

CD-1086 Transcription

Paris Forum on Antisemitism in Europe [4]. 20 March 1983.

TANENBAUM: [00:00] -- why we would be falling into the trap of the terrorists who want to create this impression that what is happening is part of anti-Semitism.

F1: That each bomb is an anti-Semitic...

ABE: That each bomb is an act of anti-Semitism.

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French)

ABE: (translating) One of the reasons for this terrorist approach -- there are two hypotheses. One that, perhaps, they want to lead to a [01:00] general political destabilization. Second, that perhaps they hope to separate diaspora Jewish from Israel, by making diaspora Jews feel that they're insecurity arises from the fact that they support Israel, and therefore, they shouldn't do it.

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French)

ABE: (translating) He gave as an example the meeting of Foreign Minister Cheysson of the French with Arafat, where immediately after Cheysson, [02:00] warned that there would be further terrorist attacks against the Jewish communities in Europe -- thus, in a sense, bolstering the thesis that Jewish communities must disassociate themselves from Israel, or bring pressure upon Israel to change its

policies, or otherwise be ready for further attacks of  
(inaudible).

TANENBAUM: Is there no feeling that the killing of Jews who  
are Jews is, in and of itself, a rewarding act? That,  
beyond the political motive, is there no feeling that  
there's hatred of Jews, and striking against a Jew anywhere  
is somehow in revenge for Israel?

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [03:00]

ABE: (translating) He summarized your question, and then he said  
he doesn't believe this hypothesis. He believes that it was  
an organized commando, and its objectives are much wider in  
the political framework than simple death.

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [04:00]

ABE: (translating) Within the framework --

F2: (Speaking French)

ABE: (translating) Within the framework of anti-Semitism in  
Europe, and the explosion of bombing, he does not believe  
that local Jewish communal [05:00] leaders should  
necessarily base their language and their reactions upon  
the basis of that which is Israel. For example, he gave the  
case of Prime Minister Begin's reaction, speaking about the  
outbreak of a wave of anti-Semitism in France, when the  
policies of France and Israel were particularly divergent  
for a particular moment. And he believes it is a mistake

for Jewish communities abroad to necessarily follow an Israeli lead reaction or (inaudible).

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [06:00] [07:00]

ABE: (translating) There is a difficulty for lots of Jewish leaders. They fear that separation of their position from that of Israel, of course, can be used by the enemies of Israel. Therefore, they remain silent. He's speaking, particularly, for -- he knows the French, Belgian, French-language countries. Inasmuch as the local Jewish leadership in these countries do not have a language of their own, only one voice is heard. It is very strongly -- it is heard in the media. And since there is no local voice, only that of the Prime Minister of Israel, and even while this may be that of a majority of Jews, especially of the Jews in places [08:00] where bombs and explosions take place, it is not an attitude that necessarily should be that of the local leadership. As the (inaudible) believe that this failure to speak out about a position of their own weighs heavily in the balance, and is finally (inaudible).

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [09:00] [10:00]

ABE: (translating) It is normal that -- Israel to be occupied with the situation of Jews in the diaspora. But it is also normal for Jews themselves in the diaspora to take positions. Dignity itself requires it. It requires it. And

it is up to the diaspora Jews to make themselves respected in Israel by Israeli leadership. And there should be consultation with them, not through ambassadors of Israel who usually short-circuit what they have to say, but directly. So that, he would hope there would be that kind of consultation in the future. He gives another example of this working in the [11:00] opposite direction, as regards the situation in the invasion of Lebanon. Here were 15 days where, by the habit of waiting for Israel to react, and Israel's position, local leadership had no position, no explanation as to what was happening, why the Israelis were going in. There was no analysis, and this hurt Israel's own propaganda, and own position here, not to mention that of the local Jewish communities themselves.

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [12:00]

ABE: (translating) In conclusion, he's very happy for this meeting, and that American Jews are represented here. And if there are difficulties for local communities to be heard -- I think there was an implication that, perhaps, the Americans, though that was not stated -- perhaps the American Jewish community might be able to do, [13:00] perhaps, a little more in that respect. So, that's another story.

