

C-7400 to C-7401 Transcriptions

Friedman, Herbert A. "Modern Times." [Columbus, Ohio.].

29 April 1986.

Herbert A. Friedman: ... hope there are those two big maps up front; I talked to Bob about it yesterday. One should be a map on Zionism, 1860-1939, the other one should be the map that's entitled "Napoleon and the Jews," and with the use of those two maps and the outline that I sent you and the reading that you did, let's go to Lecture 5 and get back on the history track of modern times, 1800. We are at the French Revolution at 1789. You know, to get back into the history track after all the Prager and the theology and the God Israel, and after the Boston trip and after -- it seems hard. But just remember that those first four lectures, we took ourselves all the way down through the shtetl, and we followed the Jews through, into Hasidism and into their life in that internal ghetto and all through all the dangers and the tribulations and the crusades and the Spanish expulsion. We are down now to modern times, which, in a way, might be better known to you and in a real way, might not be better known to you because, it's tricky. To make the slide, to make the slide from a confined ghettoized and partially

internally-satisfied people with that ghetto, out into the big world is a very tough transition and we have paid incredibly for it. So that the first step to realize is, that by the end of the seventeenth century get the dates in your head, don't forget, the Ba'al Shem Tov was born in 1700, died, I think, in 1760, Hasidism is that 1700s production and by the end of the 1700s, you had the American Revolution, in 1776, the French Revolution, 1789, and you are into the modern world.

One small transitional group got into the modern world before anybody else, and that -is the first item on the list of tonight's lecture "Modern Times," if you have the sort of table of contents with you, the first item is the Court Jew in Western Europe. Now, that was a very small sample, and it applied only to the provinces in Germany and Austria, and what it represented was a handful, and I mean just a few hundred, scattered over the whole Central Europe, Jews who were called in German Schutzjuden [11:00], which means protected Jews, because a prince, duke, baron, even sometimes a bishop, protected them. In order that that Court Jew could serve that nobleman in a financial capacity, that's what they wanted them for.

Um, there were 300 principalities in Western Germany -- what we call today Western Germany -- and in every one of those

principalities there were one, two, three, four -- a family of protected Jews. They could live anywhere they wanted, they dressed any way, they carried money, they carried passes, they could travel, they were not confined, they were kind of an economic and political elite. And they got out into the big world, the dukes liked them, and they began to make things better for the rest of the Jews. Um, it's a small phenomenon, books have been written about them, Fongler wrote a book about them, "The Court Jew." Anyhow, really, the first major Jewish personality who hit the big world outside was Moses Mendelssohn, up in Berlin.

Now, that's the famous Mendelssohn, the family of music. The bottom line of the whole story is that after it's all over and done with, the four kids of Moses Mendelssohn convert to Christianity. But, during his lifetime, he really, um, was the first phenomenon whom the Gentiles in all of Europe, Austro-Hungarian empire, France, Italy, Germany, saw as a modern man. He believed very simply that he wanted to try to bring the Jews into the modern world. He did that by making a whole host of friends. The best friend he had was a man by the name of Lessy, a Christian voice in Germany who spoke on behalf of the Jews. Then he wrote his play, "Nathan the Wise," appealing to

Christians to treat Jews with justice. I mean, "Nathan the Wise" was the first presentation of a Jew since the Shylock play in a totally different way of a kind, temperate, man with a good temper, loving justice, loving the culture of the big world, a wise man. In Lessy, in Mendelssohn pushed it, and then Moses Mendelssohn got onto the kick which he thought was the solution, and that was that the Jews of Germany must learn to speak German. And his whole, his whole analysis was 'language is the key to equality.' Now, you think of that. Language is the key to culture, language is the key to understanding, to intellect, to appreciation of the world. Language is the key to dreams, and soaring and ambitions, and to science, and to music. And language is, I mean, what is the essential difference between the man and the animal?- It's only language, there's nothing else. Now, German was not open to most Jews, and Mendelssohn tried to figure out how to do it. So, he went right to the one way which was to translate the Torah into German. Because everybody, every reasonably educated Jew learned Hebrew in Hebrew school and could read some of the Torah in Hebrew. Okay. With that as a base, if you get the Torah in German, then he translates and he learns the German language through the Bible. And that did it. Now, Mendelssohn was a very pious Jew.

