the future of the Jewish people.

That is how we must put the question to Jewish youth today. The same applies to the adults. We must submit to them the essential content of Zionism, the truth that is inherent in it. We are convinced that if the Zionist Movement once again makes the central feature of its practical and information work the moral and national values of Jewish life, which only Israel can give to the Jewish man, if it calls for Aliyah which converts the immigrants into a co-builder of a new Jewish history, a fighter for the freedom of the Jewish people and the Jewish State, it will exercise a far greater influence on the minds and spirits of the Jewish man than the efforts made to convince him that Israel is capable of giving the same material values as he is able to obtain in the country in which he is at present living.

Indeed it will prove easier to discover the common language with the Jewish youth and with the Jewish students, and begin a new era in the Zionist Movement and the realization of Zionist ideals if we adopt this approach.

Yeshayahu Bernstein
(Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi - Israel)

Our deliberations are being held in a gloomy atmosphere. Even if one has one's reservations about putting the entire picture in gloomy terms – and there is no doubt whatsoever that all its aspects are not gloomy – one cannot ignore the fact that the wonderful image that brightened our lives and the skies of this entire generation, from the day Israel won its sovereignty, is today overshadowed. However circumspect we may be, however careful not to exaggerate, it is our duty not to conceal from ourselves or from others, the gravity of the situation in the Diaspora, in the Zionist Movement and in the State of Israel, for all this constitutes for us a single unity.

Primarily we must return to first axiom of Zionism, which has become blurred and almost forgotten in the course of time. By its very nature Zionism is the negation of Golah, that is the negation of continued residence in the Golah as the normal state of a people, and even in a large degree of individuals, from the Jewish point of view, at least. This is a truth that must be repeated without fear, however unpopular it may be. Herein lay the revolutionary character of Zionism, herein lay its strength, in its proclamation of this truth when it was even less popular. It must be stressed again and again, with all that stems from it. Jewry in the Diaspora, in the affluent countries, must be extracted from its state of complacency. We must sound the tocsin unceasingly, we must warn of the danger threatening Jewish existence which is inherent in life in the Golah, and repeat again and again the truth: Israel among the nations is exposed to assimilation.

We must underline: Jews cannot exist as a nation, nor can Judaism exist as a spiritual entity, capable of realization other than in the Jewish State in Eretz Israel. We must repeat this again and again to the Torah-true Jews who continue to remain estranged, indifferent to Zionism and warn them against entertaining any illusions. Assimilation can win many victories, notwithstanding the immunity that observance of the Torah and the mitzvot may give. Not only are we commanded to dwell in this country, but residence among the Gentiles is regarded as a punishment, it is Galut - exile! Even if we are permitted to live in peace and observe the commandments without let or hindrance, the fact remains that it is spiritual Galut, for insofar as the Jew considers himself a member of the nation among which he lives, an American or an Englishman or a Frenchman, his specific religious and national character is diminished.

There is one element in this Zionist axiom, and this is its supreme value: Zionism means the Return to Zion. Not only a "secure refuge" to ensure survival, but the return of the Jewish people to Zion, its concentration in an independent State. Zionism is the beginning of redemption, it is the carrier of the Messianic mission.

Here we have the key, too, to the question of Aliyah, not only from areas of distress, from the affluent countries. Recognition of the negative aspects of residence in the Golah, consciousness of the dangers of assimilation and loss of national identity, the readiness to realize the aspiration cherished by so many generations for the Return to Zionism, these are the basic motives for Aliyah. Such Zionism and all it implies in breadth and depth constitute a challenge for Jewish youth, can induce the young people to prefer Israel over all other tasks to which they may be attracted, for here they have a national-Jewish and humanitarian objective at one and the same time. Naturally ("the hidden things are for God" and I speak only about what

is revealed to flesh and blood) the immigration into Israel of millions from the four corners of the earth, and the concentration of the Jewish people in our own country is a matter not for a single generation, but for generations. At all events mere recognition of the fact that this is the objective we have set ourselves, can persuade large numbers to make a determined effort to come to this country and to strike root in it. We can sum up at this point and say: In order to stimulate Aliyah we must imbue Jewish hearts with the Vision of the Return to Zion in its pristine form, with its ardent vigour. We must broadcast the Zionist consciousness that has been forgotten, first of all among the Zionists.

There is another Zionist truth that is not yet subscribed to by the majority in the Zionist Movement. It is a truth we religious Zionists are fighting for: There can be no Jewish existence without Judaism, and there can be no Zionism without Judaism. Nor will the State of Israel ensure the survival of the Jewish people, if it is not based upon the Judaism, which is our centuries old legacy, the Judaism of Torah and mitzvot. We are not discussing the point of view of believing Jews, which may be considered a matter of conviction, of freedom of conscience. We must, however, warn the entire people of the dangers threatening its future and very survival, if there is no change in the consciousness of the non-religious section of our people in its appraisal and attachment to traditional Judaism. Jews resident in the Golah, who do not believe, who do not observe the Torah and the religious commandments, and particularly the youth, have no answer to give to the question: "In what am I a Jew, what is my Judaism, and why am I a Jew?" There is no reasonable explanation for the terrible struggle we are engaged in here, a single lamb of Israel among the millions of Arabian wolves, while we with our own hands are undermining our special character, our difference from others, our national-spiritual entity, in whose name alone we are fighting this battle.

The problem with which we are confronted is – How are we to bring about this revolutionary change in the Jewish people, a change in its attitude to Judaism and to Zion? It cannot be brought about by a consciousness that is no more than mere knowledge, it can be brought about only by a true attachment to Judaism. I am referring particularly to Zionist education and all that flows from it. Itzhak Korn's statement about religious education that does not ensure an attachment to Israel is irrelevant, for obviously we are discussing religious Zionist education. And that is not a matter for the religious community alone but for the entire Zionist Movement.

Yosef Bankower
(Achdut Ha'avoda - Israel)

I trust that this Session will not enter into past accounts but will show that the Zionist Movement is capable of extricating itself from the rut of routine, which has continued for decades.

If there is any link between unemployment and the absence of immigration, and between the absence of immigration and unemployment and re-emigration abroad, our intention is not only to analyze the causes but also to try and measure up to the challenge. We witnessed successive waves of immigration into this country, and the country was built up as we see it today, and we have assets of which we can be truly proud, which give us, the Zionist Movement and the Jewish people in the Golah, much strength. When the influx came in we paid little attention to whether the immigrants came from all countries and whether the Zionist Movement was fulfilling its function. I have a deep faith in the Zionist Movement and I do not think that it has outlived its usefulness. Indeed the contrary is true. The existence of the State has proved how wide the basis is for the continuation of a great Zionist Movement. But if the

Zionist Movement does not place in the centre of its interests the practical realization of its ideas and ideals in immigration, there is no value, or at best very doubtful value, in all that has been said here about the structure of the Zionist Organization.

The Chalutz movements declare: We cannot under present day conditions in the Golah, with its attractions, its abundance of halls for which the communities give millions, take up the challenge with our poor forces, without even the aid of shlichim. And so now, seeing that we are in a process of re-organization, and I do not underestimate the importance of that re-organization, there is room for economy here too—in due proportion. But when there is retrenchment the problem is what is to be given precedence. Is there any justification for the present distress in the chalutz movements?

In this country there is economic absorption, widespread housing construction, but there is no social absorption, and social absorption does not depend upon the staff of the Absorption Department, it is not dependent upon those seated here. It is dependent upon all of us, without exception.

I recall now how highly we soldiers of the Jewish Brigade were commended as shlichim from this country, when we dealt with the survivors of European Jewry. And you will recall at the end of the War we thought that it was not the five years of hostilities that were important but the encounter with the immigrants. I recall when we met the survivors of Dachau, only thirty six hours after Hitler had fled and the ovens were still burning. What did we give them, I ask now? Not transport, or money or even organization. We gave them much love, much devotion, and they understood us.

And today when an immigrant says to us in Yiddish: "We come from a country in which we had work, where we were well-dressed, perhaps not as you are here in Eretz

Israel, but we dreamed about a little Yiddishkeit, about a Jewish spirit. So we came here." They are seeking the Jewish heart, the Jewish soul, to respond to them in their distress. And we, who are experienced in the distress of Aliyah, and know that every wave of immigration has its own troubles and difficulties, who knew how to meet and to handle waves of immigrants, as the survivors in Europe met us we said: Let us restore their faith, let us restore their hope for a new family life. Let us teach their children to sing, for in the ghetto they forgot how to sing. Other Jewries, other conditions. But there must be the same wave of love and devotion. Against the background that prevails in this country, of hardness, who knows whether we shall be able to perform our task? So in order that we may be able to do our duty there must be a change on two levels: A basic change in methods of social integration, and the rehoisting of the banner of the chalutz movement and the youth movement, the movement of Aliyah throughout the Zionist Movement.

SIXTH MEETING

Tuesday, January 10, 1967, in the afternoon

Chairman: RAPHAEL KOTLOWITZ

Continuation of the Debate on
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE,
ITS PLANS AND BUDGET

Menachem Daniv

(Delegation of the Youth movements - Israel)

The participation of representatives of the Israel youth movements in this Session of the Zionist General Council poses the question: Will the Zionist Movement be a full partner of the youth movements in the work they are doing? In theory it collaborates in thinking, in concern, in charting policy, in measuring up the current problems and in tackling the tasks of this generation. In effect it must lend constant encouragement, it must give real support, it must provide the tools and the money to enable the continuation and the expansion of the work the youth movements are doing.

The existence of the youth movements in Israel, the creation of the conditions essential for their work, supply of the necessary means are not conditional and do not depend upon the response to this question being affirmative. It is true that the contribution made by the Jewish Agency is important and it assists considerably in the educational work they are doing, especially in immigrant settlements and in the development areas. But the main share of the burden is borne by other institutions and public bodies.

I shall not make any complaint about the proportionate share of this aid, within the context of the Zionist Organization's budget, and the general pattern of its ramified activities. At the same time I do not wish to conceal my own consciousness that the current situation — and on the horizon

there are clear signs of retrenchment, notwithstanding the steadily growing needs – makes the continued participation of the Zionist Organization in the work of education in the youth movements in Israel doubtful, to say the least.

The last Congress was the first in which representatives of the youth movements in Israel participated actively. The slogan of this Congress was "Our faces to the Golah". There is no doubt, of course, that everybody is convinced that this duty applies equally to the youth. So it is only logical that the Zionist Movement should not refrain from being an active and activizing factor in imposing this duty upon the youth, in the full knowledge that the youth movements constitute a broad and suitable channel for this purpose.

Most of the youth movements operating in Israel maintain close mutual ties with their sister movements in the Golah. Nevertheless perhaps Members of the Zionist General Council will be interested to learn that the consciousness and willingness of youth in Israel to intensify their ties with the youth in the Golah have been renewed. The Hebrew Scout Movement in Israel has established a league with the Young Judea Movement in the United States. Shlichim and members of the movements have arranged reciprocal visits. And last year the two movements held a Joint Conference in Israel. The Noar Oved Velomed Movement devoted a special session of its Central Committee to a discussion with youth groups from the Diaspora, and for working out common patterns of action. And in order to make these ties closer a delegation of fifteen members of the movement of from sixteen and seventeen years of age went out to meet the chalutz movements in Holland, France and England. The delegation included working and student youth, youngsters from the towns and the settlements, the children of veteran settlers and also newcomers from Rumania and South Africa.

Not long ago Dr. Raanan Weitz brought the greetings of the Zionist Executive to the settlers of Grofit in the Arava. We have the temerity to ask: Will the Zionist Organization content itself with the amelioration of the soil alone, and not devote any attention to preparing the hearts? Will its functions be confined to providing the tools and the money to establish a flourishing settlement?

**NOMINATION OF MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL
WITHOUT VOTING RIGHTS**

Jacob Tsur

(Chairman of the Zionist General Council)

You are aware of course that the Constitution of the Zionist Organization empowers the President of the Zionist Organization in conjunction with the Chairman of the Zionist General Council to nominate up to ten veteran members of the Zionist Movement as Members without voting rights of the Zionist General Council. This arrangement replaces the institution known as "Virilists". In this connection I should like the General Council to approve the following statement, which is made with the consent of the President of the Zionist Organization.

In accordance with Article 32 Para. 6 of the Constitution of the World Zionist Organization, and in keeping with a joint proposal made by the President of the World Zionist Organization and the Chairman of the Zionist General Council, the General Council approves the following as Members of the Zionist General Council without voting rights: Aba Bornstein, of London; Rabbi Prof. Dr. L.I. Rabinowitz, formerly of South Africa and today a resident of Jerusalem. I request the General Council to confirm this statement.

Donald Silk

(World Confederation of General Zionists - Great Britain)

The ranks of the Peace Corps teem with young Jews. A predominant motif of those who dared abuse persecution and even death in the Civil Rights Campaign in the Southern States of the U.S.A. was the Jewish student daring all for freedom and liberty. In the vast continent of South America, young Jews - in many cases, unfortunately, divorced from their people and ancient traditions - are in the forefront of left-wing revolutionary movements.

Now we must ask ourselves: Why, in the vast majority of cases, we have not been able to win these people for our cause? If we look around this hall and examine the membership and the organizations that we represent we would maybe discover an interesting fact. In many cases, in many countries of the Dispersion, the Jewish leadership is an immigrant leadership: it's a leadership that in many cases and in many countries could never, in the nature of things, assimilate completely into its surroundings. Their native tongue is not the native tongue of the people with whom they live. The culture and background of the people amongst whom they live is not the cultural background of those whose early years were spent for the most part in Eastern Europe. But today in all countries of the Dispersion a new generation has grown up: they are native born; they have spoken the language of the country in which they live from birth; its culture and traditional history are part of their very being. They do not need the stimulus of Jewish communal activities as an outlet for their desire to be of service to their fellowmen. The glitter and attraction of the all pervading surrounding culture beckons to them - and let us acknowledge that it is capable of offering far more glittering rewards than can ever be offered by a life devoted to Jewish communal services.

Allied to this, we must understand that there is a generation growing up, and grown up, having children itself whose parents perhaps knew what a full Jewish life was – and by this I mean a Jewish life centred round the home and centred in Jewish tradition – so that in the case of their parents when these people left that tradition, they left something that they knew; but their children have never known it! They don't know what they've missed, they don't know what they've given up.

I would submit to you that to this new generation which has grown up since the establishment of the State – and we in this room perhaps sometimes forget that there is a large percentage of the Jewish people to whom the State of Israel is not only an accomplished fact but something that isn't even for them a source of wonder – and so for them Zionism and the establishment of the State and the centrality of Israel has not been allowed to appear as a revolutionary ideal and a revolutionary movement.

With the establishment of the State of Israel, the financial demands for immigration and absorption were so great that perhaps, inevitably, they took priority over other matters concerned with Israel and Zionism. As a result, this work had to be done... but as a result only too often the image of Israel and Zionism in the minds of those who are today reaching maturity is the image of mother and father dressing up in their best clothes to attend a ball. No one would gainsay this had to be done, or suggest the need does not remain... Nevertheless, aided at times by certain people in Israel from whom in the past we would have expected help and support for the Zionist Movement, there has grown up today the fantasy that Zionism and Israel is for the big donor... And for this reason the young student feels no call to action. The young intellectual feels there is no place for his gifts and the young man starting out in life, in business or in a profession, with a home and a family to build is only too often inhibited from participating in our work lest the monetary contribution which he is able to give at present should be the subject of stricture.

Yet I believe – and I think we must all believe – that Israel and the Zionist Movement can still, if we have the will, provide projects that fire the blood.

In Europe, over the last fourteen years – and, against certain people who would object to its non-political character and with, at times, a derisory budget – many hundreds of young people have been inspired by the Shnat Sherut scheme – to give a year's service working on a kibbutz. And we in England today are endeavouring by means of what we call the "Ahdut Scheme" to combine fund-raising for the Magbit with a rich and varied Jewish cultural programme.

And this, I would submit, Members of the Zionist General Council, is the true challenge. We must make Zionism again a revolutionary movement. We must persuade Jewish students that there is a challenge in the Negev as great as that which they may face in the Mississippi. We must show our young men and women that the challenge to work for their people is as urgent and as necessary as political work for the general good. But we must bear in mind that it must be made as satisfying and as rewarding as such work.

Dr. Marcos Vodovotz
(World Union of General Zionists - Israel)

Today I am addressing the General Council with an entirely different feeling, rather with mixed feelings, in my new status as a resident of Israel, who is trying to integrate himself in the country but has nevertheless not forgotten the experiences of the Golah.

The general atmosphere in the country is not a Zionist atmosphere. It is not an atmosphere in which it is easy to become integrated. It is difficult to create such a climate, but at the very least such a climate should exist

in the offices of the Jewish Agency. I can tell you on the basis of my own experience over the period of one year, that most of the Latin American immigrants who are returning are not doing so because of problems of finding a livelihood or housing. They are returning because they have not found the suitable atmosphere in this country. And, as I have said, they do not find it, neither in the country generally, nor in the Jewish Agency. One must not only have a job and an apartment. Culture, theatre, music are also necessary. In committee at the time of the last General Council session there was a discussion about such small matters as culture and theatre and music – which in my opinion are very important. We discussed the importance of a smile, whether a Jew should be met with a smile or otherwise.

I am speaking not out of any personal bitterness, and I consider it important to say from this rostrum, that I found warmth in the Agency, that I felt completely at home. The same can be said of other members. But here and there I have heard from new immigrants and also from established residents, and even from important personalities in our movement, that we are the exceptions. This hurts me. We should not be the exceptions. I repeat: I am not speaking in any spirit of personal resentment. I am speaking in terms of Zionist resentment.

It is a brilliant idea to create a Zionist Council, for we have the feeling, we Zionist leaders from the Golah, that we are not being used. I should like the Zionist Council not to be a body made up of parties. Its purpose should be to take advantage of Zionist forces here which still have the unease of the Golah and can constitute elements to make the atmosphere of Israel more Zionist, so to speak.

The youth will feel that their leaders are serious in what they say, if the latter settle here themselves. I know how difficult that is and I do say that all can or should do so. There are also other factors to be taken into account.

But within these limits the proportion of leaders who realize their own ideas is regrettably far too small. That is the first step towards gaining the confidence of the youth.

The second step is as follows: Latin-American youth both Jewish and non-Jewish are living through the drama of Latin America. It is a profound social, political and economic drama, but it does not feel and does not experience the drama of the State of Israel. It does not feel the rhythm of the human revolution towards liberty in the State of Israel. That can be brought about by a strong chalutz movement. The chalutz movement is the foundation stone, the very basis of a sound Zionist Movement in the Golah, it is the basis of any Aliyah. Our Aliyah from Latin America began with the chalutzim.

The strengthening of the chalutz movement in the Golah and the offering of a personal example, will bring to the youth the drama, the need, the prospects of an internal revolution, and will bring about an Aliyah of the youth, which will be followed by an immigration of the adults.

Reuben Arzi
(Mapam - Israel)

Immigration and absorption are mutually dependent. Mass immigration helped produce economic prosperity in Israel. The reduction of the dimensions of immigration constitutes one of the factors in the present economic recession; hence too, the difficulties experienced in the field of absorption.

This Session of the Zionist General Council must pay greater attention to the problems of Aliyah from the affluent countries. Obviously it is by preaching that we shall solve the problem. The Chairman of the Executive has told about certain measures adopted in this sphere. Our hearts are open to Aliyah, by all roads and of all ages. We shall support every proposal which offers any prospect for the absorption of Jews. But it is necessary to prove from this high

rostrum that precedence should be given to chalutz immigration, which is deeply rooted in Zionist education, over any substitute, which may remain here only for a short while.

Last night the Chairman of the Executive rightly appraised the chalutz movement, but I am sorry to say, there is a disparity between what was said and the means placed at the disposal of the chalutz movement. There is an outstanding disparity between the theory and the implementation. This is proved by the facts. In the past two years the budget of the Youth and Hechalutz Department has been reduced by almost forty per cent. The number of shlichim to the youth movements by thirty per cent. Youth Aliyah is planning the absorption of 2,400 children instead of 3,000. The Mercaz Letfutsot, which has a budget of five millions at its disposal has allocated no more than IL 250,000 for this purpose.

It is important that we should know that last year chalutz immigration constituted ten per cent of the total influx, and no less than twenty five per cent of the total number of immigrants from the affluent countries. Chalutzim are absorbed without difficulty, both economically and socially. The proportion of re-emigrants – Yoredim – among them is small. It also possesses an attractive force for the parents, and it is a stable and constructive element. But there are those who argue – and the Chairman of the Executive has joined them – that there are too many currents in the pioneer youth movements. What harm is done if every movement tries in its own way to penetrate into the youth, those who uphold the principles of equality and cooperation of the kibbutz, socialism and the fraternity of the nation, and others who seek to penetrate into the religious section of the community. The attraction of Israel for the youth may above all be in its social, pioneering and progressive image. And this does not prevent in any way maximum cooperation between the various sections of the youth movement. On the

contrary there is a desire for such cooperation. Perhaps we should examine the idea of bringing high school pupils to Israel and to place them in settlements under suitable conditions. There seems to be a reasonable prospect that the proportion of those absorbed here among these pupils will exceed that among the student youth. We are conscious of no reason which can justify retrenchment in the allocation to the pioneer youth movements, and indeed to work in the Golah generally. On the contrary these allocations must be increased.

Immigration is the elixir of life for the State of Israel, in the same way as it is the anchor of salvation for the Jewish people in the Diaspora. It is the sacred duty of the State to ensure that absorption disposes of the necessary funds, just as it is the sacred duty of the Zionist Movement to encourage immigration, without which its very existence may become questionable.

Rabbi Mordechai Kirshblum
(Member of the Executive - New York)

For the past ten years the President of the World Zionist Organization, Dr. Nachum Goldmann, has been dreaming of a Zionism without parties, which according to him, must mark the eschatological era of this sacred and historic movement. I am very much afraid however that when the doors of the Zionist Movement are flung open wide, through the introduction of a watered-down ideology and a lukewarm programme, more people will leave our ranks than will join them.

I wish all those who are convinced that we stand on the threshold of a new era in which new policies, new methods and new programmes will be introduced, every good fortune. If they succeed in extending out ranks it will be fortunate for us all, who believe in the Zionist Movement as the binding force of the Jewish people. I am, however, a little sceptical about the potentialities of these revolutionary

plans, now being proposed in radical forms of organization. I have the feeling that we shall have to work hard before we return to the status quo.

One remark about immigration from the free and affluent countries. Shalom Aleichem made the renowned statement: "How fortunate I am! I am an orphan!" I should like to say, however, that I am fortunate, not being an orphan. Whatever comes to pass, however our movement is reorganized, I am secure in the faith that with the help of God, I am a member of a party that for many years ahead can nourish my religious-national soul. This is my consolation; it is the consolation of hundreds of thousands of Jews who belong to the Mizrachi.

And now that central and sacred matter which is the core of our deliberations today: the problem of immigration from the affluent countries. In other words: how are we to increase the number of immigrants coming to Israel from the free countries, particularly at a time when the influx from countries in which Jews are repressed has shrunk considerably. Let us make no mistake and delude ourselves that America is a country capable only of giving material benefits: money and homes, wealth and luxury. That is a falsification of the overall picture of the United States. There are also great ideas and ideals, deeply rooted in the way of life of the Pilgrim Fathers. America is rich in things of the spirit and culture, consciousness of God and biblical ideals. From such a country one can depart only because of an irresistible internal behest; it must be a spiritual Aliyah. The entire process must be accompanied by people and conditions encouraging and stimulating the immigrant, lending him the feeling that he is "accepted of the multitude of his brethren" in the land of his dreams and aspirations, that he is on the road to a higher, more spiritual, purely Jewish way of life.

In fact Aliyah was always the result of strong external pressure, or because of a profound and intensively felt

ideal. In regard to the communities from which we expect a stream of voluntary immigrants both of these factors are still absent. There are, we thank God, no persecutions in the so-called affluent countries. There the urge to Aliyah can only be internal, a desire for a more integral Judaism, and this is to be found only among the chosen few. Immigration from the affluent countries calls for a special variety of enthusiasm and ardour, a deep understanding of pure Jewish life and a readiness to exchange material for spiritual values. Emigration from the affluent countries must be preceded by a basic process of introspection, a profound analysis of the true meaning of such terms as distress and affluence, and where the borders between the two lie. Here lies the great duty and opportunity of the Zionist Movement, to explain that affluence is not merely a matter of bread and butter. The opportunity to prosper in all fields, to enjoy to the full equal political and civic rights may exist in a country which can be considered from the Jewish point of view "a country of distress", if Jewish existence and survival are not assured, because of the absence of a Jewish will to survive as Jews, notwithstanding the fact that the law and the political situation allow such Jewish survival.

The fact that American Jews respond so eagerly to the call of the Peace Corps, but show little interest in chalutzut in Israel, has been pointed to time and again. They enthusiastically fight for equal rights for the negroes and other minorities but remain apathetic towards the security problems of Israel, which call for the immigration of young, strong and educated young people. It must be understood from what this attitude stems. The reasons must also be made clear. The reason is not that our propaganda is backward. Jewish boys and girls fight for equal rights for the negroes, because they are still inspired by ideals of sincerity and justice, inherited from their pious grandparents, who lived by the ancient principle "Justice, justice shall thou pursue". They do not go to Israel because their hearts are empty; they have no Jewish content. They see their humiliated negro neighbours, for whom they feel a profound

sympathy. Judaism. Jewishness, the Jewish past, are unknown values as far as they are concerned; not a shred of these values has remained. And wherever a spark remains, it is that spark which fires the few immigrants who come to Israel.

Quite recently I had the opportunity to speak to a group of Jewish students on a college campus. It was terrible to see how little our Jewish university youth know about Jewishness and Jewish history. There was a brighter student there who quoted, in English, of course "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself". The source, he cited, was not the Pentateuch, the Book of Leviticus, but – the New Testament. This reflects the tragedy of Jewish youth, who must be rescued from decline that is the result of their ignorance and estrangement from Jews and Jewish life.

To create such a situation, to attract Jewish youth to Aliyah and the State of Israel, through an internal urge, the State must pay more attention to its own spiritual features. It must be absolutely clear: the State cannot attract Jewish youth in the free world by its music and theatre, its night clubs or even its art galleries. The attraction of the State does not lie in its English translators and its atheistic original literature.

The Zionist Organization must issue an urgent call we should make a personal "tithing" towards immigration. One Member of the family should settle in Israel to study in a Yeshivah or in a university, take part in a summer institute or in Shnat Sherut programme. In this fashion thousands of young people would strike root in this country land of their fathers and convert it into the country of their children and grandchildren. It was in this fashion that families transferred themselves from the Old World to the New. One member of the family went over to America, and helped another to follow, until the entire family was united on the other side of the ocean.

And now, in conclusion, a word about our work in the Diaspora. In this respect our situation is peculiar and paradoxical. From the day we proclaimed from the rostrum of the Zionist Congress the newly-coined motto "Our face to the Golah", our faces began to shrink, and soon the entire matter will have no features at all. The fault, of course, does not lie with the respected Chairman and Treasurer of the Jewish Agency Executive. I wish whoever envies him his job to bear his responsibility. He would undoubtedly be only too glad to place the largest possible sums at the disposal of the ramification of the work in the Diaspora, but debt redemption, interest payments and such like obligations, devour all that we should devote to Golah activities.

But we cannot continue in this fashion. Not only the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency are obligated to strengthen Jewish life in the Diaspora, spiritually and culturally, in all countries where there are Jews. All of us, without exception, are under an obligation to implement this programme — "Face to the Golah", while our faces turned simultaneously to the State of Israel, for whom the Jews of the Golah have proved their ability to raise large sums of money, and to give of their time and energy. At all events, our present situation, of speaking continually about education and culture, fighting ignorance and assimilation, at a time when the allocations for these purposes are being reduced from one year to the next, reminds me of the Rabbi who began to suffer from consumption. The doctor advised him to take walks and to drink a lot of milk. The Rabbi called together the leaders of his community, informed them of the state of his health, and asked them to take into account his new needs. Perhaps they would raise his stipend, and not be so strict about the time he was available to answer questions and to meet people calling upon him. He requested an early reply from the leaders. After the meeting, the President quietly entered the Rabbi's sanctum to deliver the decision of the

community. "Rabbi", he said. "After long reflection we have resolved, that you may take your walks. About the milk and the financial aspects involved we will continue to consult among ourselves". We are in a similar situation. One section of the Golah programme, that involving speeches and slogans, is being implemented. What remains to be solved is the problem of finance, which calls for the participation and efforts of all Zionist parties and territorial organizations. Looking at the great change wrought in the state of Jewish education by the relatively limited funds at the disposal of the Jewish Agency's Education and Culture Departments, we can gain some idea of what could be achieved if all conscious Jews were to place Jewish education on a level no lower than that of a hospital or an old aged home.

Mrs. Zivia Loubetkin
(Member of the Executive - Israel)

It is by no means surprising that there is no gathering in which the problem of immigration and absorption is not presented in the most drastic terms. It is no secret that immigration has dropped sharply. It has not ceased but it has declined. We have reached the stage where if there is a change the very existence of the people is threatened, the further development of the State is jeopardized, and the fate of the Zionist Movement is in question. And I ask myself the question: Is this the result of objective conditions? are we ourselves to some extent to blame?

I think we have no doubt about the reply. There is no sense in trying to apportion the responsibility; the State or the Agency or the Zionist Movement. We are all to blame in the same measure. And we all bear the responsibility, for we did not invest sufficient energy in the years of mass immigration in educational and ideological work, and now we are paying the price.

It is not by scolding but by educational activity that we can hope to exert any influence, not by rousing a panic

but by pointing to our historic experience. Of course we shall seek new organizational forms, more in keeping with present-day conditions, but organizational forms will not solve the problem. We cannot build temples without a God. Ideas are not a function of other forms. The forms must be the functions of the essence.

And I know that greater duties devolve upon us, the State, in this field of absorption. Primarily on the institutions which have been set up for the purpose, the Jewish Agency and the State. We have been told here, and we all are aware of the fact, that the criticism is justified. We lack the smile as someone has already said, we lack the heart. This is something that we must change. But we must recall that we have sought new ways, that we found new ways, something was changed, materially and economically much has been achieved. At one time we placed the immigrants in tents and in maabarot. Today apartments are waiting for them. The Absorption Department has set up institutions which help the newcomer to become integrated in the country from the first day he is here. There are Ulpanim for those who need them, for adults and for youth. For two years, under present conditions the new immigrants and their children are being given high schooling free. This is important aid, given at no cost. Aid is also given to students in the universities, and there is a range of other economic facilities.

The chalutz movement implies not only reinforcements for the kibbutzim, but for the entire people, for the Zionist Organization, for national security. Arms can be purchased, but Jewish workers and defenders must be created by ourselves.

We are told that it is only a small movement. But upon more than one occasion a small movement was successful in saving the entire people. What would have been the fate of our Movement and of the State of Israel if in the initial years of Zionist activity the handful of enthusiasts were not

forthcoming to leave their own homes to settle here, and to bring Israel to the stage we have reached today? And that is why it is abundantly clear to us that as long as there are empty spaces in our country and we constitute a small proportion of the Jewish people neither the land nor the people will be built up without a strong chalutz movement. We must do everything we can to strengthen it.

And allow me a few remarks about one matter, closely related to the question of Jewish survival, namely, about relations with Germany. The years that have passed since the great calamity which overwhelmed the Jewish people have not expunged our pain. Among us there are people for whom those years remain permanently fixed in their memories, set apart from the present and the future. The period of those inhuman acts is still raw, to be recalled only on the Day Remembrance, when the entire people recites the Kaddish. I cannot for a single moment forget the dangers threatening the Jewish people and the Jewish State. Have the forces which brought down catastrophe upon us, has the brute they brought forth, the Third Reich, been destroyed? Those forces are still alive, first as frightened individuals, then in a new guise, as groups, organizations and the parties which had been set up in Germany, and today they are marching under their own flags in the streets of Germany.

I wish to believe that there will be a better Germany, that there will rise up a generation that will detest its own past, that will campaign actively against those who carry the ideas of murder. But have we already a promise of that other Germany, can we see symptoms of it in Germany's political and ideological life?

A few years back I heard here in Jerusalem from Dr. Goldmann a reckoning of the Jewish leaders of the free world during the Second World War. I have not got the courage to make a similar reckoning. But if the account is as Dr. Goldmann rendered it, then the Jews and the Jewish leaders in the free countries remained silent for their various reasons in the days of our tragedy, or did

not speak out loud, or failed to act. That was an historic mistake. How can we be certain that things might have taken a different course had we raised our voices? Was it necessary for us to be the first to fly to Germany to shake the hand of that former Nazi who is today Chancellor of Germany, even if we got money in return for it? The dangers of our silence, the dangers of our speaking of another Germany are great for the Jews of the entire world and for world democracy.

SEVENTH MEETING

Tuesday, January 10, 1967, in the evening

Chairman: JACOB AMIT

Continuation of the Debate on
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE,
ITS PLANS AND BUDGET

Moshe Kitron
(Union Poale Zion-Hitachdut - Israel)

I do not think that there will be a greater influx into Israel if we only continue to talk about the need for such an influx. Though, of course, Aliyah is all-important. The question is whether Members of the Zionist General Council, are ready, after this meeting, to go out and make it clear that Aliyah is necessary not only for the State of Israel but also for the Jewish people in the Diaspora, that it is equally important for the State and for each and every community in the Golah. And seeing that Aliyah is in a sense Redemption it offers a personal solution to thousands and tens of thousands of Jews, for the Jew who has to grapple with the multitude of his problems of his own Jewishness and of the Jewish entity in the world. There are hundreds of thousands in this category. There is the religious Jew who is concerned about the integrity of his Judaism. There is the young Jew alert to social problems in the world, seeking some channel for his energy. There are the parents alarmed at the prospect of intermarriage of their sons and daughters. There are the young people who do not know the meaning of Judaism and come and ask us: Why am I a Jew and what must I do to be a Jew? But as long as they keep on asking, they are seeking their road or their own niche in the world, as Jews. For all people in these categories Aliyah is a solution for themselves and not only for the State.

For years now there has been talk of improving methods of absorption and simplification of the processes involved. Some progress has been registered but this progress is not satisfactory. For years we have been speaking about merging the departments and the authorities handling the newcomers, but the decision has only been taken now, and we must wait and see how this is implemented, even if the new methods are not perfect. We have been told about a joint authority set up by the Government and the Jewish Agency, and we hope that some progress will be made. It is most important that they should be. But that is not all.

There is something else that in my opinion is entirely dependent upon Israel society and institutions. It is vital, more important than the formal treatment of the newcomers. This is the attitude taken up towards the immigrant. Yesterday we visited the Knesset and heard the speech of a former Member of the Zionist Executive, who is today Minister of Tourism. He spoke about the work of his Ministry in putting into effect the slogan "Welcome the tourist!" But what Ministry is there to implement the slogan "Welcome the immigrant"? I would like it to be dealt with not by any Ministry but by a great public movement. And being familiar with conditions in this country I believe it possible to set up such a movement. In the past year or two there has been a great interest in the Diaspora, and even in Zionism, in the Yishuv in Israel. I come into contact with the youth and find that it is precisely in the high schools that there is an interest in these problems and a willingness to act. There is also a willingness to act within the circle of the liberal professions. A movement can and should be set up (I do not know what its slogan will be - "Welcome the immigrant" or something similar) to alter the attitude taken up towards the immigrant.

I believe that Zionism should also revolt against certain chapters in Jewish history. There is one chapter which raises all sorts of thoughts and ideas, and which has given rise to stormy debates within Jewish public opinion, - that

about Babylon and Israel, about Jewish centres and the centrality of Israel. If there is one aspect of Jewish history which we must rebel against, from which we should guard ourselves, and be careful never to repeat – that is the great sin of the Babylonian exile. We do not know how many Jews there were in the Persian Empire. But only 42,000 Jews left to settle in Judaea, a tiny province of Israel, and I believe that it was because of this reason that the courage of the Maccabees and of the Zealots and of the Knesset Gedola and the Sanhedrin proved in vain. . . How could it be otherwise if there were only 42,000 immigrants? And there is a danger, and today we are becoming more conscious of it, that if from the great empires – taking into account all the differences in the circumstances – only a similarly small number will come, this Third Temple will not stand. I say this with the greatest concern. No one wants to say so explicitly but once and for all it must be stated clearly: Let us not repeat the experience of Babylon. Such a danger is real.

I must repeat what I said previously. The various arrangements and conditions must be improved as much as we can, more than we can. We must welcome immigration with a public movement, with the feeling that each and every Jew must want, must know and want to be redeemed.

Eliahu Dobkin

(Member of the Executive - Jerusalem)

The Premier, the Chairman of the Executive and other speakers in this Session have placed Aliyah, or more correctly the drastic decline in Aliyah, at the centre of our deliberations and thoughts in this unsettled period for the State and the Zionist Movement. If I have taken the floor it is not to utter a warning that the time has come for us to cease deceiving ourselves and the entire world with this fateful Zionist question. For what has happened up to now?

Six years ago we convened a Zionist Congress which we were bold enough to call "The Aliyah Congress". Since then six years have passed and in this period the Zionist Movement has done little indeed to fulfil its mission. The Zionist Movement, in effect, sought to assuage its conscience by the arrival, in this interval of 250,000 immigrants from the countries of Jewish distress. We have stuck our heads into the sand, and in our blindness for which there can be no forgiveness, we failed to foresee the emptying of these sources of immigration. The day has come and we are seen to be naked. Zionism is incapable of furnishing any response to the most difficult crisis which has overtaken our movement since the establishment of the State—the crisis of immigration! I am concerned lest in the future, too, Aliyah will be no more than a catchword, implying no action. We have reached the critical stage when we dare not continue to deceive ourselves and others. I will not argue in terms of "you and we", but will try to see the situation in the cruellest realism, against the background of the failure of Zionism in the Golah and the acts of omission of the people living in the State of Israel.