F2: Right you are. That's what he meant.

ABE: (translating) He concludes, the last, to urge that there be more such meetings, and the possibility for Jewish communities, together, to go to Jerusalem, to give their point of view on the repercussions of the Arab/Israel conflict could have on their situations. Lots of luck.  
(laughter)

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [14:00]

ABE: (translating) He wanted to speak about polls, and being much discussed, and to point out -- and it was pointed to him that it had been discussed -- that there is no isomorphic relationship between the support or non-support for Israel, and support or non-support of (inaudible) [15:00] to being anti-Semitic. He pointed out, further, as one example, that when pro-Israel sentiment was strongest in France -- in 1967 -- it was just that moment when General de Gaulle switched policies. So, the analysis has to be not that public sentiment, but the interests and the relations of states and of the politics with (inaudible).

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [16:00]

ABE: (translating) He believes it would [17:00] be a terrible -- and we'd fall in the trap of our opponents when we too start equating anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism, or vice versa. Another concept is needed. We cannot consider that

everybody who thinks an anti-Israel position or an anti-Zionist position is therefore anti-Zionist or anti-Semitic. In parentheses, obviously, everybody has the right to criticize. We, too, do not deprive ourselves of that privilege with regard to Israeli particular policies. We abuse language, however, if we are not able to make this distinction between those who criticize and those who are fundamentally anti-Semitic or anti-Zionist, and we hurt our own cause in so doing.

TANENBAUM: Question: how many (inaudible) on how it is regarded in France -- the anti-Zionist ambience at the United Nations, where Zionism is overtly equated with racism? And the implication is clear that it has an anti-Semitic tinge [18:00] to it, where at least American Jews are of the firm opinion that the greatest disseminator of anti-Semitism in the world today is the United Nations, which takes its form in attacking Zionism.

M3: I would like to say that nobody, I believe here, around this table, would give as definition of anti-Zionism the fact of criticizing this action of the government of Israel. I believe anti-Zionism is a well-defined notion of people who don't accept the existence of the state of Israel. And, for instance, I would say, at the limit, I could say that somebody like Cheysson is between the two.

Because every of his actions is against Israel. But when Mitterrand, for instance, gives regularly some criticism against the government of Israel, I still consider Mitterrand as one of the best friends of Israel. [19:00] So, anti-Zionism is not the fact of criticizing. Absolutely not.

M2: Well, (inaudible) is overreacting in making the criticism of Israel anti-Zionist. That's what you're saying.  
(overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

M3: But nobody said that here (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: Not around this table, but I (inaudible).

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [20:00]

ABE: (translating) OK, we have a propaganda difficulty. To call an adversary anti-Semitic or anti-Zionist is sometimes an advantage for us. But he warns -- Mr. Heisenberg warns that to abuse this will cause difficulties for us, and turn against us in the long run.

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [21:00]

F2: (Speaking French)

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [22:00]

F2: (foreign)

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [23:00] [24:00] [25:00] [26:00]

ABE: (translating) To speak of anti-Semitism is really to speak of goyim, and what bothers them. But I am worried about the

image of the Jews and of Israel among Jews. Anti-Semitism, I might say, in an exaggerated fashion, is the problem of the goyim. But what Jews think of themselves is our problem, as it is the future, and affects the future of Jews and Israel. I would like conclude with what [Nelly Guttman?] mentioned. Many are worried about anti-Semitism, and we're in this anti-Semitic crisis, and there would be an anti-Semitic crisis during recent months. The Jewish community today -- and this is something which would not have been possible even 10 or 12 years ago -- is accepted as being specific, different, having [27:00] its own positions, and is so accepted by the political community and by the general French community. That is has a specific alliance with Israel is also accepted, as was not the case some years ago. Is this good? Is this bad? It is a question of ideology. It happens to be an important, existentialist stage in Jewish history at the present time -- this recognition of Judaism, per se, not only as a religion, but also on political and cultural grounds. The problem is that our leadership wants us to be like others, rather than assert the specificity. So, what is important to us -- what is more important for us -- more important than what others think of us, is what we think of ourselves. Mr.