M1: Wasn't the Hebrew, though, more the language of prayer and study and not the common vernacular, wouldn't it have been more practical to translate it into Yiddish?

Herbert A. Friedman: No, no, not Yiddish, no. Yiddish was not a language in Germany. Yiddish was a language east of Germany; in Poland, in the Pale settlement, in Lithuania, down into the Ukraine. Yiddish was not a language in the German territory.

M1: What were the German Jews speaking?

Herbert A. Friedman: What were the German Jews speaking between themselves? The, uh, religious Jews who knew Hebrew, spoke Hebrew between themselves and wrote their correspondence in Hebrew. All the correspondence was in Hebrew. Hebrew was learned in the Hebrew school as the language of prayer, you're right -- but, as the language of reading the, the Torah, the five books of Moses.

Between themselves, they spoke mostly, uh, let me call it a Patois, because these principalities all had different little dialects. The homogenization of the German language, as one

Hochdeutsch, High German tongue, didn't take place until later in the 19th century of Bismark. German, Germany became Germany only in 1870 -- never forget that. The linking of all the provinces, or the deprovincialization and the nationalization [17:00] of Germany, of any country, Italy didn't get formed until Gaboldi at the end of the 19th century, in the 1860's and 70's, the same with Germany. So language was a province and it was dialect, and the Jews spoke the dialect of that province in which they lived.

M1: A dialect of German, though?

Herbert A. Friedman: A dialect of German, yes.

M1: Still, Mendelssohn perceived that they didn't have German culture because of some deficiency of the German language?

Herbert A. Friedman: Yes.

M1: And, I'm just not following you.

Herbert A. Friedman: Because, uh, I'm distinguishing between fragmented German dialects, which didn't unite anybody, verses a nationalized German language which would unite all Jews living in the whole territory of what would become a united Germany.

M1: This is something that all of Germany apparently needed?

Herbert A. Friedman: Exactly. Mendelssohn wasn't interested in doing this for, for 30 million Germans, he was doing it for 50 thousand Jews. But it's the net result. Yes, you're right, it's the same process. Both groups needed it and it happened for both groups.

M1: Did he write in a particular dialect?

Herbert A. Friedman: He didn't choose a dialect. He wrote the translation of the Torah in High German. He knew High German. Mendelssohn knew seven or eight languages. Mendelssohn said I am going to teach the Jews Hochdeutsch -- High German, classical German. I will translate the Torah, the five books of Moses, the contents of which they are familiar with in the Hebrew language which they learned in the Hebrew schools, in the Hebrew Schools

cheder, in the Talmud Torah. I will translate that book with which they are more, or less, or some, or partially familiar, and he created a small dictionary to help them, a standardized language. And German began to be, then, a standardized language. And I think probably, I'm not sure at this point, the Jews as a group probably spoke standardized High German before most of the general German population did.

At any rate, everybody, uh, in the highly religious establishment was criticizing Mendelssohn for going off into that German kick because, they said, he is going to turn the Jews, uh, uh, against their religion, they won't read Hebrew anymore. And they will read the Torah in German, and so he is making them secular.

And so Mendelssohn's answer was: no, I am a pious Jew. I remain that way, I have to prod the Jews to get out into the secular world, but I am not going to make them secular and I am not interested in assimilating them, and he wasn't even thinking of emancipating them. Mendelssohn was not thinking about emancipation of Jews from their religion, from their closed culture and from their society. What Mendelssohn was thinking about was making them aware of the fact that there is the big world outside. That's really what he was after. Now, he got

swept up in something which became much bigger than himself. And that, of course, was the general movement of emancipation in Europe that started in France, not Germany. The Jews in France got their citizenship in 1791 by an act of the General Assembly. Now, I don't want to take you through all the complicated details of the French Revolution, but the French Revolution started, uh, in 1783.

M2: How many Jews were living in France at that time?