First of all we must do the most simple thing, which we have not done up to now: we must make the demand for Aliyah as the first Zionist mitzvah. We must do this in a far more uncompromising fashion than up to the present. Let every Zionist know that the distinguishing trait of Zionism is no longer moral and material aid for Israel, to which demand every Jew responds, but the insistence upon self-realization.

At the opening session we heard the trenchant demand of the Premier, then of the Minister of Labour and others. But what have we in this country done? What has the State leadership done day in and day out? The State has been educating the Golah that it must render financial aid. I have received very instructive figures in this respect. Within the upper bracket, including Prime Ministers, Ministers

of the Government, Members of the Knesset, Supreme Court Judges, top-ranking officers of the Israel Defence Army, mayors and university professors – 220 visits have been made abroad for the purpose of raising funds since the establishment of the State. Of these only two persons were despatched on educational missions, to encourage Aliyah and work among the youth. (This does not include Members of the Executive, for whom this is part of their normal duties).

Small wonder then that the Golah has begun to believe that it is only required to provide the sinews and not the men. We must not forego the financial assistance Jews offer for the consolidation of the State. But we are undermining our very existence if we regard this as some sort of substitute, to excuse the absence of immigration. A Zionist Movement that does not make Aliyah the chief of its concerns, is not worthy of the name. We cannot pride ourselves on the 600,000 members of the Zionist Movement in the United States, and the hundreds of thousands in other countries. I believe that it were better to give up the fictitious Zionists, and not give up the very content, the kernel of our ideals.

The strength of the chalutz movement must not be gauged only by the 1,800 chalutzim who came here every year (though they constitute more than a third of the total of immigrants coming from the affluent countries), but in the influence they radiate, far beyond the confines of their own ranks. At one time chalutzit was the apple of the Zionist's eye. Today it has been shoved into a corner. It must be extracted from that corner. More funds, more manpower, must be invested in it. It must be liberated from its poverty, from the clubs it must house in basements and cellars. Without the necessary tools and equipment all that is being said about chalutzit will remain just idle talk. And this at a time when we are talking about encouraging immigration and about "Our face to the Golah". For the truth of the matter is that year after year we are being compelled to contract our educational work among the youth in general and among the pioneering youth in particular.

In order to make the movement more attractive we must overcome its partisan fragmentation, enable it to appear as a united force, capable of coming to grips with the changes that have been registered in the Jewish world and among the youth. Every corner of this country calls for pioneering endeavour. Let us restore to the chalutz movement the vigour of its youth.

Stress upon chalutzit and upon the realization of Zionist ideals in no way contradicts the efforts that must be made to contact and to penetrate into all cells of Jewish life in the Golah. It is our duty to help every organization, every Jewish initiative, to ensure the continued existence of Jews as Jews, to help them in every possible fashion to withstand the encroachments of assimilation. The happy experience that has attended our work in recent years indicates that these two trends can operate and coexist, side by side. In fact they are complementary. It is a fact that more than half a million of Jewish young people, of every hue of the public rainbow are organized in various bodies. Most of them are students, the majority of whom have not yet developed any Zionist or chalutz consciousness. They are members of various congregational bodies, the Bnei Brith and the like, and maintain ties with the Jewish Agency's Youth and Hechalutz Department, accepting the latter's authority as a centre for guidance and education, requesting from us shlichim, entrusting to us the tasks of training madrichim, conducting work in the various Institutes which we maintain in this country and sending thousands of their chaverim every year to this country. And from time to time many organizations submit to us another and another bill for payment and it is not always within our capacity to respond to all the calls made upon us. As a result we must neglect many opportunities which may never recur, for some other body may fill the void.

This development, which for some of you may be unexpected, constitutes adequate proof of our basic assumption of the possibility of co-existence. It would be blindness

on our part if we were to neglect eighty per cent of the organized Jewish youth who have not yet come to Zionism and chalutzit. We must continue to deal with them, too, and make arrangements to ensure that the chalutz element coordinate its activities with them, too, and constitute a guiding nucleus, the leaven in the lump so to speak.

Raphael Kotlowitz
(Herut-Hatzohar - Israel)

Israel and the Zionist Movement are today facing a unique challenge – a challenge and a test: Will this small State of about two-and-a-half million people, beset as it is today by economic difficulties, be able to hold those who are here, will be able to absorb in these difficult times the two hundred or three hundred thousand who have arrived in these past few years? Will it succeed in bringing about the Aliyah of tens of thousands of Jews from the Diaspora? It is an historic test, and an historic challenge for if we cannot meet this challenge, if we cannot pass this test then grievous injury will be done to the State.

It is not an easy problem and it is not easy to meet the challenge. I spoke about holding those who are here and I believe that no amount of talking will be able to impress, in the least, the people who live in this country – those who came here decades ago, those who experienced the horrors of war and the difficulties of existence, those who were prepared to go through thick and thin. Who are we to tell them: Don't leave this country! It is presumptuous – for it is up to us to create the conditions which will make them want to stay because they don't really want to leave. It is not easy for a vatik – a veteran – who after years of struggle and then prosperity, suddenly finds himself out of a job with the lure of the Diaspora calling him to a more peaceful life. It is not easy – it is a test for the State, primarily, and for the Zionist Movement.

And the second category, those who came here only very recently, who were transplanted from a state of affluence, from a position of well-being to menial work, who were prepared to change their order of things, transplanted into a new social environment, experiencing economic difficulties, always having their relatives writing to them: why did you leave us? It is not easy to live in Dimona or Ashdod! Who are we to preach to them? We must create conditions that will make them want to remain! If youngsters from Britain, from Argentine and from South Africa come to our office and they tell me: We are sorry, but we cannot remain — this is a challenge for us to meet! And the third category: those who have not yet arrived, my friends, do you want them to come here? They would like to. They are prepared for difficulties but speeches will not do the trick! And not speeches by those who have not as yet set an example themselves! A Zionist leader in the Golah must be presumptuous to tell X and Y and Z to go on Aliyah when he himself remains there.

When we talk of Aliyah from the West it is not something new that we have discovered. I do not want to quote myself in this instance — but I've brought with me the Report of the 25th Zionist Congress. At that Congress I made an appeal to the Zionist Organization, then far richer than it is today, and I said: It is not enough to devote 1% or 1 1/2% of your budget to Western Aliyah! Instead of the duplication you have — devote money to prepare the machinery now! A Central Authority! A Central Immigration Authority — I spoke about it as early as 1956!

I cannot rid myself of the feeling that we are plodding along in the old way of routine — of "business as usual". A small illustration.

Earlier on, I received a copy of the unfinished budget and I had a look at it — and I knew exactly the position: How much would go for Settlement and how much for X and how much for Y! — because this is how it has been throughout

the years. Things have changed—the budget, the money allocated for the various departments, basically, have remained the same. It was 70 million a year ago and 68 million today, and 65 million the day before yesterday!...

Or, for instance, let us take this matter that is so uppermost in our minds: the question of duplication. In 1961, from the platform of the Zionist Congress, I brought forward a proposal asking to appoint a Commission of three to determine, whether there was duplication between the Ministry of Agriculture and the Settlement Department:

The following proposal deals with a matter of duplication in a very important field. We believe on the basis of data which we have studied that it may be possible to justify the fusion of the Settlement Department with the Ministry of Agriculture. I will confine myself only to pointing out the following: The Settlement Department employs 1,400 officials; the Ministry of Agriculture has 1,600. In our view there is a certain connection between these two departments.

And then the late Mr. Zisling mounted the platform and said:

"I very much regret that I must oppose the majority proposal of the Committee of Finance. I move that the proposal be removed from the agenda. It is very strange. Should the Zionist Organization consider whether we need a Settlement Department? There is no connection at all between the functions of settlement and those of professional supervision of various branches of agriculture. These are two completely separate functions. If they had to be united in a single place, two separate Ministries should be set up. Only people who have no roots in this country could put forward such a proposal."

Was it necessary to wait until 1966 for a Commission to state that there is room for a replacement of officials, for changing the scope of work, because of duplication? Or, for instance, take the question of officials. Was it necessary

for Mr. Sapir to come in 1966 and to tell us, Mr. Pincus, that there were one thousand officials too many? Weren't they there all the time? Mr. Shragai came once – and I may tell you that now – and said: We couldn't bring 10,000 people from Persia because we didn't have the funds. I have done a little statistical calculation and I say with a sense of responsibility: Duplication and waste in the Zionist Movement since the establishment of the State has cost us more than 250 million Israel pounds'. And while the duplication went on and while we didn't have the money to bring immigrants we found money to pour into investment companies with which the Jewish Agency ought to have had very little to do. I came to Mr. Pincus time and again – and I came to his predecessor – and I said: Liquidate these investments! – but these investments grew from 100 million in 1961 to 280 million in 1966. Investments in 90 companies; investments that are not properly looked after.

.. The time has come for a revision of that policy.

And now I come to the last point and this point is the question of re-organization. I have great regard for Mr. Pincus. When he took office I told him so and I really believed that he set out on the correct course. For the first time a person came and said, openly and publicly, there was waste and duplication and that he was going to change it. And so I heard, for the first time, the proposal to reduce the departments to nine, ten departments and one head for each department. And then there started the horse-dealing. I sat in the inter-party committee and I was approached by A and B and C to agree to three heads for one department – and I said: "No! in this matter I will not add chaos to duplication". I want to know – a new immigrant, will he go to Shragai or Cygel or Dultzin – not to all three of them? And the answer was: I'm sorry, but they will have to go to all three of them. Three heads and not one. Why? Because you couldn't not divide the spoils among yourselves! This is the truth.

Harold Miller
(Union Poale Zion-Hitachdut - Great Britain)

On Aliyah and education, I will speak about Great Britain - about which I think I probably know as much as most people in this hall. There is still a belief that if you have some large mass meetings this will affect Aliyah; I do not think so. I believe that Aliyah is a matter of either conditions or education. In the case of Great Britain, it is education. But in Great Britain we are not even sure of the number of Jews in the country. We were under the impression that we were approaching at least half-a-million, but recently a paper was published giving some very interesting figures.

The marriage rate of non-Jews in Great Britain is 7 per 1,000 and if we have 500,000 Jews in Britain we should have, with a similar marriage rate to the rest of the population at least 3,500 marriages per year. In 1965, the total number of Jewish marriages in Great Britain, counting all types of synagogues, was just over 1,800 - giving a marriage rate of just under 4 per 1,000. Two explanations exist: one, that our marriage rate is lower than the rest of the country - which may account for part of our small numbers; or two, that a large percentage of our people are either marrying in Registry Offices, that is civil marriages or intermarrying. And it is doubtful whether our birth-rate is sufficient to maintain our present population.

Can we prevent the self-destruction of our people? Our problem must therefore be to furnish a ladder of Jewish knowledge for our Jewish children and youth - a ladder by which they can climb to the knowledge of the Jewish people and of Israel and a basic knowledge of the Hebrew language, and to be proud Jews. To do this, it is necessary to build a Jewish Day School system so that a generation will grow up who will work for the fulfilment of the upbuilding and consolidation of the State. This is a long-term policy. Everything

else is a short-term policy – and a short-term policy means a policy of energy and drive to organize Aliyah which we can do and will do, and the individual will come to live here. But whether they will stay here depends on their reception. You, in Israel, will decide whether they stay and settle here or not. I believe over 150,000 people have returned to their countries of origin in the last eighteen years. You must see that this side of our joint work is equally improved – and we have told you on many occasions what our people need. Because this is a partnership and everybody who leaves Israel is to us a headache in our work. You must deal, with greater sympathy, on your side. Because they are individuals with foreign passports in their pockets.

I would like to deal for a few moments with the re-organization. No one questions the fact that re-organization was overdue. No one doubts the need for streamlining the departments, but re-organization is not an end in itself; it must have a purpose. Is it only in order to save money, or are we looking further ahead than the next budget allocation? This is the real issue. I have an uneasy feeling that what we have been doing is to re-organize Zionist officials, not the Zionist Movement – and that, as a result, we have been more concerned with the formal aspects of the Zionist Organization than with Zionism as a political movement. This is our real trouble.

Let us not forget the ordinary people whom we should attract, but do not. The fault is not theirs; it is ours. Zionism seems to have lost its sense of direction and its order of priorities. We tend to start in the wrong direction. To the new Jewish generation growing up in the affluent countries, in commerce or at the colleges and universities, the image of World Zionism is that of a tired old man: they look at the leadership, not at the youth camps. They judge us by our leaders. They see us haggling over party precedence, over parochial peculiarities; they do not see us marching into the 'seventies planting our banner of progress in the Negev, in the Galilee and wherever there is need for it.

Mrs. Raya Jaglom
 (Chairman of Executive of Wizo;
 Member of the Executive - Israel)

To my mind, anyone who takes up the time of this distinguished gathering should speak on Aliyah and Klitah only, as this is the burning problem of Israel today and a question which should take priority in the discussions of the Zionist General Council Meeting at this crucial time. Therefore, all of us who have come here to discuss ways and means of how to increase Aliyah from the Western countries should ask the leaders of the Zionist Movement in the Diaspora: How are we to stimulate this Aliyah? You, our friends from abroad, should tell us what we here in Israel could do to attract Aliyah from Western countries and how we could help you to increase it.

I'm afraid I did not entirely agree with the Chairman of the Jewish Agency when he spoke about the failure of Israelis in social integration of new olim. Of course, we are not doing enough but the little we do in this sphere is done entirely by voluntary services on the part of all the Women's Organizations in Israel. We do meet the new immigrants in the many larger and smaller places in the country and not only in Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem and Haifa. We have opened clubs for them and most of our groups throughout the country try to help them in their absorption by organizing social gatherings, lectures, home visits and excursions to show them the country. We're trying to help the women by training them in various crafts so that they can earn some money. We also help the immigrants by taking their children into our institutions. We are doing all this despite our very great financial difficulties and I believe that we can honestly say that we are tackling this problem with our hearts and minds - exactly as you preached this last night, Mr. Pincus.

May I repeat my proposal, which I made some time ago to you, Mr. Chairman, and to other organizations to centralize and co-ordinate the activities of all the women's

organizations in Israel for social integration of new immigrants thus putting it on a broader basis and pooling the resources of experience and manpower which are available for the tackling of this problem. And if what we need today is a voluntary emergency Aliyah then we must make an appeal for it under this very slogan. There have been times of emergency before when Jews from abroad came here to help us and it was mostly the young who answered the call. This was during our War of Independence and the Sinai Campaign. As we are now threatened by a different kind of danger, by the lack of Aliyah, we ask Jewish youth again to take up the challenge - to come to Israel and to help us to build it together.

If we want a voluntary emergency Aliyah to come we must find a way to put across to the Jewish people - and especially to Jewish youth abroad - that the very existence of Israel is in danger and that with Aliyah all that has been achieved so far will be left unfinished and the many sacrifices of the Jewish people to establish this Jewish Homeland may have been in vain. We must communicate this appeal to World Jewry that Aliyah now is a necessity, an emergency for Israel as well as for the continuity of the Jewish people as a whole.

Dr. David Roizin
(Mapam, Argentine)

If we wish to speak about aliyah and absorption in the current period of Latin America and of Israel, we must speak in entirely different terms. For the past fifteen years I have been hearing the same argumentation, the same systems, the same plans. Our communities are well-organized, but the younger generation, notwithstanding the efforts of its elders, is becoming more and more estranged and becoming partly assimilated and partly apathetic.

Yeridah is increasing among the immigrants who were not sufficiently versed in the problems of the State of Israel (for it was not economic difficulties that occasioned this re-emigration), while immigration has been reduced to a mere trickle. According to official figures, from a community like that in the Argentine, well-known for its strongly Zionist character, no more than 641 immigrants came in 1966, — this out of a Jewish population of half a million. It is true, it was a young immigration, sixty per cent of its members being under thirty-five years of age, and included dozens of academicians and about two hundred members of chalutz youth movements, but in spite of this the figures themselves indicate that there is little fruit for our labours, that something is out of order.

Aliyah from Latin America is a voluntary influx, and it is the result of a profound and prolonged Zionist education. It is totally different from the immigration that comes to Israel because it has no other alternative. For which reason indeed it stands in need of other methods of absorption. Most of the immigrants coming from our countries reveal conditions totally different from those described by the shlichim and the promises they broadcast in Buenos Aires or Montevideo. It is inconceivable that one shaliach should come and say one thing and his successor should rub all that out because there is no harmony between them. There is no prospect today of a mass immigration from our countries. Under present day conditions only an immigration of individuals is possible. The immigration of families will be the natural sequel to the immigration of chalutzim. And in parenthesis, a word about the immigration organized by the Zionist parties: these immigrants are mature ideologically and politically, and their absorption has been astonishingly successful. They come mainly from Argentine and Brazil; they have settled in Tel-Aviv and Haifa and also in a number of kibbutzim.

All this calls for proper planning, in keeping with a better method of selection, in order to obviate failures.

Every family of re-emigrants severs the chain. The entire structure in which so much labour has been invested over the years suddenly collapses. We must put the stress on the strengthening of the Zionist organizations, for this is the most constructive type of immigration.

Notwithstanding all this I am of the opinion that there is still room for great hope, for the communities in our countries have been ideologically educated, and it is only reasonable to expect that the Zionist Movement and the State of Israel will reap the fruits of these many years of effort. But methods must be radically changed. The Zionist Movement must be led by people most of whom themselves offer an example of what they have preached for years and years. Youth will have no faith in those who preach aliyah without surcease but remain where they are, on their chairs at their desks in their offices.

Jewish youth and particularly Jewish student youth in the universities, have a front for action that is closer home, in which they live their daily lives. For example: How can one talk about Zionism if in a central square in a turbulent country there stands a gallows? Youth is conscious of the problems close to them, those irking the countries in which they live.

If we do not radically change the methods I have referred to, then gradually the Zionist Movement will become a movement of the Golah, a movement of sympathy for Israel, regarding Israel as only one point of many in its programme. It is perfectly true that most of the local institutions are controlled by Zionists, leaders of the Zionist parties and Zionist workers, but their programmes, their practical work, are of local character, while the Zionist Movement remains paralyzed, without a programme, without a budget, and in effect without any activity. And for that reason the Movement does not reach out to the youth, it does not touch the younger generation, who slowly become estranged from our problems. We must speak to them in new terms, in language they understand, which they can absorb and feel.

In the present era when the regimes and the political situation in Latin America are not so stable, when social and economic crisis are daily occurrences, we must be vigilant, ready to meet any negative situation that may arise. In this respect the Zionist Movement, the Zionist ideology must be ready to play a decisive, determined role. It must serve as a guide for all the Jewish communities. This calls for years of unremitting labour, the investment of the necessary funds, the creation of Zionist communities, the fostering of Hebrew culture, the expansion of Jewish education, the imposition of authority upon our institutions, the strengthening of the chalutz movements, which constitute an un-failing source of chosen immigrants, never for a single moment to neglect our institutions for masses, which constitute the reservoir for the continued survival of the Jewish people.

Dr. Sara Feder
(Union Poale-Zion-Hitachdut - U.S.A.)

I cannot begin without remarking that we've had some very curious situations that could well have been omitted. I speak of the President of a large Zionist organization in the United States who surely should not have said what he did. Had it been earlier in the evening or during the day I would have used much stronger terms! But here I say that no citizen of one country has a right to inject himself into the life of another country, especially when that country is Israel, and especially if related to the security of the country. We Americans know how quickly not only the Israel press but the American press as well pick up such items.

I also want to say here that the very explosive presentation that a gentleman made in a criticism of the Jewish Agency belonged to a committee meeting where people can discuss and ask questions. That was no service either, to all of us.

Now I come to the new organizational structure. Far be it for me to say that we do not want friends for the Zionist Movement. But what is the use of having friends who will join us if, in the basic elements – and Aliyah is absolutely basic today – they will not go along with us. If they, our Zionist friends, go along with us on Aliyah there will be "mazel broche" in everything we do. Is there a threat then that if we do not generate Aliyah there will be other organizations created for that purpose? This is indeed a fantastic thought. Therefore we come back to the problem. We hold the destiny of Aliyah in our hands.

And I want to say without any sense of modesty that we, in the Labour Zionist Movement, have propelled many more people percentage-wise to our numbers to Israel. As late as Saturday night, I addressed some of them, over 250 from that older group who came before 1930. I want to say to you: We take great pride in recording that Pioneer Women, their children and those of our whole Labour Zionist Movement have come – though not enough, of course.

I also want to record here, because I am a member of the Association for Americans and Canadians in Israel, and I do read the statistics occasionally. These statistics show that in a decade and a half over twenty thousand Americans have come to Israel. David Breslau, the President, has so stated it in his editorial column. We see them in the kibbutzim, in the moshavim, in the development centres, in all the cities; and we are proud of our American young people and older who have come here on Aliyah. They are chalutzim in the modern sense of the word. For make no mistake, in our American economy, with its middle class psychology, it takes courage for young people to uproot themselves and come to Israel. And they are here. They're not here in large numbers, as large as we want them, but they are here.

Our American scene is good to Jews. We can do anything we want in America. There was an Americanization

process that attempted to put us in one mould. That was effective among many immigrants, among some immigrant groups. It was not effective among the Jews. Today we have cultural pluralism in whatever form we want; and we can even take our young people and propel them into Aliyah. We have in America the example of the Peace Corps, and what do they do? They go to help other people. Surely no goy will say that we have no right to come and help our own people in Israel. Earlier there were the missionaries who went to various countries from America to help them. So there is no problem of the normalcy of service to a country that needs it, if we have the courage to face up to the fact that the destiny of Jews today in America requires that we attempt to increase Aliyah.

I want to speak now of the importance of the role of the Jewish woman in the family. But much more obvious than most people realize is the fact that she really can help her children in the direction of Aliyah. This is not an easy thing for many American mothers. We have to re-gear our thinking, and we have to realize that there is something in evidence today that was not there before. And I look to you mothers of America and I say to you: why do our children have to go into the Peace Corps? And if they must go in that direction and if they must go in marches, and if the sudden sense of the importance of the human being has come to them, and they're not students alone, and they're not young people alone in offices, etc. - why cannot we get them to go on Aliyah? Here is a question that we have to consider soberly and precisely. The short term responsibility now is to come to our young people. Do you realize that most of our American young people today are wage earners, whether white collar workers or professionals? Do you realize that many of them are in unions, though they may be conservatives? They can be compelled by their conscience to face the fact that destiny calls them to Israel in the most critical period, today. And so we must come to them, whether it's through whatever contacts

we have, and call them to serve the Jewish people today, as relatives of theirs did from Europe.

We cannot go on with business as usual. And so we must, returning to the United States, get all the specialists, psychologists, sociologists, any specialists who will help us change the social climate in America, so that a young Jew will say: Yes, I'm going into the Israel Peace Corps, or: Yes, I'm going to go to a kibbutz or to a moshav, or a development centre. What is important is that "Yes". We will come to Israel.

But remember this, they will only come if we the Zionist groups in America will do our part.

EIGHTH MEETING

Wednesday, January 11, 1967, in the morning

Chairman: PAUL L. GOLDMAN

Continuation of the Debate on
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE,
ITS PLANS AND BUDGET

Sara Kafri

(Union Poale-Zion-Hitachdut - Israel)

Those who say that active interest is not taken in Aliyah in this country, just do not know what is happening in Israel. Much is done for the immigrants but of course all this is not enough. The difficulty is financial and finding work for the newcomer, especially if he is elderly or partially incapacitated, and unfortunately many of the immigrants are in this category. So there is no reason for talk about the cold atmosphere enveloping Aliyah and the immigrant. Thousands of people have volunteered for work of this kind and are willing to assist in the social integration of the newcomers. Many of these volunteers are members of the diverse women's organizations.

A few remarks about the contribution of that great organization, the Moetzet Hapoalot, which is the loyal instrument of the Histadrut, in which I myself work. Thousands of our members in all parts of the country devote time to teaching Hebrew, for that is the first bridge between the new citizen and the country. This immense task is being implemented with the aid of the Ministry of Education and Culture. And I may mention here the outstanding work of hundreds of girls serving in the Israel Army, who go from house to house in the immigrants' villages in their efforts to teach and to help the womenfolk. It is mainly the women who learn with their aid. Much effort is invested in teaching the immigrants how to run a home, in order to assist them in adjusting to life in this country, which from all its various aspects

is so different from the countries from which the immigrants come. There are new alignments and relationships within the family and in society generally and nothing can be done to prevent the crisis that is the lot of every immigrant upon arrival in a new country. We organize study circles, information work in the homes, in clubs, we organize seminars in the languages spoken by the immigrants. I meet the immigrants and know their problems. Each of them is a world all of her own. We organize hundreds of Sabbath and festival parties, outings to enable the newcomers to become more familiar with the homeland; we endeavour to educate the mother, and to imbue her with a consciousness of the Jewish people, which she does not know sufficiently well. The work we are doing is not easy, but it radiates its influence through the entire immigrant family. It is the woman who shapes the character, who creates the atmosphere at home. Much effort is invested in the vocational and agricultural training of girls. Under the guidance of the Ministry of Labour we organize vocational courses for women, and run children's institutions, which make it possible for the womenfolk to seek work outside their homes. In many cases, as a result of all these activities, closer ties and friendships are formed. It is by no means easy to overcome all the limitations and the sins of omission, the differences in economic standards and of the regime in our country. Sometimes things run smoothly. Thousands of families have struck root in the soil of our country, so let us not see the picture in such sombre hues, let us not develop unnecessary feelings of guilt and frustration. At the same time, as has already been stated here, there is much work still to be done, in the absorption of the re-unification of families immigration, which we hope and pray will increase. The influx calls for an individual approach, more circumspection. And it is our hope that the Public Council will succeed in making effective use of all bodies operating among the immigrants, including, of course, the volunteers of the diverse women's organizations.

We have convened at a difficult time. In the course of the days at our disposal we wished to make our position clear to you, and to put greater stress upon the problems of the Jewish people in the Golah. These problems are manifold and graver, perhaps, than those of us living in this country are aware. We as Zionists are under a special obligation to fulfil our duty and realize the objectives we have set ourselves, which indeed have not changed. These are the same objectives as existed seventy years ago. Our main aim is the consolidation of the State of Israel. Together with us you must bear the historic responsibility of the Zionist Organization. In this country there are hundreds of thousands who bear that responsibility, in town and in country. Let us not negate our youth in toto. Look at the wastelands in the Negev, see the young people leaching the soil of its salts in order to convert it into a flowering garden, producing vegetables for local consumption and for export. They occupy forward defence positions on our borders. They undertake many vital duties in ensuring the security of our country. But notwithstanding all the praise we have heard here about life in the Golah, about its wealth, its pluralistic culture and its lofty ideals, let us not forget the purpose of fore-gathering here – to strengthen responsibility for the destiny and future of our people.

Moshe Dworkin

(Representative World Union of Jewish Students)

I speak here in the name of Jewish students in general, the World Union of Jewish students, and in particular and more specifically, the Student Zionist Organization of North America.

While here I have tried to listen very hard to what has been said by the various leaders of the movements. And it seems that two trends have developed, two trends which are both valid. The first is the trend that there are certain things

which we continue doing. And the second trend is that there are certain things which we cannot continue doing if we are to exist at all. And I think that, as I said, both the trends are valid but we must choose. And the choice is up to the people, those of you who choose to come, those of you who choose to listen, and those of you who choose to act.

I wish to submit to you that the "to be or not to be" of organized student Zionism is going to be decided here, it's going to be decided by you. By some account, many people here are already beginning to make those decisions. But I wish to submit to you that your decisions are based on two great fallacies, fallacies which seem to dominate the thinking of the decision makers who sit before me. The first great fallacy is that American Jewish youth is lost, that 300,000 Jews on the American campus are lost because of intermarriage and because of their lack of knowledge, and of commitment, etc. — all well-known to you. I think the second great fallacy is the opposite extreme, one of great optimism. The Jewish students are involved, they are active. All we need is one little shaliach to swing them over to Israel. These extremes are wrong, and they are irrelevant. There is no total loss and there is no great optimism.

Now if you will permit me I would like a few moments to put things in perspective as I see for my generation. Each generation seeks to carve out its place for itself. Each generation has to struggle to survive, even in a world of plenty. The first generation represented by those of you who are sitting here, who came to America, sought each other out. And thus you were able to start the Histadrut, and thus you were able to form landsmanschaften, and thus you were able to maintain a great cultural heritage. The second generation became American by mastering the American idiom. And these are the people who produced the great artists and the great writers of our time; but they did so by breaking with tradition. My generation has the problem of all third generations, generally known as the

"quest for identity". Jews, and non-Jews as well, it is the third generation which is putting up the Swedish Cultural House, and is becoming active in the Jewish Cultural House, the Synagogue. The point is that we must speak to each generation as it fits. Perhaps it does fit for someone to address the audience from this podium and to remind all of you of the great accomplishments of the Zionist Movement, to remind the press of their responsibilities, to remind Israelis who wish to leave, what they are leaving. But you can't remind my generation, my generation which has grown up, after Hiroshima and after May 14, 1948.

The 300,000 Jewish students on the college campus today take college life as a matter of course. It's part of their life cycle. Which means that it is merely an extension of high school, as far as they are concerned, and therefore a postponement of the time for decision. To have a shaliach speak to American youth by saying: We made decisions when we were eighteen years old, why don't you make decisions when you are eighteen years old? - shows that there is not a clear understanding of what is going on in the American scene. My generation does not feel anti-Semitism. Please remember that my grandfather and John Kennedy's grandfather were both immigrants. Whether there is or is not anti-Semitism is irrelevant as long as my generation does not feel it. My generation does not know, does not remember the smell of the cheder, and they are not moved by the memory of the shtetl, as produced on the stage by "The Fiddler on the Roof". What do we know? That there is a mystique. But our most dedicated and socially sensitive people reject any relationship to Jewish life.

A young Israeli, whom I just met a day or so ago, told me that he was in America on the eve of the march to Selma, Alabama, and that he was in the home of a Unitarian minister where fifteen young people were preparing to leave. Fourteen of them were Jewish, the fifteenth was the Minister's son! And these fourteen people that he met with I think are typical. They had the uneasy feeling that Jewish

ideas, the Jewish establishment is indifferent, or at least fearful, of change. And what was this Jewish mystique, what bound them together? A common view of idealism. We heard from our Chairman that we must turn this idealism to Israel. Israel no longer evokes the intensity of concern as in the past. Israel is safe, it's supported. And the Jewish youth of today feel that their task is where they are. Other causes move their hearts and minds. Viet Nam, Yes; civil rights, Yes; Peace Corps, Yes; Watts ghettos, Yes; Warsaw ghetto, No; Soviet Jewry, No; Israel, No. Jewish affairs are simply too parochial. Arab propaganda? Not for me, they will say. And some of the leaders who are sitting here, whom I have had the pleasure of meeting, have made snide remarks to me about the lack of concern shown by the Jewish students on the campus, in terms of fighting Arab propaganda. And it is these Jewish leaders that I blame, for not having trained youth to know what they are supposed to do. Because our Zionist education has been done in a hackneyed and an irrelevant fashion, an approach that is not in tune with the times.

But what do we need from you? We need shlichim, who are college trained and who understand the life cycle of a student; who can inspire. And not non-English speaking, self-educated, remarkable people, who come for two years, and it takes them that long to understand what it's all about. We need a budget that's twice that of what it is today.

You have to choose what you can do. Are we going to make things happen or are we going to watch things go by?

**GREETINGS TO THE ISRAEL ARMY
AND THE FRONTIER SETTLEMENTS**

Chairman: PAUL L. GOLDMAN

With the approval of our Chairman, Mr. Jacob Tsur, I will read out greetings sent by the Zionist General Council to the Israel Army and to the frontier settlements..

The Zionist General Council convened in Jerusalem follows with anxiety and concern developments on the northern borders of the country. The General Council sends its greetings and a message of encouragement to the men and women serving in the Israel Defence Army and in the frontier settlements on the Syrian border, in the Jordan Valley and the Hulah Valley, occupying advanced positions in the defence of the State and its frontiers.

The General Council I am sure will subscribe to this greeting and I request the Secretariat to make arrangements for its despatch.

Continuation of the Debate on
**THE ACTIVITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE,
ITS PLANS AND BUDGET**

Itzhak Harkavi

(Member of the Executive - Jerusalem)

Perhaps until the representative of the students of the United States took the floor one might have thought that here we were hearing and seeing something similar to "The Fiddler on the Roof", which is so nostalgic and so far from reality. The fiddler sat the whole time on the roof and refused to come down to earth to make himself heard. But ultimately he did come down, and it seems to me that at last we are reaching the crux of the present debate.

There was the danger — and it still threatens — that it would descend into a dialogue between the Israelis and the members from abroad. We speak about Aliyah, instead of you speaking about Aliyah. We speak about education and work among the youth, a subject which you should speak about. And so I feel that this Session of the General Council should begin to speak in the first person and not in the third, as has been the case up to the present.

If, somehow or other, we could continue in the old rut up to two, three or four years ago, when a major influx was still in progress, today such a policy would mean suicide for the Movement, an abdication of its obligations towards the State of Israel.

Not long ago a meeting was held here of teachers who had returned to Israel from their educational missions in various countries. Golda Meir took part in the meeting, and summed the occasion in a pithy phrase. One of the participants said that the Golah was not suffering from some imaginary malady, but that it was deceiving itself that it was in good health. To this Golda Meir replied: Not only does the Golah imagine itself in good health, but Israel is guilty of the same delusion. Actually neither the Golah nor Israel are in robust health, though both delude themselves that they are.

We must intensify the work being done in this country. Much has been said, with justice, about the need to create a Zionist climate in this country. But such a Zionist climate can be created only when the young people in this country witness the arrival of young men and women from abroad to settle here. Here we do not have any question of conviction, of historic concepts, of historiosophy. We are dealing with something simple and concrete. It is proved in the real ties between Israel and the Golah. The question may be asked: What is the cause of the difficulties we are experiencing in establishing contact with the younger Jewish generation in the Golah? The cause is

the fact that the majority of the younger Jews are still living through the great storms which are troubling the world. They live with Vietnam and San Domingo, with Cuba and other issues of the same nature. They are conscious only of the drama in the world, they are not conscious of their own Jewish drama. And they do not see their own Jewish drama because they have no Jewish roots.

Jewish youth was roused prior to the establishment of the State, and before that in the time of Hitler, because these reached them through general channels, through what was coming to pass in the world generally, and not necessarily through their specific Jewish channels. But Israel does not always make headlines and for that reason it does not call constantly, other than to people with a deeper Jewish consciousness. It does not evoke any response from people with no Jewish roots. This is the source of our difficulty. How can we compete with the great drama that is being unfolded on the world stage, when the Jewish consciousness is lacking?

The question accordingly is: Upon what lines are we to educate our young people? How are schools to be built? How is a suitable atmosphere created for teachers? Not long ago I had a talk with representatives of a women's organization in a certain country. The women argued: Our children do not want to be Hebrew teachers. You Israelis must supply us with the teachers. To this I replied: What sort of division of labour is this? Your children will become engineers, doctors, leaders and executives, and ours will be the teachers. Does the fact that Jewish life is so weak imply that we must assume this mission entirely? Everything that must be done, must be done on a cooperative basis. Israel is obviously regarded as the centre. Today we are already the educational centre of the Jewish world. The growth must be organized, with the aid of all interested parties, by initiative in every possible form, by development of teachers colleges, by bringing teachers from Israel, by sending students to Israel. It must be directed by the Zionist

Organization. We who occupy ourselves with education in the Zionist Executive must have a Zionist address for educational questions in the various countries. Unfortunately this is not the case in the required degree. There are other institutions desirous of collaborating with us, which do cooperate, but we have no Zionist institution to address ourselves to in most of the Jewish communities.

It is not only about Aliyah that we must speak in the first person. The same is true of education. This is obligatory. It can serve to lead to the realization of our paramount mission in the Zionist Movement.

Shlomo Zalman Shragai
(Member of the Executive - Jerusalem)

Absorption efforts, in my view, will not succeed until every one of us, from the uppermost stratum in the State and the Jewish Agency, down to the last and humblest of the officials, is permeated with the consciousness that each and every immigrant coming to this country, whoever he may be, brings closer the Redemption, as long as we do not feel that every immigrant is a son of our people returning to the land of his fathers, and when he comes here he must feel that all of us, from the highest ranks down to the last of the officials that we are glad to welcome him. We must rid ourselves of the attitude that we are the masters here, and we can decide their fate as we wish. In order to make this more tangible to the immigrant he is sent back and forth, from one official to the next, and his requests are responded to only after the intervention of other people and the application of pressure. In the meantime the immigrant is taught to be disgusted with the State and all that is in it, and is reduced to a state of despair. As long as such a consciousness is not shared by us all, no facilities (and today there are many facilities granted by both the Government and the Jewish Agency) will be of any use. Nothing will avail if we

do not teach the newcomer to love the State of Israel, for if he does not love the State he will not be able to overcome the natural difficulties he encounters. Under such circumstances the immigrant regards the State not as the land of his fathers to which he has returned in order to be redeemed, but as a country which estranges itself from him. The officials of the Government and the Jewish Agency he regards as aliens, who are not interested in his welfare, and whatever is given to him, even if it is beyond our capacity, cannot counteract the bitterness that has been engendered in the meantime since his arrival in this country. Certainly this state of affairs will not be remedied by the merging of the Immigration, Absorption and Economic Departments, under three Heads, for this, in my view, will increase fragmentation. For our Sages have said: "A good deed that has chanced your hand, do not forego it!" and it is interpreted "Do not perform it with a sullen countenance". Let us not greet the newcomers with a sullen countenance.