[Achenburg?] is worried, indeed, that Jews will disappear,



because they have defined themselves, or they are coming back to the community not for internal reasons of how they view themselves, but for what might be called [Sartrean?] reasons as to how others [28:00] view them. And this, for ourselves and Israel, is a very grave, because, as he says, it should be our own opinion of ourselves for the determining factor in this situation. Today, Lebanon gave us an example of a problem that we have, because most Jews live out their Judaism today through Israel. So, what we feel and how we react with the (inaudible) in school and so on, is part of a reflection of what happens in Israel, as well as what happens to ourselves. And this is the time that image and discussion -- self-image that we must have dialogues upon, as well as upon anti-Semitism.

M3: I'd tell a little anecdote to answer to that. The difference of the Jews is -- what they call it in French, I don't know -- the (foreign). Because this difference can be made in a positive sense, and can also be made in a negative sense. And I will you a little example -- not very important maybe, but very symptomatic, [29:00] concerning a Belgian tradition about that. After the bombing of the synagogue in Antwerp, there was a very long (inaudible) about the dead, with pictures, interviews, and so on. And after this was completed, the speaker said, "Let's come

back to Belgian affairs." So, it was very badly (inaudible) by all the Jewish community in Belgium. And this was clearly the difference you spoke about, in that sense. Twice in the French TV, one of the most famous commentators, Christine Ockrent, said about the grief -- (foreign). (laughter)

TANENBAUM: By the way, one question to you. You also mentioned the fact that (inaudible) Jewish specificity in the cultural and other fields. [30:00] And that you were worried about it, whereas in other countries, for example, we see this as a reawakening in ways we never even expected a decade ago, of a specifically Jewish culture in France, and a positive attitude toward Jewish culture and Jewish events. And yet, here you have negative doubts it.

F2: And we are mixed up now (inaudible).

M7: No, I have negative feelings about it, from the Jewish point. I think that's a good thing. But your specific question was, does anti-Semitic prejudice decrease or increase? And I had the feeling, if you compare the situation of Jews as, in fact, totally accepted Dutchmen, 20 years after the Second World War, that that changed now. [31:00] They see the Jews as this specific group, and they're pinpointed by their Jewish background. I just wanted to show that it might be, also, a tendency of

increased prejudice against Jews. But I have no negative feelings from the Jewish point of view on that.

(overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

F1: (Speaking French) [32:00] And again, I always like to point out that, to have a precise position for the Jewish community in any country, according to its links with Israel, it constitutes a danger for diaspora Jewry. First of all, from a physical motive, because they [33:00] themselves in a position (inaudible). Both in the physical country where they live, and, also, in Israel, because they are not (inaudible) in Israel. So, they find themselves actually in a kind of vacuum.

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [34:00]

ABE: (translating) [35:00] One great problem with regard to defense of Israel -- I'm sorry. With regard to the great problems -- with regard to subjects like the defense of Israel -- Jews cannot take -- diaspora Jews cannot take a position. But two points ought to be made with regard to it. When you see, first, that Israeli positions can affect diaspora Jews. And, by the way, we haven't asked ourselves here why -- where such Israeli positions can even affect the lives of Jews, we haven't asked ourselves why there have been no attacks against the Jews in the United States. That's something that we ought to ask about. The second

point is, that the Israeli leaders see the diaspora Jews as the first-line troops of defense in promulgating or defending any particular position. So, we have even all the more reasons why we should demand to have -- we should demand of Israel that we have discussions between diaspora Jews and Israel, so we can take positions with some understanding [36:00] of these positions, and not accepting simply as pawns who are unwittingly and unknowingly advanced on the checkerboard.

M3: And as payers.

TANENBAUM: Or contributors.