Herbert A. Friedman: 40,000, of whom 30,000 lived in Alsace-Lorraine, most of them in the city of Strausborg. In all of France, there were about, at that time, 20 million people, and there were, uh, 40 thousand Jews.

The Strasbourg Jews was were the whole thing got started, in Alsace-Lorraine, because they were rich, because they had been loaning money to peasants, peasants who couldn't pay their debts through the years of the French Revolution and the terror. The Jews were foreclosing farms and houses, the peasants were getting sore, the thing got to Napoleon, and, um, Napoleon said, I am going to do something about this. The story unfolded in a very interesting way.

Mirabou, liberal, 1787, by the way, interruption. Do you know what started the whole French Revolution? The French Revolution was not against Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette and all that stuff that's in the storybooks. The French Revolution was started by a man by the name of Beaumarchais, who wrote a play called "Figaro", in which he attacked the nobles and he wrote another play, "The Seville Barber" and these are artisans. Figaro is a surgeon, a barber, and the other guy, a barber. The artisan class was against the nobility. The nobility were the bastards. They were the ones oppressing. The king had nothing to do with it. The king didn't get killed 'til six years later. So, in all of that turmoil, there were two people who were liberal and who said the Jews can help France through this period, we must give them their emancipation. One was the Count de Mirabeau in 1787. He wrote a great sentence: "Do you want to make the Jews useful citizens? Useful to France? Banish all distinctions against them. Open to them all avenues of subsistence and livelihood, it will make them better men and they will make France better." Nice quote. The second guy was an Abbe, a priest, Andre Deguire, and he wrote "If the Jew has faults, it is the Christian society which is responsible. In their place, wouldn't we be worse?"

So, you have a mood flowing out of the French Revolution to give rights of man, equal rights, liberte, fraternite, egalite, everybody's equal, the rights of man. The American Revolution in which the French had a part, as you know, and it was the general wind of liberalism sweeping. Okay. Active citizenship was given to the Sephardic Jews way down, way down in the Province, way down there, a handful of them, 7-8 thousands. They accepted citizenship in France, they said we don't want anything more. Don't help us, don't give us anything. Thank you. Goodbye. And they retreated back down into Avignon, Enime, and Arles, and all the places, Grenoble, Marseille, and they never took part, from that time on, in the whole political turmoil up in the north of France. After they got their citizenship, I told you, a year later, in 1791, the general assembly admitted all Jews to the full rights of citizenship and the Jews, of course, jumped in with both feet. They joined the national guard by the thousands, serving in the French army and in Napoleon's army later. They made big money contributions to the Jacobins and all the other groups in the French Revolution. They occupied public office, they took political front positions, which they'd always been scared to do before. They sent their kids to the public schools. They shifted into businesses and professions facing the French

public and serving them. Now, this, um, ah, was not a full-fledged granting of citizenship to them, as they found out later. Because when that scandal busted up in Alsace, the huge anti-Semitic outbreak because so many Jews were calling in loans and foreclosing on properties that French peasants couldn't pay off on, and as I said, it got to Napoleon.

Napoleon had, uh, uh, he said, I'll solve this problem in Alsace Lorraine. Now, now, what did he do? Napoleon is after the French Revolution, don't forget. The Revolution really finished in '89 when Louis XVI was killed, Marie Antoinette, after that you have a series of governments being run, you have the terror by Robespierre, killing halls, and the thousands of people that Robespierre got his in return. And Diderot. The French Revolution faded into a kind of government by a directory of people, and that faded into Napoleon after the battle Jena in 1805, Napoleon says, what's all this nonsense, I'd better take over France. Running around conquering Westphalia, Prussia, and Russia, and France is in a mess. Now, what he did, he was very clever and he thought very hard about how to stabilize France through religion, which he didn't believe in at all. He was an atheist, but he saw a device by which to stabilize France and yet it meant that he could not discriminate in favor of one

religion or another, he had to go with all three and here's what he did:

First of all, he made a concordat with the Pope in 1801, making Catholicism the official religion of France. Bingo. Then he had to do something for the Protestants, so he wrote a constitution with them, extending recognition to them as the "official" religious group. Now, the third thing is, what does he say about the Jews? There is a quote from Napoleon: "My policy is to govern man as the great majority of them wish to be governed. If I were governing Jews, I would rebuild the temple of Solomon."