In regard to immigration my feeling is that at this Session the General Council has gone down to the root of the matter. And if we and when I say "we" I am referring to the Zionist Movement here in Israel and in the Golah, and the Government and the Zionist Executive – if we have the courage to draw the necessary conclusions from what has been said, this Session of the General Council can serve as a spur to Aliyah, to the redemption of the people. It can serve to proclaim to the people that the time has come to be redeemed. And with this in view it must leave the alien lands and the alien culture to be a free people in this land, bearing the vision of Israel in its heart and soul, and realizing that vision in its way of life. This Session can serve if it has the courage to draw the conclusions that we are at a turning point in Israel way of life, and the immigrant when he comes here will feel that indeed his Aliyah has been a spiritual and Jewish Aliyah. For this country has a rare atmosphere, for it is here that the Shechina rests, for love of Israel is revealed here in its full glory in relations between man and

man, between the State and the newcomers and to the residents, all of whom are in the light of immigrants.

I trust that the Government, with the aid of all of us, will overcome this transient phase of unemployment. The renewal of immigration can also serve to generate a new era of prosperity. I trust that this time we will not waste the years of prosperity by introducing luxury into our lives. I wish to stress that there is hardly a country in the whole world, in the east or the west, from which Jews do not come to Israel. This proves that the aspiration to come to Zion has not ceased to operate, and that the efforts to settle in Israel have not weakened.

To our sorrow we bear witness that our generation has not ascended to the heights of redemption. This strange phenomenon, whatever its reasons, can cost us dearly. It is precisely our generation to which it has been granted to see the realization of Jewish sovereignty, which witnesses assimilation and loss of national identity engulfing large sections of our people. In one section there is willing assimilation; in another, coerced. We still do not know which category of assimilation is worse. I think voluntary assimilation. We must find the way to protect ourselves, both spiritually and materially. It is not something beyond our strength if we bear in mind three things: a. that the State of Israel has a redemptive content; b. that people coming here must be able to find an economic niche for themselves; c. that people must feel that in coming here there is something of spiritual and, more, ascent, and that we welcome their arrival and look upon them as returning to their father's house. In order to create these conditions a supreme effort is necessary on the part of the Jewish people now in Israel, and a veritable revolution in our social life. We must raise moral standards to a higher level, there must be mutual aid encompassing the individual and all sections of the people.

Obviously the State of Israel is not able to give all her sons and daughters all that they are entitled to receive.

Sometimes a mother is not able to provide fully for her children. But that is no reason to change mothers. Children cannot choose a mother capable of providing for them more generously. The State of Israel, Mother Zion, cannot give the newcomers all that it would wish, all that it should. But we are giving them their Mother Zion. Of course the attempts being made to regard the State of Israel as the State of a new Israel nation and not of an ancient people, the Jewish people, and the attempt to draw a line of demarcation between Israelis and Jews, and to cut off the Jews dwelling in Zion from the people in the Golah, notwithstanding the fact that these efforts are foredoomed to failure, they do not constitute positive factors in this revolution of the vision and the redemption. And until we recognize this failure we shall pay dearly, for it arouses the question of our attachment, the historic right of the new people to Eretz Israel. It is very doubtful if the new Israel residents of this country, if one can call them that, will remain attached to the State and will not leave it as soon as they encounter difficulties. Nothing will stop them from migrating from this country and settling in the lands of the Gentiles. For one can be as the other nations among the nations, too, better than among the Jews in the State of Israel, and conditions in the Golah constitute the best proof of that. In our work I do not propose that we should conceal from the Jews in the Golah the difficulties and the defects in this country. Indeed they cannot be concealed for they are manifest. But notwithstanding all the defects there is a rule in our history - "in spite of everything". It was operative not only in our struggles with others but in our struggles with ourselves. And I say in spite of everything there is in the State of Israel as it is today more light than in all Jewish life in the Golah, and the possibilities latent in the State are infinitely richer than in the alien lands. In the State of Israel we must combat ourselves to improve things. We reprove each other. The Jews in the Golah do not combat themselves, nor do they combat others

and the encroachments of assimilation and loss of national identity, which are ravaging Jewry in the Golah constitute the best evidence.

The Zionist General Council dare not confine itself to consideration of the financial and organizational questions. Needless to say without money we shall not be able to do anything, and if organizational reforms are necessary they will be introduced because they are necessary and for other reasons. I am very much afraid that we are trying to quieten our consciences by introducing organizational reforms, which cannot in the nature of things generate that Zionist revolution about which I have spoken. The Zionist General Council and all that has been said here has proved something that is self-understood, that it is faithful to the existence of the Jewish people, that it is desirous of its special character, and hopes to see it as a people bearing the vision of Israel and the Prophets for itself, before serving as a light to the Gentiles. This Session of the Zionist General Council, must accordingly once again unfurl the banner of redemption inherent in the State of Israel. It is not for individuals alone that we need a secure asylum; it is for the entire people in need of redemption, in order that it may be a free people in its own land. If the General Council will raise this banner then the people will rally round it and answer its call.

Zvi Lurie

(Member of the Executive - Jerusalem)

It is customary to say that the Zionist Movement is in a state of permanent crisis, and there are people who console us with the saying: "In our crises, live!" But it is my impression that I will not be guilty of any exaggeration if I say that we are in state of very grave crisis, the like of which I find it difficult to remember. As a member of the Zionist Executive, with a certain store of experience,

gained in the course of a number of years, I am oppressed by the feeling that our very existence is in jeopardy. The gravity of the danger is accentuated by the state of feeling among the Jews and in Israel society, of which we are no more than a reflection. I do not know how to infect this Session with this feeling of extreme disquiet which oppresses me so much. I do not wish to indulge in any analysis and I do not wish to formulate any theories. The crisis is not in essence a structural crisis. It is not inherently a functional crisis. It is a crisis of being. It is a crisis of content.

We have a Zionist Organization but in effect we hardly have a Zionist Movement. We have a Zionist Organization a small part of which is good and most of which — let us put our hands on our hearts, let us engage in a little self-criticism, and I do not exclude myself and let us not indulge in any fine educational speeches — is shaky, and must be supported daily. I do not wish to go any further in painting the picture in its right colours, though I could, if I wished, add. There is no doubt that the Organization must be strengthened, rational reforms must be introduced, outdated forms removed, doors must be opened to enable the affiliation of allies. But on condition that we foster and safeguard every section that makes sense from the point of the Movement and ideologically, as a party or in any other fashion, be it of any Zionist grouping whatsoever. Obviously we must accept the hypothesis that the present party structure cannot be exclusive. But the debate with Dr. Goldmann does not range around the percentage that will go to the parties and the organizations and the non-partisan individuals. It is far more basic.

The fashion today is to denigrate the parties. It belongs to the current intellectual individualism, the non-conformism of aesthetes, but in this country the parties and the ideological groupings have created many things. The conquest of Hebrew labour, the pioneer settlement,

resistance to the British Mandate, the Palmach were the product of ideological organization. We are told that the situation is different in the Golah. There the parties are defective. I must confess that there is a lot of truth in the charge. I am prepared to fight together against chicanery and monopolies, but at the same time we must foster every ideological grain and not enough attention is paid to this aspect.

I wish to say something about the territorial structure of the Zionist Organization on a regional basis, as proposed by Dr. Goldmann. This is not a technical organizational matter. It is something fundamental. In this country too, someone is heading the campaign for constituency elections, with an approach that is, in my view, anti-ideological. In my view it is anti-democratic. It aims at power and I do not know power for whom. I should not like my friend Dr. Goldmann to preach that same constituency system against the background of Jewish life in the Golah.

Obviously a structure is not enough. We need a structure, it is true. But a new attitude, a change of heart is more essential. I know that it is not within the competence of the Zionist General Council to take the relevant decision. Hence my own hesitations – I regret very much to say this – to speak. For an openly Zionist, political in the most part, organization can enlist various Jewish bodies, in whole or in part. I am in favour of this. I have been operating in this direction for years. But only such an organization can become the body of the Jews of the states quo, and those who believe that the era of Jewish dynamism has come to an end and that we are living in a static period that must be welcomed. It will be an organization suitable for those who are willing to subscribe to the Jerusalem programme, as a formality. But on the other hand there are virile though amorphous undercurrents, party circles which do not accept the status quo. There are religious Jews who believe that "And may our eyes witness Your return to Zion", is not a plank in party platform, but a

Mitzvah of paramount importance. There are young self-conscious Jews, subscribing to diverse opinions, socialists, who do not know about us, or do not wish to know about us, because they are stolidly marking time.

The Zionist Movement can have only one point in its compass, pointing to the broad concept of the ingathering of the exiles, of which Aliyah is the practical expression. The two are not congruent but adjacent, one being the product of the other. It cannot only be part of an abstract programme, but an expression of a philosophy of life, of intellectual challenge, of a congregational and public way of life, of education from early age, Hebrew is not enough, the Book of Books is not enough, if it is not enlarged by this dimension.

In this country we have obstinately insisted for decades on the need to bring the Jewish people here, despite all the difficulties and the disasters. There is nothing like it in human history. We held on here with our fingernails, notwithstanding all the back-currents of Yeridah which have been a feature of every wave of immigration. We shall not rest content with two and a half million Jews. We are not alarmed at the dimensions of Yeridah. We shall fight for every boy, for every Jew. But this can be done only within the framework of a Zionist Movement that is fired by a vision, an ideal. It may well be that this century is the century of the last chance given to the Jewish people to foregather in its millions in its own country. This is the exclusive message, both theoretical and practical of the Zionist Movement. For this reason I am opposed to a new phrase that is being coined about an end to the process of the ingathering of the exiles, that today we stand on the threshold of an era of individual immigration. I understand the method of individual absorption, whether it accompanies mass immigration or a lesser influx. Every individual immigrant must be regarded as the millionth immigrant, as far as absorption goes. But when we speak about individual immigration we are referring to the immigration of a few.

The period of rescue immigration has come to an end but that of emergency immigration has not.

Sometimes an exaggerated theoretical approach can blur the gravity of a problem in a time of crisis. We are in no such danger. With us the danger has assumed another guise, which is that in times of stress we recognize the problem only as it emerges, under pressure. There is the danger that someone will reduce the problem to its components, and will deal with each as if all were not mutually dependent. A purely pragmatic approach trying to measure up to the facts instead of measuring up to the theory, which is much more serious than the facts actually are, is probably a sign of a normal organization. This is alien to the nature of the national liberation movement. But the matter is not at all theoretical.

I would like you to regard what I have said as not being directed to any specific address. I am far from suspecting the good intentions of any section of our Movement. But I am compelled to forego such a theory and say something in simple arithmetical terms. I force myself to use restrained terms. I am in no need of proof that we are in need of a cut-back, economy and retrenchment. Even if the financial situation were not as grave as it is, it would be a justification, not only financial, but almost ethical for such a process. I belong to a movement for which it would be a waste of time to try and convince it of the need of economy, for austerity and efficiency. But in the course of the years, by tightening our belts and before anyone thought of the recession, we achieved a balance budget and good settlements on the border, we did this in order to accomplish one thing – to expand our economy and not only in order to consolidate what we have, for the absorption of new immigrants and for the little piece of homeland beneath our feet. The cut-back, even though justified by its own reasons, even if it is the result of the critical situation, must lead to a further cut-back, with far-reaching consequences.

The Jewish people is beginning to be more parsimonious and those who hold the purse-strings are beginning to dictate programmes to us and say: Not for Hebrew education in the Golah, national Zionist education is not suitable. At the same time a pale, superficial, education in keeping with their specific tastes enjoys an abundance of finance. There is no doubt consolidation is necessary and so is a balanced budget and I do not envy the Treasurer in his efforts to square the circle. But consolidation of the Zionist budget makes sense only if its purpose is to save the core, what we cherish most. Inevitably there must be some scale of priorities. I do not know of three things more important which we must salvage whatever the distress than these: immigration, absorption and our work in the Golah, particularly our work among the youth and Aliyat Hanoar.

Chaim Finkelstein
(Achdut Ha'avoda - Argentine)

The concern and anxiety with which the question of immigration has been discussed in the Zionist General Council is fully justified. Obviously it is the most important question facing the Zionist Movement today. But the problem of how to bring Jews to the State of Israel is dependent upon two things. On the one hand, the aspect of the State and on the other the character and content of the Jewish communities throughout the world. Permit me to say that the situation today in the Jewish world is very difficult. In respect of the spiritual standards the situation of Jews in the Golah has perhaps never been so difficult as it is today. We have a weakness to idealize the past. I do not regard the Jews of previous generations as better than ourselves. But I do know that however difficult it was at one time to be a Jew, it is today, under existing conditions, far more difficult. It is more difficult to be a Jew today because it has become so easy to be a non-Jew.

At one time it was hard to pass over to the alien camp. It involved conversion, denial of faith and values, betrayal of traditions, of family and environment. Today it is easy enough to swim over to the other side. Not very much need to be denied. And the alien world is now far more attractive; it is open to the Jews, and especially to the younger element. That is why conditions for the corporate existence of the Jews as a national entity are becoming more difficult.

The great problem facing us is that of the new generation, the problem of the youth. What will become of Jewish youth in the next few years? I should like to say that all of us who are engaged with the affairs of Jewish youth appreciate what a wonderful youth we have. They are not indifferent to problems, they are not conformists, not apathetic to what is happening around them. Our youth was ready to fight for San Domingo and for Vietnam, for equal rights for the Negroes and for other causes. But this youth is not with us in Jewish life. And they are not with us because they do not know us. They are unacquainted with their own people, but even more than that they do not know themselves. It is not a youth that has exchanged Jewish for alien values. It is a youth that has grasped at alien ideals, because they are not familiar with their own. Our Jewish values, our Jewish ideals, our historic struggle, are all a closed book to them.

It is in this light that we must see the problem. So if at the previous Session of the Zionist General Council and at the last Zionist Congress we issued the slogan "Face to the Golah" our slogan today must be "Our face to the new generation", to the youth. But it must not remain an empty slogan. It must lead to a total revision of all work done in this field. The majority of the young people have false notions about the content of Jewishness. It does not know Israel .

This does not depend upon the propaganda about Israel, Zionism or Jewishness. It depends primarily upon a different

type of education for the young people. Education must not begin when the young person is already mature. Education must begin at the beginning. We suffer from the fact that only too often we begin Jewish education too late. Jewish education means bringing the youth to our own Jewish values, inculcating an attachment to the people, fostering a national consciousness. It has been mentioned often here that our youth must know Hebrew. I am wholeheartedly in favour of studying Hebrew. The youth must know Hebrew and they must also know Yiddish. The youth must be familiar with our culture in both languages, and with everything pertaining to the Jewish spirit and to Jewish creativity. But it is not enough for the youth to know Hebrew only. It is not enough even if they are versed in the Bible. We need another type of education, something different from that developed up to the present. One can know Hebrew and be alien to the needs of the Jewish people. Such things are known to happen. There are schools in which Hebrew is taught, where the Bible is a subject in the curriculum, where the Talmud is studied but the people is not seen. Our struggle for national rehabilitation is absent from such a school. Zionism must be introduced in Jewish education. In this sphere we have sinned grievously. We have not yet evolved a Zionist philosophy for Jewish education. It is not a question of propaganda, as some people seem to think. It implies a total change, no less than a revolution in the content of Jewish education, which must be loyal to the period in which we live. We need a new interpretation of our life, in other generations and in the present day. It must express the consciousness of the people, the great idea that is being realized in the State of Israel. The child sitting at his desk in a school in New York or in London, in Paris or in Buenos Aires should feel that the Jewish State is his. This does not imply any contradiction in his attitude towards the land in which he lives.

If we introduce these values into our education we will develop in the youth a consciousness of their Jewishness, an identification with the Jewish people, with the State of Israel and the Zionist Movement.

Dr. Dov Biegun
(Union Poale-Zion-Hitachdut - France)

I wish to refer to a tragic lesson in our history. We still recall the day when we did not have the courage, nor even perhaps the understanding, nor the capacity, to act, to raise our voices, to protest so that all the world should hear, and the cost was millions of Jewish lives. Dr. Goldmann spoke about style, and with much justice. Who like him has the feeling for the mot juste, for just the right formulation, for placing a political problem in such a fashion that we who are well versed in the craft are seduced to accept views which perhaps we were not ready to accept at first. I congratulate him for possessing this quality, for it is one of the qualities of leadership. But it is precisely his style in relation to one burning problem, that of the Jews of Russia, that he should not continue to use. I regret that he is not present here, but I assume that he is told everything that happens.

What is the style that he proposes to use? It is the style of silk gloves, lest, God forbid, we make the rulers angry, that we cause a storm in the quiet waters of Russia, in the Kremlin. And I insist that raising our voices, voices that come from the depth of the hearts of the Jews throughout the world, is an historic necessity not only for the Jews of Russia, but primarily for national unity, about which we have spoken so much in the course of the present Session. Do you appreciate what it means for the Jews of Russia that the Jewish world refuses to remain silent? If I do not know what Dr. Goldmann says in his talks, in his secret diplomacy which is the fashion in the world, how can my sister, the only one of our family who has miraculously survived and is today living in a Russian country town? I should like her to know that her brother, that tens of thousands of her brethren, are raising their voices, are calling out "Let my people go!", the call that we gave vent to in the years 1946 and 1947. Could we protest against England and dare we not protest against Russia? At a time when they say that it is the most

enlightened country? Or is it because Dr. Goldmann is frightened? Perhaps we will be accused of lending a hand in the Cold War? I know of no Jewish organization in the whole world which has anything to do with Cold War. I, within the circle of my friends, know of no intellectual, merchant, or workman, who lends in slandering the Russian regime. We as a public body are not interested in the internal regime of any country. We have neither the will nor the competence to interfere. We have the right, we have the will, we have the historic duty, to demand that the doors be opened. We need this voice emanating from the depths of the Jewish soul, the voice crying out for unity, for brotherhood among the various sections of the Jewish people scattered over Russia and over the entire world, so that we can comfort the Jews of Russia and ourselves.

Rabbi Dr. Bernard Bergman
(Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi - U.S.A.)

Up to the present time immigration into Israel has been almost entirely a forced immigration. The newcomers were forced to leave their countries of origin under stress of political circumstances and to come to Israel. But when we speak about Aliyah from the Western countries, we must not delude ourselves, we must ask ourselves what is the power of Israel's attraction. What is to persuade the immigrants to come to the State of Israel. We must give the new immigrants and the youth a spiritual content here in the State, if we wish to attract them. And if we have been successful, through the Immigration Department headed by Mr. Shragai, to penetrate into Chassidic circles and other religious Jews, these too are sometimes discouraged by the creation of religious problems which might well have been avoided by mutual discussion and consultation with the Chief rabbinate.

A colleague just now said to me: Do not touch on the matter of the autopsies. I do not intend to do so, I do not propose to issue any decision on the matter. Our Halachah is democratic enough and liberal enough to allow a round table discussion to reach an understanding. The problem is not an easy one — I understand that very well. But a solution to problems of this nature can be found within the framework of the Halachah.

And when we speak about the painful problem of Yeridah — re-emigration, many participants in the debate have underlined its gravity — I should like to say that one of the major causes for this Yeridah is the black plague of missionary activity in the State of Israel. We know, and I have statistical data to prove it, that the missions have secured visas for hundreds of people, to Canada and to other countries. This is a very painful movement here in the country.

I wish to take advantage of the opportunity to comment on a tragic news item in the newspapers, to the effect that the Hebrew University has resolved to establish a Department for Catholic Studies — a Catholic faculty in the Holy City of Jerusalem! Members of the General Council! Jerusalem the Holy, Mount Zion, the site of the Sanctuary on the same mountain as a Catholic Faculty! What a terrible manifestation! We call upon the Jewish Agency, the Zionist General Council, to protest against such a shameful project, not to allow a profanation of the Divine Name. We contribute funds for the Hebrew University, and we cannot permit this to happen. Let us hope that in our times the prophesy will be realised "And many nations shall go in Thy light", and all nations come to the true Divine Light and say, "Come and let us go up to the mount of the House of the Lord".

Professor Marie Syrkin
(Member of the Executive - New York)

The question of Aliyah which is before us, and particularly the question of Aliyah from the United States, with which I am familiar, obviously raises both long-range and immediate questions. I will make a curious confession here. I am not a traditional Jew; I am a secular Jew - but if I had to do it over again, I don't say that I would become a believer, because I don't think that's something which one can will, but I would have a traditional home. And I say this - I don't know whether this is irreverent - on national rather than religious grounds; because even when we consider the scene in the United States we know that among our alienated intellectuals many have come from good traditional homes, but they at least know what they are rebelling against. The danger that hovers over us is that there is going to grow up a generation which will have nothing to rebel against, and that in itself is, of course, a tremendous peril.

I spoke recently to a Princeton professor, not a Jew, who couldn't care less as to whether Jews assimilate or not. As a purely professional job he was given the task of studying a number of Jewish communities in the United States and very calmly, very cheerfully, he gave me the happy prognosis that in seventy-five years there will be no Jewish problem in the United States because there will be no Jews.

Now to come to the question of Aliyah. Obviously re-organization in the United States, better absorption, etc. - I shall not belabour these points again - are essential. But these are not the magic formulas; I don't know that we have the magic formulas. The only thing that I can think of is this. We ask why does idealistic youth in the United States go to the Peace Corps? They go because they are idealistic. What we have failed to do, I think, is to present that aspect to them. Lately, Israel is presented as a success story. Youth is not fired by a success story. They associate success with Establishment.

What we have failed to do is to come to this youth, who have never known the great emptiness of a world without a Jewish State and to show them the realization of what that would mean. It can be reached only if it believes that as an act of historic justice such a State must exist. Koestler said, not long ago, that Zionism solves the problem of the Jew because if there is a Jewish State it will exist and non-Zionist Jews will be free to assimilate. And that was accepted as a formula by many. I think we must realize that this form of escapism, this formula, is not valid; it has been disproven by the trends of the present. We must, I think, bring home that the wonder of a restored state is not an automatic guarantee of its existence. A miracle is not inevitably eternal. True, we must not speak of catastrophe, or of the possibility of a Hitler in the United States, but I think we can rightfully raise the image of a catastrophe in history. I cannot forget the ship which circled the shores of the United States in 1939 – and found nowhere to land. That ship with nowhere to land is the image of Jewish destiny except for Israel – and it is an image whose force, I think, every Jew will be able to perceive. Should demographic trends continue without reversal, without Aliyah in Israel, with continuing assimilation in the West, the lines will converge to a fatal nothingness – but, ironically, that ship laden with Jews may still be there.

Zivia Loubetkin spoke of the process when the masses were driven by need. We can no longer rely on the inert process. We must think in terms of volition, active volition – otherwise our period may be a period of which still another terrible question will be asked already, tragic questions have been asked of our times – tragic questions in regard to the perishing of the Jews of Europe; and still more terrible questions will perhaps be asked of it in retrospect. The Jews of Europe were helpless before savage forces which overpowered them, but from them – from the survivors – sprang the national will which helped create the State. We have been sure, until now, that the last act of the great drama of which we were witnesses and in which we

were participants has had an inevitably glorious finale, applauded by the world. Was our confidence premature? Is the last act of the Jewish people's history in the twentieth century to be a passive decline, a bloodless withering? The answer to the question will be determined by Aliyah, the measure of life-giving involvement with the source of Jewish peoplehood.

We must try all the ways: education, trips to Israel, study in Israel – you know them as well as I – but with the urgency that comes from the sense of the void if we fail. In all this talk of co-existence, with this power or that power, we must bear in mind the more insidious threat of non-existence should we let slip the great creative act of the Jewish people in the last two thousand years. In this land David conquered Goliath more than once – these Goliaths were the physical enemies consisting of hostile men and a harsh nature. It is our duty to see to it, and I believe we can, that the valiant, imaginative conqueror of Goliath – the visionary who overcame – is not, in turn, destroyed cravenly, not by a Goliath but by the stupid Golem of passivity.

Jacques Orfus

(World Union of General Zionists - France)

The immigrant enters upon a critical period when he begins to doubt the wisdom of his coming to Israel and he starts pestering himself with the question "Was I right in leaving my home in the Golah?" It is then that he stands in need of social integration, friends whom he can talk to, who can explain to him that this is a transient phase, that the difficulties will pass, who can encourage him and help him and enable him to withstand the temptations of Yeridah. This case points up the need to create an atmosphere of social integration.

About the appeal voiced by the Prime Minister, Levi Eshkol, in regard to the obligations and duties of the

Zionist Movement in regard to Aliyah: An abyss separates his call and the actual conditions for absorption in this country. We live in a time when we cannot rely on miracles. When an immigrant comes here from a country – I am not referring to countries of distress, I am speaking about the affluent countries – and facilities for acclimatization, and finding a suitable place in the economic life of the country are not granted him, no propaganda in the world, no Zionist Organization, is likely to be of any avail. The World Zionist Organization can carry on propaganda in favour of immigration into Israel but the Jew who comes here and writes back to his relatives and friends and tells them about his first impressions of Israel is of more weight than all the propaganda of the Zionist Organization. Thus the question of absorption is at least as important as that of immigration. And when the Prime Minister issues an appeal to the Zionist Organization we must tell him that we cannot accept the obligation if here in this country the initial part of the duty, that absorption should be conducted on suitable lines, is not fulfilled.

A remark about our work in the Golah. The Jewish Agency must not be party to the internal affairs of the Zionist Federations. The basic assumption must be that we constitute a free movement, and that decisions cannot be taken solely on the basis of the majority voting against the minority. Nobody has the power to force a Zionist party to remain within or even to join a federation, if that party feels it will not find suitable place there. Moral pressure may be applied; it may be that the Jewish Agency possesses the function to persuade one party or another to enter a Zionist Federation, to operate solely with the group that exists is a false policy.

In the country in which I reside, in France, there is something wrong with the projects that we are trying to launch. Something is wrong from the point of view of the Jewish Agency. The President of the World Zionist Organization, the Chairman of the Executive, have each tried

to create a basis for cooperation of the Jewish Agency on the spot with the Zionist Federation. But they give us the impression that they have not the slightest power to compel the Departments to accept their proposals. Some method must be worked out, a system whereby the shaliach of whatever Department of the Jewish Agency, residing let us say in Paris – or New York or England for that matter – must also feel that he serves the Zionist leadership of the country in which he is operating.

Jacob Katzman
(Union Poale-Zion-Hitachdut - U.S.A.)

The time has come to stop talking about Aliyah in the abstract, and to start thinking about, and setting up, the concrete new programmes that are required, to make Aliyah. For, whatever may have been the situation in the past, there is not a single Zionist organization today, there is not a single Zionist leader today who does not with all his heart want to see Aliyah increase – and, yes, from America too! The problem is: How do we go about harnessing this interest? What can we do, in a workable way, to carry it into wider circles – beginning, of course, first of all with our own Zionist families and spreading it into the larger community?

This is not something for which the onus rests alone on us in the Diaspora. We cannot and we do not want to divest ourselves of the responsibility that must rest squarely on our shoulders; but, at the same time, I have the conviction that an even greater responsibility rests with you, our colleagues in Israel. Why do you not marshal all the forces that are required, not only to storm the Diaspora, on behalf of Aliyah, but also to work on and to devise and to put into action all those things that are required – and without stint – to mobilize the Aliyah from the Western world as if it were indeed a matter of life and death?

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not trying to shift the responsibility to you alone. As a Zionist, I recognize that besides the needs of Israel there is also the innate, the essential, meaning of Zionism which dictates or, should dictate, the personal need for self-realization through Aliyah. But no matter how much I am prepared to share the responsibility for Aliyah. I have to reckon with the fact that it is not the push from America but the pull from Israel that is decisive in this matter today. I use the word "pull" in its broadest sense, as including not only the historic and the cultural and the spiritual aspects, but also the essential nation-building needs that have to be met and that can have an appeal to the heart and to the conscience of significant segments of Jewish youth, including American Jewish youth. Mine, therefore, is not a shifting of responsibility but an earnest plan: Help us! Yes, help us to devise the ways and to adopt the means, and to do what is necessary that Aliyah from my country too may be increased, that it may begin at least to meet in greater measure the needs of which you speak and which I accept without question.

And if this will be taken by some as a confession of failure on our part, so be it, I am not concerned about preserving our reputation so much as I am concerned with the fundamental question itself, and with what must be done about it! And although I have not been mandated by the American Zionist Movement in its totality to say so, I have the deep faith that when you and we sit down together, not only in the atmosphere of harangue, however sincere and deeply felt, but with sober regard for the development of the approaches and the methods, and the means, we can together mobilize a growing Aliyah from year to year also in America.

NINTH MEETING

(Wednesday, 11 January, 1967, in the afternoon)

Chairman: BARUCH WEINSTEIN

ELECTION OF COMMITTEES

The names of members of the various committees of the Zionist General Council were read out at the beginning of the meeting. (The list is published at the end of this volume).

Continuation of the Debate on
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE ZIONIST EXECUTIVE,
ITS PLANS AND BUDGET

Dr. Jose Schmidt
(Union of General Zionists - Brazil)

Brazil is a country of Jewish new immigrants, who came to that country between 1930 and 1945. Today the generation born in Brazil, the generation to which I personally belong, is taking over the leadership of the community. It is not an easy task for us. We always argued that our elders did not want to hand over the communal reins to us. Today we see that the contrary is the case, but that there is no one on the receiving end. For this situation they themselves are largely guilty.

I wish you to know that our task in Brazil is a difficult one. The Jews live in the centre and the distances there are not like in Israel or like in Europe. It takes four to seven hours by plane from one point to another. The Zionist Movement in Brazil is doing good work. Whether it is doing its job perfectly, or whether it could not do it better, is entirely another question. I believe that the current leaders of Zionism in Brazil can do a better job.

For the first time two young people, born in Brazil, have been elected to a committee. The two are my friend Fuhrer and myself. In Brazil, moreover, the parties are doing very good work. Every time we are told by Israel that we must put an end to the parties; we have also received much advice on many occasions from the American Jewish Committee and from the Bnai Brith asking what we need parties for.

We lack leaders in Brazil, people with whom we can take counsel. We have the problem of shlichim. We must have shlichim in Brazil who are familiar with us, who know the American mentality, who can speak the language. Do not send anybody to Brazil who cannot speak Portuguese, and can make himself understood neither in English nor in Yiddish. In Brazil the language of Zionism is Portuguese. The new youth, be it good or bad, speaks Portuguese. Today we have Jewish schools in which both Hebrew and Yiddish are studied. Previously this was not the case.

So I ask you: When you send shlichim to Brazil choose people who speak our language, who know something about our geography, where Brazil lies.

Izak Warszawski

(World Confederation of General Zionists - France)

There was a time when Zionists had the deciding voice in determining policies in a Zionist spirit. This was a major feature in our Zionist tactics, in the conquest of the communities. What happened then? Contacts were established with the central Jewish institutions, without the participation of the Zionist Federations in the various countries or of the Zionist leaders, who for years had headed Zionist activity, and at the same time were active in the communal affairs. In this manner the enthusiasm of Zionists was quenched, and they lost much of their prestige.

We must appreciate that central Jewish institutions, however important they may be, however important the congregation carrying on Jewish activity, cannot reflect a Zionist consciousness, achieving organized expression in a Zionist Movement, particularly in such complex matters as Aliyah, education and the like; because only Zionists trained in the original spirit of Herzlian Zionism are capable of coping with all the difficulties they encounter and carrying out their main Zionist duties.

Our Confederation in France last year sent 26 young people for a year of service - "Shnat Sherut" - in Israel. Some of them remained in this country. This reflects the work being done in the various countries. We do the work and Zionist prestige must be enhanced accordingly; local federations must be fostered so that they develop into the major force in Jewish life. They must represent the Jewish Agency and its leadership, and thereby win over the Jewish institutions and increase Zionist influence.

As long as the Jewish Agency fails to understand that only by strengthening the local Zionist federation can the prestige of the local Zionist leaders be enhanced, can the central Jewish institutions and the congregations be reached. When all is said and done it is the local Zionist leaders who are familiar with the mentality, the customs and the traditions of the community in question; they speak the language of the local institutions. If we fail to harness their potential strength then I do not believe that with the aid of shlichim alone we have any chance of reaching the institutions. For this reason the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem must remember that contacts must be established exclusively through the Zionist federations. The strengthening of the Zionist federations can lead to the strengthening of the entire complex of Jewish life in the Diaspora, and more effective observance of Zionist duties.

No gap should be allowed to separate the Department of the Jewish Agency in the Golah from the local Zionist

federations. They must be one. No real difference exists. We must have the shlichim sent out by the Jewish Agency. We must have the officials working in the various Departments. And there are important people who have the experience, who are prepared to carry out certain duties, but they must also be prepared to collaborate with our people. They must work together with the local leaders, they cannot ignore them. On the contrary they should take advantage of our loyal workers in the Israel interest, enlist them for Aliyah, the appeals, for Hebrew education, and generally for bringing the Israel spirit to the Diaspora.

It is only through such close cooperation between the Departments of the Jewish Agency and the Zionist federations, inspired by the same ideals and aims, that the Zionist Movement can be strengthened, and be brought to the stage where it can furnish the necessary material, moral and political aid which Israel expects from World Jewry.

Shimon Avizemer

(Union Poale-Zion Hitachdut - Israel)

I do not share the views either of the pessimists in the Diaspora, or of the disappointed and mockers in Israel. We know that from the very beginning of our people there have always been nihilistic currents undermining our inner morale. There were times when it seemed that the pessimists would be proved right, but always the instinct for national survival proved triumphant. It was always a proud and traditional instinct. Have we, representatives of the Zionist Movement, lost our will to survive, the willingness to take up the challenge? Are we not all of us conscious that our sons and daughters in the Diaspora are being torn up by the roots? When will such a consciousness move the Jews of the Golah, when will they understand that no true Jewish national growth is possible except under these skies?

We have heard much severe criticism here in regard to the gloomy situation in Israel. I should like to raise the

morale of friends from Israel and the Golah, the representatives of the Zionist Movement. After all is said and done we are still engaged in setting up the walls of the State. We are still trying to build up an independent State economy. We are still engaged in the wonderful task of developing Jewish education, and of ensuring that Israel children from early childhood to the age of higher education receive a proper schooling. More than seven hundred thousand children are in the network from kindergarten to institutions for higher education. We are living the daily struggle to ensure Israel's security. Is this all a gloomy picture? Mistakes have been made, there is no doubt, and no one should ignore them. Many among us, regrettably, refuse to see the light and welcome the shadows. But in sum what is positive preponderates in all spheres of life in the State. For the very existence of the people, in order to make Israel stronger and more attractive, in order to allow a refreshing Jewish national breeze to purify Jewry in the Diaspora, we must make it clear to ourselves that the year ahead will be a year of trial for the Zionist Movement and for the Jewish world, in the organization of Jewish communal life upon a broader and stronger basis, in the intensification and expansion of Jewish education, and in the dissemination of the Hebrew language among the Jews of the Golah and in immigration into Israel. These are the main duties which must be fulfilled together, corporately and with a new elan.

Harry Landy

(Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi - Great Britain)

Each and every one of us must be concerned with and must in every way endeavour to aid and show out solidarity with our brethren in Russia. In England, we are doing all we can. The Board of Deputies of British Jews has set up a Committee consisting of representatives of all organizations in order to consider ways and means of dealing with this problem, having particular regard to an approach at

the appropriate time to Soviet representatives. I would like to refer here to the earnestness with which the Jewish university students are devoting themselves to this issue. They are organizing protest meetings of Jews and non-Jews addressed by Members of Parliament, canvassing Members of Parliament and raising funds for this work. It is most encouraging to see such solidarity with the lot of their brethren on the part of second and third generation British-born Jews.

Dr. Goldmann still believes in the possibility of a non-party organization. The World Jewish Congress is supposed to be a non-party body. In England as a result of the British Zionist Federation caucus, Mizrachi and other organizations are no longer represented in the British section. Can Dr. Goldmann enforce the Constitution and correct this? I say he cannot do so, in the same way that he cannot enforce in England a territorial Zionist body to include all British Zionist federations, despite the oft-passed resolutions of the General Council and Congress.

We have always known that Aliyah is the life-blood of the State. Recently I was told by a high official of the Bank of England — a non-Jew who has visited Israel — that the economic problems were inevitable unless the growth in population continued. As a religious Jew I believe that the Divine Prophecy of Kibbutz Galuyoth will be realized. We have until recently seen as one door closes another opens and I am sure that this will continue. I, too, share the hope, please God, of a large immigration from Soviet Russia in the not-too-distant future. The prophets have told us that if we do not go willingly we will be made to go. Anti-Semitism is again rearing its ugly head to remind us that we are not in our Homeland. But we must make things easier for the would-be Oleh. I would suggest that a special committee be set up to investigate the specific cause of Yoredim and to recommend corrective steps. For every one that returns, two or many more are discouraged from coming on Aliyah. And for every one who is settled satisfactorily at least two others may follow.

Yigal Allon, in an excellent speech, referred to investments and exports. Investors already here should be assisted by Government loans to maintain and increase exports. If they succeed, others will follow. If they fail, others will not come. Let it not be a truism "that to make a small fortune in Israel you have to come with a big one". He also said that housing and jobs are available. Generalities are not sufficient. Specific facts are wanted and promises that will be kept without reservations and without the cynicism of bureaucracy in arranging a settlement. A humane approach is even more important than comforts.

It is essential that an extract of all propositions made by many delegates should find their way to the respective Government and Agency Departments and not be left in the minutes merely for the archives. If we set ourselves to face these tasks realistically then our meeting here and all our talking will have been worthwhile.

Mrs. Chaika Grossman-Orkin
(Mapam - Israel)

It cannot be denied that non-Zionist doctrines have taken root even within the Zionist Movement. One of the tasks of Zionism is to warn about the course of impending events. I have not the slightest doubt about the process of advance and I believe in the brotherhood of nations that will prove triumphant. I do not think that we should try to make people's flesh creep with prophecies of a new catastrophe, but it is our duty to prevent disaster. For this reason we must be fully familiar with the past, to assess the present realistically and to work for the future. That is Zionism. But are the representatives of Zionism in the Golah really telling the truth about the dangers that threaten, or are they trying to avoid seeing them? And have we in Israel not perhaps adjusted ourselves to this type of escapism? Instead of uttering a warning note we are consoling and calming our people?