M3: By giving money to Israel, also. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

F2: Everybody wants to talk on this. What are we going to do? (inaudible)

F1: No, I think that we are actually moving around the circle as we have said. Basically, everybody is -- practically everybody is saying the same thing with different emphasis on the question. The idea is that it is clear that is necessary for the Jews to find this very middle way, which is very difficult to find, between being aware of the need to support Israel and the need to assert themselves as Jews and their own problems, especially with regards to anti-Semitism, with regards to terrorist attacks in their

country. Now, I think that the question is whether this group would be [37:00] basically willing to formulate the kind of a joint statement on these things. And it seems to me that (inaudible) to, kind of, a call or an appeal -- I don't like the term *appeal*, because it seems like we're going down on our knees to appeal to something -- whether we don't also think that it is worth our while to make it clearer to the American Jewry, because they are the leaders of the Jewish world. And I do not think that European Jews, unfortunately, can make themselves heard in Israel. I think that American Jewry -- we must go with them. Otherwise I don't think there will be much chances of being heard, except for when there is a bomb (inaudible) and [Benny?] said that he would send his (inaudible) Jews (inaudible). Normally, there is no interest in what is happening among Jews.

So, I think that it is time for us to see whether there is some kind of a joint opinion. I think there is. And not to go around and say the same things. [38:00] (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

ABE: I think we've -- you know, in the last 10 or 15 minutes, we've sort of have completely changed what we were talking about in the hours that we were... What we've established

is that there is anti-Semitism. It's not in our imagination. It has nothing at all to do with what's happening in Israel other than that the anti-Semites -- the structural anti-Semites -- have been using what's happened in Israel in order to continue their campaign against Jews. I certainly wouldn't even consider forming some kind of a consensus which would use our meeting in order to provide another stick against Israel. I would issue a minority view if anybody tried that. (inaudible) the World Jewish Congress, and [39:00] must avoid that at all costs. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) Because it's not against Israel, but it's used against Israel. And I don't want to a party to...

F1: We are convinced (inaudible) you don't have to...

ABE: Now, why we were called together, I understood, was how to help the situation.

F1: Right.

ABE: Now, we haven't discussed that. We've now gone into the philosophical aspects of the problem, when I thought in the last hours (inaudible), we were going to come forward with some kind of suggestions as how, in a practical way, we could improve the situation. If I could have a few minutes to talk about that, I would appreciate it. First of all, as far as tomorrow is concerned, I agree with Tamar that it

would be very, very disadvantageous for us to concentrate an attack on the media. Nevertheless, that should be one of the aspects of --

F1: How to take on the media rather than how to attack it.

ABE: Right, it shouldn't be the main focus of our attention tomorrow, but only one [40:00] aspect of it. Nevertheless, I think we're entitled to talk tomorrow about the distortions, without becoming hysterical or paranoid. And I think, to that extent, Tamar is right. Now, if I could have a few minutes to talk about what I would think are some of the things we could do. First of all, we haven't really discussed very much what are the legal steps that one could take, on an international basis, based on the different national groupings that are here -- what legal remedies there are? We've mentioned the action which didn't work in Sweden -- the action against Felderer. Nevertheless --

M4: We don't know yet.

ABE: We don't know yet, and it's dragged out for two years. And it shows there is some problem there, in using a legal remedy. In Britain, there is a race-relations law, which we've [41:00] attempted to use, and which had great effect, although no action was brought. The fact that we referred Ken Livingstone to the attorney general for prosecution under the race-relations law, and this is the first time we

did it with a left-wing organization... Until now, we had always confined these references to the extreme right. Although no prosecution was [laid?], it had a tremendous effect. And this was brought out by the *Evening Standard*, which is a newspaper which was campaigning against Livingstone, so that we were able to identify anti-Zionism as anti-Semitism very effectively.