[Laughs] How do you like that? Now, what he really wanted to do was to lock the Jews into an unequivocal loyalty to the state. And, the way he figured to do that was to call the Sanhedrin. Now that is the most remarkable thing that happened because the Sanhedrin hasn't happened for 1,800 years. But the Sanhedrin can't meet without a preliminary body, so here's what he did. He called an assembly of Jewish notables, 112 people. Rabbis, businessmen, financiers, scholars, and they came Hotel de Ville, the City Hall, in 1806, five years later. Big honor guard, big parade, band, everything, and then a nasty little anti-Semite, Mathieu Mole, made a cold speech to them standing

on the steps of the City Hall. And he said, "you people are not trustworthy. You got your citizenship in 1791, but I'm telling you something -- we don't trust you." This is 1806, you are usurers, but the emperor Napoleon is gonna offer you a chance to remedy these things and he is going to give you a shot at it, and he's got twelve questions. These twelve questions are what took the Jews out of the deep loyalty of nation, religion, community, Jewish identity, and the answers to those twelve questions, I will give you the bottom line, resulted in the, the ripping of the Jews away from their roots. The bottom line answer to those twelve questions resulted in destroying the Jews as a nation, their sense of nationhood, and their sense of pride in past history, and their sense of destiny in the future, and it turned them into another simple religious sect, nothing else. I mean, the most major downgrading you can think of, and yet, they were delirious with joy to have it.

M3: What were the Rothschild family doing around that time?
Counting money and buying supplies?

Herbert A. Friedman: The Rothschild family was, they were doing that, loaning money, buying supplies. They probably funded 25% of Napoleon's conquests for fifteen years.

M3: Then they acquired their wealth, the basic wealth of the Rothschild family, is centered in this area.

Herbert A. Friedman: Sure, exactly. The other Rothschilds over in England were hunkering down, doing nothing, and later on, in the eighteenth, in the nineteenth century, one of the Lionel Rothschild said, emancipation is a disaster, because we lost, and we became assimilated.

M3: What is corporatism?

Herbert A. Friedman: The word corporatism refers to, mainly to, uh, guilds, economic guilds. A corporation is the same as a medieval guild. A corporation of a certain trade or craft, or art is, or profession.

M2: What was the context, it kept being mentioned, what was going on the, larger movement?

Herbert A. Friedman: Well, the larger movement was an economic shift away from medieval feudal economic forms, into 19th century industrial forms. You could no longer have corporations or guilds that were closed. You had to have an open, capitalist society. So, the destruction of corporatism, or even syndicalism -- a syndicate is a closed group of people in a certain business or profession. The economy, it was the shift, it was the shift through, from feudalism through the industrial revolution, into 19th century capitalism.

Um, now, look at the twelve questions. I don't know if you have your notebooks, and I don't know if you have the outline I gave you, but I have it in front of me and I am looking at page four of the out- [laughter] -- and I want to read you the twelve questions.

Number one: Now, Napoleon said, "I want the answers to these questions, boys, and no flubbing around, and I want them fast." Are Jews permitted to have more than one wife? I don't know why the hell he wanted that one, I really don't.

M2: The answer is yes.

Herbert A. Friedman: [Laughs] Well, you're not a Moslem.

Does Judaism permit divorce? Here's the kicker. Can Christians and Jews marry? In the eyes of the Jews are the French brothers or strangers? Aha! You see, in others words, are you guys really taking our citizenship but you're going to keep your own little clique and you really don't want to treat us Christians as equals? Five. What behavior does Jewish law prescribe toward French Christians? Six. Do Jews born in France consider France their country? Are they willing to defend it and obey its laws? I mean, don't you hear that question today, down at the end of the 20th century, are Jews loyal to the country in which they are citizens? Well, you don't really hear it anymore, I guess it's a dead question, but the echoes of it hang in the air. Seven. Who names the Rabbis? Because, you see, from the point of view of the Christian theme, the Rabbis are the leaders of religion. And since the Jews are now agreeing to be only a religion inside France, not a nation of their own, then the Rabbis are the bosses -- who names the Rabbis? Eight. What police jurisdiction do the Rabbis exercise over the Jews? Can you imagine that? Nine. Are Jewish electoral forms and police jurisdictions prescribed by Jewish laws, or merely by custom? In