We are educating the younger generation in the spirit of the dependence of Jews on philo-Semitism and anti-Semitism in their milieu. That is not true Zionism. Zionism must furnish a radical solution to Jewish nationhood, to Jewish sociology, and also to Jewish psychology. Jewish pride and Jewish existence for itself, and not because of the nobility of others, is also part and parcel of the Zionist programme. This is called auto-emancipation. The problem of Jewish survival must be seen only in its historic context. In history we have witnessed how an anti-Semitic minority developed into a majority and how a democratic majority can degenerate into a paralyzed minority. We have paid a high price for this lesson. Let us not tell the Jews again and again merely what they want to hear.

I regret that I must enter into a debate with the President of the World Zionist Organization, who is not here at present. There are certain sections of his speech upon which I agree with him. The President has informed us that most Germans today are anti-Nazis. That is not true even if we try to be objective ad absurdum. When he embarked from his plane in Lydda he brought tidings to the people dwelling in Zion: the new Bonn Government, headed by Kiesinger, will now be more favourable towards Israel. And politicians in Israel found it necessary to stress that the NPD polled no more than eight per cent of the votes in the recent elections. Ergo, 92 per cent of the Germans are anti-Nazis. All this brings me to the conclusion that we are not fulfilling our Zionist duty. Neither Israel nor the Zionist Movement are demonstrating that tense vigilance regarding Nazi danger. All of us, and not only those who demonstrated in the Dizengoff Square a fortnight ago, should have insisted that the NPD be outlawed. We should all of us have condemned the choice of Kiesinger as German Chancellor. The German debate is not superficial as it is made out to be, and it is not to be solved with an argument of "raison d'état", vis-à-vis the emotions of the survivors of the Holocaust. If there is an economic interest, is it

sufficient to change Kiesinger the Nazi? Can economic interest alter the fact of his twelve years of service with the Nazi machine, when it slaughtered six million Jews? Of course I know that there is a certain logic in all this. There is also a certain logic in the fact that the President of the Zionist Organization came before all leaders of the West to shake Kiesinger by the hand, but I reject that logic. For in keeping with that logic we feel uncomfortable when Jewish youth demonstrates against the rise of the Nazis and against Kiesinger in New York or even in Tel Aviv. Then it is not so comfortable to pass unambiguous resolutions against the Law of Limitation and against the Nazis still serving in leading positions of the Administration. Thus even if we do not intend it to be so we are furnishing an indulgence to the murderer. And as a corollary thereby we are increasing cynicism in our own camp.

These are serious matters. They are far more serious than cultural relations with the Germans. Zionism is blemished, and it is emptied of its function to utter a note of warning against a recurrence of a national catastrophe. Why turn the debate into a side street about emotions, about reason, when everything is so simple, horribly simple? I admit, Dr. Goldmann has been a target for too much criticism up to the present. I am of the opinion that this criticism should be shared more fairly between more personalities and institutions.

GREETINGS TO DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN

Jacob Tsur

(Chairman, Zionist General Council)

I have requested the Chairman to permit me, on behalf of all those present, to send our best wishes and congratulations to one of our leading members, Dr. Israel Goldstein, Member of the Executive, on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.

At the reception to be held today, and I am sure on other occasions that will certainly follow, expression will be given to his life's work. I have no intention accordingly of detailing now what he has done for and in the name of the Zionist Movement. I will rest content with the statement that there are few leaders who are regarded by the majority of those seated here today, from Left to Right, primarily as a friend and colleague. I am happy that it is possible today to send him greetings as one resident of Jerusalem to another. We have always regarded him as a representative par excellence, of the second generation in American Zionism, in a sense of member of the "Second Aliyah" in American Zionism. For many years now he has been active in many fields; in education and culture, in the struggle to disseminate the Hebrew language, in the organization of the Zionist Organization, in the international struggle for Jewish rights, on behalf of the funds, in the organization of appeals for funds for Israel, and permit me to add as Head of the Jewish National Fund, in his capacity of Chairman of the Keren Hayesod who at the same time has perhaps done more than any other man for the consolidation of the Jewish National Fund in that country.

His has been a full life, replete with energy and achievement. Our greetings are also extended to his wife, who, too, has been active in public life affairs. Indeed one cannot separate them despite differences in party outlook. Theirs is perhaps the closest and most comradely coalition that we know of. May it be granted him to continue his fruitful work for many years to come, to fulfil his national duty and to remain active on behalf of our national culture in the Diaspora.

GREETINGS TO ZIONIST PERSONALITIES
ON THE OCCASION OF THEIR ANNIVERSARIES

Baruch Weinstein

(Member of the Presidium of the Zionist General Council)

I have been entrusted with an honourable duty by the Presidium of the Zionist General Council to invite you to leave this debating chamber for a while and to enter the shrine where there are Zionist figures who are living with us here today, all of whom, with the exception of only one, have reached the ripe age of eighty.

This gallery includes two women, one calling us back to the romantic days of the Galilean Shomrim – a distinct era in Zionist history and in the annals of the Yishuv of Eretz Yisrael. She has and had an official title, wife and today widow of the Second President of the State of Israel. But it is not that title which sums up her personality, surrounded in an aura of charm, of struggle, vision and resolution. I am, of course, speaking of Rachel Yanait Ben Zvi.

The other is a member of the kibbutz of Mishmar Ha'emek. At one time we sat together as Members of the Zionist General Council. She was one of the active Zionists in women's organization, heading Hadassah – Irma Lindheim.

Now I come to a man with whom we were closely associated in our daily Zionist work, as Secretary of the World Zionist Organization. Personally I recall him from the London period. We saw him burrowing in books, intent upon scrupulous observance of the Zionist Constitution. He is a devoted Zionist who served the World Zionist Organization in the good days as in the bad. He is our dear Dr. A.L. Lauterbach.

And now one of the veterans of the Galician Zionist Movement, of classic Zionism. He, too, at one time served as a Member of the Zionist General Council and made his contribution towards the reinforcement of Zionist ideology and of the Movement generally – Dr. Spann.

Now I come to a seventy-five year old. With him we strove mightily, in both the political and the ideological fields. He led us to Prague, to the Prague Zionist group headed by the Selbster, and also Max Brod and the Weltch brothers. Robert Weltch is now seventy-five years old. He served as editor of the "Juedische Rundschau". He leads us back to Meinicke Strasse, the headquarters of the German Zionism. He held opinions which many among us did not support, but they contributed intellectually to the treasury of Zionist thinking. Robert Weltch heads the van of the Zionist intellectuals. Even today, far from the course of active Zionism, from his residence in London he continues to make his publicistic contribution, of a classically high standard, which is perhaps not popular because it is so serious.

There is another celebrant, Rabbi Shachter, a leader of Zionism in Ireland, where he served as Head of the Jewish National Fund. He, too, was at one time a Member of the Zionist General Council.

From another world, from Czechoslovakia came Walter Kolner, President of the Zionist Organization in that humanistic Czechoslovakia.

The greetings and good wishes of the General Council are sent to all celebrants, that they be granted many years of good health and happiness.

Continuation of the Debate on
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE,
ITS PLANS AND BUDGET

Leon Kronitz
(Union Poale-Zion-Hitachdut - Canada)

Resentment, and scolding American Jewry, will not set in motion any wave of Aliyah from that country. Aliyah calls for preparation. Only after such preparation can one

expect an increased influx of immigrants. Generally speaking Aliyah from the West is not motivated by any outside pressure. It is produced by the force of attraction. Such an attraction must be exerted by Israel but not only in Israel. A magnet does not attract everything. It attracts certain metals, certainly not wood. A lot must be done to ensure the operation of Israel's magnetic force, but more must be done among the Jews in the Golah, to make them feel the attraction of Israel.

Bialik's statement "Verily the people is as grass, they are dry as timber" is as true as at the time when it was written. American Jewry is a good Jewry, but it is sadly lacking in Zionist enthusiasm. It is a dry Jewry. Much is spoken about Aliyah and the youth. But why should American young people want to come to Israel? What do they know of Israel, what do they know of Zionism? Not only have they not received any Zionist education, but the majority of them have never even learnt anything about Judaism. Sixty to seventy per cent of them do not know the Hebrew alphabet. They never went to a Jewish school. They are proud of Israel, but they are conscious of no inner urge to live in Israel. What we need is to educate the younger generation to want to settle in Israel.

I wish to take advantage of the opportunity to make the following statement. Canadian Zionism was recently discussed in the general and Zionist press. There existed a serious danger of a split in the Canadian Zionist Movement. I am gratified to inform the General Council that such a rupture has been avoided. And instead of a split what has resulted is a state of true unity in the Canadian Zionist Movement. A Federated Zionist Organization of Canada has been created, incorporating all groups — the Zionist Organization, the Zionist Labour Movement, the Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi, Herut, Achdut Ha'avoda and Mapam. The new body will carry on all common activities of the Zionist parties and groups. That such agreement has been reached, is a reflection of the sense of responsibility

animating the leadership in our country. Each relinquished something of his autonomy for the common good.

We are convinced that this unity will open up a new era in Canadian Zionism with prospects for a progressive and extended programme of Zionist activities in the interests of Israel and Canadian Jewry.

Mrs. Charlotte Jacobson
(World Confederation of General Zionists - U.S.A.)

I have hesitated to take the platform to speak at these sessions because for a long time Hadassah has been a valiant, although losing fighter to change the formula of this general debate. We have pleaded, and written countless letters, expressing the fervent hope that the time all of us give, at great sacrifice, to these sessions of the Zionist Movement could be put to more productive discussions than those which come forth from this outmoded formula of general debate. Maybe if the Movement at long last is reorganizing its Executive and maybe if at long last the Reorganization Commission is trying to change the structure of the Movement some day our voices will be heard and more opportunities for more thoughtful presentations to the point will be part of the formula of planning these meetings.

Because the subject of Aliyah was made the main theme of this session of the General Council and because all the speeches have been directed - and rightly so - to the American Jewish community - I feel impelled to speak, although I say, again, with great reluctance. Hadassah prides itself as an organization that does not make speeches for the sake of propaganda and we will not take the platform to make promises or to state commitments which we do not know how to carry out. I did not want it misunderstood; I did not want Hadassah being quoted that it was not in favour of Aliyah nor that it was not in favour of trying to

do everything for Aliyah. It is simply that I do not feel that either the Zionist Movement, the American Jewish community or the Jewish Agency have found the way to attract Americans to come to Israel.

I am absolutely amazed at the constant talk and reference to the Peace Corps as a parallel example. A young man or woman who goes into the Peace Corps goes in for two years and returns home to his or her own community. What is more, he goes as an expert. He goes to a country where he is treated with great respect. He goes to set an example. He is looked up to - and when he returns home he feels he has made a contribution.

I think you will admit that that is not exactly the position of the American who tries to find his way in this very, very difficult absorption process into the Israel community. It is our belief in Hadassah that the programmes which now exist are sufficient. There are countless programmes which are excellent, which have not really received our full and devoted attention as the means of bringing young people to Israel for the Summer, for six months, for a year, or to spend time at the University. Giving young people contact with Israel is the best way of implanting the seed of positive Aliyah. If we have not sent more of them, it was not because we couldn't send more; it was because Israel was really not equipped to handle more of them in a way that wouldn't do more harm than good when they returned home. It isn't a very good experience when we receive letters from Israel from these young people, or get telephone calls from their parents telling us stories that absolutely amaze us about the inefficiency of their treatment when they come here.

I do not say it in criticism. We are all one. We have the programme, we have not found the way in which to carry it out properly and I think that all the speeches and propaganda that comes forth will not produce the Aliyah.

In Hadassah, at our Medical Centre in Jerusalem, we have this year for the first time allowed internes to come

from South America and from South Africa. It is our hope that these young people, after spending these few years as internes at Hadassah, will want to stay here. The way to make these people have a sense of commitment is to give them a sense of their being important and needed in the development of the community. And that is the ingredient that is missing in all this discussion of Aliyah. You give us a feeling that it is only numbers that count – and the numbers alone will not bring them. One has to have a sense of being able to play a role as an individual. Today 80 per cent American Jewish youth are attending colleges and universities, therefore you must understand they will not feel that their special gift is in the development of the Negev. They have not been trained for that – and if they come here they want to make a contribution in the area for which they have been trained.

Itzhak Artzi

(Member of the Executive – Jerusalem)

When, one day, the contribution of Zionism in the social sphere is examined, it will be found that the Movement produced two creative projects without parallel elsewhere in the world: cooperative settlement in all its diverse forms, and Youth Aliyah. It is by no means fortuitous that to this day these two projects merit much attention throughout the world. To this day Youth Aliyah is a source of wonder and admiration, for the methods it adopted and the achievements it has registered, in converting human flotsam into proud Jews, who have taken the fate of their own country into their own hands.

It is difficult to conceive the virile constructive role of Israel society without the contribution of the 130,000 graduates of Youth Aliyah, who occupy positions in all strata, as educators and professors, agriculturists, workers, soldiers. Statistics show that one citizen out of

twenty is a past pupil of Youth Aliyah. Thus our graduates constitute an important element, a central pillar of the emerging Israel society. In Israel society Youth Aliyah are represented mainly in the most important social stratum – that under fifty years of age.

But Youth Aliyah cannot rest upon its laurels. It cannot rest content with its achievements in the past. Let us examine what contribution it can make to the current problems of immigration and absorption. In the course of the current debate much has been said about increasing immigration from the West, about preventing re-emigration, about strengthening the Zionist element in Israel. What can Youth Aliyah contribute in this respect?

The dangerous backwash of re-emigration, which has affected large circles and not only of recent immigrants, the dissatisfaction and resentment which affect many of the newcomers, prove that no less important than the efforts being made to persuade the Jews to come here are those to enable Jews already in this country to strike root. Youth Aliyah plays an important role both in accelerating Aliyah and in social integration.

In the course of years Youth Aliyah has developed a ramified network of places of absorption, grammar and vocational schools, institutions for secondary education, places where religious children could be placed. All these many and diverse institutions can constitute a magnet for all young people who in the years of their intellectual development would like to breathe the Israel atmosphere, who wish to bind their personal future to the destiny of the State of Israel. The emissaries of Youth Aliyah operating abroad are few and we do not propose to increase their number. For that reason I wish to take advantage of the opportunity presented to me now and to call upon the delegates coming from the various countries, particularly to those who are trying to increase Aliyah to Israel, to consider the possibilities offered by Youth Aliyah to younger people. The

doors of our schools and institutions are open wide for these boys and girls. Youth Aliyah, indeed, has proved itself sufficiently flexible to meet the special needs of these youngsters. Such figures as 400 pupils coming from the countries of Latin America, 120 from the Anglo-American countries, 140 coming from Western Europe, can be increased. I certainly hope that they will increase. In the present year a special effort is being made in South America. And I trust that the Zionist bodies and the Aliyah Committees in these countries will lend every assistance in the effort being made to increase immigration from these countries. In 1967 Youth Aliyah was primarily engaged in the absorption of young people who came here together with their parents, from different countries.

The Zionist Movement cannot shake off the responsibility for the children of immigrants already in this country. There has been some talk in this chamber about the "second Israel" and already the danger of a third Israel looms large on the horizon. I have stated that we cannot restrict our task to bringing Jews from abroad to Israel. It is our duty to convert them into useful citizens. The State can do and indeed does much to enable the younger generation to strike root here, but it cannot do everything. Immigration creates special problems. There is the social gap, the clash between divergent cultures. The transition from the previous way of life to that lived in Israel creates a grave crisis, and the younger generation is the first to suffer. Thousands of immigrant children are calling for a solution to their problems. In the spirit of close cooperation between the Zionist Organization and the State of Israel that is already a tradition for the solution of these problems Youth Aliyah has taken care of these children for many years. The status of the immigrant is not only a function of the time he has been in the country, but one of the social conditions in which he lives. The economic recession has laid bare a sad state of affairs, It has transpired that many people whom we thought had already been integrated, have not been

integrated in fact. Most of the pupils of Youth Aliyah are the children of recent immigrants. Fifty one per cent of them come from families with four children or more. Most come from families who are unable to give their children a proper education and many of the latter have already failed to find their place in ordinary schools. Youth Aliyah offers them a new chance in life in the kibbutzim, in the youth villages, in the institutions for special education for children who have been the victims of adverse social circumstances, in the youth centres which are run jointly by Youth Aliyah, the Jewish Agency's Absorption Department and the Ministries for Labour and Education.

There are few enterprises in Israel or in the world at large for this matter, which can boast a reputation equal to that enjoyed by Youth Aliyah. The achievements it has registered are the fruit of the concerted efforts of a number of bodies who have acted in conjunction in the best traditions of pioneering Zionism – the kibbutz movement, successive cadres of educators, the enthusiastic supporters of Youth Aliyah throughout the world, thanks to whom the financial basis for our work has been found. Youth Aliyah has given these organizations Zionist aspiration, the consciousness of being partners in a great educational enterprise, sustained by humanitarian principles of universal import. From this rostrum I must express my gratitude to the Hadassah Women's Organization in the U.S.A., to the Youth Aliyah Committee in Great Britain, to Hadassah-WIZO in Canada, to the Pioneer Women, the Mizrahi Women, to WIZO and to that vast network of committees from Tokio to Belgium, including the Swiss, Mexican and French Committees, each and every one of which has operated to the limit of its ability and resources, to furnish Youth Aliyah with the high proportion – 53.5 per cent – of its funds which come from these sources. But this year we shall not be able to rest content with what you have done for the welfare and education of Jewish children. In view of the drastic retrenchment in the Jewish Agency's budget we must make new demands on you.

We shall extend our work to Latin America, which with the exception of Mexico does not participate in this aspect of our work. I trust that your response to our call will be positive and that you will do what you can to relieve the suffering of Jewish children.

Harry Hurwitz
(Herut-Hatzohar - South Africa)

For years now, we have been stressing and over-emphasizing the structural defects of the Zionist Movement. We have described the parties as the root of all evil. We have attempted to liquidate the parties, to reduce their influence and have suggested that the doors of the Zionist Movement are closed to others. At the opening session of this Council, the President of the Organization accused certain sections of the Israel press of presenting a biased and distorted picture of the situation in the country and on Monday morning, in the second portion of his address, he stated that as long as Zionism is based on Zionist political parties we will not fulfil our mission. These words of the President are harmful to the cause of Zionism, to the image of the Zionist Movement in the eyes of the young generation as the very things of which he accused sections of the Israel press. You say that this Zionist Movement, as it is presently constituted is unable to fulfil the mission of Zionism. So what do you want from this young generation of the twenty-fives and under? How do you expect to attract them to a Movement whose Presidency declares, openly and publicly, that it is incapable of fulfilling its mission. Knowing full well that with the best will in the world and all the efforts that he will make to affect structural changes, the reality is that the parties cannot be legislated out of existence, they will not go into voluntary liquidation; there may be certain modifications, but basically the Zionist Movement will continue to function as heretofore. And, therefore, what is our message to this young generation? What is our appeal to the twenty-fives and under?

I have the feeling that this whole attack on the party structure is a smokescreen to cover the real malaise in the Movement. I'm sorry that Mr. Pincus, in his excellent address, felt that we should not say, again and again, that what we face is a deep-seated spiritual and ideological crisis. It is so - and I believe that by emphasizing the structural changes we have put the cart before the horse. We are much more interested in the outer garment and less concerned, for the moment, with the soul of this Movement which is so vital to the intellectuals, to the young generation. And, therefore, my appeal, to the President of the Organization and to his colleagues, is to stop sniping at the parties. They are not damaging the parties. On the contrary, their attack on the party structure is creating a rare unity among various groupings. They are damaging the image of the Zionist Movement as a whole.

Actually, what is it that they want? My first experience of a General Council was when the President appeared on this platform and asked for the right to negotiate with the Synagogue Council of the United States in order to bring them into the Movement. We gave him the authority to do so. Then the President asked that he be permitted to invite youth delegations to the Congress. We gave him the right to do so. The President also asked for the right to invite representatives of communities to address the Congress on the last occasion. The President asked for the right to co-opt non-political personalities to the Executive. We gave him the authority to do so. We regret that not all these new members of the Executive were present at this session of the Council. What more is it that they want? What more is it that they ask? We are now told that there are sections of the people, that there are elements who still cannot find their place within the Zionist Movement. I deny this. I believe that anyone who is really and seriously interested in serving the cause of Israel and Zion can find his place within this Organization.

I come from South Africa. We have a Zionist Federation which I believe, in its structural composition, is already twenty years in advance of most territorial organizations. It is an organization in which there are parties and there is a non-party group, and there are women and youth and medical groups, and sports organizations. We live together, we work in harmony. We have our differences, sometimes more acute than others, but generally we have succeeded in finding a unity in diversity. We can hope for no more than that other territorial Zionist organizations should follow our model.

I see no necessity for further structural changes and for surrendering to the few individuals or groups who are still not satisfied because, as you know, the chain is as strong as its weakest link – and I would hate to see the Zionist Movement diluted for the benefit of those who are today standing aside, and who have for the last ten years or twenty years stood outside. We must at all times not confuse Zionists with friends of Israel whose service to the cause is limited both in scope and in vision and in its duration.

Dr. Berl Frymer
(Union Poale Zion-Hitachdut - Israel)

First of all I wish to deal with the question of reorganization. I do not believe that this is the panacea for our ills. However I favour reorganization for what we have at present is certainly not good. But there are two conditions a. Any reorganization that is not in keeping with the democratic nature of our movement is foredoomed. There is no substitute for the simple method known as elections, and if one adds other organizations to the existing Zionist parties, the character of the Movement will by no means be changed thereby. b. There is also the question whether this reorganization is capable of attracting the youth. I am fairly familiar with the latter. In the Argentine I spent days and

nights in seminars for these young people. I know the youth from America too, and perhaps the greatest danger threatening our movement is that it has no younger cadres.

The truth must be told: In the centres, in the congregations, young people are present. However to this day the Movement has not shown itself capable of bringing into its ranks these younger elements.

In this light the attack on the ideologies of the parties seems to me to be an obsession. With an abstract Zionism one cannot come to young people. Young men and women regard the Zionist Movement as part of the establishment which possesses no romantic aura or ideological attraction. If it is at all capable of attraction it will be to religious elements because it provides humanistic, spiritual content for some of them. And for a large section of the youth which is by nature belligerently liberal and socialistic, the challenge of pioneering Israel can prove attractive. Any other framework other than parties has not been invented by any democracy in the world.

I look forward with horror to a Zionist Organization which will be no more than a club for leaders, sans content, without any influence among the Jewish masses. I believe that of all bridges that connect Israel with the Golah, the most important in the last resort is the cultural-spiritual. Do not say: What is the use of the few millions of pounds for education in the light of the great needs of American Jewry which spends 65 million dollars a year on education, and this too is no more than a drop in the ocean?

Julian Mercer

(World Union of General Zionists - Australia)

I bring to the Zionist General Council the greetings of a small, but very active and progressive Jewish community—the Jewish community of Australia. We are proud, I think

with much justice, of our achievements. Our community counts seventy thousand souls, living mainly in two cities, Sydney and Melbourne, and we have collected one million dollars for the Appeal, that is the highest per capita contribution in the world. We have eight day-schools, one of which is renowned, with 1,500 pupils. We have three Jewish newspapers, two journals, youth organizations affiliated to all the movements, who are assisted by six shlichim from Israel.

We have much influence on the Board of Deputies, which indeed is a Zionist Board. There are people here who know this; we have a steady Aliyah of chalutzim. Ten to fifteen young people of the various Zionist youth organizations come to Israel every year, in addition to about one hundred emigrants to Israel in other categories. We have done a lot in the field of public relations.

We have a federation which has been in existence for some twenty years and which can serve as an example for other countries. Under the roof of this federation we have all Zionist parties without exception. In our Constitution we have a paragraph – for twelve years now – according to which those who do not wish to belong to a Zionist party can join the federation on a personal basis. I can promise you that by the next session I hope with God's help to bring you a photograph of such an individual member. But up to the present no application for personal membership has been lodged. This perhaps is a good thing because if fifty individual members applied for membership we should have on our hands the problem of how to grant them the representation to which they are entitled, notwithstanding the fact that they have nothing in common. But we are concerned about what will happen in another twenty years, How are we to ensure the survival of the Jewish people. And when we consider the situation we must come to the conclusion that if we wish to attract the youth there is only one way. The youth must be inspired with a Zionist ideal, with national consciousness, must become organically bound up with Jewish life and with the Jewish future.

It is surely not fortuitous that the strongest organization, that which possesses the most powerful attraction for the youth and which shows the best results is the Mizrachi. This has already been mentioned here. I am not a member of the Mizrachi, but I must take my hat off to this organization, for reasons which are perfectly simple. The Mizrachi has a maximalist ideology, with which it comes to the youth, and as long as we do not likewise, we shall not be able to conquer the youth. Ideals can be fostered if we have a strong Zionist organization at our disposal. Not an adulterated organization, but one that is capable of putting its ideals into practice.

Aron Luis

(Representative of the Delegation of the Youth Movements
in Israel)

It is an honour to me to be able to bring before this august gathering of the Zionist General Council the attitude and views of the Maccabi World Organization on problems engaging this session. From the very inception of our work we have regarded the physical education of youth as a means for bringing them into a Jewish framework and as preparation for duties towards the Jewish people and our country. A return to Jewishness precedes the return to Zion - this truth is as valid today as it was when Zionism set forth on its road. We have accordingly considered it our task to attract Jewish youth, who are still unorganized and are indifferent to Jewish problems, to the youth clubs where they can meet young people of their own age, and engage in sport and physical culture in keeping with the spirit of fair play, self-discipline and preparation for future tasks. In our own era the demands made by youth in this affluent society have multiplied after the Second World War. Excellently equipped clubs have been set up, and in order to get the young people into them they must be adjusted to their needs. While training in sport is in progress and between one activity and

another one can give the young some information about their own history, about the national revolution and the role played by Jewish young men and women in that revolution.

Individuals have always been attracted to the chalutz ideal. But we see before us the broad masses of Jewish youth going to non-Jewish clubs or completely unorganized, descending into apathy with no Jewish thinking to sustain them. For this reason we have evolved a programme that can prove attractive for all youngsters, that does not imply any obligation to settle in Israel forthwith, that does not tie the young person down into any partisan framework, but open new doors for integration in a Jewish atmosphere. Once the boy or girl enters the Maccabi framework he remains there, for in the club he finds a chance of developing his personality. The environment is comradely; it is one of equality and fraternity, with no dogmatic political fetters. This is the initial stage, and when he is integrated into the club he finds an interest also in Jewish educational activity. Sporting activity has never been an end in itself but rather a means to an end. This end, we believe, must be the continued existence of the Jewish people, because it is only when the boy or girl is convinced of the need for the continued existence of Jewry that we will feel the need to settle in Israel. To foster that obligation to ensure Jewish survival requires a close bond with the State of Israel. This can be achieved only with the aid of shlichim of a suitably high standard, inspired by the Maccabi ideals. We have embarked upon certain activities with the aid of the Youth and Hechalutz Department of the Jewish Agency. But at a time when the number of our members is increasing we find that the aid extended by the Agency is diminishing. Today we find ourselves in the ridiculous situation of only five shlichim operating among our members throughout the world. We suffer discrimination because we are not affiliated to any one of the political parties or factions represented in the Jewish Agency or the Zionist General Council. We do not share in the party key, notwithstanding the fact that our

numbers are far larger than parties who share out between themselves the quotas of shlichim and the financial allocations for youth work. In this period of search for new ways and methods, of bringing Zionist groups into the Zionist Organization the General Council must resolve on an increase in the funds allocated to the Youth and Hechalutz Department. We, representatives of Maccabi, call for adequate consideration for the scope and quality of the work we are doing among the youth.

Rabbi Dr. Simon Federbusch
(Virilist - United States)

I consider this session of the Zionist General Council particularly important for, in view of the crisis in which the Zionist Movement finds itself especially in the field of Aliyah, there is the feeling that Zionism is about to face a new test in which it must prove itself and justify its continued existence, and show that even in the present period it is capable of firing the masses with a pioneering spirit, not only in view of distress in the Golah, but because of love of Israel. That love is a lofty altruistic love, independent of the pressures in the Golah and motivated by an aspiration towards individual and national redemption.

Hence our responsibility to undertake the new task which has been summed up in the motto "With our face to the Golah". Regrettably in Mr. Pincus' excellent speech we were not told what the Executive had done to put this slogan into practice. On the contrary I know that in the course of the year the allocations to the Departments for Education and Culture were cut down further. The Executive and the Zionist Organization must concern themselves about a more intensive Jewish education, greater attachment to Eretz Israel, and a more basic Zionist concept.

If we speak about integral Jewish education as essential for setting in motion any wave of immigration from the more

affluent countries, this is possible only on the basis of the eternal values of the Torah. Religious education in this spirit gives rhyme and reason to the personal life of every Jew; it is this education that has enabled the survival of Jews throughout centuries of alienation and suffering. It is this education which lit up the darkness of the Golah with the light of hope for redemption. It has been said that Torah will go forth from Zion, but the reverse is also true — that Zion can go forth from the Torah, in other words that loyalty to the Torah of Israel can serve as the unshakable foundation for devotion and loyalty to Eretz Israel.

Abraham Hason
(Hanoar Hatzioni)

We had hoped, perhaps we were justified in hoping, that in the light of the resolution passed at the Zionist Congress, we stood on the threshold of a new campaign within the Jewish communities throughout the Diaspora, and especially among the youth. We had hoped that as a result the Zionist Movement would assist and exercise its influence on behalf of those engaged in the work of education, to repel the forces of assimilation which threaten our nation. But instead of this new campaign came retrenchment in financial allocations, instead of a concerted effort, planned and effective we witnessed successive blows the results of which were drastic reduction of the dimensions of Chalutz Shlichut, and restriction and even liquidation of highly important educational projects. It seems that the present is a suitable juncture to repeat to ourselves a number of ancient verities, which still hold true under the present arduous conditions, in which our national movement finds itself today.

The major question confronting the Zionist Organization today is not that of structural reform, it is not even the question of efficiency. It is the ideological question. The

essence of the problem lies in the fact that the Jerusalem Programme does not constitute an adequate basis for the definition of a movement that is fundamentally revolutionary. At all events the Chalutz movements and all its constituent groups and sections cannot rest content with that basis, because we must go out to the tens of thousands of boys and girls in the Diaspora with the message of global revolution, perhaps the greatest revolution of its kind in human history. It is with regret that I must note that for us, the representatives of the Chalutz movement, from Hashomer Hatzair to Betar, the meaning of the axe that has been wielded over the allocation for youth education work affects not only the financial aspects. What is far more significant is that it has been raised to cut down an important, perhaps most important, position, the central position in the Movement. From the Chairman of the Executive we have heard high praise of collective settlement in this country. This creative work, the foundation of which was educational work carried out in the Golah, this enterprise can serve us today under conditions which by general consent we can regard as anti-Zionistic. It pains me to say these things. Perhaps it is painful to hear them said. Without a clear scale of priorities in that same budget that has been presented to the Plenary Session of the Jewish Agency, in which work among the youth must be given pride of place, no Zionist work is at all conceivable.

TENTH MEETING

Wednesday, January 11, 1967, in the evening

Chairman: NAJMAN RADZICHOVSKI

Continuation of the Debate on
THE ACTIVITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE,
ITS PLANS AND BUDGET

Leon Ilutovich
(World Union of General Zionists - U.S.A.)

The cardinal error in plans for reorganization derives from the belief on which they are founded, that the problems confronting the Zionist Movement can be solved by organizational reforms and administrative measures. Personally I have great faith in the efficacy of good order and organization. But for long I have been convinced that our difficulties are not of an organizational character. Indeed, the contrary is true. They are ideological in their nature, questions of our programme, of the content of our work, of the policy that the Zionist Organization must pursue, if it wishes to carry on large-scale work. For that reason the theory is illusory that our problems arise out of the existence and operation of the political parties, and that if the parties were liquidated or their influence reduced problems would find their solution.

In the United States ten years ago the attempt was made to create a non-partisan framework for Zionists. It failed from the very outset, and even the fact that this "non-partisan" party excluded from its name "The American Jewish League for Israel", the term "Zionist" did not help it in any way. American Jews did not queue up to join this organization and the so-called "League" exists today only on paper.

Zionism has always been a political movement. For that reason it is unthinkable that the Zionist Movement, almost twenty years after the foundation of the State, should not have a special department to handle political affairs. The Jerusalem Programme formulated in 1951 calls for serious changes. Such questions as the situation of Russian Jewry, the emergence of Nazism in Germany and similar problems, must become part and parcel of Zionist work. They cannot be kept apart, they cannot be allowed to become the monopoly of other organizations, such as for example, the World Jewish Congress.

The Political Committee of our present session of the Council must consider how to revise the Jerusalem Programme, in order to bring within its scope questions which affect not only the State of Israel, but the Diaspora as well.

Professor Rabbi Simon Greenberg
(Member of the Executive - New York)

It seems to me that there is one problem which the four main addresses so far delivered did not face, or else merely touched upon. It was, before this last session or two, the most unpopular of all problems, but I'm beginning to see that everybody is now beginning to talk about it more; namely the problem of Zionist ideology. I believe everybody now recognizes that that problem is the central problem facing us from the long range point of view at this time. I do not like the word "ideology". It smacks too much of those barren scholastic dogmatisms which have all too frequently brought tragedy to mankind; in our day in particular ideologies have been the source of endless woe. I prefer to speak of an identifiable universe of discourse distinguished by the presence within it of a goodly number of interacting, ethically pregnant, concepts. What has happened to Zionism is that it has become identified with a rather narrow universe of discourse, distinguished by a

small number of concepts which are either intrinsically barren or whose deeper recesses have remained unexplored.

I would like to take the two paragraphs that have been referred to in the Introduction to the Constitution of the World Zionist Organization, and examine them for a moment and see what they have in mind and what they can mean to us. First is, of course, the Basle Programme. It speaks of the aim of Zionism, to create for the Jewish people a publicly recognized home in Palestine. In the Twenty-Third Congress, we spoke of the task of Zionism, not the aim but the task of Zionism, and that is the consolidation of the State of Israel, the ingathering of the exiles in Eretz Israel, and the fostering of the unity of the Jewish people. Now neither of these statements help us in understanding the primary, or one of the primary, ideas and concepts that are constantly causing us a great deal of trouble: the relationship between the Diaspora and the State of Israel. When the slogan of "Im hapanim el hagolah" came out, we all thought that there was going to be a sort of revolutionary approach, because it was supposed to be in contrast to what Mr. Ben Gurion had always been saying, that the definition of a Zionist is one who comes actually to settle in this land. At this particular session we have heard over and over again that that is really what is meant, that Zionism means Aliyah. It is impossible for any of us to stand here and say that Aliyah is not important; that it isn't central. But we must not forget that the gentleman in whose name there is a school run by the Agency, Haim Greenberg, urged us to come and remained in the Diaspora himself; and nobody accused him of not being a good Zionist. I don't say that there is an easy solution to that problem. And I'm not standing here to offer a simple and easy answer to this question. But let's understand what we mean when we say "Panim el hagolah". Do we really mean that we want a Jewish Tfutsah? Do we want five, six, seven million Jews in the United States, or will that be a catastrophe? Will it be a defeat of the Zionist Movement to have

strong Jewish communities wherever they can live? Is there some way of bridging this gap? I believe that there is a way of speaking about this subject in a manner that would be clear to all of us, and would really make us understand and believe that what we mean as Zionists is that we want a strong Jewish people everywhere in the world with its core and centre in this country. Take, for example, the whole problem of "Yeridah". If a Jew leaves Eretz Israel and comes into a Jewish community in the Diaspora and identifies himself with that community and helps to build it, none of us would complain too hard about it. What we are complaining about is that those who leave, come and do not remain a part of the Jewish people, and they are not among the great builders of our people everywhere.

I'd like to touch on one more aspect, which is taboo apparently at a Zionist Congress. We talk about the things which keep the Jewish people alive, that preserve the Jewish people. And I haven't heard anyone utter the word "synagogue" here. What is the last link between a Jew and his people? What is the ultimate cut-off point? We have come to the point where Jewish communities accept as leaders — and I'm not blaming them or passing judgement upon them — men who are intermarried, whose wives have not been converted and whose children are not growing up as Jews. But they still can remain as leaders within the community. But can you imagine a Jewish Christian being elected to an office in the Zionist Movement? Or a Jewish Mohammedan? Or a Jewish Buddhist? We don't expect every Jew ever to want to pray. Some Jews may never want to pray. But what we do want is that when a Jew does want to pray, he should want to pray in the Jewish way. And if he doesn't know how to pray in the Jewish way, you have cut him off from the Jewish people. Now we have that kind of a generation, in large numbers growing up right here, who are strangers to the house which has been the life-blood of our people. I grew up in the synagogue, and I wouldn't know what to do as a Jew without the synagogue, nor would my children, nor would tens of

thousands of other people in the United States and in other countries. But we're afraid to talk about it.

I want to tell you a very simple thing and what it means to be in "golus" right here. I have a yarmalkah in my pocket. I wouldn't dare to put it on here. I have enough courage to put it on — nobody's going to kill me about it; but I'll tell you why. Because it's become a label. And I don't want to be labelled. When I wear my "yarmalkah" in the United States nobody labels me in any particular way except that I'm wearing a "yarmalkah" and I'm a Jew. But here it has taken on the kind of thing that is dangerous, the symbol of a political party and not only of a religious conviction.

And I'll tell you what has happened that is dangerous to our people here. This is the only Jewish community in the world that has an active anti-religious movement! I don't know whom to blame for that, and I'm not casting any blame. But if you want to know what an image means for the Jewish people, and what it means for us to bring our young people here: we bring our young people here and we have to be careful that they don't see certain things or hear certain things because they might come away confused! Now I'm not arguing again; and please, remember that I'm limited to a very few remarks. And I'm merely talking about things that have to be talked about at greater length.