But here, the group liked the race-relations law because it requires the national government -- the attorney general -- to maintain an action, involves questions of the invasion of free speech and censorship by governments. Therefore, I have come to the conclusion [42:00] that a group libel law might be much more effective, as France and other countries have, which would give recognized ethnic minority organizations including the Jewish community the right to maintain an action for group defamation against Jews, so that if people talk about Zionist-Nazi collaboration; that the Holocaust is a hoax; on the grounds that Jews tried to take Palestine from the Arabs, or tried to get reparations from the Germans -- that is a --

M3: You can't forbid that. I don't see which way you can legally forbid people to say that (inaudible).

ABE: Yes, you could. If you give --



F1: (inaudible).

ABE: Let me (inaudible). If we said about an individual that he committed a fraud, that individual could maintain an action for slander or defamation or libel.

F1: So, you say this --

ABE: Now what we're saying is [43:00] that that same right that individuals have should be given to an entire ethnic minority. So that if somebody says that black people are inferior --

M3: Each (inaudible) separately. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

ABE: Of course.

TANENBAUM: Some countries have it; some countries don't.

ABE: Right. I'm suggested that, in those countries that don't have it, we should be pushing for it.

M2: Who does not have it?

TANENBAUM: The United States.

M3: The United States has it because you have the First Amendment. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

M4: It exists in Sweden, too. But there has been maybe two cases prosecuted during five or ten years, none of them successful.

ABE: You say they're prosecuted. By who?

M4: By the legal attorney. But you are not allowed --

ABE: Now you are (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

M4: See, this is what I'm talking about. As a group to [indict?] or to go to court. You can't file a private suit against someone.

ABE: Now you're saying something. That's precisely the point that I'm trying to make. When the [44:00] government does it, that is an invasion on the rights of people to criticize. If that right were given not to governments but to recognized groups which represent the various ethnic minorities... A corporation has that right. If you libel a corporation, if you libel International Telephone or Ford Corporation, Ford can maintain an action. Why should a corporation have that collective right, but not a group, whether they're Jews or West Indians or Kurds or Druze, or even Arabs?

M3: It exists at present in Belgium. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

F4: In France, they (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

F5: (inaudible) Italy.

M7: It exists in Holland for the (inaudible).

M4: And it doesn't work. (inaudible) is a bad example because that's an obvious lie, telling that the Holocaust didn't exist.

ABE: That's all we want.

F1: OK, but that's what we want.

ABE: That's what I want.

M4: Yes, but you want it very largely, even that the people shouldn't be allowed to say that the [45:00] Jews took Palestine from the Arabs.

ABE: No, no, no, no, no, no. That the Jews invented the myth of the Holocaust in order to take it.

M4: OK, OK. Sorry.

ABE: OK, now, also along legal lines, we might consider laws which restrict the investment or funding by foreign countries of groups within the various countries. The United States has a law which requires the registration of foreign agents. Under that law, William Grimstad registered as an agent of the Saudi Arabian government. Now, we were able to use that registration of Grimstad, because he was now acting on behalf of Nazi groups to spread the ideas of historical revisionism. In Britain, we've tried, for instance -- and it hasn't yet [46:00] succeeded -- to have newspapers, when more than 10% of their shares are owned by foreign governments or foreign investors, have to register that fact. That would control some newspapers such as the Workers Revolutionary Party, which are now subsidizing other left-wing groups by (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

TANENBAUM: No control them, but make clear their origins.

M7: That can work against us, too, I think.

ABE: Well, I'm quite willing that any...

M7: No money from Israel. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

ABE: I'm quite willing... (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

M4: (inaudible) because that's the easiest problem.

ABE: Believe me, we can't compete with the Arabs. Tamar talked about Israel's manipulation of the press. We can't [47:00] compete with the Arabs in this. Let's say that nobody has a right to pay money secretly into another country to spread...

M4: You could reverse it and prevent people to give money to other countries, and that would be very bad for Israel.

ABE: They do that anyway, under the (inaudible) tax laws and other things. They do that anyway.

F2: So, OK...

M2: There's a technical problem in that you can't control subsidies given for (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

F2: OK, now it's 6:15, and we're already 15 minute ahead... So, may I suggest that you conclude your several suggestions, so that we can go around and see (inaudible) suggestion of the collective (inaudible).