other words, Napoleon's men knew enough to know that there is a difference in Judaism between *din* and *minhag*. Law and custom. Ten. Does Jewish law prohibit the Jews from entering the professions? They were already worried that Jews were going to swamp the professions. Eleven. Does Jewish law encourage Jews to practice usury among their own community? Twelve. Practice usury among the Christians?

Now, this assembly of 112 people came back with their answers in three weeks. Of course, the Jews considered France their country and Frenchmen their brothers. Of course they were willing to defend France to the death. Of course the Rabbis exercised no police jurisdiction, their authority was purely spiritual. Of course the Jews were monogamous.

The only tough one was on that question of marriages. Because as much as those 112 people wanted to give Napoleon the answer that he wanted to hear, that they would intermarry and they would be good Frenchmen and it didn't matter if they married Jews or non-Jews, they didn't want to say it, they didn't want to agree to it. They didn't want to get into it. So they sort of slid around it, and here was the answer, the compromise answer that they came up with, which didn't satisfy him, because he kept pressing them on it. The answer was: the

Bible forbids marriages between Jews and heathens. But, these French Christians in the 19th century, they're not heathens. So, you may marry them. Now, you know, it's a kind of evasive answer.

Anyhow, Napoleon was satisfied with it. And he said, "we are going to have a great big dazzling ceremony." And, he issued a summons a few months later for Sanhedrin and, as I said, the Jews were speechless and the news spread all over Europe. February 4, 1807. The Sanhedrin gathered in Paris. Eighty delegates, 46 of them Rabbis, the Sanhedrin endorsed the answers of that earlier assembly of six months ago. Napoleon was not disappointed. Once again, it was affirmed that the law of Moses and the Rabbis were exclusively religious and France alone could claim the political allegiance of French Jews. French Jews gave up political allegiance -- political allegiance to what?

Jews didn't have any other political state in 1807, they had a political memory of a state that they wanted. Three times a day they prayed for the restoration of the state of, well, of Palestine, the memory of the kings and the original independent Jewish state.

So, their political allegiance was to a dream, and a hope and a prayer, but it was political allegiance. And now they are

going to give that up and become only a religion. Okay. That's the crux of the matter. Napoleon secured this endorsement for Jewish political loyalty. A couple of months later, the Sanhedrin was adjourned and the President of that Sanhedrin simply, in one sentence said it all. [inaudible] Fortaggo, a man from Strasburg, "We no longer form a nation within a nation, France is our country. Jews, such today is your status. Your obligations are outlined, your happiness is waiting. You should be thrilled and pleased that you are now nothing but Jews by religion and French by politics, economics, citizenship, nationality, and protection of the great Emperor." There is a quote here, a sentence which is very good from Howard Sachar's book. "The Sanhedrin's solemn renunciation of separate Jewish nationhood [41:00] was truly of watershed importance in the Jewish history. It set the tone for Western Jewish life for a century to come. "When one of Napoleon's commissioners wrote later that the Jews ceased to be a people and remained only a religion, he perceived the Sanhedrin's true significance even more accurately than the Jews themselves.

The twelve answers led to this conflict. In Germany, an organization was formed called Deutsche Juden Mosaiche Glauben, which means German Jews of Mosaic Faith. A hundred and fifty

years later in the United States, an organization was formed called the American Council for Judaism. We are Jews by religion alone. That organization was formed in 1943. Do you know what its purpose was? In the middle of the war, in the middle of the Hitler Holocaust, the purpose of the American Council for Judaism who believed that we are Jews only by religion, was to fight *against* the establishment of the state of Israel. Against the establishment of the state of Israel, because we have given up being a state, people and a nation. We are not a nation, we are not a people with a dream of a nation, we told Napoleon we weren't. And you know who was the leader of the American Council for Judaism in 1943, a man in Philadelphia by the name of Lessing Rosenwald who was the brother of William Rosenwald, who was the head of the UJA. Here you have this other conflict between two brothers on the basic philosophical question which was settled 150 years ago.