And one more thing and then I'm through: ideology, and its relation to what we are talking about when we talk to youth. Abraham was not appointed or chosen by God to be the ancestor of a people that should be dedicated to its unity. We are told that Zionists must foster the unity of the Jewish people. I don't understand what it means. You can't go out and tell the young people today who are thinking in broad terms, that there is a great purpose that the Jewish people have in the world, namely to preserve its unity. We were the first people in the world to conceive of themselves with a universal destiny and purpose. We were created to serve mankind — we weren't created to preserve

our unity! And our young people don't know that! We weren't created even to have a State; and I've heard leaders say over and over again that the State is not an end-all and a be-all. The State is a means. Well, a means to what? Are we telling our young people what it is a means to? We have to picture our movement and our existence as a Jewish people in the universal terms in which we were conceived as a people, instead of limiting our horizon.

Now I'm going to end rather abruptly by reading what I would like to suggest as a possible preamble to a Constitution for the World Zionist Organization: Zionism aims to make Judaism an effective spiritual force in shaping the life of the individual Jew wherever he may live, of the Jewish people, and of mankind as a whole; and believes that the existence of a politically independent, physically secure, economically viable, democratically organized State, a majority of whose citizens are Jews; and the nurturing of the Hebrew language as a language of daily use and literary expression for Jews throughout the world; and the maintenance in Jewish communities everywhere of a traditionally rooted, intellectually alert, ethically sensitive and socially effective synagogue are indispensable to the achievement of its aims." I would like to propose that as a possible preamble to our Constitution.

DR. NACHUM GOLDMANN'S REPLY TO THE DEBATE

At the outset I wish to congratulate our good friend and colleague, Mr. Jacob Tsur, on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. I see that he is pleased with the fact that he is marking his sixtieth anniversary. From my own point of view I think it is good to be sixty. I must tell you something about who he is and what he is. He is one of the most loyal workers of the Zionist Movement, who has had a very brilliant diplomatic career, and who gave up the attractions of that career, not God forbid, because he was not successful

in it, to work in the far less glamorous framework of the Zionist Movement. He believes not only in the need for the Movement but in the possibility of rejuvenating and reinvigorating it. In this spirit he has operated not only as the Head of the Jewish National Fund and the Chairman of the Zionist Council, but as Jacob Tsur – which is far more important. He has made an invaluable contribution already, and I trust that he will continue for many years to come to contribute to the renaissance and the reinforcement of the Zionist Movement.

I referred in my opening speech to the criticism being expressed in this country. Since then there have been other manifestations of the murderous internecine party strife in Israel and I have found it necessary to include in my present address a statement handed to the press and the radio. I will read it in the language in which it was made, in Hebrew.

"As President of the World Zionist Organization I wish to express my astonishment and profound regret at the intolerant and aggressive tone of the political party strife in Israel. It is natural and healthy in democracy for the opposition to criticise the Government. But here this criticism sometimes takes on the form of personal recrimination and insult, which inevitably undermine public ethics in the State, with the most destructive repercussions on both Jewish and non-Jewish public opinion abroad.

If Israel leaders, with world-wide reputations, occupying central unchallenged positions in the annals of our people, insult the Prime Minister, accuse him of unethical practice and of telling untruths, untold damage is caused to the image of Israel in the eyes of Israel youth and the Jewish people throughout the world, and it certainly will do nothing to mould the character of the people of Israel. As an Organization whose principal task it is to strengthen the

bonds of the Jewish people with the State of Israel we regret and condemn the tone of this intolerable controversy, which has hardly any parallel in other countries. As the World Zionist Organization we respect the will of the citizens of Israel as reflected in democratic elections and shall always lend our full support on a basis of mutual respect and responsibility to every Government of Israel, and to its Prime Minister, who have been elected according to law.

We shall do this particularly in the case of the present Prime Minister, one of the great builders of Israel, the architect of Jewish settlement in Israel, developer of the State's economy, who strengthened its security, and who has demonstrated his Zionist loyalty not only during the years he served as a Member of the Zionist Executive, but in his present capacity of Prime Minister in lending unremitting support to our Movement, proving, not only with words but also with deeds, his desire to foster closest cooperation between the Government of Israel and the World Zionist Organization."

And now permit me to revert to my reply to the debate. I wish to make a few remarks regarding the matter of Germany. On Sunday evening I said in reply to Mr. Weinstein, that I do not accept the distinction in principle – neither on this question nor on other fateful questions in Jewish life – between the State and the Jewish people. Mr. Weinstein declared – if I am quoting rightly – Israel has a "raison d'état" for having relations with Germany, in accordance with its understanding of Israel's interests. The Jewish people must be guided by its emotions on this question. I do not accept this thesis, neither for Israel, nor for the Jewish people. I believe that the State must establish its relations with Germany not only on a basis of *raison d'état*, but also on the basis of emotions, because Jews living in the State of Israel, are moved by the same emotions – I hope – as all other Jews throughout the world. And in this sense notwithstanding the normalization of diplomatic relations, regarding the emotional relationship of the State of Israel these will be determined

for many years to come not only by *raison d'état* but by the emotions of the citizens of the country on the question.

Insofar as the Jewish people is concerned, it must not allow itself to be led solely by its emotions. Though *raison d'état* may be missing, there is what we may call "*raison du peuple*". The people also has its interests — compensation payments, combating anti-Semitism and the like. I should like to know, if I have understood Mr. Weinstein correctly, if he would have accepted their attitude, what this implied in concrete terms. Should the Claims Conference not have entered into negotiations? Do you think that the Germans would have negotiated with Israel about the compensation for the Jews who do not live in Israel? The invitation of the Germans to discuss the matter was addressed in the first place to representatives of the Jewish people and only in the second place to Israel.

Now in regard to what my friend, Mr. Friedrich, had to say. You will excuse me for making a remark about arguments with my friends of the Herut party. You know that I had something to do with the efforts over the years to enable them to enter the Executive. I believed that it would have some effect. Hopefully it may yet have! They are still too green. I can hardly argue with them at all. I am not saying this aggressively. I trust they will not misunderstand me, sometimes they are a little sensitive. Someone once said: You can become a Christian but you must be born a goy. One can become a Mapainik, but one must be born a Herutnik. There is a certain style about being one. I do not say this in any derogatory sense. I am fully aware of your great qualities, your devotion, your fanaticism. There are few Zionist leaders for whom I had so great an affection and respect as Jabotinsky. Incidentally I seldom agreed with him, except over the question of the Extended Jewish Agency. They have a style all of their own. Sometimes I listen to them only when they are attacking. At the World Congress it was the same. But I suffer from a certain schizophrenia. I am not only a

speaker, I am an expert on oratory. You probably know the famous story about Haim Greenberg. Upon one occasion he was to deliver a philosophical discourse. A member of the Poale Zion from Milkauwee or some other place came up to him and said to him: "Dr. Greenberg! Every year I come to hear you speak, but I am never able to understand you. But not to understand you like today, can only be because the address was not a good one. To this Greenberg replied: My good friend! I may be a bad speaker, but am I an expert on public speaking? You are, said his interlocutor. In that case, went on Greenberg, I can tell you that the address was an exceptional one." I sit here in my capacity as an expert. Sometimes I envy them. They can say whatever they want to. They can shout, exaggerate with the greatest pathos. If there are evil manifestations in Germany then the whole country is infested with Nazism. There is no distinction between Hitler and the situation existing today. I know that there are sad phenomena in Germany and I have never given any statement that there is no danger threatening from the Neo-Nazis. Others have done so. I attacked them at the time. They must still be tested. As long as the boom continues in Germany; even a Hitler could not have come to power, if there were not six millions unemployed in Germany. One must wait till they have to deal with major political and economic crisis, before they are given a clean bill of health. I am not one of the extremists on the positive side, but to exaggerate is unnecessary. They do not accept any nuances. Everything is described with exactly the same pathos.

Mr. Gelerter has told a story which I must repeat here. The story impressed me very much. There was a group of Chassidim from Karlin who used always to pray in a very loud voice. And there were other Chassidim who always said their prayers quietly. Upon one occasion a Tchortkow Chassid came to the Beth Midrash of the Karlin Chassidim and heard the Jews there shouting at the top of their voices. What are they doing, he asked. They are praying, he was told. They are not, he answered, why are they shouting? Have they tried talking?

I would counsel my friends of Herut to try to talk. Not everything can be secured by shouting, though the method is current in Jewish life. In the Golah it is quite understandable. In the State it is a little more difficult. But what is new is their complete liberty to say what they please, the irresponsibility, psychologically speaking, while I, being a President here and a President there, must think twice about saying one thing or another. One thing can affect the interests of the Congress, another may damage the Claims Conference, a third may affect the chances of Zionism. I must resolve how to say certain things. They have no responsibility. For decades they have been in the opposition. I know that power corrupts. But it can corrupt opposition, too, for which reason indeed I said you must also accept responsibility, not only within the Zionist Organization. But it will take time before you rid yourselves of this complex of opposition, that everything is bad, and that the world can be divided into black and white.

Mr. Friedrich! There are other colours, too. You live in France and I am sure you have seen impressionist paintings. Wherein does their greatness lie? There is no black and white in the whole world! Black and white exist only in the minds of the intellectuals. There are thousands of different colours in the world, and in political life no less. This people who bear responsibility must take it into account.

I wish to reply to an attack made in the press on my interview with Kiesinger. First of all I was not the first statesman to see him. Fanfani came to see him before me. Thank God for that. I was informed before I set out – I was supposed to come earlier but Kiesinger was not there – that the previous Government, that headed by Dr. Erhard, which was voted out of office partly because of the exceptional deficit – six billion marks – had appointed an Economy Commission. This Commission was inherited by the new Government which in the months of December or January had to approve the budget. The Economy Commission

proposed, in view of the drastic retrenchment in many items amounting to billions, that the allocations for Idemnification and Restoration of Assets, should be cut by a sum of 250 million marks, out of the two billions, more than ten per cent in fact. They had introduced cuts in the previous year already. The cut was very drastic at that time. They did not cut as much as they wanted to, but we could do nothing about it as in the Erhard Government there was no one to talk to. Promises counted for nothing. There was no disciplined address in Bonn. We were told that this was the last cut they would make. But they left the legacy to their successors that it would be repeated. I was told that I must come immediately to prevent it. If I had come there after the Session of the General Council the budget might have been cut and dried, because it had to be submitted in January. I should like to see the representatives of the refugees from Nazi persecution, who have painted slogans on the walls of my house, or others then. They would have said: Where was Goldmann, where was the Claims Conference when sixty million marks were cut from our allocation? But I did go to Bonn and the cut was not put into effect. And if it is important to retain the fine distinction that I came immediately after he saw De Gaulle and others, or Brandt and not previously, and for that reason lose a sum of 250 million marks - that may be the reasoning of the Herut. It is not my line of reasoning.

And now I wish to reply to Dr. Neumann. I have already made him compliments and I do not wish to repeat myself on the present occasion. He proposed that the Movement should carry on, in organized form, a world Jewish political activity. Mr. Friedrich made a similar proposal, but with Herut exaggeration that if this was done then the youth would become Zionist. Excellent. It has an immense influence on the youth if we demonstrate in favour of the Government! We must not exaggerate. Is this the panacea which the Zionist Movement is seeking? Dr. Neumann made his statement in a very moderate fashion, like a

statesman. I have nothing against this. I would be opposed to the creation of a permanent political department. I have said so at Congresses, many times. The late Meir Grossman used to come regularly with a proposal of this nature. I put a stop to the debate on the question. Congress rejected the suggestion and so did the General Council. I would advise the same course if any proposal in this spirit was made. But what Dr. Neumann has suggested is something entirely different. A Zionist Movement must take a closer interest in general Jewish issues, not only education and youth affairs, as we do already, but in matters of a wider interest such as the situation in Russia, anti-Semitism throughout the world, the state of affairs in Germany. I am entirely in agreement. We are not only Zionists we are also Jews and we have Jewish interests.

Only I should not want us to make the attempt alone. There is enough anarchy in the Jewish world, particularly in the political sphere. Jews, especially American Jews, have suddenly discovered the glamour of international activity. I recall the years when American Jews were isolationists. They extended aid, they engaged in philanthropy, they donated money for Israel, they supported Israel politically. But they said: Let the Congress do the job, let the Bnei Brith, the Zionist Council and the American Jewish Committee. Today it has become very fashionable in America and everybody wants to engage in international work. Even the Council Welfare Fund. I do not know what this body has to do with this matter, but there are ministers, there are excellencies, and there are reports in the "New York Times". There is something in it. Solitude is not glamorous. So as I have said there is enough chaos. I believe that the time will come when we shall have to discuss this matter, and I have begun to be a little active to reduce this state of anarchy. There has been a slight reduction in it. America has its Presidents' Conference, the International World Congress, but enough chaos still remains.

If the Zionist Movement were to express a desire to engage in this field of activity itself, I would strongly advise against it. First of all it would weaken it, and secondly there are matters for which we constitute a bad address. About Russian matters, Russian diplomats will not negotiate with Zionist representatives. But in the coordinated form of Jewish world politics the Zionist Movement must rest content that its President is also President of the World Congress and that seventy to eighty per cent of the members of the World Congress are also good Zionists. It may be said that this situation is not satisfactory. I have told Neumann that the Zionist Organization as such, its Executive, should be represented on the World Congress. In every form, in which this is possible - I have informed Mr. Pincus of this - they should be full members of COJO and not mere observers. I am fully agreed on this.

And now we come to another demand which I agree to. If I have understood Dr. Neumann correctly, no special department is required for this activity, but there should be - so he suggests - a permanent committee. Not an ad hoc committee. Whenever it reports to the Executive the matter is discussed. Ordinarily there is no time for this. So there is little discussion or no discussion at all. There should be a permanent committee, including members from Israel and America, and the Executive, who will discuss the details - if Neumann should make the proposal in prescribed organized form. As I have said I have nothing against this, there need be no debate about this and I believe that it will be in the interests of the Organization, if we take the matter up.

I was very eager, I should like to tell Mr. Greenberg, to talk about the matter of religion and Zionism. Only I do not know whether I have the time today. I will confine myself to two remarks, not directly related to the matter. I feel I have the right to speak though I may not be, in his sense, a religious Jew. Upon another occasion I declared at a session of the Zionist Council that religion is too

important to be left to the Rabbis. I even had the courage to say the same at the conference of Orthodox Jewish Congregations in America. This only goes to show that for us religion is more than religion, the concern of no more than a section of the people. It is a matter for the entire Jewish people. A Jew though he may have sinned remains a Jew. The commonalty of Jewishness embraces religion. This does not mean to say that every Jew should go and pray, just as it does not mean to say other things. But I should like to tell Greenberg, and also Rabbi Zambrowsky who deals with this matter upon every occasion that it is not so simple as they make it out to be. Religion is not a matter regarding which resolutions can be passed. Ten Congresses can pass resolutions that every Jew should be religious, but that would be meaningless because religion is a matter emanating from voluntary conviction. Today it has become one of our most difficult problems. There is not the slightest question that in ensuring the future of the Jews religion in the synagogue plays an immensely important role. In certain respects, in many respects, it is the central point for large sections of American Jewry in their Jewish lives.

But a church is the very opposite of Jewish religion or of the Jewish people, for the two are closely connected. Which means that it is a problem not only for religious Jews. It is a problem for the entire people. And there is the danger that the abyss separating the religious section and the non-religious section of the people will grow wider and wider. This is not only a disaster for the religious section. It can develop into a great national danger. It can lead to a rift in the people. But so that we can discuss the problem, before calling some sort of Jewish Ecumenical Council—I can only hope that we had the courage and the daring which the Catholic Church demonstrated. The religious sector must also be adequately prepared. I do not propose changing the Halachah but we must discuss the problem. Jewish religion, especially

Jewish orthodoxy and particularly orthodoxy in Israel where the problem is even more delicate, because here it is a state institution, and in certain respects it has the power of coercion. Jews cannot be forced to say their prayers but orthodoxy can exercise coercion in matters of matrimony, divorce etc., in many spheres. Jewish orthodoxy lives today with a mentality of courageous defenders, who have shut themselves into a fortress which they are sworn to protect. They must emerge from their fortress. And they must begin to talk like others. I do not propose to say what the Zionist competence should be in this respect. But for years I have been having discussions with Rabbi Soloveitchik who is a great religious leader, not only of his own circle of rather different American orthodoxy. Take the initiative here. You are not only a great religious leader. You have the qualifications not only from the Jewish people. You have the education, you have the erudition, you have the intellect. It is not so easy to persuade him to do this. But it must be done because the problem exists.

And now to the final point, regarding the Zionist Movement. I wish to make it clear that I do not favour the liquidation of the political parties. Our debate assumes a very peculiar form. There is an anecdote I have repeated on several occasions regarding a Yeshivah student who came into another student's room and as such students do, began to sway back and forth in study saying, "What do I need the lammed for in "Ematai". The other replied: Yankel! Have you gone out of your mind? What lammed is there in the word Ematai? Said the other: Assuming that there is one. What would one need it for?" I have never said that the parties should be abolished. Indeed how can this be done? Do we live in a totalitarian regime? All that I ask for is that the parties should not monopolize the Organization, or control it. That is all. There are many methods by which this end can be achieved. In Congress I suggested that seating be not according to parties. If the majority wants it - the majority is made up of the parties - there can be other forms

of party work without absolute monopolization which is to be the case today. I say this completely frankly. If the General Council repeats next year what it has already done, but the resolution of the Council will be more salient, so that individuals and organizations which have no connection with the parties can enter the territorial organizations, on the basis of the Jerusalem Programme, the present or the future – at the moment I do not wish to discuss this question – it is worth nothing if the parties do not put it into practice with goodwill. And if major organizations are given two or three representatives at Congress, while Zionist Federations which do not have a tenth of their importance have eighteen representatives, the other organizations will withdraw gracefully. It all depends on the spirit in which the thing is done, not on the formula.

What do you want to be? Small and petty? Or a great Jewish organization at the present juncture of Jewish history? There are two different trends operative here. Zionism may be called a revolutionary movement (I myself had stopped using this expression because it no longer signifies for the present-day Zionist Movement) imposing obligations on the individuals? Or does it want to be the leading political movement of the Jewish people? It can't be both.

I understand both. We are a pioneering movement, with individual obligations. That does not mean to say that we should indulge in exaggeration, as Ben Gurion does, to the effect that if a Zionist does not settle in Israel he is not a Zionist. This is his absolute obligation. The worst thing is when moral obligations are not taken seriously. If one does not take a political resolution seriously little harm is done. A little cynicism is inherent in politics. But when moral duty is involved it is a different matter.

In my younger years that wonderful man, Dr. Eder, was a member of the Zionist Executive. At a Congress held in Lucerne a resolution was solemnly passed, to the effect that every Zionist must learn Hebrew. On the following

day a meeting of the Executive was held under the chairmanship of Weizmann. Dr. Eder took the floor and said as follows: I must resign. I am a Member of the Zionist Executive but I cannot continue. The other Members were astonished: "Why" ? they asked. Dr. Eder replied: "Yesterday you passed a resolution to the effect that Zionists must know Hebrew. I do not. I am too old to learn Hebrew today." The other ten members all tried to dissuade him from taking this step and it was only the representations of Dr. Weizmann, for whom he had the greatest respect, that convinced him that for the time being he must remain in the Executive.

I can understand it if one wants to constitute a small radical movement. I find it difficult to choose a minority that would take these obligations seriously. I believe it would be a fiction even if we chose the course suggested by Baruch Weinstein. We are today in a position when we must no longer remain a minority. The Jewish people has accepted the Jewish State. Jews at one time laughed at the idea of a Jewish homeland, a Jewish State. Today it is supported by the greater majority and there are millions more who wish to accept the aspiration towards the ingathering of the exiles. Not only as a personal obligation, but to work in that spirit and to educate the youth, and to create facilities for those who are won for Aliyah, to enable them to settle down more easily in the State. The unity of the Jewish people is the minimum demand of the Jerusalem Programme. Everything that I have proposed for years now, and which the Committee on Structure has accepted – not everything it is true, but it is advancing in that direction, is to exploit the opportunity of attracting millions of Jews, whom I am convinced constitute a majority, though I cannot prove it, and are prepared to accept the Jerusalem Programme.

Upon many occasions I said to Mr. Ben-Gurion: With your ideas you should head a pioneering movement operating for this purpose alone, because you have provided the personal example. The Organization, as it is today, cannot

undertake such a task. If it does it will not succeed. It would only make itself a laughing stock. I believe that we must try to develop into a great movement. In the times when we constituted a minority, even then the Chalutz movement, which could be said to constitute a main achievement, of which we were all proud, but not every Zionist was a member of the Chalutz movement.

Sometimes one must take a decision. It need not be taken here in the General Council. The question is not on the agenda, but it must be at the next Session. The test will be in the attempt, if it is not successful. We have passed enough resolutions, and this is the reason for the crisis why we are not taken seriously. We do not take ourselves seriously.

And in conclusion — an appeal to you to pass the resolutions which are ready to be implemented, without mental reservations. If you do not wish to take in other organizations do not accept the form of territorial federations as decided by the Commission. But make up your minds what you do want. Both roads are possible. But both must be followed consistently and sincerely, with conviction. But they must not be confused and must not be sabotaged.

REPLY TO THE DEBATE

Louis A. Pincus

Chairman of the Executive

Firstly, let me say something about the Preliminary Recommendations of the World Zionist Organization Reorganization Committee. These Preliminary Recommendations were not on the agenda for discussion. I regret that Members of the General Council — I think mainly Members of the Executive — decided to advance an opinion on what they thought had been the recommendations. I am sorry they did it because half-work should not be discussed even by members of the Executive. Secondly, I regret that it was done, because it was immediately put in a negative fashion.

The most significant feature of the Recommendations, as far as they have gone, is that we got a basic world-wide consensus, that it is not going to be a question any more of inviting, it is not going to be a question any more of trying to lay down conditions, it is going to be a question of whether, by our Constitution, we are going to make our basis wider. This, the overwhelming majority of the parties accepted.

What is important is that in practice, in a demonstrative way, we are saying to the world, we, the Zionist Organization of 1966 and 1967, we, the parties, that go to make up the Zionist Organization, are prepared to give you a position as of right. Now I say that for all the things that we want to do with the Jewish people, whether they are organized or unorganized, whether they are chaotic in one form and overorganized in another, let me say that we create our image of not being in-bred. Without going into the arguments that Dr. Goldmann gave of the consequences of continuing the present part of exclusivity, I would say, as I said in my opening remarks, let us not try and get a decision of one extreme as against another extreme. And I think here Mrs. Halprin was absolutely right: The territorial federations will not be able to exist if they will not accept at this stage that Aliyah is a primary element. If they do not, we will not be able to build the kind of organization we want. And I do not agree with the point of view that says that by bringing in organizations which accept the Jerusalem Programme only we are watering down our Zionism and how can we then talk of Aliyah? I hope that as in other fields, we will find so-called non-Zionist bodies being more active and more understanding on what could be purely a Zionist issue than the Zionist bodies themselves.

Now I do not think that any of the suggestions are a total solution to all our problems. I do not think that we are obliged to find total solutions overnight, certainly not in the Jewish people and not in the kind of organization that we are trying to build. But I do say that it is a sign of a first step.

A number of persons here took the line, and it was a criticism of the Executive, that until you hand over all the things the Agency is doing in any one country to the federation, you cannot expect to have a federation. I want to say quite bluntly from the platform that the Members of your Executive are concerned with it, and this last year I personally have been vitally concerned with trying to build up a Zionist Federation in France. But if individual Zionists think that between them and a real profound existence in which they can influence the country in which they are is just that if we hand over to them the budget we spend in that country and make the shlichim subject to their discipline, the Utopia will be reached, they are quite wrong. Why is there a difference between England and France? Because no matter how much we have tried – and we will continue trying, because the Executive is committed to strengthening federations – the position is such that we could not risk handing over everything to the French Zionists. When joint committees are set up in France, we do not get the kind of attention from the lay leaders that we get in England, for example. And, in England they do not ask to have control of the Jewish Agency budget, yet with all my criticisms – and I have them, though they are not relevant to this discussion – there is no question of where the power lies. What I say to the French is simply this: the moment that there is a sign that you will be vitally interested in the basic propagation of the Zionist principle in practice, you will find no difficulty, not with shlichim, and certainly not with the Jewish Agency Executive in Jerusalem. And I take France because that was a place from which criticism came. But I could make the same point about other countries.

And here I return to the question of Aliyah. That is one of the hallmarks. The question of activity and campaigns is another criterion. The question of your real effect and influence in the community; the question of whether the leadership is prepared to be active; these are the criteria.

Another example was quoted, the example of Canada. Many of you might remember that when I used to speak on Canada at a Congress, at General Councils, I used to criticize it. Today a serious step has been taken. For the first time there is more than just a semblance of unity. They have got together. The Canadian Zionist Federation which has been brought into being will acquire, I hope, more and more control and influence on Zionist life and Zionist work in Canada as a whole.

I want to deal with the United States. We have tried very hard. There are some enormous difficulties. I only want to make one plea, and to those to whom it applies, let me make that plea. . In the creation of a roof organization with the kind of power and influence that I have described, let the parties not see in that a diminishing of their strength. I am convinced beyond all doubt that given a real opportunity, not only will we have a united front for the kind of talks to which I have referred, but the parties within that federation today, each and everyone, will in a very real sense gain in strength and in influence. It is a short-sighted view to see in that over-all organization a competitor of any one organization.

Then the next aspect – the attack on the administration and efficiency. The main attacker was Mr. Kotlowitz. He started by saying: Look at your budget! Business as usual! I saw a draft copy, no changes in it. Well, I do not like using the tu quoque argument, but still let me say that his speech was also "business as usual" – exactly the same things that he said last year and the year previous. But it is not fair. Let us deal with it on the merits of the case. You can have all kinds of criticisms of this budget – and no doubt we will have them tomorrow – but to call it a budget of "business as usual"? Have you ever had a budget in this Jewish Agency which purports not to increase debts? Is that business as usual? You have a budget in which our share of agricultural settlement – I do not say it with pride, I am just

saying that it is a difference – is no longer 100 per cent, or even 50 per cent, but down to 25 per cent, and the Government is participating at a rate of 75 per cent. That does not make you think; that is just dismissed as business as usual. Is it business as usual that we have had a Ben Aharon Report which did not say that we must hand over the Department of Agricultural Settlement? It said the exact opposite! So we took the best advice that we could – we took nine people from every political walk of agricultural life in this country – not one Member of the Executive and not one member of the Government – and they came up with a decision and they said that Agricultural Settlement should remain within the Jewish Agency and should not be handed over; that there should be a closer look as to how the departments function, and that certain projects can go from us to the Government, just as easily as something from the Government can come back to us.

Therefore I would say that you might have taken the other view and seen that there was an honest attempt to try and change things, to try to change the work of Absorption from the mere mechanical assistance to the kind of thing that I believe a Government bureaucracy cannot deal with – the proper integration of the people. But to come along and say business as usual – here, I want to talk with some sharpness – that we had to wait for Mr. Sapir to tell us to sack workers – why did not we do it years ago? Now if you had not sat on the Permanent Finance and Budget Committee I could excuse ignorance – I do not know whether I could excuse lack of insight, to use a euphemistic expression for what I really want to say. But you know as well as I do that this question of retrenching workers first of all related to the change in the nature of our work. Out of the Ben Aharon Report a certain number of people in that department would no longer be necessary. Owing to the drop in immigration a certain number of workers became unnecessary in the Absorption Department. But to cast the aspersion – and here I want to say something genuinely, not just for the purpose of controversy – on workers employed in this institution for decades

as if they had gone around not earning their fare! I want to say in all sincerity: I am prepared to put the Civil Service of the Jewish Agency - I do not want to compare it with other countries because it may sound too grandiose - against any Civil Service in this country or any Civil Service that I know. I think the time has come for the General Council to realize that it is not a celebration when we are getting rid of people but rather a painful, miserable job, under our economic conditions, of getting rid of people who have given the best years of their life to us. Let us say thank you to those who are still with devotion continuing to work here and pay our regard to those who unfortunately have to go, and not talk of them as though they are a lot of little nobodies.

Herut in all its debates has been making the strongest pleas to let the parties remain as they are within the Movement. The Executive which consists, in this matter, only of parties, handed, at a certain stage, because in our Constitution it had not other option, this matter to the parties to make their decisions. So they made their decisions, by an overwhelming majority. What is this denial and defiance of ordinary democratic principles when it is the parties that make the decisions? When you talk about "you over there" who is "you over there?" You are a part of the you! And if you are in the minority, then the time has come for you to accept the decision of the majority and then you try to make the decision work as best as possible.

I say in all seriousness to my friends in the Herut Movement, and I am not using the word friends in inverted commas. We cannot perpetuate this situation in the Jewish Agency Executive from any point of view, certainly not from the point of view of the image. When an Executive, after consideration, takes a decision that binds the component parts, an individual may not like it, and he has an option as an individual. But it binds. We cannot incessantly carry on a fight after a decision is taken, because a group decides it does not like it.

I am really appealing, that the time has come that if we are a parliamentary body and the parties want only to be parties, then when the parties by a majority decision come to a decision they must respect it. We took the final decision. What could have been avoided and what should have been avoided was the four or five months of controversy in the columns of the newspapers. It did not help getting a better decision. It just distorted the image which had no right to be distorted.

I want to deal with the question that Dr. Goldmann dealt with. Let me deal with it from my angle – the question of our political work. I think that the time has really come – and I will explain why we cannot wait very much longer – that on these broad issues that we have been discussing, relating to Jewish affairs, Jewish international affairs, if you like, the Zionist Executive is bound to have an attitude. I say why have we to have this for quite a different reason? We have decided that we shall cease being observers in the World Jewish Congress and in COJO. We are going to become an integrated part and we need not go into details but we will be bearing a great responsibility for the policies in both those organizations. Both those organizations deal with Jewish affairs, international Jewish affairs. Both those organizations deal with the kind of issues that we have discussed. It is unthinkable of going into these institutions if at the same time we do not prepare – not in the shape of a Department – an orderly table, an orderly form of consultation and arriving at a decision, which is done haphazardly or ad hoc, but as an ongoing continuous process. And so I think that I can say here in advance that the Executive will accept the principle of that proposal and will give it the necessary administrative form so that we can get the proper results.

Now let me turn to the Youth and Chalutz movement. This thing is not so easy. I said in a private meeting this morning: I am hopelessly split on this. I know our financial position and I know what is at stake if we depart from

the principle of "non increase of debts". I also happen to know and to understand that the Chalutz movement really feels, and rightly feels, that they have a certain opportunity - I do not know if in the tens of thousands, maybe in the thousands - it may even only be in the hundreds. At any rate at this stage the cut really seems too much. It is a matter for the Budget Committee. I am hoping that this aspect will be discussed with a desire to try to find a way of helping.

I said last time and on other occasions - we have got to find a way of making the communities realize that in all our Golah work and particularly our work in youth and chalutz and education is a community responsibility. That is where the federations can play a part. That would be a programme and plan of activity for a United Zionist Movement second to none.

If nothing else comes out of this General Council - and maybe I am talking mainly of the English-speaking countries - but a determined attempt by the Zionist Movement first of all to create its own united front and secondly to begin the basic grass root level work, then I think we will achieve two things: we will have begun to win the Jewish people again for Zionism in its ideological sense and we will have begun to create the instruments and the means for doing the job.

I do not believe that there is any other way - and that if this year and the next year this situation does not change, then the opportunities will be there and we will have failed to take them. And this, therefore, brings me to that breath of fresh air that I felt, (you have heard my positive view of this General Council as a whole) when Mr. Dworkin spoke for the students. It is not because I agreed, and I will make it clear where I disagreed with him. But that was an authentic voice, whether it was mistaken or not, it represented at least some youth. I think that he painted too black and too generalized a picture. Not all Jewish youth want to have nothing to do with "isms". Not all Jewish youth do not feel a kind of identification with their people. I have found too many students

who are perturbed, who are puzzled: they do not like what we look like. It is not that they gain any comfort from where they are. Maybe I will leave for a little later the question of why they go to the Peace Corps and the false analogy. But he did say one thing with which I agreed and other people agreed, and let us take it to our hearts. He said the main thing why Israel does not appeal to the bulk of the young people is because Israel is safe, it has its protectors, it offers no challenge. Now I would not want Israel to become unsafe, I would not want it to lose its protectors in order to be able to capture the students of the free world.

The truth of the matter is, we have never in a large impressive way gone to these students to tell them that Israel is unsafe—I am not talking about the political-military situation. She is unsafe because of her enormous social problems. She is unsafe because she has a desperate desire for having a State based on social justice. She has neither the personnel, equipment nor the means for doing it. She affords, if you like, in these decades, by chance or by good fortune, a challenge. If only we could put it that way, if only we could find the right answer to satisfy all these desires of rebellion that have characterized every young generation, I do not think we could get all of them, but we could certainly get more than we are getting. This is certainly a case where sweet are the uses of adversity. Our position today, in my opinion, is that we appear in the eyes of the young person with a social conscience far more attractive than when we come and tell them that we have the Hilton and we have roads and railways and we have telephones (which we have not got) like in any other country. I think that the truth of the matter is that our present position will highlight our enormous basic social problems with which I tried to deal. And as I said, we will get our fair share if we begin to talk all in the same language, in the same way—and that does not mean denigrating. It means coming to them and saying: social integration is our main problem. It means saying, if you like, that the

Jewish Agency in its present administrative form is not yet ready to cope with what, after all, is a basic human and scientifically sociological problem. We have to change and in our changing, I think, we make ourselves more attractive.

And now a word as to the Women's Organizations in regard to this social integration. I am sorry I did not mention it, but I was not referring to institutional work with social integration that we have to do. When I spoke about Israel I said there is no public conscience about this question. We have forgotten to. When I hear the stories of what took place in this country before I immigrated, when there was a boatload of immigrants, how the average man-in-the-street looked upon it as a "hug", how people behaved with warmth, then I know that does not exist today. Maybe this is one of the trappings of Statehood—that is not impossible to re-achieve. And that is what I meant when I said that we have to arouse a public conscience. I do not know whether the Agency is the instrument. It could act, probably, as a kind of spur. Maybe the Zionist Council that will be set-up could be it. That at least was the thing that animated the discussions between us and the Government. This is another example that our history has a logic all of its own. The same kind of spirit that will be aroused, when we arouse it, to deal with social integration, will be the same kind of spirit that will pull this country out of its economic doldrums. Because what this country needs is not so much a technical new economy policy—it needs it, but no new economic policy will work unless there is a new atmosphere and a new morale in this country. It may well be that Zionism will be playing a new role. Out of Zionism may come the voluntary spirit again and out of that spirit will come a new relationship to our Government, whatever Government it may be, to our State and to our own lives—our private interests as against the public interest.

This brings me, therefore, to the last aspect of what I have to say. And that is the burden of this General Council: the question of Aliyah. This is the burden which, if not

undertaken by the Zionist Movement, will not be undertaken by anybody, either in the international field or in Israel itself. There are a thousand ways. There are three hundred thousand students. I am sure there must be a hundred ways of approaching each segment. Of the three thousand students of the campuses of America each is different, each is a world almost unto himself. But if you will sit and plan, and plan together, believe me all the departments of the Agency that function in this field in America will be at your disposal for anything that you want to do. Stop leaving a situation in which we in Jerusalem are left trying to find our own way by the hit-and-miss method. We will hand ourselves over to you. We will give you what we can, but you have to think, you have to plan; above all you have to want.

And so when I listen to Mrs. Jaglom who spoke for WIZO, and spoke in favour of Aliyah – they took a resolution at their Conference – I want to throw out a challenge to Hadassah, to WIZO, to Pioneer Women, to Mizrachi Women – first of all the women's organizations, and then the federations. Do not tell me how many resolutions were passed, or even that you sat on a sub-committee on Aliyah with the Jewish Agency shlichim or representatives, but what did you do primarily – and this is the first step – to create a new atmosphere?

The leaders of Israel have told you what their problem is. Your job as leaders in the Diaspora is to pass that on. To get rid of an individual ambivalence on the matter. I am talking to a movement! I am talking to an organization – an organization can do hundreds of things at one and the same time, even if an individual cannot. Zionists, as leaders, are obliged now to go to the total community with this problem. I say that if we tackle it honestly and genuinely we will get the public opinion and we will get young Jews, and mainly young Jews, willing to come and throw their lot in. Then Jewish identity will no longer be such a question of pure theory. It will take on

flesh and sinew and will not have to be argued as a metaphysical question.

Therefore I want to conclude by saying this: do not put the Zionist Movement under a test because the Government may reconsider the Charter - maybe it never will. It will have enormous difficulties if it will try to. The Charter is but a reflection of whether we have a right to go on existing. The Charter purely reflects that, at a given stage in the history of the Jewish people, the Jewish State said: Here is an instrument a priori that can do a job. The job that we have to do today is a job that, first of all, we have to seek in ourselves. And I want to give this flesh and blood. Tomorrow we go into Committee, and every Committee will have something to do with this (if you like in the Finance Committee, in the prosaic question of money; in the Committee that will deal with Golah work). Let us try and give flesh and blood to this. Let us begin to see what we can do and what you are obliged to do. I am sure that if we tackle this thing honestly we will add a glorious page at a time when I think the solution of our total problems is so near. If the dangers are so great, the opportunities are even greater. I think this General Council can be the beginning of a new era!

ELEVENTH MEETING

Sunday, 15 January, 1967, in the morning

Chairman: MEILICH TOPIOL

QUESTIONS PUT TO THE EXECUTIVE

Question put by Dr. Abraham Stupp
(World Union of General Zionists - Israel)

HEBREW STUDY IN THE GOLAH

Following the cultural agreement reached between Israel and France, there are now a number of new Departments of Hebrew in Universities in France and also courses in the high schools.