ABE: Until now, Jewish communities all over the world have been on the defensive. [48:00] We wait until we're attacked, and

then we try to respond, we try to explain. I think that that's a mistake. I think we should keep the enemy so busy that he doesn't have time to attack us. Now, for instance, we did that in Britain with the National Front. For many years, the Jewish community used to answer every challenge that the National Front used to make against Jews. Instead of that, we took the offensive. We produced four million pieces of literature exposing the National Front as not being an anti-immigrant, patriotic group that was more British than the Conservative Party. But we showed that they were actually Nazis, and we proved it. We so discredited them that they now, as I told earlier, have been fragmented.

Similarly, we should expose the connections between the extreme left [49:00] and the Arabs as, again, we did with the *Labour Herald*, Ken Livingstone. We should talk about the similarities between the left and the right in their approach to anti-Zionism. That has had the effect, for instance, on campus, of banning some of the pro-Arab groups which were held to have been guilty of anti-Semitism rather than anti-Zionism, because we showed that they were using the same literature as the National Front.

F1: When you say "we," does (inaudible)?

ABE: The Jewish community, and the individuals --

F1: (inaudible) collectively as European communities, or  
(inaudible)?

ABE: No, no, no, no. As individuals. We can't act on an international basis. We'd be no more effective than the Common Market. What we have to do is, in our own individual countries, we should learn from each other and adopt our own policies. I think that we should be talking about Israel as a bulwark against [50:00] Soviet imperialism. We should talk about the Syrian/Soviet alliance, and that Israel is the first line of defense for the West.

M4: That's a very bad argument to use. It's the argument of the left.

ABE: (inaudible) What I am saying is this: what we are doing now is, we are so much now worried about what the left says about Israel that we are neglecting -- we begin to think that the whole world is left. That's because we've always had a kind of a sympathy towards the left, and an antagonism towards the right. I think we have to change our thinking a little bit. Most people are anti-left. Why should we always try to do everything to satisfy Trotskyists? I can't conceive of that as being a sensible policy. I think --

F2: We must conclude now.

ABE: Well, I'll stop now.

F2: No.

ABE: I can't -- I was told we were going to use this meeting...

F2: Yeah, but, you know, I can't (inaudible). And we already  
(inaudible).

ABE: Well, I'll wait until everybody.

F2: No, no, no. You conclude your (inaudible).

ABE: I'm trying to do this briefly [51:00] as I can.

F2: Yeah, but it's a long briefness. (laughter)

ABE: I'll stop now. Well, what can I do? I mean, you want me  
to... I'm trying to --

F2: Yes, but now you are elaborating on this bourgeois  
(inaudible), so it -- I mean, (inaudible).

ABE: But I think we haven't discussed that. I mean, it's  
something that one should discuss.

F2: Yes, but we cannot talk (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

TANENBAUM: I think you can mention it, but you can't discuss  
it. You don't have time.

ABE: I have alluded to...

F2: (inaudible) different views and a right to set them out --  
set them forth.

ABE: I think we should be talking about the rights of non-Arab,  
non-Muslim minorities in the Middle East -- the rights of  
the Kurds, the Druze, and the Christians, the Maronites --

the Christians. There are more Christians than Muslims in the West, and why shouldn't we...? And part of the reason why the opinions have moved towards the Jews, back to Israel, in America, is the fact that, secretly, many Christians were [52:00] glad that the Jews were helping the Christians in Lebanon against Muslim oppression. We should be talking about the persecution of the Baha'i in Iran, of the Kurds in Syria and Iran.

I think, then, also, we should exploit divisions amongst the enemies. Even amongst the Trotskyists, there are divisions. In Britain, there is now a lawsuit by the *Labour Herald* group, which is one brand of Trotskyism, against the Socialist Organizers Alliance, on the grounds that the Socialist Organizers Alliance accused the *Labour Herald* group of taking money from the Libyans. And, in fact, our own Board of Deputies received secret information from the Socialist Organizers Alliance about the *Labour Herald*, because it was in their interest to attack each other. We should exploit those differences.