F1: Is this a part of Reform Judaism was anti-Zionist from early beginning?

Herbert A. Friedman: Yes, Ellen. Because, we will come to that in a second, but you are quite right. You anticipated it. The

reform of the religion, in order to make it more compatible to the modern, assimilated world, and in order to make it "less Jewish," i.e., less exotic, less Oriental, so you take away all the crazy things. You take away the Hebrew language. That is some Middle-Eastern, you know, anachronism. We don't want that - - we are Germans, or we are French, or we are British or we are Italians. You throw away the Hebrew language, you throw away crazy, exotic customs like bar mitzvah. You didn't have a bar mitzvah in a Reform Temple for damn near a hundred years because it is some Middle Eastern, vestigial anachronism. You throw away [44:00] all the peculiarities that you don't sit men and women together. You introduce the things that are familiar to the Western world like an organ in your service and a choir and if the choir is consisting of Gentiles who sing, uh, Bach, it's better than if they are singing the *trop* (cantillation) of the Torah. So, yes, the religion gets reformed in order to conform to the new concept that you are a modern religious group and that's all you are and you are not a people. Okay. So, the whole thing got settled down and the French phrase was [in French, then English]: each Jew regards the state as his homeland. [45:00] Now, we pay a terrible price for that, we paid a terrible price. In March 1808, Napoleon declared Judaism to be

an official religion of France, just as he had earlier done for Protestantism, so now you have Catholicism is the state religion, and Protestantism and Judaism are two *equal* official religions, and that's the beginning of the whole process by which, today, in the world at large, the Western world, that is, one always talks about the three equal religions. But, how can you talk about equal? You have six hundred million Catholics, and twelve million Jews in the world, or thirteen million. But you see, psychologically, philosophically, politically, Jews are one of three absolutely equal religions. It has nothing to do with numbers.

Now, uh, when I say that we paid a terrible price for it, the price that we paid is one that we are going through now, and again I am jumping to the bottom, but I will work backwards. We have spent the last forty years since WWII and since the Holocaust trying to figure out how to back away from that position that we submitted to, in the Sanhedrin. We bought it then, and we have spent 170 years, or now, 40 of those last 170 years thinking we have made a mistake, or at least a partial mistake, and the struggle for Jewish identity now is a reversal. Yet, yet, obviously we want our cake and eat it, don't we? So, we are modern citizens of the modern world, there isn't a one of

us disloyal to the country in which we lived, a quarter of a million Jews served in the American army in WWII, Korea, everything. Jews do it. And yet, we insist that we do not want to pay the price of total surrender, total giving up of our identity, we invented and carried out and executed a nationalist movement to recapture our nationalism, having given it up in 1806 and 7. [Recording cuts out briefly]

Meanwhile, let's run through this business of what was taking place in the rest of Europe, because up to now, I have concentrated on France. You had an emancipation...uh...

M3: Do any historians take the position that the decision of the Sanhedrin and the Jews at the time was an error?

Herbert A. Friedman: No, no no, no ... except one, I'm sorry. There is a historian by the name of Simon Dubnow, who wrote a three-volume history of the Jews. And Simon Dubnow said it's a mistake: we should not have accepted emancipation at the cost of assimilation. We shouldn't have done it. But there were no other historians who second-guessed the situation. Grets, the famous one, who wrote the six volumes, didn't. Now, modern historians. You are coming into the 20th century. If you are talking about

Louis Finkelstein's book of history, or well, without the names. Yes, all modern historians say -- they understand the temptation - and that was the word, it was temptation, dammit, um, and they understand that it was very hard to resist it. But now, in retrospect, we know that we were sliding on very thin ice. We are safe now, but we could have drowned.

M3: It got us out of the ghetto, I mean, that was a helluva reward.