To this day there are not ten Jewish students in the Universities or the high schools who have registered for such seminars and courses - this after two years of our work "With our face to the Golah".

I ask the Executive what it proposes to do to remove this disgrace.

Reply of Mr. Itzhak Harkavi
(Head of the Department for Education and Culture in the Golah)

We now have ten lectureships in French Universities and though the number of non-Jewish students is almost equal to that of Jewish students, the overall picture is that Jews constitute 60-70 per cent of the students in the University Hebrew courses.

Notwithstanding the differences in the programme of studies in the Department of Foreign Languages in French

Universities, introduced in the 1966 academic year, agreement has been reached (with the aid of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs), under which Hebrew may be taught in keeping with the old programme. Every lecturer teaches in addition to his University schedule, eight to twelve hours a week in high schools or in Hebrew courses for adults.

In order to encourage the study of Hebrew we have brought for the first time an entire class of students of the High School for Living Semitic Languages (which, interestingly enough, was founded by Napoleon) for a two months intensive course in Hebrew, one month of which, at our expense, was spent in the Ulpan Akiva.

In the course of the past year we established an Education Commission in which representatives of all Departments of the Jewish Agency and of French Jewish bodies, took part. The object of this Commission was to encourage the teaching of Hebrew in French high schools and Universities. This fertile cooperation led to the establishment of the "French Association for the Study of Hebrew", which undertook practical measures for the diffusion of Hebrew. In addition we have set up a "Council for the Dissemination of Hebrew", headed by Professor Chaim Rabin, for the joint planning of studies, and for gathering all information gained by bodies in the diffusion of Hebrew.

Question put by Mr. Yosef Bankower
(Achdut Ha'avoda - Israel)

**LIBEL AGAINST THE KIBBUTZ MOVEMENT
IN PUBLICATIONS OF THE JEWISH AGENCY
ECONOMIC DEPARTMENT**

In the offprint from "Industrial Data, 1967" issued by the Economic Department of the Jewish Agency, Dr. L. Berger writes as follows: "This industrialization of the kibbutzim is pregnant with another factor operating against the absorption of new immigrants. Kibbutz plans take into

account maximum capital investment in the mechanization of industrial production disregarding profitability in order to obviate the need for employing hired labour, which means immigrant labour. In this case the concern is for the social ideology of the kibbutz at the cost of false capital investment, without any prospect of profitability and contrary to absorption needs, not only in agriculture but also in industry.

This statement constitutes a libel on the kibbutz movement which is made out to be operating in its economic activity against the absorption of immigrants.

I call for an urgent investigation of the matter and for dissociation from this unfortunate pamphlet.

Reply of Mr. Leo Dultzin
(Head of the Economic Department)

In Israel and in many other countries the debate is continuing: What is preferable: Full exploitation of available manpower resources, or exploitation of equipment, which as in Israel is in many cases imported, and therefore imposes a burden on the balance of payments.

The pamphlet "Israel Society and Immigrant Absorption" attempts a socio-economic analysis of development methods of the Israel economy against the background of this debate and taking into account the prospects for the absorption of immigrants from the affluent countries: experts, professionals, academicians and the like. This analysis is divorced from any connection with the ideological values of any sector of the Israel community.

It is difficult to understand Mr. Bankower's attitude, according to which consideration of possibilities of immigrant absorption, freedom to analyse the Government's policy and the immigration policy of the Jewish Agency, the operation of the private and public sectors of the economy must exclude examination of the policy of the kibbutz economy, though it is well-known that within the kibbutz organization a debate is in progress on these self-same matters.

Mr. Bankower's question was also published in the daily "Davar" of 27 November 1966, in the form of a letter to the editor. The letter was replied to by the author of the article in question, Dr. L. Berger, in "Davar" of 7 December, in the following terms: "Investment in kibbutz industry and its influence on the absorption processes was studied some time ago in all its aspects, and it is still at the centre of our interest from various angles. Thus, for example, the weekly "Iggeret" (of the Ihud Hakvutzot Vehakibbutzim), discussed the problems involved as they are seen from within, in the internal discussions of the kibbutz movement. Inter alia this discussion touched upon the dilemma created by the need to ensure employment for those seeking it and the principle of self-labour. Testimony to the gravity of the problem is provided by Meir Mandel of Kiryat Anavim (a former secretary of the kibbutz) who declared that "it is difficult to talk about idealistic ethics when people round about us are struggling for their daily bread".

The debate about the character of the investment—of the economics of scale—is raging today throughout the world, and is engaging the attention of theorists and businessmen on both sides of the Iron Curtain, in developed no less than in developing countries.

Its purpose is to discover some guiding line, some standard, by which to gauge the character of the economy and the most desirable form of investment. Economists wish to read some consensus regarding the use of capital and manpower for optimal development purposes. Science comes to the aid of the businessman and the entrepreneur in setting forth the various alternatives he can choose from in the relationship between capital and manpower.

The subject of the discussion is the establishment of new enterprises, and it is to be regretted that Mr. Bankower has raised what is mentioned only in a single sentence, chosen at random from page 10 of the pamphlet in question, and not the pamphlet as a whole. On that same page, for

example, mention is made of The Size of the Plant Competitive Capacity of Industry as discussed in the Economic Quarterly published by Am Oved (the article is by I. Aharoni of the Hebrew University and the number of the issue 41/42), and also on page 11 an article on the "Israel Model for Private Initiative" is mentioned.

It is superfluous to point out that all these details testify to the motives of the author of the pamphlet in question, and his purpose of studying the problem from a purely economic angle, and to describe all aspects objectively, which in the nature of things is free from all sectoral interest.

Question put by Mr. Yosef Bankower
(Achdut Ha'avoda - Israel)

RE-EMIGRATION FROM ISRAEL AND WAYS OF PREVENTING IT

I should like some explanation of the causes of re-emigration (Yeridah) and the methods of propaganda that must be adopted by the Zionist Organization and the State of Israel in order to put a stop to, or at least to reduce, this phenomenon that must give rise to so much concern.

Reply of Mr. S.Z. Shragai
(Head of the Immigration Department)

The Immigration and Absorption Departments follow up all reports that reach them regarding the desire of new immigrants to leave the country, when these reports are received by officials of the Departments or other persons, as well as through information published in the press.

One of the main reasons for re-emigration, even of people for whose Yeridah no reasonable reason can be found, is the atmosphere of re-emigration created by exaggeration of the dimension of this phenomenon. Reports create

feelings of panic among people thinking of leaving the country, with the excuse that they cannot go on living in Israel. It also provides a justification for those who have not yet finally made up their minds.

There is not the slightest doubt that the press can constitute a deterrent influence, and I am gratified to place on record that of late the newspapers have given prominence to the lack of success of emigrants from Israel in their efforts to strike root in other countries. I trust that if the newspapers continue on these lines the dimensions of Yeridah will be reduced.

According to the Government Central Bureau of Statistics from the establishment of the State and down to the close of 1965 140,000 Jews left the country. Of these 89,000 stated their intention of leaving permanently while 51,000 are already resident for two years or more abroad. This constitutes about twelve per cent of the total number of immigrants in this period. The Yeridah figures for the present year are not yet clear but the Central Bureau of Statistics estimates that it will total, together with those who left the country two years ago and have not yet returned, somewhere in the vicinity of 10-12,000.

Re-emigration over a period of eighteen years, ending December 1965, can be distributed as follows: 1. One third people who had been five to twenty years in the country. The proportion of those who had been less than five years in Israel among those re-emigrating did not exceed two per cent. 2. The remaining two thirds can be broken down as follows: half of them local-born Israelis and half veteran Israelis who had settled in the country prior to the establishment of the State.

In spite of the fact that exact data are still lacking we can list the reasons for re-emigration as follows: 1. Non-integration - economic and otherwise - in this country. 2. People who came to Israel as this country presented the only outlet from the countries in which they were previously

resident. However, they did not intend remaining here from the outset. They were sole survivors of their families after the European Catastrophe. They still had relatives of varying degrees in other countries who were not willing to settle in Israel. The immigrants accordingly sought to become united with these relatives. 3. Sabras and veteran residents who for thirty or forty years had been subjected to constant tension in Eretz Israel, dating from the Arab riots before Statehood to the War of Liberation. In this period and as result of these events they might have lost close relatives and sought to relieve the tension to which they were subject by emigrating to countries where they perhaps had relatives, by forgetting all that they had passed through. 4. People who had seen service in the War of Liberation and after release from the Army (this may have taken place quite recently) found it difficult to settle down in civilian life. 5. Students who for various reasons could not continue their studies at the University in Jerusalem, and for that reason went abroad to continue their studies there. Upon conclusion of their studies they could not find their place in Israel, in keeping with their qualifications and under reasonable conditions, while in other countries they were offered suitable positions. 6. Some of the re-emigrants left Israel - and from the Jewish point of view this is the worst category - in order to make money, taking with them even the money they had succeeded in accumulating here. It is this element that is mainly responsible for slandering Israel abroad.

From the establishment of the State to the present day 15,000 of these Yoredim have returned to Israel. This for two reasons: a. they found it difficult to find their niche elsewhere; b. the psychological difficulties of their children and the insistence of the latter that their parents return.

A special committee of the Immigration and Absorption Department including Government representatives examines every application made by a Yored to return to Israel. If

there is no reason to oppose his return he is allowed to come back and even assisted in various ways. At present under study are various measures to facilitate still further the return of people who have emigrated from Israel.

It should be noted that only a small section of the Yoredim indulge in slandering Israel. It is particularly those who stand in need of the aid of the local Jewish institutions who do so, the reason being their desire to justify themselves. Those who are able to settle down satisfactorily slander neither the State nor the Jewish Agency. They explain their decision by the difficulties they experienced in settling down in Israel, and make an effort to integrate themselves in local Jewish society, and even to be active in Zionist affairs, in Jewish education and in work on behalf of the Funds.

In sum, it must be taken into account that no country in the world is capable of absorbing all the immigrants satisfactorily. And if we compare Israel to other countries of immigration, the figure for those re-emigrating is far lower. There are countries from which re-emigration is as high as forty to fifty per cent and sometimes even sixty per cent.

The comparatively low percentage of re-emigration from Israel may be explained by the fact that this country is not an ordinary country of immigration; immigration has the higher sense here of Aliyah, both as personal redemption and the achievement of greater personal liberty.

Question put by Dr. Abraham Stupp
(World Union of General Zionists - Israel)

THE SITUATION IN THE MOVEMENT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ALIYAH; ASSIMILATION

The situation in the Movement and developments in respect of Aliyah, assimilation in the Golah, the lack of education for the young people there, indicate that the

national movement is experiencing a grave and profound crisis. In such a period I do not think that the Congress should be held once in four years. I would like to ask the Executive why Congress should not be convened next year instead of in another two years?

Reply of Mr. A.L. Pincus
(Chairman of the Executive)

This is a problem that is causing the Zionist Executive special concern, and it is not reasonable to convene Congress without having detailed plans beforehand. The Jewish Agency Executive is studying plans in this sphere and the problem was discussed in detail at the present Plenary Session of the General Council and in the Committees. These deliberations will guide the Executive in the next few years in preparing practical plans. At all events the situation is not ripe enough to convene Congress, while Congress itself is in no way a remedy for difficulties experienced.

Question put by Mr. Reuven Arzi
(Mapam - Israel)

MERCAZ LATEFUTZOT

What are the main activities carried by the Mercaz Latefutzot in the past year, what are its future plans and how does it propose to implement them? What is the budget of the Mercaz for the years 1966/7 and 1967/8 and what are the main items of expenditure? What institution approves these allocations? Is the Joint Committee of Cabinet Ministers and Members of the Jewish Agency Executive for the Mercaz Latefutzot in operation and what is its composition?

Question put by Dr. Abraham Stupp
(World Union of General Zionists - Israel)

MERCAZ LATEFUTZOT

What is the membership of the Mercaz Latefutzot?
How often has this Mercaz convened since it was founded?
What sums of money has it expended? What are its connections with Zionist organizations in the Golah?

Reply of Mr. L.A. Pincus
(Chairman of the Executive)

The Mercaz Latefutzot was established in May 1965 in keeping with a resolution of the Coordinating Committee of December 1964, which was later approved in separate resolutions passed by the Government of Israel and the Plenary Session of the Jewish Agency.

The Mercaz is responsible for its activities to the Committee for Overseas Affairs of the Coordinating Committee. The registration of the Mercaz as a corporation the shares of which will be held jointly by the Government of Israel and the World Zionist Organization is at present under consideration. It is envisaged that the Executive of the Mercaz will be made up of an even number of members, half of whom will be appointed by the Government and half by the Chairman of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization. The proposal to establish the company has already been approved by the Cabinet Committee for Economic Affairs, and final approval is awaiting a forthcoming session of the Government.

In view of the changed membership of the Coordinating Committee and the registration of the Mercaz Latefutzot Corporation regular meetings of the Committee for Overseas Affairs of the Coordinating Committee have not been held.

The budget of the Mercaz Latefutzot comes from an Israel Treasury allocation. This allocation is studied by the Knesset Finance Committee, and is approved by the Knesset. In 1965/66 it totalled IL 6 million, actual expenditure being IL 5.4 million; in the following year the allocation was IL 4.95 million. In the budget estimates for the financial year 1967/68 the allocation has been set at IL 4.8 million. In addition the Development Budget has set aside a sum of IL 1.25 million for the construction of overseas students housing

The main items of expenditure in these three years were:

	<u>1965/66</u>	<u>1966/67</u>	<u>1967/68</u>
	(IL)	(IL)	(IL)
a. Educational activities	2,050,000	1,700,000	1,000,000
b. Cultural activities	580,000	550,000	440,000
c. Work among youth and students	1,970,000	1,350,000	2,060,000
d. Training	500,000	550,000	500,000
e. Information	500,000	550,000	500,000
f. Administration	400,000	250,000	300,000

A Supreme Council of the Mercaz Latefutzot, the membership of which will be made up by Cabinet Members and Members of the Jewish Agency Executive, is to be set up shortly. This Council will lay down the general policy of the Mercaz, and will also determine its practical activities. The main task of the Mercaz is to ensure the training of qualified manpower to meet the challenges facing us. Within the next few weeks the institutions of the Mercaz will be set up and will be put into operation. At the outset an annual budget of IL 40 million was envisaged but the Government allocated what it was able to.

Question put by Mr. Reuven Arzi
(Mapam - Israel)

GOVERNMENT AND JEWISH AGENCY
JOINT ABSORPTION AUTHORITY

The Minister of Labour, in his address to the Zionist General Council, made the statement that a Joint Authority for Absorption had been set up the members of which included Cabinet Ministers and Members of the Jewish Agency Executive. I should like to know: What are the functions of this Authority? What is its programme of activities? What is the membership of the Authority?

Reply of Mr. L. A. Pincus
(Chairman of the Executive)

The Minister of Labour did not make any statement regarding the establishment of a Joint Authority. The Chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive informed the Plenary Session of the Zionist General Council that last September the Jewish Agency Executive had submitted a plan for immigration and absorption, and that its recommendations regarding this plan had been approved by the Coordinating Committee. The recommendations envisaged the creation of a Joint Authority in which the Government and the Agency would cooperate. The Coordinating Committee instructed the Minister of Labour, Mr. Y. Allon, and the Chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive, Mr. L. A. Pincus, to draft a programme for the Joint Authority. Following the Session of the General Council, the Minister of Labour and the Chairman of the Jewish Agency Executive will submit to the Government and the Jewish Agency Executive, the plans they have drawn up, after which the Coordinating Committee will convene to endorse the proposals for the Joint Authority. The principle underlying the plan for setting up the Joint Authority is to obviate duplication and the harassment of the newcomer.

Question put by Mr. Yosef Bankower
(Achdut Ha'avoda - Israel)

REDUCTION IN PIONEER YOUTH OPERATIONS
IN THE GOLAH

What does the Jewish Agency propose to do to ensure developments in regard work among the pioneer youth in the Golah, especially in respect of the establishment of clubs for such youth?

Reply of Mr. E. Dobkin
(Head of the Youth and Hechalutz Department)

There is no doubt that the slowing down of the pace of immigration and the general situation in the Zionist Movement oblige us to intensify work among the Chalutz youth movements. One of the ways in which this purpose can be achieved is closer cooperation between the Chalutz youth movement in the Diaspora, by setting up joint clubs, and organization of joint activities. Such initiative has come from the Chalutz youth movements in the United States and it is true that it has not been crowned with success. But insofar as closer cooperation and unity is concerned, this is not dependent upon the Jewish Agency but upon those actually engaged in the work. The Jewish Agency will lend every possible assistance in this direction. I trust that the Chalutz movements will be encouraged in these efforts to achieve greater cooperation in their centres in this country. The expansion of the activities of the Chalutz youth movements is dependent upon additional funds being placed at their disposal, and in the course of the present year we are scheduled to meet a delegation from the United States in which the various problems involved will be discussed.

At a time when the demand is being made for millions to extend the work among the youth the question is how to maintain our existing activities. Youth clubs have not been

closed down, but no new ones have been established. The establishment of a million pound fund to finance the establishment of youth clubs was envisaged but for budgetary reasons was not put into effect. As a result the Chalutz movements have to compete with the general youth movements, and the situation of the former is not easy. There is no doubt that we can expand our work provided the Zionist Movement in the Golah is prepared to make the effort, with its own funds for intensification of work among the youth.

Question put by Mrs. Chaika Grossman
(Mapam - Israel)

CHALUTZ SHLICHUT

In view of the decline in the volume of immigration I should like to ask: In what degree has the number of shlichim to the Zionist and Chalutz youth movements abroad declined? To what extent have the allocations for Chalutz Shlichut been reduced in the Zionist budget? Is this reduction not in contrast with the concern we all share for the continuation of Chalutz immigration?

Reply of Mr. E. Dobkin
(Head of the Youth and Hechalutz Department)

Against 145 shlichim this year the number next year will be 119, in other words a drop of 18.5 per cent. As against this the number of emissaries to Zionist and economic bodies and institutions will drop from 44 to 20, or by 55 per cent. In this latter category arrangements have been made for thirteen of the emissaries to general organizations to be maintained at the expense of these organizations. In addition to the 139 full shlichim despatched by the Youth and Hechalutz Department it subventions the operations of another 61. Formally the Chalutz Shlichut budget has dropped by only IL 300, 000, but in terms of shlichim the cut is far more serious, in view of increasing salaries and special allowances.

The decline in the number of shlichim can affect operations among the youth. One can only hope that this will not be the case. Shlichut to the Chalutz movements in recent years has enjoyed the support of the Mercaz Latefutzot out of its budget, but in the estimates of the Mercaz for the forthcoming year no such provision has been made. We must hope that this situation will change.

Question put by Mr. Yosef Bankower
(Achdut Ha'avoda - Israel)

YOUTH ALIYAH

What measures are being adopted to ensure the normal operation of Youth Aliyah?

Reply by Mr. Itzhak Artzi
(Head of the Youth Aliyah Department)

The estimated budget of Youth Aliyah, to an amount of IL 14,350,000, with difficulty allows us to maintain the present number of Youth Aliyah pupils, and to absorb only young people who have come to this country unaccompanied by their parents. We are unable to provide for thousands of others within the framework of our estimates.

Youth Aliyah, however, has not given up hope. We propose to do everything to increase the funds at our disposal in order to provide these young people and those who will come in their wake the facilities that they can get only from Youth Aliyah.

Our funds come from two sources: The allocation from the Jewish Agency Budget; the funds raised by committees of friends throughout the world, from Hadassah in the United States to the Friends of Youth Aliyah in Great Britain, Hadassah-WIZO Canada, the Women's Mizrachi Organization, and the smaller committees in Australia, and Hong Kong.

In regard to the Jewish Agency's allocation, however grave the financial straits of the Agency its Treasury must rise above considerations of revenue and expenditure, and make a supreme effort to increase its participation in our budget. Accordingly I call upon Members of the Zionist General Council to do whatever they can, to insist that the retrenchment in the Jewish Agency's allocation be set aside.

Youth Aliyah has many true friends throughout the world, Jewish organizations, who are doing all they can and more than that for the advancement of our work. These friends have for years borne more than half of Youth Aliyah's financial burden. It is to these organizations that we now turn with our appeal. I am gratified to note that three fine organizations have already responded to this call — Hadassah in the United States, the Committee of Friends in Great Britain and Hadassah-WIZO in Canada.

We are urgently engaged in the study of prospects of establishing additional committees of friends, among others in the renowned centres of Latin America, and I trust that Members of the Zionist General Council coming from these countries, will lend every possible aid in the creation of such committees.

Question put by Mr. Shlomo Rosen
(Mapam - Israel)

YOUTH ALIYAH PUPILS

What was the number of Youth Aliyah pupils last years? Had the number of pupils as at 30 June 1966 risen or declined? One hundred and seventy-two pupils had been absorbed from abroad. Could this number be increased, and does not the absorption of pupils from abroad increase the chances of the immigration of their parents? Were there any children of new immigrants who were not absorbed because of budgetary difficulties? In what proportion does

the Government, through the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Education, participate in the education of Israel youth, and what is the participation of the Jewish Agency in the education of children of the slums and the under-privileged elements generally? Could the number of pupils not be increased by placing more of them in agricultural settlements instead of various types of institutions in which educational costs are much higher? What is the average cost of education of a child in a settlement and in an institution? Were there any vacant places in the settlements which were not filled? Has the Department any plans for expansion and what are they?

Reply of Mr. I. Artzi
(Head of Youth Aliyah Department)

The average number of pupils in 1965/66 was 9,620. The average figure in the following year was 9,249, while the highest number of pupils in that year was registered in June 1966 when it reached 9,859. In addition we must take into account an average of 2,500 boys and girls in the youth centres in the development towns.

The number of pupils has declined by four hundred since June. This figure was arrived at after the absorption of new pupils. Pupils completed their course of training in the months of July and August, and new pupils were accepted in their place.

Youth Aliyah, through the agency of its emissaries and the shlichim of the Immigration Department, and assisted by the Youth Aliyah Committee in various countries throughout the world is endeavouring to increase the number of new immigrants coming to Israel unaccompanied by their parents from Persia, Latin America and other countries.

In recent months, owing to financial difficulties, we could not accept children already in the country for some months and veteran immigrants, as this would increase the estimated deficit. Thanks to joint efforts made by the Youth

Aliyah committees of Hadassah, the Committee for Youth Aliyah in England and Hadassah-WIZO in Canada, together with the Treasury of the Jewish Agency the funds to prevent this envisaged retrenchment were found. We shall, accordingly, continue to absorb every young person coming to Israel.

In the Youth Centres, which are joint projects of the Ministries of Labour and Education and the Departments of Absorption and Youth Aliyah, the Government meets thirty per cent of the maintenance costs. In the normal instruments of Youth Aliyah in certain cases the Government assists in the maintenance of pupils in kibbutz youth groups to an extent of 35-40 per cent.

Transfer to youth institutions is not always practicable. First of all the desires of the pupils themselves must be taken into account and as a result sometimes we have to place them in homes where they can get vocational training, which in the majority of cases - unfortunately - the kibbutz is not capable of furnishing. Secondly: A considerable number of our pupils opt for education of a religious nature. We have two youth groups in religious kibbutzim, but this is not enough. The rest have to be placed in educational institutions. Thirdly: A section of the children of the new immigrants come to us only in the initial period of twelve to eighteen months for the purpose of learning the Hebrew language and striking root in Israel. The kibbutz youth group is not suitable for such temporary absorption, for it is built on stable, multiennial groups. This is another reason why we have to direct young people to the institutions.

Costs are not a major determinant and are dependent upon a number of factors. A child in a youth group costs IL 40-90 and in an institution IL 45-110.

About two thousand vacancies in Youth Aliyah have not been filled.

The key to expansion of absorption facilities lies in the magnitude of the budget.

Question put by Mr. Shlomo Friedrich
(Herut-Hatzohar - France)

DR. GOLDMANN'S SPEECH IN PARIS

In "Davar" daily of 11 December an item was published under the headline "Dr. Goldmann's speech in Paris": "The State of Israel was established before its time".

The President of the World Zionist Organization, Dr. Nachum Goldmann, is of the opinion that the proclamation of the State of Israel in 1948 came too early. This view was voiced by Dr. Goldmann publicly in a speech delivered at the Conference of the French Branch of the World Jewish Congress.

The Conference was held in Paris at the end of November, and the Paris paper "Unzer Vort" has the following to report about Dr. Goldmann's statement. "He opened with remarks on the situation of the State of Israel. At the time of the foundation of the State he was among those who were of the opinion that the declaration was made prematurely. First we should have reached agreement with our Arab neighbours and only then have proclaimed the establishment of the State. That was my opinion and those who held that the declaration should not be postponed were wrong".

On behalf of the Herut-Hatzohar Party I wish to ask: Why did the President of the World Zionist Organization find it necessary at the end of 1966 to restate his position in regard to the proclamation of the State of Israel?

Does not the statement made by the President of the World Zionist Organization according to "Unzer Vort" that "he was only of the opinion that during those historic days prior to the proclamation of the State that we should have waited two or three weeks in which to come to agreement with the Arabs, and only then to proclaim the State" constitute justification of Arab claims.

Following the statement made by the President of the World Zionist Organization, denouncing the form assumed by political controversy in Israel, I ask without expressing any point of view in regard to the form of that controversy, is it the business of the President of the World Zionist Organization to interfere in the internal affairs of the parties in Israel?

Reply of Dr. Nachum Goldmann
(President of the World Zionist Organization)

If the press had reported what I had actually said it would be clear that the entire report is false from beginning to end. But it is just as well that Mr. Friedrich has put the question, as this gives me an opportunity once again to clarify matters.

I made the statement in the office of the World Jewish Congress in Paris, in the presence of a restricted group, without the participation of the press, and the meeting was not intended to be published in the newspapers. However one person was present who did circulate the report in the press. Perhaps he did not understand what I said, and perhaps he was seeking some sort of sensation. A few days later I held a meeting with the shlichim of the Jewish Agency in Paris and at that meeting I was asked whether the statement published in the Paris paper "Unzer Vort" was correct. I replied that I had not read "Unzer Vort" for the past five years. Subsequently I spoke to the editor of "Unzer Vort" over the phone, who apologized, and I issued to him a clarification over the telephone. But even this clarification was not published accurately.

At that meeting I discussed the political situation of the State of Israel, touching especially upon the tension between the Arab countries and the State. I said that in the light of eighteen years of experience I was not convinced that what I had advised in 1948 had not been the best course. Incidentally I was not the only one who held this opinion.

At that time I was of the opinion that there existed certain prospects of avoiding war had we delayed the proclamation of the State for a short time, and taken advantage of this breathing space to sit down and discuss matters with the Arabs. I wish to repeat: I never thought of delaying the proclamation of the State until the consent of the Arabs was obtained. Such an idea is completely absurd. On the contrary I was in favour of the proclamation of the State forthwith, for I believed that time was operating against us. For that reason I did not say and could not say that we should have waited until we secured the consent of the Arabs to proclaim the establishment of a Jewish State. All that I did say was that we should have waited a short time in order to try and prevent the outbreak of war.

I repeated this statement in a closed meeting and I did not wish to publicise this view in any way. I did not publish it, but the person who happened to be present at that meeting did. Another thing must be placed on record: the editor did not find it necessary to contact me and to consult me before he published these distorted remarks.

In regard to the second question touching upon my statement on the tone of political controversy in Israel I wish to stress that the purpose of my statement was to clarify that though the opposition's criticism of the Government could be justified and even encouraged, in the past year controversy with the Prime Minister of Israel had assumed a strikingly personal tone. This adversely affected the Jews in the Diaspora. Everywhere Jews discuss this and cannot understand how people permit themselves to call the Premier "a liar and a deceiver". This leads to demoralization and undermines relations between the Jews and the State of Israel. I consider this a serious danger from the point of view of the Zionist Movement. The purpose of my declaration was not to express any opinion who was right and who was wrong in the debate between the Government and the Opposition, for I have always held that one should not confuse the Israel controversy between the

Opposition and the Coalition, with the situation in the Zionist Movement. For this reason I always favoured that Herut join the Jewish Agency Executive. But more recently the style of the controversy has taken on a character that is so personal that it has a dangerous influence on Jewish relations and the attachment of Jews to the State of Israel.

In regard to my declaration on cooperation between the World Zionist Organization and the Government of Israel, it is related to the Charter. This cooperation has nothing to do with the membership of the Government, but to every Government elected by the citizens of the State of Israel.

OBSERVATION ON THE FORM OF THE QUESTION-TIME
INSTITUTION BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE
LOUIS A. PINCUS

The form and content of some of the questions put, in my view, are not suitable, in keeping with the procedure that has already begun to develop. I am not speaking about questions which I think are to the point. There are questions which are of more general interest, which cannot be referred to one or other of the Committees. But when the question is used to obtain report on any Department of the Executive, there are Committees, and there is a procedure, and if it is desired to discuss the operations of any Department in Plenary Session, then this may be done. But that some of them should be discussed and others not through a series of questions – that is an entirely different matter. It is a waste of time. I would go even further and say that it is unfitting to convert the institution of question-time in order to bring pressure to bear in the matter of allocations. I take the last two questions relating to the Youth Aliyah Department. And in the reply, this is dependent upon the Treasurer, this is dependent upon the budget. We are not so naive about these matters. I would ask the Presidium to pay attention to this aspect in the future and ensure that the questions fill the role which we envisaged, which is to

obtain information, which cannot be obtained, generally speaking, in the committees, because they do not come within the scope of the latter, and to prevent the practice which is growing of enlisting public opinion on budgetary details.

JACOB TSUR
(Chairman of General Council)

I wish to say, and I think I may say this in the name of the Presidium, that much in the remarks of the Chairman of the Executive was justified, and in a forthcoming meeting of the Presidium, after the present Session, I will propose that we prepare a better form for the questions put in the Session of the General Council.

TWELFTH MEETING

Sunday, January 15, 1967, in the afternoon

Chairman: ITZHAK KORN

JACOB TSUR EULOGIZES ZIONIST LEADERS

I will ask the General Council to rise to honour the soldiers and citizens of Israel who fell on the borders of our country, in defence of the State, and also to honour Members of the Zionist General Council, leaders of the Movement and friends who have passed away since our last Session.

The outrages on our frontiers which are causing loss of life took another victim yesterday. Joseph Cohen, a young man of the moshav of Dishon in Upper Galilee, a soldier who had come on leave, fell at the hand of murderers on the football field. He is not the last victim in the long list.

In the interval since our previous session Vera Weizmann has left us. In the course of my present remarks I need not mention her part as the life partner of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, her role in the foundation of the largest women's organization in the Movement, her personality as all knew her.

Just a few hours ago were received from Mexico word of the death of a delegate to many Zionist Congresses, and a former Member of the Zionist General Council - Tuvia Reznikow, who did trojan work for the Funds and for the Movement until his last day.

A few months ago Max Bressler left us. Mr. Bressler served as President of the Zionist Organization of America and of the Jewish National Fund. He was a truly ardent Zionist.

We also mourn the passing of a great woman who headed one of the organizations of the Zionist Movement—Etta Rosensohn, a former President of Hadassah who was possessed of great vision, whose interests included not only Zionism but also social work.

Dr. Aryeh Kubovy, leader of Belgian Zionists, a fighter for Jewish rights, a prominent figure in the World Jewish Congress during the War, a distinguished member of Israel's diplomatic service in Eastern Europe, in Czechoslovakia and Poland, and later Ambassador to the Argentine, who in the last years of his life headed the Yad Vashem Memorial Authority has died.

Another veteran of the Zionist Movement who has left us in Yaacov Klebanov, Member of the Congress Court, one of early Zionists in Russia, where he served as Secretary of the Central Committee of Zionist Organization.

We must also remember, among the departed, in this interval, Yaacov Leshchinsky, one of the architects of Jewish sociology; Eliahu Meridor, Member of the Knesset and a Member of the Congress Court; Mary Rosenberg, Secretary of the British Zionist Federation in years long past, and a delegate to the Zionist Congress; Dr. Michael Gelber, historian of the Zionist Movement; Judah Liss, of the Keren Hayesod and a writer; Dr. Asher Bavli, founder of a school in the study of Jewish folklore and Dr. Nachum Sloucz, who died at a ripe old age, who was perhaps the first historian of Hebrew literature and the pioneer of early Canaanite studies, a delegate to many Zionist Congresses, and Chairman of the World Hebrew Union.

In other countries we have lost Rabbi Dr. Joseph Litvin, Editor of the English-language organ of the British Zionist Federation, *The Gates of Zion*; Dr. Manfred Menachem Rosenthal, an active member of the Zionist Federation in Germany and in recent years Director of the Jewish Agency's office in Frankfurt; Joseph Pevsner,

who did great things on behalf of the Appeal and the Jewish National Fund; and just a few days ago, Dr. Gerhard Goldheim, who played an important role in educational work among the Zionist students in Germany. I will conclude with the name of an outstanding scholar in Israel, Professor Benjamin de Vries, who at one time served as Chairman of the Mizrachi in Holland and at the time of his death was Professor of Talmud at Tel Aviv University.

The Movement will remember them all.

The Chairman, Mr. I. Korn: We shall now deal with the resolutions of the diverse Committees. First—the Committee on Organization. In keeping with the Constitution of the Zionist Organization, when the amendment of any paragraph of the Constitution is desired, it must be passed by at least a majority of those present, but no less than 54 members of the General Council. I declare that there are not less than fifty four Members of the Council present and we can therefore proceed with the debate on constitutional amendments.

PROPOSALS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES IN THE DIASPORA

Rabbi Tsemach Menachem Zambrowsky
(Chairman of the Committee)

The Committee which is studying the reorganization of the structure won't be ready for another six months. And after they are ready, they will first present to the Executive and then to the next Session of the General Council their recommendations for implementation. So that Resolutions on that score at the present session would be out of place.

We have heard reports of the work of the Departments of Youth and Hechalutz, and Education and of the urgent need of shlichim, since the Department of Youth and Hechalutz has

succeeded in making inroads not only in Zionist Youth circles but also in the various community centres, particularly in the American Continent, who have started to put in requests for shlichim who should guide those in charge of the educational activities in the various youth centres. We know that these departments are in need of greater funds because of the limited budget of the Agency. It therefore becomes our sacred duty, to see that in our respective countries we find the means of implementing the work which is so vital, not only to our present operation but for building a future strong Zionist Movement starting with the youth of the various respective countries.

Rabbi Zambrowsky read the Resolutions which are printed at the end of this volume.

PROPOSALS OF THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND ABSORPTION

Leon Kronitz
(Chairman of the Committee)

I wish to report that the Committee on Immigration and Absorption held four meetings. Up to the present the situation in regard to immigration has been as follows: The countries of distress, with one third of the total Jewish population has contributed 95 per cent of the immigrants. The affluent countries, with two thirds of the Jewish people have contributed no more than five per cent. We must, however, take into account that though the numerical proportion may not have been high the quality of these latter immigrants was good. They include engineers, doctors, scientists and students. Our Committee devoted considerable attention to ways and means of increasing immigration from these countries. We also heard a report on the problems and institutions of Youth Aliyah.

We propose to introduce the resolutions on immigration with a preamble stating as follows:

The Zionist General Council regards immigration into Israel as the principal aspect of the public and Zionist activity of the Zionist organizations and calls upon the members of these organizations to join in the effort to intensify Aliyah consciousness and the need for immigration into Israel, and to work for the implementation of this principle by personal Aliyah to Israel.

The Zionist General Council has heard from the Premier and the Minister of Labour, and from the Chairman of the Zionist Executive and Members of the Executive, of the grave results in the economic and security spheres caused by the decline in Aliyah. In this grave period Aliyah from the affluent countries must reflect the identification of the Jewish people in the Diaspora with the State of Israel and its difficulties.

The Zionist General Council therefore calls upon all Zionist organizations and all their constituent bodies to make the encouragement of Aliyah their paramount concern. Chalutz Aliyah through the agency of the Chalutz youth movements, acceleration of immigration within the framework of Youth Aliyah, the immigration of professional and technical workers, of young people who come to study in institutions of higher learning and Torah institutes, of skilled artisans and capitalists to establish enterprises in this country.

Israel society, for its part, must facilitate the integration of these immigrants, by intensifying absorption consciousness and the creation of an atmosphere favourable for social absorption.

Mrs. Zilla Amidror: I have a supplement which reads as follows: Before the paragraph referring to the duty of Israel society to facilitate social absorption, I suggest that this one line be interpolated: "The Government must create the conditions for the absorption of immigrants." We cannot

call upon Israel society and the public in general without calling upon the Government which makes the laws and moulds the climate and the conditions favourable for the absorption of these immigrants.

Leon Kronitz (Chairman of the Committee): The Committee was unable to accept the amendment of Mrs. Amidror. It was the opinion that an appeal should be addressed to the public and that any call upon the Government in this context would be out of place. On this point opinions differ. I have rendered the view of the Committee. There are four points about which much is said regarding the Government's share as you will see from the resolutions. But here, on this point, the Committee held that the Government should not be criticized. We call upon Israel society but not on the Government. For this reason I propose that we do not endorse the *votum separatum* of Mrs. Amidror.

Leon Kronitz then read the Resolutions.

Dr. Raanan Weitz: A slight correction in the wording in the interest of clarification. The General Council regards it as important that the new immigrants be diverted to agricultural settlement in the kibbutzim and the moshavim, and welcome the joint plans of the Government and the Agency for sending young couples and the children of settlers to the new settlements.

I. Korn (Chairman): The amendment is very much in place and I suggest that if there is no one against it that it be passed.

The Resolutions on Immigration were passed.

There is a *votum separatum* to be considered.

Dr. Austri-Dunn: On behalf of Mapam I wish to introduce another resolution, which was not accepted by the Committee. We heard the Minister of Labour, Mr. Yigal

Allon say clearly that the problem of unemployment is a Zionist problem. How can we pass such good and fine resolutions, which we all support unanimously, and not give voice to the major concern which we all share? The resolution which we propose reads as follows:

The Zionist General Council recommends that the Executive make representations to the Government that the latter provide for the maintenance of immigrants until they find employment.