Lastly, I would say, I think what is the most important -- what's come out of this meeting [53:00] is, I've learned a lot from listening around the table to the similarities of your problems to ours. And I don't think it's an accident.



I believe what we are unveiling here is an international campaign by both the neo-Nazis on the one hand and by the Arabs on the other. For instance, you in the Netherlands now have a football problem.

F2: I thought we were in the suggestions stage?

ABE: Right. You have a problem with football hooliganism. Now, I have no doubt, after listening to what you're talking about, that this is a direct imitation of the neo-Nazis using the football terraces in Britain. You have [IX?]. We have Tottenham against Arsenal. Now, knowing that every year at (foreign), the Nazis meet to discuss their international [54:00] campaign, if we alert each other, if we keep in contact, if we inform each other of what's happening in our own countries, you will then be able to pick up a pattern of behavior on an international level, which we can identify and then do something about.

F1: This is what the World Jewish Congress tries to do.

ABE: Well, I don't think we should limit ourselves. I'm not talking about setting up a rival group, and I'm not in favor of that. Nevertheless, we represent different organizations in our own countries, and we've made the connection now, the links between us. And I think we should continue it, even if it's on an informal level, and we just exchange information on a regular basis.

F2: OK, this was an interesting set of suggestions. And I think we can (inaudible). [55:00] Any other suggestions?

TANENBAUM: Going around the table?

F2: Yes. Would you like to say something?

F4: The only thing I can say, the set of suggestions of Dr. (inaudible) seem to be more or less -- having already been used in most of our countries. Which is to say, France and Belgium have, I think, the most elaborate law against racialism and anti-Semitism. So, there is not much to achieve in this field on making trials, and that's what you are doing. We are trying to do work about the fascist and the leftist links, and the support of (inaudible). I don't know. What I would say, and maybe it sounds awkward, but when I remember our first meeting two years ago, what I still [56:00] remember was that our next problem -- our next main problem -- may be the image of Israel. And two years after, I think that it's a very big dealing of our meeting. So, may I just say, I could suggest that we have not meeting once in two years, but once a year, just to listen from each other --

F2: No. (laughter)

F4: -- about what we really want and we can do. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

F2: I'm sorry, ladies. (laughter) I know you don't like that.

F2: No, it's a problem with this. Maybe, as Europeans, we should set up our own system of mutual participation, without having the Americans coming to help us out. And in this sense, I must say (inaudible).

ABE: Wouldn't invite me, huh? (laughter)

F2: Within the World Jewish Congress, (inaudible) we have been fighting, and we're having a meeting in Stockholm in May. And there is a suggestion [57:00] that the European branch of the World Jewish Congress establish itself as a European Jewish Congress, precisely for the motives and for the (inaudible) of which (inaudible) and Heisenberg was suggesting. I mean, the idea is to have a body which can be an instrument of collective representation, (inaudible) *vis-à-vis* the international organizations and the (inaudible).

ABE: I'm not -- never -- I think, quite honestly, I have never received a communication from the World Jewish Congress in the 10 years that I've been with the Board of Deputies.

F2: Well you -- maybe you received -- you don't -- they don't get on your desk.

ABE: And why not? Am I -- I mean, since (inaudible), my department (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

F2: Does (inaudible)?

ABE: Well, I mean, if I have to -- I mean, that's the point I'm trying to make. The World Jewish Congress -- I don't want to criticize it. But the World Jewish Congress (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

F2: (inaudible) very generous. But...

ABE: (inaudible) the issue, come [58:00] to talk to you later about the (inaudible).

F2: Excellent idea. Because [Grendel?] is vice president, so you should...

ABE: Have you ever spoken to Grendel?

F2: I've tried to. (laughter)

ABE: Well, there you go. (laughter)

TANENBAUM: Well, let's try to keep personalities out of it.  
(overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

F2: No, Heisenberg wanted to say something.

HEISENBERG: (Speaking French) [59:00]

END OF AUDIO FILE