Herbert A. Friedman: Well, I'm not sure, Neil. I mean, maybe we could have gotten out of the ghetto some other way. Because the winds were blowing. I mean, what the hell, we had Humboldt in Germany, we had Metternich in Austria, we even later had, by the end of the nineteenth century, that crazy iron Chancellor Bismarck, who was an anti-Semite, but understood that Jews had to be liberated if a united Germany was going to be born.

So, who knows? Maybe we would've gotten out of the ghetto fifty years later without paying that price? The trick is to know whether we paid a price which will forever be to our detriment. My feeling is no. We did pay a price for 150 years, we lost our sense of élan, we lost our sense of prestige, we

lost our sense of self-esteem. We were groveling, we were taking rewards from people. We were kissing behinds we shouldn't have done. We had an inferiority complex. We didn't fight back in the Holocaust because of that. We paid a price. On the other hand, it was not a price, an ineluctable, unchangeable one, because we have fought our way out of it. We are strong, proud dignified people, built a country that is now 38 years old, we have it. We have, uh, uh, a thrust forward. We have an appreciation of, if you look at the books that are written, Charlie Silverman's book about the Jewish people, and a lot of them that we are moving in a healthy direction forward, that the American Jewish, uh, community will be strong, that the prophets of doom are wrong, that Jewish education is growing, Hebrew education is growing.

And so, y'know, when you look at it all, the sense of peoplehood has been restored. The sense of nationhood has certainly been restored, the sense of pride has been restored. So, you know, unbalanced, okay we sweated for 150 years. Have we lost the game? Not at all. Therefore, the way you look at all big, major historic sweeps, it may not have been crucial.

M2: I mean, Herb, had we not met in a joint general population, what kind of leverage would we have had to gain Israel, and later, its statehood?

Herbert A. Friedman: Oh, no question about that, Nelson. It is Nelson, isn't it? No question about that. What the hell, no we had to come into the modern world. We had to. We couldn't have had any of these things you just said. Absolutely. We wouldn't have had a professional class, we wouldn't have had kids in college. We wouldn't have had 450,000 -- whatever we've got -- Jewish students in America, 45,000 professors, we wouldn't have had 250 departments of Jewish studies in universities. We wouldn't have had anything. We wouldn't have had the state of Israel. We had to come into the modern world. The question is, the price we paid to do so. Was that too tough a price or a dangerous price of a risky price? It was dangerous, yeah, it was risky. It turns out ...

M2: I just felt there was the other option would be, to remain like the Jews in Ethiopia or...?

Herbert A. Friedman: No, that isn't a fair comparison. To remain like German Bergers in 1820, 1830, 1850, until Germany developed. You see, the Russian thing came to an end in 1881 by a different ending which I'll -- let me get to it. We would -- there are those who -- and I am among them -- believe that history would've pulled us out of the ghetto by a variety of other ways, because I see the ways. 'Cause I'm not guessing, I am not making it up, I know what happened in every country. The trick is, we got out earlier, and that's always better. Time is everything.

Take a quick look at the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The Jewish question -- when Napoleon -- at the end of the Napoleonic Wars -- that was the Congress that settled Ezan, he is off in exile in Elba, and the Congress of Vienna settles it.

The Jewish question was put on the agenda of the Congress of Vienna. For the first time in history an international forum dealt with the Jewish question. Never happened before. Uh, by the way, I am interrupting myself. I want to go back, I want to go back to that Napoleon map. I want to make sure that you look at it and read it and understand it carefully, um, because that's the watershed. Let me just do a quick thing there. Way up at the top, you see a little box which says 1805, Napoleon forms

a Jewish battalion which fought at Waterloo. Groups, nations, peoples, established their rights by virtue of the arms they bear. And when the Jews bore arms for Napoleon, that liberated them, gave them status.