We know that provision is made for all unemployed in the country and soon legislation will be introduced, but the immigrants have not been included in the economic framework.

L. Kronitz (Chairman of the Committee): Needless to say the Committee was not opposed to this idea, even with the amendment introduced by Dr. Austri-Dunn, but with the amendment it would appear that the Council commits the Executive to the outlay of money. The procedure is that the resolutions do not commit the Executive. For this reason the Committee was opposed. I have spoken to Dr. Austri-Dunn and he has agreed. I propose that we refrain from dealing with this matter and to transmit the votum separatum to the Executive.

PROPOSALS OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, FINANCE AND FUNDS

Mrs. Fay Schenk
(Chairman of the Committee)

This is the first time that a budget is based upon a non-increase of debt. Our Committee manifested its awareness of the need to step up activity on behalf of the absorption processes in the development towns, and to accelerate Zionist education in youth work, while at the same time bearing the responsibility of commitment to the assumption

of no further debts. Reconciling two apparently irreconcilable conditions is an undertaking which must be dealt with in depth. Certainly it could not be handled in the short space of time allotted to us. It was therefore resolved that the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee, whose members are much more familiar with the facts and who are in full possession of all the details pertinent to the contemporary situation – that they be vested with this serious and heavy undertaking which we are confident that they will discharge competently and effectively.

Our Committee devoted a good deal of time to a discussion of the responsibility which must be assumed by Zionist leaders in order to strengthen and increase the results of the Keren Hayesod campaigns in those countries of the world where they take place. It was recognized that drastic changes are indeed in order to increase collections.

Mrs. Schenk then read the Resolutions:

1. Financial Report for April 1, 1965 to September 30, 1966

The Zionist General Council takes note of the Financial Report of the World Zionist Organization, Jewish Agency for Israel, for the period of April 1, 1965 through September 30, 1966, and expresses its gratification at the implementation of budgets during this period.

2. Budget Estimates for 1967-68

The Zionist General Council takes note of the estimated income of the World Zionist Organisation, Jewish Agency for Israel in the amount of IL 309,776,000 and of the framework of the expenditure budget in the same sum, which is based on the principle of no increase in debt, and authorizes the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee to consider and decide on.

- a. Details of the expenditure budget.
- b. Any further budget which may be submitted to it by the Jewish Agency Executive in the course of the budgetary year in the light of further needs and developments.
- c. The income received from the United Jewish Appeal in the United States and the Keren Hayesod United Israel Appeals in other countries serves as the main source of finance for the budget. The Zionist General Council therefore calls Jews throughout the world, and particularly organized Zionists, to remember the fact that the implementation of this budget depends upon greater efforts by all to increase contributions to the United Appeals in the various countries. It calls on every Jew to participate actively in the work of the campaigns.

Mr. Pincus: It has been drawn to my attention that the first sentence of "b" should be reworded (I'm not dealing with the contents which remain as they are) so as to conform to the set-up in Israel, because the United Jewish Appeal has many beneficiaries - we are really only one of the beneficiary of the United Israel Appeal - some purely verbal changes so that the publication can be suitable.

Jacob Schutzberg: On behalf of Mapam and Achdut Ha'avoda Poale Zion I suggest the inclusion of the following supplement after Paragraph 2a. "The General Council has noted the demands made by the Youth and Hechalutz Movements and also by Youth Aliyah, not to cut their allocations, and suggests that these demands be taken into account when the details of the budget are considered." I have heard from the Treasurer - and an item to this effect was also published in the press - that notwithstanding the fact that we have passed a balanced budget, money will not be wanting

if we need it to finance immigration. These two items are included in such a declaration. The youth movements are very important in the current situation of the State and the Zionist Movement, because immigration from the countries of distress has virtually come to an end while immigration from the affluent countries is still minimal. There is the prospect of bringing young immigrants to Israel and others will come in their wake. Thus any retrenchment in this allocation is in effect retrenchment in Aliyah. Indeed the same applies to Youth Aliyah. Only a few minutes ago fine resolutions were passed in the matter of the reunion of families. The reference was to countries from which immigrants are already coming. Absorption, we are all agreed, is no less important than immigration.

L.A. Pincus: We have not set up an Education Committee. I can imagine that had we set up an Education Committee in the Golah someone could easily get up and say very convincingly that without Jewish education we cannot expect immigration from the free countries. My attitude on this point — I am speaking about Youth Aliyah — which is the attitude of the Committee, is that it is difficult to determine beforehand, where retrenchment is to be made. There are other departments too. I am not saying this because I propose that the Youth Aliyah allocation should be cut. The Executive must see the picture as a whole without setting off one item against another. Four years ago two thirds of Youth Aliyah's funds came from special external sources. We have not reached a situation when fifty per cent come from the general budget of the Jewish Agency. If you wish to make use of this argument, I believe that it is entirely irrelevant. When we call upon the various bodies to restore the situation as it existed previously, that is they should find two thirds of the money required. But I suggest that we refrain from going into this aspect. Let us leave that to the Executive and even what the Executive says is not absolutely final, because there is also the Budget Committee.

In respect of the other matter the situation is different and I have taken up a different attitude. I made a statement on the matter during the plenary session and I repeated that statement in more detail before the Committee. A delegation of the Youth Movements has informed us of the consequences of further retrenchment, and Mr. Dobkin also explained to us this morning the results of that retrenchment, for it is not only a monetary cut but the result of rising salaries, and other expenditure. However they explained that there were places, particularly the smaller centres, where the removal of a shaliach left that area entirely without any shaliach from Israel. The result is that work in that particular area is completely paralyzed. I stated -- and I repeat that statement -- that I would do everything possible not necessarily within the framework of the budget as it stands today, to prevent retrenchment in those centres where cuts can have serious consequences for the work of the Youth Department. I am referring to this matter of shlichim. I say this because in the Committee already I explained a number of proposals. It is not possible to state now what proposals are feasible. But I wish to say again: I as Treasurer -- and I wish to make it clear that there is a little between what I promise now and an absolute promise, because I understand fully what the situation may be if we allow the cuts to remain without close scrutiny -- to find ways and means, out of our own budget or through calls upon other bodies, which should be interested. And in conclusion I should like to turn to those who sponsored the votum separatum, not to force us as if we have to vote on a matter of principle. None of us wish to vote against. I do not seek to evade the issue. I think that we should be guilty of an ill-service to the matter we have at heart if we compel the General Council to vote on the issue. By my statement which was more or less accepted in the Committee, and by reiteration of that statement, I call upon Mapam to withdraw their votum separatum.

Following an exchange of views, no vote was taken on the votum separatum.

Mrs. Fay Schenk
(Chairman of the Committee)

Approval of the Jewish National Fund Budget for 1967-1968

- a. The Zionist General Council authorizes the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee to consider and decide upon the budgetary proposals of the Jewish National Fund for the year 1967-1968 which will be submitted to it in due course.
- b. The Council has taken note of the large-scale plans for land development which the Jewish National Fund has been called upon to carry out in the interests of the country's economic growth and progress. Since the implementation of these plans requires the urgent mobilization of additional funds, the Council calls on all organizations, institutions and individuals to strengthen the work of the Jewish National Fund so as to increase its income from contributions by all means at its disposal.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

Mrs. Fay Schenk
(Chairman of the Committee)

The Zionist General Council, following a recommendation adopted at a previous session, reaffirms that, while recognizing the principle, that representatives of the Movement have the right to have their expenses paid for travel to the sessions of the General Council, it calls upon them to endeavor to cover these expenses themselves either in

whole or in part. The detailed regulations are subject to the approval of the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee.

The resolution was passed.

Mrs. Fay Schenk
(Chairman of the Committee)

The Zionist General Council approves of the findings of the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee as adopted and approved unanimously in its meeting of December 16, 1966 as follows:

The Committee expressed its gratification to the Controller and his Office for their comprehensive report on the various fields of activity of the Zionist Executive and its institutions; and takes note of the reply which was given promptly and adequately.

By virtue of the authority granted to it under Section 16 B of its statutes approved by the Zionist General Council at its Session in March, 1964, the Committee resolves:

- a. The findings of the Committee require constant follow-up by the Controller's Office with regard to the implementation of the reforms which the Executive has undertaken to carry-out in the coming budgetary year.
- b. The Committee will set up a special sub-Committee from among its members to examine the problems raised by the Controller in connection with the Companies of the Zionist Movement and its institutions and shall submit its findings to the full Budget and Finance Committee within four months of the publication of the Report.

- c. On the completion of the work of the Subcommittee on Companies the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee will draw its conclusions regarding the details of the Controller's Report.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

THIRTEENTH MEETING

Sunday, January 15, 1967, in the evening

Chairman: JACOB TSUR

PROPOSALS OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE

Dr. Max Nussbaum
(Chairman of the Political Committee)

I would like to make a suggestion to you as Chairman of the General Council and to the Agency for a certain reform which is necessary in connection with the Political Committee. It is entirely impossible to do this type of work in a day and a half. That means it is a day and a half in which you have to listen to the experts in all fields, to ask questions, to get information, and then in a few hours, usually late at night, as we did till 2 o'clock at night, to formulate something, which then comes in one form, and then is changed again, and a third time, and a fourth time, and you don't have time to call the Committee together. It is the consensus of opinion of most of the members of our Political Committee, that there would be a good improvement if this Committee would be established very soon at the beginning of the session. Resolutions should be prepared in advance. You never come to a final editing with any sense of maturity, because of the pressure of time. We would suggest that this be taken into consideration for the year to come.

Jacob Tsur (Chairman of the Zionist General Council):
I have taken note of the remarks of the Chairman of the Political Committee and will gladly submit it for the consideration of the Presidium. The resolutions studied by other Committees, too, are affected, as they are also formulated in haste, at the last possible moment. I am sure

that the Presidium will devote to this question its most earnest attention, until the forthcoming Session of the General Council.

Dr. M. Nussbaum (Chairman of the Political Committee) reads Resolutions 1-10 which were passed unanimously. They are published at the end of this book.

Dr. M. Nussbaum (Chairman of the Political Committee) reads Resolution No. 11 on Germany:

The Zionist General Council notes with deep anxiety the signs of revival in the Federal Republic of Germany of extreme nationalism with neo-Nazi tendencies. This is bound to be a source of danger to mankind in general and to the Jewish people in particular. This manifestation calls for constant vigilance on the part of the nations of the world, the Jewish people and the State of Israel, and the encouragement of the efforts of all those engaged in the struggle to uproot this menace.

The Zionist General Council calls on the Federal German Government to undertake a comprehensive educational campaign to eradicate the remnants of the spirit of Nazism in that country.

You will have to understand that the resolutions on Russia and Germany are not an easy matter. But this is as far as we could go for a consensus, and there is now a request, and rightly so, according to our procedure, of one of our parties to bring in a declaration of its own on Germany. I suggest that the Chairman call upon a representative of Mapam.

Mordechai Oren: It is a patent fact that the salient victory at the polls of the Neo-Nazi Party in various parts of Germany, which many short-sightedly already regarded

as a different Germany, pure and fit, and also the placing of a former conscious and devoted Nazi at the head of the German Government – combined to cause profound spiritual shock to the masses of the Jewish people in the Diaspora and in Israel and to all progressive humanity.

For that reason we must insist, in the name of the entire Zionist Movement, that the German Neo-Nazi Party be outlawed, that all categories of Neo-Nazi activity be prohibited. The outlawing of political parties in Germany of today is not something unusual but up to the present this has been applied only against the Communist Party. We must protest against the fact that persons with a Nazi past have been elected to the leadership of Germany and its Government. We must declare that this policy is opposed to Germany's pretensions to have cleared itself of its Nazi past, aspiring towards democracy, and working for peace in the world.

Together with the Jewish people, whose loyal spokesmen we are, and fearful for the fate of millions of Jews alive today, and respectful of the memory of the millions of our martyred brethren, victims of the Holocaust, we call upon Germany and the entire world: Let not the Nazi monster rise again! Let there be no more Nazism!

I ask that this be added as a supplement and not as an amendment to the resolution.

Dr. Nachum Goldmann: I deeply regret that the Mapam alternative proposal forces me to take the floor. I would be able to live a much easier life by saying nothing, and even easier still while earning the praise of people who normally attack me by voting for the resolution. But as long as certain responsibilities devolve upon me, and I possess certain duties and obligations, I cannot choose the easy way out. I wish to make it clear what this second resolution means in my view.

The two parties sponsoring this resolution, are members of the Government of the State of Israel, which maintains good relations with the German Government. Israel's Ambassador sits in Bonn, and is received by that self-same Chancellor, and we must conduct very important negotiations with the German Government, headed by the Chancellor. I give no guarantee that in the near future responsible leaders of the State will not have to meet these same people.

I do not know why it is my job not being a member of the Government and bearing no State responsibility, except that of an ordinary citizen, to have to say this to parties which are members of the Government and which could draw certain conclusions, if the matter is sufficiently important for them.

Now a few remarks about myself personally. As long as I continue to serve as the Chairman of the Claims Conference I shall have contacts with the German Government and with its leading members. And if the General Council endorses this resolution I shall have to choose: either I opt for the offices which compel me to negotiate with the Germans, or I submit to the resolution of the General Council. In view of the regard I have for the interests which I represent in Germany – at the request of the State and also because of many other things (and I shall not explain the nature of these things) – and as representative of the twenty one major Jewish organizations, united in the Claims Conference, which are as important as the emotional resolutions, which I understand very well, though unfortunately in the pursuit of our policies and as responsible people we cannot indulge our emotions. I have spoken enough about this matter, too. I wish to declare that I will not sever my contacts, and the General Council can draw its own conclusions if the resolution is passed.

Very important interests in Germany are at hazard. I am I am not referring solely to financial interest, though these

are so great that it is difficult to claim that emotions and honour are greater. What are involved are not hundreds or thousands, but hundreds of millions, not only for the organizations but for thousands and tens of thousands of people, most of whom have suffered, more than the larger part – immeasurably more, I am not saying this of Chaika Grossman – of those seated in this chamber who will have to vote.

And important political interests are also involved – Jewish interests, some of them supporting the State which sometimes stands in need of the help of the big Jewish organizations, and also more general Jewish interests. It is for these reasons that I have said what I have said. I wish to point out to the General Council that I will do everything in a disciplined and circumspect fashion in regard to the conclusions that must follow from such a resolution taken in Jerusalem by the Zionist Organization, which holds a charter from the State of Israel.

And now as a veteran chairman, who has presided many times over the General Council and Zionist Congresses, I should like to tell my friend Jacob Tsur – he need not heed my advice but I am addressing the General Council – what procedure has been followed in such matters. Resolutions have been submitted to the Council or to Congress (and is needless to say the majority can decide otherwise) which it is not advisable to endorse and at the same time not desirable to vote against. In such cases the procedure is that the majority resolution of the Political Committee is first submitted. It is understood that if this resolution is passed other resolutions on the same issue fall away. The General Council need not permit itself to be coerced to vote against a resolution, upon which it does not wish to take any stand. That is also a privilege of the majority. The minority cannot compel the majority to vote when the latter does not want to.

Reuven Arzi: This resolution sponsored by the Achdut Ha'avoda and Mapam parties constitutes an amendment to the main resolution submitted here. We do not oppose the main resolution. We propose an amendment, and it is customary in these matters to vote on an amendment, for or against. Then the main resolution will be put to the vote, as our resolution is not opposed to the main resolution.

Salomon Friedrich: A proposal has been made in the Political Committee by Chaika Grossman, a Member of the General Council, and we have agreed to support this proposal. Seeing that the original proposal submitted to the General Council, to the Committee, has not been brought to the plenary session (as printed) but a new resolution, we do not accept that resolution. We wish to make our declaration on the matter. We do not submit any votum separatum. And on all resolutions here about relations with Germany we shall not participate in the vote, first of all because it constitutes a call to Germany. Our movement to this day insists that we do not talk to them, that we have no relations with them. As a movement we shall assume the duty throughout the world to do everything possible to prevent the rebirth of Nazism, to prevent German Nazis reaching positions of power in that country which perpetrated the crime against the Jewish people. Of course we could have submitted a votum separatum. We have not done so because we know that a certain mood dominates leading circles in the State and in the Zionist Organization.

We should like to remind you: Be very careful when you say that we should not exaggerate the resurgence of Nazism. Be careful in entering into relations with the Germans. Be careful in not protesting enough against the liberation of Nazis through so-called judicial processes in Germany. We state quite clearly: We will hinder you in all these matters and we will continue our information activity so that the Jewish people should be in the vanguard

of the entire world in the campaign against the resuscitation of Nazism, against all that stems from the Nazis and from Germany in the future, not only in respect of the Jewish people but for the whole world.

Jacob Tsur: The question is one of the voting procedure. In my capacity as Chairman I declare that the resolution submitted is not an amendment, within the meaning of the Rules, Paragraph 14, which must be voted on before the general formula. It is another formulation of the resolution, which bears the cipher 11. The first part is a paraphrase in stronger terms. But it is another formulation.

I concur in matters of procedure with the view of the President of the Zionist Organization, who has presided over many Congresses, that in the present instance we have one wording juxtaposed with another wording, and the Chairman may have his own opinion that this is so in the present instance. We will vote first on the wording of the majority of the Committee, and if this formulation is supported by a majority then all others fall. I am prepared to take a vote on the procedure.

We have the version of the majority of the Political Committee, read by the Chairman of the Committee, and we have a votum separatum of Mapam and Achdut Ha'avoda. We are now voting first of all on the version of the Committee.

This motion was accepted, by 49 votes against 12.

I am now putting to the vote the statement given by the Chairman of the Political Committee, and this is Resolution 11 - Germany - which in front of you, Page 3 of the Hebrew text and page 5 of the English text.

The motion is accepted 58 votes for and 15 abstentions. There is now no need for voting any other motion.

Dr. Max Nussbaum, Chairman of the Committee reads Resolutions 12-13-14, which were passed. They are published at the end of this volume.

Dr. Max Nussbaum (Chairman of the Committee) reads Resolution No.15:

"The serious problems confronting the Jewish people in various parts of the world and the continuing problems affecting Israel's position and security call for increased vigilance and effective action by the Zionist Movement.

"The Zionist Council notes the statements made by the President of the World Zionist Organization and the Chairman of the Executive favouring the establishment of a special committee, whose principal function would be to deepen Zionist awareness of these problems and activate more fully the entire Movement. The Council views this proposal with approval and recommends that the Executive give consideration to the feasibility of this proposal, and that it shall report progress to the next session of the Zionist General Council."

I promised the parties that I would add a clarifying note, what the Committee wanted to make sure in this text, whether it came through entirely or not, is that the Executive shall have full power to make a decision one way or another. It is not bound and it does not have to wait for the next General Council. It should feel free to debate it and make a decision, but whatever the decision is, it should come back for next year and report.

Mrs. Judith Epstein: There are two words put into this statement which originally were there, but which were taken out after the discussion and that is that the Council views this proposal "with approval". Not that there was disapproval, but it was very clear even from the inadequate discussion that was held, that there was much too much involved in such a Committee, for us to have judgement as to whether it was good or not.

That is why we said that it should be passed on to the Executive. When it is said "with approval", this presupposes the kind of discussion of the kind of point of view, which I assure you, the Committee did not take, and therefore I urge those two words be omitted.

Dr. Max Nussbaum: I would like to reply to this. I am sorry, but as far as my sources are concerned, and the text which I have before me, and studied again tonight what was taken out as a result of opposition to it was a line that the Executive should study it with a view toward implementation. That line was taken out. The first line in my text was in, and was not taken out. I am speaking of "The Council views this proposal with approval", these words. In my sheet of paper that I had, the third line was taken out, the first one was left in. That is to the memory of most people I spoke with.

L.A. Pincus: May I refer to a procedural point that arose out of the voting. I think that the Presidium should be asked to frame a regulation for the future conduct of the General Council, to consider and frame a regulation which would correspond in America to "tabling a matter", would correspond in British procedure to "moving the previous question", but not to find ourselves every time in a grip that we can't wriggle out of when we don't want to vote on a matter. This kind of situation is well-known in parliamentary procedure and all I do now is to express a request that the Presidium should consider this, and if they come to the conclusion, to frame a proper regulation.

The second point, and now I want to deal with the procedure here. It may be very well to ask the parties to move a *votum separatum*, or to have an interest in this matter, but where you are asking the Executive to do something, I think it only right and proper that the President and the Chairman should be given sight of the proposed resolution, which is going to impose something on the Executive, before it is brought straight on to the General Council. I asked

Dr. Goldmann if he knew the details of this resolution. He said "No", and the first time that I saw it was when it was placed on the table this evening.

I think that procedure is something that has to be taken note of for the future. However, this is the position now, and I would like to make my position clear in this matter. In my reply to the debate, I said that in principle, I thought the recommendation of having a committee to deal with this kind of matter was a good one. The manner, the nature, the content, should be left to the Executive. By now presenting this resolution in this form, you are not leaving it free to the Executive. You are putting the Executive in the position of having to say why it does not approve of this precise wording.

I would therefore ask you to keep the thing in line of both Dr. Goldmann's reply and my reply, to leave paragraphs 1 and 2 stand, and just say "... the Council recommends that the Executive give consideration to the feasibility of this proposal and it shall report progress to the next session of the Zionist General Council." It is clear and obvious that if the Executive comes to the conclusion that it wants to do things, like in relation to all matters, it hasn't got to wait for the next General Council, but can proceed with its business.

But I don't think that there should be any words of this kind. I have had no opportunity of discussing it with the Executive, I have had no opportunity of even discussing it with myself, and under these circumstances, I can't see any harm done to the persons proposing this resolution and it would leave the Executive free to act in the light of the declarations, both by Dr. Goldmann and myself.

Dr. Emanuel Neumann: : I don't quite understand. I am the mover of this resolution. I want to introduce myself as the mover of this resolution. I don't really understand what is taking place just now. I was extraordinarily

careful, before introducing a resolution of this character. I discussed it with three persons I thought most authoritative and who should be most concerned with it. I didn't have any text before me at the time, but the principle is quite clear. I discussed it with the President of our Organization, with the Chairman of our Executive, and with the Prime Minister of the State of Israel. I understood that all three of them saw no objection to the adoption in principle of such a resolution. Now I recall very well, I am sure I am not mistaken, just what Dr. Goldmann and Mr. Pincus said in their speeches. Both of them said that if the General Council favours such a proposal, they are prepared to favour it as well, to accept such a recommendation. I propose a recommendation and nothing more. This is the only thing which the General Council did in its Political Committee. The original resolution was framed somewhat differently. It was referred to the sub-committee of the Political Committee, the sub-committee recommended it, with certain changes, unanimously. It was then brought to the plenary session of the Political Committee, where a further change was proposed and accepted all around, and I was present at the meeting of the Political Committee in full session when this was voted upon and adopted unanimously. So I don't quite understand, my dear friend Mr. Pincus, who virtually invited that kind of resolution by saying that if the General Council wants to favour such a step, he sees no objection to it. These were the words of Dr. Goldmann, these were the words of Abba Eban.

I don't know what more a human being like myself can do in order to assure that nothing untowards happens. I would wonder what can be pointed to by Mr. Pincus or anyone else in the text of this resolution which imposes upon the Executive anything whatever. It simply recommends to the Executive - first it contains an expression of approval of the principle of such a special committee. We were very careful not to give it a name. There were differences of opinion about a name. I would have preferred a certain name, Dr. Goldmann suggested another name. He suggested International Relations Committee. However, we said no name,

we said as little as we could about it, accepting the general principle that a special committee of this nature would be a good thing to have, provided that the Executive thinks so too, and it is willing to study it further, and adopt its own course of action.

I would appeal to my dear friend Mr. Pincus, to reconsider what he has said just now, which in my humble opinion, I say with all due respect, is quite inconsistent with the position that you took earlier in the session.

Sir Barnett Janner: I am very glad that Mr. Pincus made the statement he did in respect of procedure at our meetings. Some of you may have noted that when it came to a question of a minority vote, I abstained, because I felt that in any democratic constitutional body, it was impossible to suppress in any way a minority vote, but that a body like ours could, as every other constitutional body does, move the previous question, which is an entirely different thing and which, in fact, enables any matter similar to the one that we had this evening, from being placed in such a position as to make it impossible for some people to say that they agree with part of a resolution, a minority resolution, but disagreed with another part.

Now with regard to this particular proposal, I am not quite able to understand what Mr. Pincus was driving at. I agreed with Dr. Neumann that this resolution gives the right to an Executive in order to examine and bring forward proposals which are consistent with the establishment of a body, the nature of which we are referring to. I do not agree, and I believe that this is now a general view which is being taken up by modern parliamentary organizations, that an Executive, and I am not placing any implication on our Executive, is entitled to so bind an organization that it shan't have the right at a later stage to examine proposals which the Executive wants to make, in respect of any matter.

I hope it won't be understood our accepting this resolution with which I agree, that whatever may be the form in which this ultimately is accepted and is acceptable to the Executive, we as a body shall not have the right at a later stage, to examine it. We can't, of course, stop any step which has been taken in respect of it, but at least we shall be in a position to express our views on it.

The Chairman put to the vote Resolution No. 15 which was passed.

Dr. Max Nussbaum thanked the Members of the Political Committee for their work

ASSESSMENT OF THE SESSION

by **DR. NACHUM GOLDMANN**

President of the World Zionist Organization

I wish to devote a few remarks to the nature of the Session, without indulging in any emotion or exaggeration. I believe that this Session of the General Council - everything in our lives is relative and must be assessed in comparative terms - was quite a good one. The General Debate was not too general and we have succeeded in introducing an element of order by dividing it up into three sections. Not all the speakers spoke accordingly, but as long as the General Debate retains its character of everybody speaking about everything, and until it can be abolished it will take years. It belongs to one of the old traditions of the Congress. But I believe that we have made a beginning in changing its character, and the beginning was made in changing the Debate into something more useful. I am not authorized to give good or bad marks, but I think that the greater part of the Debate was on a high standard. But firstly I should like to say that the Debate - I sat through it and listened

to the speeches – reflected a willingness to argue and to take into account weaknesses and errors.

In earlier years – this I should like to note – when Aliyah was discussed it inevitably developed into an argument between the Israelis and the Americans. The impression created was that the Israelis suspected that the Americans were not all interested in Aliyah, while the Americans felt that the Israelis were making unjustified demands. Obviously, there are different approaches to the problem of Aliyah, from the point of view of the Israeli who knows the meaning of a smaller influx, and from the point of view of a resident of New York or Montevideo, who might appreciate it rationally but does not feel it daily in the general mood of the country. In sum, however, I feel that there was a more general readiness to make concessions, and in this respect the Zionist Organization has not lived up to expectations of Israel and many of us. If the blame must be laid at the door of objective circumstances, or to the absence of élan, of effort on the part of the leaders of the Movement when faced with major difficulties of encouraging Aliyah from the West – I prefer not to enter into this question. I believe that the entire General Council – this was not the case previously – from the more extreme Israel elements, to the Americans and other groups, who were considered in Israel as not being interested in Aliyah, were at the present Session permeated with the consciousness that if we do not succeed in altering this situation, at this historic juncture when immigration from the rescue countries has come to an end – we shall be confronted with a very tragic problem. The problem will pose the question: Where do we go from here? This will be the situation if immigration remains at its present small dimensions. Here we were conscious of feelings of concern if we do not succeed in changing this state of affairs, concern which was shared by all parties represented in the General Council. At the time when we knew that in any case some eighty thousand immigrants were entering the country every year

the concern was not pressing. On the contrary the feeling was that if in addition some of tens of thousands of newcomers arrived from the free countries, absorption prospects would be undermined. Concern was two-sided. There was an ideological recognition of Aliyah. But now it has become a very grave problem and I think that we all shared this concern in the Debate, which was so sharply formulated by the Prime Minister, and I know that this is the chief of his anxieties. In all talks about other problems he comes back to this one, and I understand his anxiety. I believe that we shall take this concern with us to our homes. This is an important achievement of the General Council.

There is another aspect of the General Council Session I wish to dwell upon. Sometimes we create differences in order to be able to argue about them. And in order to ensure that the debate does not become boring we stress the finest nuances, which have little real significance. For years it has been said that there are differences of opinion between myself and others about the Russian question. But I did not have the slightest difficulty in voting for the resolution. And all this talk about Goldmann's policy and some other policy is no more than idle talk. The unanimity with which the resolution was supported reflects the fact that there existed no great differences about this central Jewish problem.

This year is a year of important Jewish anniversaries, and I hope that our Zionist work will take this into account. Each of these anniversaries recalls a stage in that outstanding and – even bearing in mind the defects we discover in ourselves – the wonderful triumphal march of the Zionist Movement.

Seventy years ago, as you yourselves know, the First Zionist Congress was held. It was not taken seriously at the time not only by the Gentiles but even by the majority of Jews. It was greeted with scorn. I am not talking about the Protest-Rabbis. Most Jews did not even protest; they

did not think it important enough. It was regarded as a fantasy – to build a Jewish homeland after two thousand years of Golah. I mention this because sometimes we become disappointed and despondent. In these days we have lived through in Israel – and we continue to experience it – an atmosphere of doubt and discouragement, and we should have encouraged Israel. I say this because sometimes we ourselves become despondent and discouraged. We are living through a period – which will continue – of doubt and discouragement when we should serve as a source of encouragement for Israel and induce the Israelis to see the picture as a whole.

I know that world history has contributed to this. When Zionists and Jews generally begin to be a little weak, and ask themselves what the morrow would bring forth, that there is no security and they have their economic troubles, then they must give one look at the wonderful realization of their aspirations. I myself know of few other examples of the indication of such a Utopian idea, not of a normal national movement generated by a majority resolved to liberate itself from alien domination. What movement has secured liberation in less than fifty years? Ours, however, is the only example of a people resolving to establish a State in a country in which it has only a small minority, and the people had to introduce others of its sons and daughters to make the State a reality. It has not completed this task, it is still in the middle of the process. What has been achieved in the past eighteen years, the further realization, the consolidation of the State, is something legendary in world history, and not only in Jewish history.

This year we shall mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Balfour Declaration, the first great political step to the realization of the great vision of the Jewish State. When the Balfour Declaration was issued fifty years ago, who thought that thirty years later a Jewish State would be realized? Indeed how many of us, at the end of the Second World War, thought that we would see the foundation of a

Jewish State? I recall – I will permit myself a personal note – in 1946 I went to see the camps in Germany together with Wise. When we came to the first camp the Jews there were very angry. Two Jewish representatives had come from America, and they began to ask: "How long would they remain there? What would happen to them? What did the future hold for them? There was no road back. Their families had been massacred. I said to them: In front of us is a long dark tunnel. But if I am not an incorrigibly naive optimist, even at the entrance to the tunnel I can see a light at the end of the tunnel, which indicates a Jewish State. Wise, who was a great Jew and a great optimist, when we were on our own back to our hotel, said to me: If you wished to comfort them I can understand you. But how can you have the temerity to say that we will have a Jewish State?" If a Jew like Wise did not yet believe in the possibility then needless to say the majority among us did not believe in it.

The first political step had already been taken, and I do not know where we would be today had it not been for the Balfour Declaration, despite all the accounts we have with the British, and all the trouble we had with the Mandatory administration. And our resolution finally to finish with the Mandatory Administration and to set up our own Jewish State, even at the the cost of some of the territory of Eretz Israel. But as I say, even this many of us did not believe. The process of realization was unbelievably rapid.

This year we also celebrate the creation of the Jewish Legion, which saw service in the First World War. This constituted the first step towards our own Jewish Army. It was a first step which led to the Haganah, and later to the Israel Defence Army. Symbolically and factually the signification of the creation of the Legion was hardly less than the political importance of the Balfour Declaration.

It was a minor attempt, but we should always respect Quixotic attempts, when they are still universally regarded

with scepticism. They need more courage, vision, more imagination, than the things that have already been given general approbation. And we cannot mention the Jewish Legion without recalling the name – which I have already done on another occasion – of the great legendary Zionist figure, who fathered the idea – Jabotinsky. I believe that if he were among us today he would be able to contribute a lot to the forms of our debates between the parties in Israel, and in Zionism. He put through the idea notwithstanding the opposition of the majority in the Executive, who were motivated by political considerations – of neutrality etc – and it is just as well to remember this, for later they were political opponents, that the only leader who supported him from the outset, was the then-President of the Movement Chaim Weizmann. In this matter he and Jabotinsky marched together, though the credit for the idea of setting up a Jewish Legion belongs to that legendary figure – Jabotinsky.

There is also a twentieth anniversary to be marked. I mention it in the same context, for one follows from the other – the resolution of the United Nations regarding the establishment of a Jewish State in part of Palestine. I know that in this country there was temporarily a tendency not to think too highly of this decision. I belong to those – together with our unforgettable colleague and friend, Moshe Sharett, and others, who know the inside story, and I am sure that Emanuel Neumann and Rose Halprin and others who carried on political activity will bear me out – I do not know whether we should have had the Jewish State today if it had not been for that resolution of the United Nations which gave us the imprimatur of the non-Jewish world, especially in view of the fact that both East and West voted for it. Had both of them not supported the resolution the resolution would not have been passed, for it would not have obtained a majority.

I have said this as from the earlier anniversaries we must learn courage, when we look at what we have

achieved, in the historic context. And from the importance of the decision of the United Nations the conclusion must be drawn that the sympathy of the non-Jewish world is very important for us. I do not think that this should be so much preached about in Israel, as previously. I recall other years when I spoke in this fashion and I was called a Golus Jew, one who thinks too much of the Goyim. How much importance have they for us? We can do everything ourselves. Today we need no longer speak in this fashion. There is a new appreciation of the problems.

I always said that second decade would be more difficult still. Sympathy for Israel – let us speak frankly – is not as great in other parts of the world as it was twenty years ago for Zionism, or fifteen years ago for the young Jewish State. In the degree in which Israel has become a real factor affecting the interests of other countries – it is no longer a matter of Zionism and the people of the Bible and so on and so forth, which was not taken too seriously – absolute support is not a priori ensured. So a great effort on the part of Israel, and of the Jewish people, which in certain respects has more influence on non-Jewish public opinion than Israel, because the Jews live among the nations and have their friends and their contacts, politically and culturally, and it is precisely the present crisis, the security crisis of Israel, which will not vanish overnight, so it is important to recreate the mood that led to a two-thirds majority in the United Nations in favour of a Jewish State twenty years back.

And a final remark about the growing and necessary cooperation of the Jewish people. This cooperation must become closer and closer if Israel is to overcome its problems. The present crisis is not the first and not the last. It is not important what name it goes by. Israel is entering upon a period of great problems, political, security, economic, immigration, with far-reaching consequences, with ramifications which I do not wish to go into now, and in such a situation it will stand in need of more, much more,

cooperation with the Jewish people. If there was any time in the past when there was doubt in certain Israel circles, and it was assumed that we could manage with a little friendship and a little money, in this respect I believe that in the course of time Israel has also learnt a lot, not especially from the current cutback, but in the passage of the years, and the youth of Israel also has this feeling. For me present forms of friendship and cooperation are not enough. I am not making any proposals, certainly at this closing stage of the General Council, but for me the Charter is not enough, and also not the attitude of the greater part of the Jewish people. Much more must be done but it is not easy. The people must be better organized than it is today. The people must become more closely attached to Israel. World Jewry, or the greater part thereof which regards Israel favourably, must assume more responsibility, which implies certain things on the part of Israel. This constitutes one of the great problems confronting us in the next few years, during which the difficulties of consolidating the State will probably grow, and we shall need greater efforts on the part of World Jewry.

I believe that if Israel took note of what took place in this Session of the General Council, and I think that the press reported it better than in previous years. I hope that the press will learn something from the pretence of part of the youth that Zionism is nonsense and then this source of trouble will also vanish. Without this sort of "nonsense" I do not know how that will solve their problems. The General Council, if Israel listened to it at all, absorbed as it was in its other problems, should have furnished some encouragement. In my opening speech I said that normally we derive encouragement from Israel. We constitute an organization the majority of whose members live in the Diaspora, and this time the Diaspora has been a source of encouragement for Israel. It is easier for us to be optimistic because of the distance.

You need not tell me that Russia is important. The fight against Neo-Nazism is also important. And combating anti-Semitism in South America is also important. And Jewish schools are more important than all of them taken together. But most important of all, for without all the other problems have no prospects of solution at all, is to assist the State to overcome its difficulties, and to guarantee its development, to give Israel the feeling that behind it stands the Jewish people. That is our paramount task – to create an organization which, by virtue of its prestige, its influence, the position it occupies in Jewish life, can speak for the Jewish people, and create such a people or influence such a people, that through us primarily, and through other organizations with which we collaborate, we shall be determined to secure the future and destiny of the State of Israel; which is the central problem of the Jewish people. All other problems are dependent upon this one problem. We must give Israel the feeling that it does not stand alone even in years when Aliyah is small. The Israelis must feel that behind them stand millions of Jews and if they are given that feeling, to ensure a situation in which the crisis will pass. It can continue, and be followed by other crises, that is inevitable, but the people must know that they operate in the name of the Jewish people, that the Jewish people is behind them. And when we go back to our diverse countries we must mobilize the people to give Israel the guarantee, because to secure Israel is primarily to secure the Jewish people.

CLOSING SPEECH

by

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

Mr. Jacob Tsur

I proceed to the closing of this Session, virtually contrary to good Zionist tradition. It is still one hour before midnight, and the atmosphere is almost calm. It seems that

the Movement has reached a turning point, that it is enlisting its entire cogitative capacity, that it is mobilizing all of its patience, to seek out new ways. I wish to note for the second year, the second consecutive year, the interest evinced by the public, both Israel in general and among the Jerusalem public in particular, in these deliberations. At the opening session attended by two thousand Jerusalemites, and in this small hall there were more people outside than within. This is the beginning to regard the Zionist Movement as vital. Before we convened for this meeting, one of our trusted delegates said to me: "What a pity! Most of the resolutions have been passed unanimously. There are no differences of opinion and so things are not so interesting." Something was remedied in the final meeting, it is true, but the fact remains that on most of the vital questions of the Movement there were no differences. There was a certain effort to achieve the atmosphere of today, and to adjust our thinking accordingly. It may be that this Session was held to a special accompaniment, the cannon roaring on the borders, the mines blasting elsewhere, the difficult general mood, which we could not ignore and which affects Zionism in the Golah, perhaps more than it affects the Yishuv in this country.

I regard it as a good sign that the General Council does not conduct its deliberations in a vacuum, and that both in the opening remarks and in the declarations made in the course of the debate positions were taken on current Israel problems.

Those of you who have come from abroad will now return to your homes. Much has been spoken here about reforms but there is only one reform really vital, and that is to open the doors of the Zionist Organization and to go out and conquer the people. I say this because there is one question which was not discussed in the plenary meetings but nevertheless occupied a central position in our considerations in the recent period, and that is the Committee on Structure and what measures we are to adopt.

There can be the best of all possible constitutions, but they may not bring about action, if they are not put into effect. It may have been a good thing that the President of the Zionist Organization plunged deep into history. True enough, from time to time, we, Members of the Zionist Organization prove that we live in history.

But the continuity of history is not enough, in itself, to show the road we must follow in the future. Certainly in this seventieth anniversary year of the Zionist Organization we must look back and survey the road we have followed. But the past, history, is not for nostalgia, but for inspiration for the future, lending new dimension to faith. And this blessing of a new dimension, or a new impetus, and seeing the organization of our movement from afar is what we must seek.

RESOLUTIONS

A. THE STATE OF ISRAEL AND THE POSITION OF THE JEWS IN THE DIASPORA

1. The Situation on Israel's Frontiers

The Zionist General Council strongly condemns the acts of terrorism by Arab elements calculated to disturb the peace on Israel's borders. Unless these acts cease forthwith a dangerous deterioration of the security situation in this area is inevitable. Israel's right to defend its borders is indisputable. The Zionist Movement pledges itself to support Israel in all its efforts to maintain the integrity of its borders and the safety of its citizens.

2. Security and Arms Race in the Middle East

(a) The Zionist General Council calls on the Great Powers to ensure the integrity and independence of all states in the Middle East.

(b) The arms race in the Middle East constitutes a threat to peace in the region and throughout the world, imposes a heavy burden on all the states concerned and hampers their peaceful development. Gravely concerned at this state of affairs, the Zionist General Council earnestly appeals to the Great Powers to halt this arms race.

(c) Until the arms race ceases, the Zionist General Council calls upon the Great Powers concerned to continue their policy of assisting the State of Israel to maintain its deterrent and defensive strength.

3. Israel-Arab Relations

The Zionist General Council notes with satisfaction that notwithstanding recurrent hostile declarations of most of the official spokesmen of the Arab States, voices continue to be heard attesting a desire for co-existence between the State of Israel and the Arab States. The Zionist General Council expresses the hope that these trends will grow for the benefit of all the peoples in the region and in the interest of world peace. The Zionist Movement shares the desire and fully supports the efforts of the State of Israel to bring about peace with its neighbours.

4. Access to the Holy Places

The Zionist General Council notes with profound disappointment that despite the relevant provisions of the Israel-Jordan Armistice Agreement Jews to this day do not have access to their Holy Places in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. The Council calls upon the United Nations and all the governments of the world to secure the implementation of Article 8 of the Armistice Agreement.

5. The Arab Boycott

The Zionist General Council strongly condemns the Arab boycott in all its aspects. No enlightened and self-respecting government or industrial and commercial undertaking can submit to pressures of this kind. The Council welcomes the actions of those governments and undertakings who have rejected the boycott, and expresses the hope that others will follow suit. The Zionist Movement, for its part, will work unremittingly to combat the boycott and will continue to mobilize public opinion towards this end.

6. Israel's Relations with the Developing Countries and Asia

(a) The Zionist General Council notes with satisfaction the strengthening of Israel's international ties, and welcomes the existing and growing successful cooperation between Israel and the developing countries.

(b) The Zionist General Council considers close relations between Israel and the States of the Asian Continent to be of vital importance. It welcomes the efforts of the State of Israel to extend its relations and strengthen its ties with these States.

7. Jerusalem

The Zionist General Council notes with satisfaction that an increasing number of countries represented in Israel have established their diplomatic missions in Jerusalem -- the State's capital.

The Council calls upon all other States represented in Israel to conform with accepted diplomatic practice and to establish their missions in Israel's capital.

8. Israel and the Soviet Union

The Zionist General Council, noting the continued efforts of the Israel Government to bring about an improvement in Soviet-Israel relations, expresses the hope that these efforts will bear tangible fruit. The Council expresses the hope that the Soviet Union, which played an historic role in the establishment of Israel in 1947 and 1948, will contribute to the easing of tension in the region and to the establishment of peace therein.

9. Soviet Jewry

The Zionist General Council welcomes the declaration by the Premier of the U.S.S.R., Mr. A. Kosygin, on December 3, 1966, to the effect that the Soviet Government will do everything possible to facilitate the reunion of families, including those who wish to leave the U.S.S.R. and that there is not and will not be any problem in regard thereto.

The Council will follow with deep interest the implementation of this humanitarian policy.

The Council would, in this spirit, urge upon the Soviet Government the acceptance and implementation of a policy to enable Jews in the U.S.S.R. desirous of coming to Israel to do so.

The Council appreciates the fact that certain positive steps have been taken to ameliorate the cultural and religious life of the Jewish minority in the U.S.S.R. However, the Jewish community, as a national and religious minority is, in contradistinction to other minorities, still bereft of essential media and institutions required to transmit Jewish culture to the younger generation, to supply religious needs, to train rabbis and teachers in the U.S.S.R. and to maintain contacts with Jews, throughout the world. The Council urgently calls upon the Government of the U.S.S.R. to remedy this situation.

10. Western Germany

(a) The Zionist General Council notes with deep anxiety symptoms of a revival in the Federal Republic of Germany of extreme nationalism with neo-Nazi tendencies. This is bound to be a source of danger to mankind in general and to the Jewish people in particular.

This manifestation calls for constant vigilance on the part of the nations of the world, the Jewish people and the State of Israel, and the encouragement of the efforts of all those engaged in the struggle to uproot this menace.

(b) The Council calls on the Federal German Government to undertake a comprehensive educational campaign to eradicate the remnants of the spirit of Nazism in that country.

(c) The application of a Statute of Limitations to the crime of genocide contradicts the moral foundations of civilized society. The Zionist General Council calls upon the Federal Government to give effect to this principle.

11. East Germany

The Zionist General Council condemns the persistent refusal of East Germany to make restitution to the victims of Nazism or in any way to help in their rehabilitation, despite the demands made to it by the State of Israel and by Jewish world organizations. The Council calls upon East Germany forthwith to take positive action in this regard. Furthermore, the Council expresses its dismay that East Germany has in recent years supported the Arab policy of hostility towards Israel, aimed at the destruction of the Jewish State.

12. Trials of Nazi Criminals in Austria

The Zionist General Council expresses its dismay at the lenient sentences imposed and improper verdicts delivered in the trials of Nazi criminals in Austria, and requests the Austrian Government to take all necessary steps to ensure that justice is done.

13. Special Committee

The serious problems confronting the Jewish people in various parts of the world and the continuing problems affecting Israel's position and security call for increased vigilance and effective action by the Zionist Movement.

The Zionist General Council notes the statements made by the President of the World Zionist Organization and the Chairman of the Executive favouring the establishment of a special committee, whose principal function would be to intensify Zionist awareness of these problems and activate the entire Movement more fully.

The Council views this proposal with approval and recommends that the Executive study the feasibility of this proposal and that it report progress to the next Session of the Zionist General Council.

B. IMMIGRATION AND ABSORPTION

14. Declaration on Immigration

The Zionist General Council regards immigration to Israel as the cornerstone of the public and Zionist activity of the Zionist organizations and calls upon their members to foster Aliyah consciousness, stressing the need for immigration, and striving for personal realization by immigrating to Israel.

The Zionist General Council has heard from the Prime Minister of Israel, the Minister of Labour, the Chairman of the Zionist Executive, and members of the Executive about the grave consequences, in economic and security terms, of the slowdown in immigration.

In this serious transition period the intensification of immigration from the countries of affluence must reflect the identification of the Jewish people in the dispersion with the State of Israel and its problems.

Therefore, the Zionist General Council calls on all Zionist organizations and their branches to place their activities for the encouragement of immigration at the centre of their programme of activities: pioneer immigration through the Halutz youth movements, an intensification of immigration through the Youth Aliyah, the immigration of members of the liberal professions, of young people coming to study in Israel's high schools and institutions of religious learning, of artisans and craftsmen and investors setting up economic enterprises in Israel.

Israel society is morally obliged to facilitate the absorption of this immigration by deepening the consciousness of absorption in its ranks and by the creation of a favourable atmosphere for the social integration of the immigrants.

15. Cooperation with the Government of Israel

The Zionist General Council notes with satisfaction the cooperation between the Jewish Agency and the Government of Israel, in implementing the basic policy for the encouragement of Aliyah and the improvement of the methods of absorption, and considers it necessary to expedite the establishment of a Joint Immigration and Absorption Authority within the framework of the Charter between the Jewish Agency and the Government of Israel.

16. Family Reunion Aliyah

The General Council welcomes the first stirrings of a "Family Reunion Aliyah" and expresses the hope that this Aliyah will continue and expand. The Executive and its various organs, as well as the whole Yishuv, will have to make every effort for the speedy absorption of this Aliyah in both social and economic respects.

17. Continuation of Aliyah from Lands of Distress

The General Council attaches particular importance to the continued fostering of Aliyah from areas of distress, especially as regards members of the middle classes and professionals who, in respect of their absorption in Israel, enjoy all the facilities accorded to immigrants from affluent countries.

18. Immigration of Students

The General Council regards as most beneficial the expansion of activities for bringing over university and Yeshiva students from all countries. The Council notes with particular appreciation the activities of the Oded youth movement whose aim is to effect the immigration of Jewish students from North Africa who are now in France.

19. Information for the Encouragement of Aliyah

The General Council stresses the importance of information activities for the encouragement of Aliyah both by visits of delegations of spiritual leaders and public figures from all walks of life in accordance with the resolutions of the 26th Congress and by the holding of special 'information months' and any other suitable means.

20. Training of Emissaries

The General Council stresses the importance of thorough training of emissaries active in the field of Aliyah as regards their knowledge of absorption facilities in Israel and their suitability for the countries to which they are sent.

21. Consciousness of Absorption in Israel

The General Council appeals to the inhabitants of Israel to intensify absorption-consciousness in Israel and to work for the social integration of immigrants on the lines of work already conducted by immigrants' organizations, women's organizations and existing volunteer groups.

22. Adaptation of Housing to the Nature of Aliyah

The General Council approves of initiative to adapt immigrants' housing to the character of the new Aliyah, e.g.: provision of flats for rent in all parts of the country, including flats for single adults and childless couples; expansion of the network of hostels, the establishment of boarding schools in hostels for young people, with classes for the study of Hebrew and vocational training.

23. Consolidation of Development Towns

The General Council views with anxiety the slow progress and expansion of development towns and appeals to government and public bodies to work for their economic and social consolidation.

24. Immigrants to Agricultural Settlements

The General Council considers it important that immigrants be directed to agricultural settlement in kibbutzim and moshavim and welcomes the Government's programme for diverting young couples and immigrant families from urban to rural areas, and members of the second generation to new settlements.

25. Encouragement of Studies in Ulpanim

The General Council recommends the conduct of information activities among Jewish organizations and youth abroad with a view to encouraging the study of Hebrew ulpanim in Israel, which are a valuable instrument for stimulating Aliyah and facilitating integration.

26. Legislation for the Promotion of Aliyah

The General Council re-emphasizes the urgent need for the implementation of the decision of the 26th Congress concerning special legislation for the promotion and encouragement of the Aliyah of people of means and professionals and for granting additional privileges to immigrants regarding capital transfer, import duties, property taxes etc.

27. Youth Aliyah

The General Council expresses its thanks to all supporters of Youth Aliyah in Israel and abroad for their efforts in mobilizing part of Youth Aliyah's budget. In view of the new tasks confronting Youth Aliyah, the Council appeals to all Friends and Committees of Youth Aliyah to increase their activities on behalf of Youth Aliyah in order to further the following aims: the acceleration of immigration and facilitation of the absorption of immigrant youth from both affluent countries and areas of distress, the facilitation of the absorption of the children of immigrants in Israel and the furtherance of their social and vocational integration in the country.

C. BUDGET AND FINANCE

28. Implementation of Budgets in the Period April 1, 1965 - September 30, 1966

The Zionist General Council takes note of the Financial Report of the World Zionist Organization - Jewish Agency for Israel for the period of April 1, 1965 - September 30, 1966, and expresses its gratification at the implementation of budgets during this period.

29. Budget Estimates for 1967/68

The Zionist General Council notes the estimated income of the World Zionist Organization - Jewish Agency for Israel in the amount of IL 309,776,000 and of the framework for the expenditure budget in the same sum, which is based on the principle of no increase in debts, and authorizes the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee to consider and decide on:

- (a) details of the Expenditure Budgets;
- (b) any further budget which may be submitted to it by the Jewish Agency Executive in the course of the budgetary year in the light of further needs and developments.

30. Payment of Expenses to Members of the Zionist General Council

Following a recommendation adopted at the previous session, the General Council reaffirms that, while recognizing the principle that representatives of the movement have the right to have their expenses paid for travel to the Sessions of the General Council, it calls upon the Members of the General Council to endeavour to cover these expenses themselves either in whole or in part.

Detailed regulations on this matter are subject to the approval of the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee.

D. THE FUNDS

31. The United Israel Appeal

The funds received from the United Israel Appeal, the principal beneficiary of the United Jewish Appeal in the United States, and the Keren Hayesod – United Israel Appeals in other countries, serve as the main source of finance for the budget of the World Zionist Organization – the Jewish Agency. The Zionist General Council therefore calls upon Jews throughout the world, and particularly organized Zionists, to remember that the implementation of the above budget depends upon a greater general effort to increase contributions to the United Appeals in the various countries. It calls on every Jew to participate actively in the work of the campaigns.

32. Approval of the Jewish National Fund Budget for 1967/68

The General Council authorizes the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee to consider and decide upon the budgetary proposals of the Jewish National Fund for the year 1967/68, which will be submitted to it in due course.

33. Land Development by the K.K.L.

The Council has taken note of the large-scale plans for the development which the Jewish National Fund has been called upon to carry out in the interests of the country's economic growth and progress.

Since implementation of these plans requires the urgent mobilization of additional funds the Council calls on all organizations, institutions and individuals to intensify work for the Jewish National Fund so as to increase its income from contributions by all means at their disposal.

E. THE COMPTROLLER

34. Comptroller's Report

The Zionist General Council takes note of the 10th annual Report of the Comptroller of the World Zionist Organization - Jewish Agency for Israel and of the observations of the Executive on the Report which have been submitted to the Zionist General Council.

The Zionist General Council approves of the findings of the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee as adopted and approved unanimously at its meeting of December 16, 1966, as follows:

"The Committee expresses its gratification to the Comptroller and his Office for their comprehensive report on the various fields of activity of the Zionist Executive and its institutions, and takes note of the prompt and adequate reply.

By virtue of the authority granted it by Section 16 (b) of its Statutes the Committee resolves:

(a) The findings of the Committee require constant follow-up by the Comptroller's Office with regard to the implementation of the reforms which the Executive has undertaken to carry out in the coming budgetary year.

(b) The Committee will set up a special sub-committee from among its members, to examine the problems raised by the Comptroller in connection with the companies of the Zionist Movement and its institutions and will submit its findings to the full Budget and Finance Committee within four months of the publication of the Report.

(c) On the completion of the work of the sub-committee on Companies the Permanent Budget and Finance Committee will draw its conclusions regarding the details of the Comptroller's Report.

F. ORGANIZATION

35. The Zionist Council in Israel

The Zionist General Council expresses its gratification at the recommendation of the Commission on Re-organization to establish a Zionist Council in Israel, charged with the promotion of Zionist values and fostering the consciousness of unity of the Jewish people, with disseminating knowledge of Diaspora Jewry and its problems, within the Israel community, and encouraging activities for the social and spiritual integration of immigrants.

The Zionist General Council charges the Presidium in consultation with the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, to take all necessary steps for determining the composition of the Zionist Council in Israel as soon as possible.

G. LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

36. Amendments to the Constitution

By virtue of Article 64 of the Constitution of the World Zionist Organization, in pursuance of Resolution 18 (a) (hh) of the 26th Zionist Congress authorizing the Zionist General Council to decide upon amendments to the Constitution of the World Zionist Organization, and in accordance with Resolution 14 of the Zionist General Council in its Session of January 1966, the Council resolves as follows:

Following Chapter II of the Constitution, Chapter III to read as follows, shall be inserted:

**OBLIGATIONS OF MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNING BODIES
OF THE WORLD ZIONIST ORGANIZATION TO THE FUNDS**

**Obligations of the Members
of the governing bodies of
the World Zionist Organization**

Article 60 (a)

Section 1: Members of the governing bodies of the WZO mentioned in Article 14 (e) of the Constitution are obliged to fulfil their obligations towards the Keren Hayesod – United Israel Appeal, the UJA and the KKL (hereinafter "Funds") in the course of the whole Congress period.

Section 2: If a member of the governing bodies mentioned in Sec. 1 has not fulfilled his obligations towards the Funds, the Executive shall notify the Attorney of the WZO in order to initiate steps before the Congress Tribunal in accordance with Article 49, Sec.1 (g). The Executive is also entitled to suspend his membership of the body until the decision of the Attorney. The Executive shall immediately notify the Attorney of such suspension of membership. Details of Procedure shall be determined in the Regulations for the Implementation of the Constitution.

Article 7, lit. (f) and (g)

**Obligations of the members
of Territorial Institutions**

Following Article 7, lit. (e) of the Constitution, lit. (f) and (g) to read as follows shall be inserted:

Lit. (f) To stipulate that a person must have fulfilled his obligations towards the Keren Hayesod – United Israel

Appeal, the UJA and the KKL during the whole term of his office in order to qualify for office in the Zionist Federation analogous to those mentioned in Article 14 (e) and to assure the fulfilment of the above obligations by means of regulations on the model of the provisions of Article 60 (a) of the Constitution, and of Regulation 11 of the Regulations for the Implementation of the Constitution.

- Lit. (g) To ensure the right of any person whose membership in a governing body of the Federation has been suspended in accordance with the aforementioned lit., to appeal from such decision to the Territorial Judicial Body (Article 57) and from the decision of that body to the Congress Tribunal.

Chapters III, IV, V and VI of the Constitution shall henceforth be chapters IV, V, VI and VII respectively.

37. Amendment to the Regulations for the Implementation of the Constitution of the World Zionist Organization

By virtue of Articles 60 (a) and 65 of the Constitution of the World Zionist Organization, the General Council resolves to adopt the following Regulation of the Regulations for the Implementation of the Constitution.

Regulation 11

(to Article 60 (a) of the Constitution)

Obligations of the
members of governing
bodies of WZO

- (a) The Executive shall submit the list of the members of the governing bodies mentioned in Art. 14 (e) of the Constitution (hereinafter, "the Bodies") to the Central Offices of the Keren Hayesod - United Israel Appeal, the UJA and the KKL (hereinafter, "Central Offices of

the Funds"), within one month of their election. If the members of the bodies were elected successively, partial lists shall be submitted within one month of each election.

- (b) The Central Offices of the Funds shall examine directly or through the territorial committees concerned if all members on the list have fulfilled their obligations towards the Funds in the year of election.
- (c) Fulfilment of obligations implies a contribution appropriate to the economic position of the member, having regard to the general level of contributions in the country concerned. The Central Office of each Fund is entitled to exempt a member of a Body from the fulfilment of his obligation in view of his economic position.
- (d) The Central Office of each Fund shall examine each year following the year of election whether all members of the Body continue to fulfil their obligations towards the Funds. The Executive shall inform the Central Offices of the Funds of any change in the personal composition of the Bodies.
- (e) Should any member of a Body not fulfil his obligation, the Central Office of the Fund concerned shall warn and request him to do so within a month of the receipt of the warning.
- (f) Should the member not fulfil his obligation in spite of the warning, the Central Office of the Fund shall notify the Executive, which shall transmit this notification to the Attorney of the Zionist Organization in order to take steps against the member in accordance with Article 49, Section 1 (g) of the Constitution. If the Executive decides to suspend his membership of the Body, it shall immediately notify the Attorney of this decision.

- (g) Should the Attorney be of the opinion that the member has not complied with his obligations towards the Fund, he shall file a Bill of Complaint with the Congress Tribunal in accordance with Chapter F of the Rules of Procedure of the Congress Tribunal. If the Attorney is satisfied that the membership in the Body should be suspended until the final decision of the Tribunal, he shall request the Tribunal in accordance with Rule 43 of Procedure of the Congress Tribunal.

38. Amendment of the Standing Orders of the
Zionist General Council

Term of the Session

Section 6 shall read as follows:

"Subject to Article 36 of the Constitution, the ordinary sessions of the General Council shall be held every year not later than in the month of March, (instead of "... every year in the month of March").

39. Amendment of the Statutes of the Comptroller
and of the Control Office

The Annual Report of the Comptroller

The first sentence of Section 17 shall read as follows:

"The Comptroller shall, within three months after the end of the financial year of the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency, submit his Annual Report to the Executive for its perusal (instead of "... within five months").

40. Establishment of the Committee for the Determination
of the Number of Congress Delegates

By virtue of Articles 18 and 31 of the Constitution, the General Council authorizes the Presidium to set up a Committee of 16 members for the Determination of the Number of Delegates to the 27th Zionist Congress for each election area, with the exception of those in Israel and the USA. The Presidium shall carry out this election as soon as possible.

H. ELECTIONS

41. Members of the General Council in an
Advisory Capacity

By virtue of Article 32, section 3, lit. (f) of the Constitution of the WZO and in accordance with a joint proposal by the President of the WZO and the Chairman of the Zionist General Council, the General Council approves the election of the following as members of the General Council in an advisory capacity:

Aba Bornstein
Rabbi Prof. Dr. Louis Isaac Rabinowitz

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND OF THE
ZIONIST GENERAL COUNCIL

who participated in the Session, January, 1967

1. MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE

President of the World Zionist Organization

Dr. Nachum Goldmann

Chairman of the Executive

Mr. Louis A. Pincus

Members

Mr. Itzhak Artzi, Jerusalem
Mr. David Beth-Aryeh, Jerusalem
Mr. Eliyahu Dobkin, Jerusalem
Mr. Leon Dultzin, Jerusalem
Rabbi Leon Feuer, Cleveland
Dr. Israel Goldstein, Jerusalem
Prof. Rabbi Simon Greenberg, New York
Mrs. S.W. Halprin, New York
Mr. Itzhak Harkavi, Jerusalem
Mrs. Raya Jaglom, Tel Aviv
Rabbi Mordechai Kirshblum, New York
Mr. Joseph Klarman, Jerusalem
Mr. Chaim Levanon, Jerusalem

Mrs. Zivia Loubetkin, Jerusalem
Mr. Zvi Lurie, Jerusalem
Dr. Astorre Mayer, Milano
Mr. André Narboni, Tel Aviv
Dr. Emanuel Neumann, New York
Mr. Woolf Perry, Jerusalem
Prof. Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, New York
Dr. Joseph B. Schechtman, New York
Mr. Shlomo Zalman Shragai, Jerusalem
Lord Sieff, London
Dr. Raanan Weitz, Jerusalem
Mr. Avraham Cygel, Tel Aviv
Prof. Marie Syrkin, New York

Deputy Member: Mr. Abraham Schenker, New York

2. PRESIDIUUM OF THE ZIONIST GENERAL COUNCIL

Chairman

Mr. Jacob Tsur, Jerusalem

Members

Mrs. Rachel Shazar, Honorary Member,
Jerusalem

Mr. Jacob Amit, Tel Aviv

Mr. Bezalel Bazak, Jerusalem

Mr. Leon Gelman, Tel Aviv

Mrs. Rosa Ginossar, Jerusalem

Mr. Paul L. Goldman, New York

Mr. Gideon Hausner, Jerusalem

Mr. Raphael Kotlowitz, Tel Aviv

Mr. Itzhak Korn, Tel Aviv

Mrs. Lola Kramarsky, New York

Mr. Najman Radzichovski, Buenos Aires

Mr. Anselm Reiss, Tel Aviv

Mrs. Dvora Rothbard, New York

Mr. Meilich Topiol, Paris

Mr. Jacques Torczyner, New York

Mr. Baruch Weinstein, Tel Aviv

3. MEMBERS OF THE ZIONIST GENERAL COUNCIL

Members Elected by Congress

Virilists

Mr. Yehuda Braginsky, Givat Hashlosha

Mr. Joseph Daleski, Johannesburg

Prof. Benzion Dinur, Jerusalem

Rabbi Dr. Simon Federbush, New York

Mr. Edward E. Gelber, Jerusalem

Mr. Yitzchak Gruenbaum, Gan Shmuel

Mr. Neta Harpaz, Tel Aviv

Mr. Abraham Hartzfeld, Tel Aviv

Mrs. Irma L. Lindheim, Mishmar Haemek

Mr. Berl Locker, Jerusalem

Dr. Shmuel Margoshes, New York

Mr. Shabtai Miron (Mirenburg), Tel Aviv

Mr. Fred Monosson, Boston

Mr. Shmuel Zakif, Tel Aviv

Mr. Baruch Zuckerman, Jerusalem

Mr. Aba Bornstein, London (elected during
session)

Former Members of the Executive

Mr. Moshe Erem, Tel Aviv

Mr. Moshe Kol, Jerusalem

World Union of General Zionists

Mr. Harold W. Carmely, New York

Mr. Leon Ilutovich, New York

Dr. Harris J. Levine, New York

Mr. Jack Lefkowitz, New York

Dr. Max Nussbaum, Hollywood

Mr. Jacques Orfus, Paris

Dr. Morton J. Robbins, Boston

Mr. Yeshayahu Shay, Ein Hashlosha

Dr. Abraham Stupp, Tel Aviv

Dr. Marcos Vodovotz, Affuleh

World Confederation of General Zionists

Mrs. Judith Epstein, New York

Dr. Miriam K. Freund, New York

Mrs. Esther Gottesman, New York

Mr. Edel J. Horwitz, Johannesburg

Mrs. Charlotte Jacobson, New York

Sir Barnett Janner, London

Mrs. Fay L. Schenk, New York

Mr. Ezra Z. Shapiro, Cleveland

Mr. Donald Silk, London

Mrs. Dorothy Spector, Boston

**World Union Poale-Zion (Z.S.)-
Hitachdut**

Mr. Shimon Avizemer, Tel Aviv
 Mr. Efraim Bariach, Paris
 Mr. Meyer Benyaer, Beersheba
 Prof. André Chouraqui, Jerusalem
 Mr. Jacques Cypel, Paris
 Mr. Hy Faine, New York
 Mr. Zvi Fainguersh, Buenos Aires
 Mrs. Blanche Fine, New York
 Dr. Berl Frymer, Tel Aviv
 Mrs. Mathilda Guez, Tel Aviv
 Mr. Joseph Israeli, Afikim
 Mrs. Sara Kafri, Kfar Yehoshua
 Mr. Jacob Katzman, New York
 Mr. Moshe Kitron, Tel Aviv
 Mr. Leon Kronitz, Montreal
 Dr. Shneur Levenberg, London
 Mr. Harold Miller, Edgware
 Mr. Israel Ritov, Tel Aviv
 Mr. Harry Trope, Johannesburg

World Union of Herut-Hatzohar

Mr. Yechia Amrani, Tel Aviv
 Mr. Iehuda Benari, Ramat Gan
 Mr. Salomon Friedrich, Paris
 Mr. Harry Hurwitz, Johannesburg
 Mr. David Jutan, Tel Aviv
 Mr. David Niv, Jerusalem
 Mr. Aisik Remba, Tel Aviv

World Union of Mapam

Mr. Reuben Arzi, Jerusalem
 Mr. Jacob Hazan, Merhavia
 Mr. Shlomo Rosen, Sarid
 Mr. Meir Yaari, Merhavia

Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi

Rabbi Bernard Bergman, New York
 Mr. Yeshayahu Bernstein, Tel Aviv
 Mrs. Miriam Eliash, Tel Aviv
 Mr. Jehuda Elinson, Jerusalem
 Mr. David Klimovsky, Buenos Aires
 Mr. Harry Landy, London
 Mr. Daniel Levy, Bat Yam
 Mr. Jacob Marrus, New York
 Dr. Pinchas Rosenbaum, Geneva
 Dr. Maurice Sage, New York
 Rabbi Tsemach Menachem Zambrovsky
 St. Laurent (Canada)

World Union of Achdut Ha'avoda - Poal

Mr. Joseph Bankower, Ramat Hakoves
 Mr. Chaim Finkelstein, Buenos Aires
 Mr. Yitzhak Tabenkin, Ein Harod

W.I.Z.O.

Mrs. Miriam Ben-Porat, Tel Aviv
 Mrs. Fay Grove-Pollak, Tel Aviv

Deputy-Members

Who Participated in the Place of Members
Absent from the Whole or Part of the Session

World Union Poale-Zion (Z.S.)-
Hitachdut

Mr. Doy Biegun, Paris
Mr. Leon Butensky, Santiago (Chile)
Mrs. Sara Feder, Columbia
Mr. Marcos Firer, Sao Paulo
Mr. P.S. Gourgey, London
Mr. Michel Radzinski, Lima
Mr. Isaac Roseby, Victoria (Australia)
Mr. Prof. Ezra Spicehandler, Cincinnati
Mr. Benjamin Teller, Bronx

World Union of General Zionists

Mr. Jacob Amitai, Tel Aviv
Mr. Roberto Aron, Ramat Gan
Mr. Elie Chemouni, Moshav Petachia
Mr. Israel Dunskey, Kfar Shmaryahu
Mr. Shoolem Ettinger, Indianapolis
Mr. Elias Hun, La Paz
Mr. Julian Mercer, Melbourne
Mr. José Schmidt, Rio de Janeiro
Mr. Chaim Teichman, Ramat Gan
Mr. Avraham Tory, Tel Aviv
Mr. Leon Wohlman, Zuerich

World Union of Mapam

Mr. Yeshayahu Austri-Dunn, Tel Aviv
Mr. Avraham Berniker, Windsor (Canada)
Mrs. Chaika Grossman-Orkin, Kib. Ebron
Mr. Moshe Kagan, New York
Mr. Mordekhai Oren, Kib. Mizra
Mr. David Roizin, Buenos Aires

World Confederation of General Zionists

Mr. Harry Cohen, Johannesburg
Mr. Solomon David Granek, Montreal
Mrs. Rose E. Matzkin, Waterbury
Mr. Izak Warszawski, Paris

Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi

Mr. Samson Krupnick, Tel Aviv
Mrs. Nathalie Reznikoff, Brooklyn
Rabbi Pinchas Roitman, Paris

World Union of Herut-Hatzohar

Mrs. Zilla Amidror, Tel Aviv
Mr. Abraham Isaac Bokser, Buenos Aires
Mr. Eliyahu Chabusha, Misgav Dov
Mr. Moshe Giloni, New York
Mr. Yehoshua Lichtenstein, Montevideo.

World Union of Achdut Ha'avoda-
Poale-Zion

Mr. Yerachmiel Assa, Kib. Hulata
Mr. Jacob Mendelsohn, Tel Aviv
Mr. Yehuda Tyberg, New York

MEMBERS AND PARTICIPANTS WITHOUT VOTING RIGHTS

Legal Officers

Judge Moshe Landau, Chairman of Congress Tribunal, Jerusalem
 Mr. Chaim Krongold, Attorney of the World Zionist Organization, Jerusalem

Representatives of Financial Institutions

Dr. Yeshayahu Foerder, Jewish Colonial Trust, Tel Aviv
 Mr. Joseph Weitz, Keren Kayemeth Leisrael, Jerusalem
 Mr. Moshe Ussoskin, Keren Hayesod, Jerusalem

Comptroller

Mr. M.B. Meiri, Jerusalem

Delegation of the Youth Movements in Israel

Mr. Mordechai Blanch, Hashomer Hatzair
 Mr. Menahem Daniv, Hanoar Haoved Vehalomed
 Mr. Gideon Shipuny, Beitar
 Mr. David Shohat, Hatzofim
 Mr. Avraham Stern, Bnei Akiva

Representatives of the Zionist Youth Movements Abroad

Mr. Israel Avidor, Ihud Habonim
 Mr. Benzion Givoni, Beitar
 Mr. Avraham Hason, Hanoar Hatzioni
 Mr. Aron Luis, Maccabi
 Mr. Joseph Shapira, Bnei Akiva
 Mr. Sheike Weiner, Hashomer Hatzair

Representatives of the World Union of Jewish Students

Mr. Moshe Dworkin, Vice-Chairman for North American Region
 Mr. Mike Hunter, Vice-Chairman for Europe

COMMITTEES OF THE ZIONIST GENERAL COUNCIL

POLITICAL COMMITTEE

Chairman: Dr. Max Nussbaum

Deputy-Chairman: Mrs. Chaika Grossman-Orkin

Mr. Reuben Arzi
 Mr. Shimon Avizemer
 Mr. Iehuda Benari
 Rabbi Bernard Bergman
 Dr. Dov Biegun
 Mr. Aba Bornstein
 Mrs. Judith Epstein
 Mr. Shoolem Ettinger
 Mr. Zvi Fainguerish
 Rabbi Dr. Simon Federbush
 Mr. Chaim Finkelstein
 Dr. Miriam K. Freund
 Mr. Salomon Friedrich
 Dr. Berl Frymer
 Mrs. Chaika Grossman-Orkin

Mr. Edel J. Horwitz
 Mr. Harry Hurwitz
 Mrs. Raya Jaglom
 Sir Barnett Janner
 Mr. Jacob Katzman
 Mr. David Klimovsky
 Dr. Shneur Levenberg
 Dr. Harris J. Levine
 Mr. Harold Miller
 Dr. Max Nussbaum
 Mr. Jacques Orfus
 Mr. Najman Radzichovski
 Mr. Ezra Z. Shapiro
 Mr. Benjamin Teller
 Mr. Abraham Tory

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, FINANCE AND FUNDS

Chairman: Mrs. Fay Schenk

Deputy-Chairman: Mr. Joseph Daleski

Mr. Efraim Bariach
 Mr. Abraham Berniker
 Mrs. Miriam Ben-Porat
 Mr. Harry Cohen
 Mr. Joseph Daleski
 Mr. Israel Dunsky
 Mr. Jehuda Elinson
 Mr. Moshe Giloni
 Mr. Solomon David Granek
 Mr. Neta Harpaz
 Mr. Abraham Hartzfeld
 Mr. Joseph Israeli
 Mr. David Jutan
 Mr. Harry Landy
 Mr. Jack Lefkowitz
 Mr. Julian Mercer
 Mr. Israel Ritov
 Dr. Pinchas Rosenbaum
 Mrs. Dvorah Rothbard
 Mr. Donald Silk

Mrs. Fay Schenk
 Mr. Harry Trope
 Mr. Jehuda Tyberg
 Mr. Yehoshua Auerbach
 Mr. M. Friedman
 Mr. Herman Hollander
 Mrs. Charlotte Jacobson
 Mrs. Genia Kanowitz
 Mr. Israel Keisar
 Mr. Raphael Kotlowitz
 Mr. Moshe Lefeber
 Mr. I. Bar-Levav
 Mr. Akiva Levinsky
 Mr. Joshua Levy
 Mr. Shlomo Rosen
 Mr. Jacob Schutzberg
 Mr. Kalman Sultanik
 Mr. Zeev Tsur
 Mr. Shalom Vered

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND ABSORPTION

Chairman: Mr. Leon Kronitz

Deputy-Chairman: Mr. Yosef Bankower

Mrs. Zilla Amidror
 Mr. Roberto Aron
 Dr. Yeshayahu Austri-Dunn
 Mr. Yosef Bankower
 Mr. Meir Benyaer
 Mr. Eliyahu Chabusha
 Mrs. Miriam Eliash
 Dr. Sara Feder
 Mrs. Esther Gottesman
 Mr. P.S. Gourgey
 Mrs. Mathilda Guez
 Mr. Elias Hun

Mrs. Raya Jaglom
 Mrs. Sara Kafri
 Mr. Leon Kronitz
 Mr. Yehoshua Lichtenstein
 Mrs. Nathalie Reznikoff
 Dr. Morton J. Robbins
 Rabbi Pinchas Roitman
 Dr. David Roizin
 Mrs. Dorothy Spector
 Prof. Ezra Spicehandler
 Dr. Abraham Stupp
 Dr. Marcos Vodovotz

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES IN THE DIASPORA

Chairman: Rabbi Tsemach Menachem Zambrowsky

Deputy-Chairman: Mr. Najman Radzichovski

Mr. Yechia Amrani
 Mr. Yeshayahu Bernstein
 Mr. Leon Butensky
 Mr. Harold W. Carmely
 Mr. Jacques Cypel
 Mrs. Blanche Fine
 Dr. Marcos Firer
 Mr. Paul L. Goldman
 Mrs. Fay Grove-Pollak
 Mr. Harry Hurwitz
 Mrs. Charlotte Jacobson

Mr. Moshe Kagan
 Mr. Jacob Marrus
 Mr. Mordechai Oren
 Mr. Najman Radzichovski
 Mr. Isaac Roseby
 Dr. José Schmidt
 Mr. Izak Warszawski
 Mr. Baruch Weinstein
 Dr. Leon Wohlman
 Rabbi Tsemach Menachem Zambrowsky