Um, go down, to show you what, to show you another teeny angle, which is terribly important, Napoleon was a Zionist. Napoleon was telling the Jews you are not a nation, you are a religious people that is the status I am going to grant you. Look at the box; look at the box on the bottom, not on the bottom, over to the right. [Reads French passage aloud, laughter]

How about that! Bring your flags and re-establish ancient Jerusalem. So here you've got this inner conflict. Okay. That's a very important map and that's why I enlarged it. I got a note from Les one day saying the maps are too small. That's why we've got big maps. [Indistinct talking in the background] At that Congress of Vienna, the famous Humboldt, who was a startling figure in Europe at that time, uh, those expeditions in Latin America, I mean, he was another Darwin, uh, wanted Jewish emancipation, full Jewish emancipation and rights and Metternich the same thing. Humboldt wanted unrestricted equality. Metternich, speaking for Austria, well, he wasn't quite sure,

yeah, they need rights, but we have to be careful about how we grant it.

The Rothschilds, you asked me, uh, I told you they were fighting for political power in provincial governments for Jews, and, uh, that's what they did. Now, there was a gap there between 1815 and 1848, in which everything turned reactionary and the great hoax of the Jews began to fall apart, and the Jews weren't getting everything they wanted, and the reactionary people were talking. But, by the time of the Revolution of 1848, things began to turn again, and from 1848 onwards, the movement was up and out and into liberation and the Jews took part in everything and the Jews were completely liberal. Democrat with a small D or a big D, I don't know if there were Republicans then or not, but for the 50 years of the second half of the 19th century, there was one Conservative Jew in all of Europe, and his name was Disraeli. Everybody else was on the liberal side. By the way, mentioning Disraeli, I wanted to tell you that story of England, because when you talk about disappointment and you talk about granting citizenship and yet not granting it -- taking it back and it is with one hand and with the other hand.

In England, Baron Lionel was elected to Parliament six times. Six, every two years, gets elected to Parliament. If he goes to Parliament, he has to take the oath, the oath of abjuration, which is the oath in which he swears to be a loyal member of Parliament, um, on the New Testament, and in the name of Jesus the Redeemer. So he won't do it, and he doesn't do it. Six times he doesn't do it, and he doesn't get seated. Now, meanwhile, bills were being brought up in the Parliament to, uh, amend that thing, to change it. *Ten times* the bills were brought in year after year, introducing a bill that instead of ending with the words "on the true faith of a Christian," you ended it "on the faith of the Old Testament" or they found some wording, and it always got defeated, and so he always refused to take the oath and-and-and I admit these words as not binding upon my conscience. Now, Disraeli crossed the aisle, Disraeli, the conservative, voted with the liberals, ten times to get the amendments, and ten times it was vetoed, vetoed, vetoed. As late as 1858, and then, the House of Lords relented and Lionel was seated in the Commons. In the Commons.

Ten years later, Gladstone proposed him for the Lords. Victoria refused. And here was the Suez Canal in the British hands because of the Rothschild money. But it took Disraeli to

win her heart, meanwhile, Lionel died [laughs] and he never got seated, but then she yielded and his son. 1885, can you imagine how late? Lionel's son, Nathaniel, was seated into the House of Lords. And Lionel spoke at the dedication of a synagogue in 1869, and that's the line I want you to remember. He said, "we are emancipated. But if our emancipation should damage our faith, it would be a curse instead of a blessing." So there's the dilemma, and there you have it. It was well expressed by a, by a cultured man -- and then, of course, there is something in 1885-1985, you got a hundred years, you've had scores and scores of Jews in the Parliament. Scores of Jews in the Cabinet, four Jews in Thatcher's Cabinet today. So it's absolutely a meaningless phenomenon.

M3: You mentioned between 1815 and 1848, the reactionary movement. Was that in, uh, in Austria and Prussia, or did it also go to France where Napoleon had started deliberation?

Herbert A. Friedman: All over Europe. It went through France, it went through Italy, it went back into England, which, as I just told you the English story. All over Europe. I mean, that period, approximately 30 years, uh, was a bad, bad period.

Europe was trying to stabilize itself. European countries were in the throes of being bored, shifted. There was no war, I mean, there was no war from 1815, don't forget it, that was the century of no war, until 1914. One hundred years of peace.

M3: Except for Franco-Prussia.

Herbert A. Friedman: Oh, little skirmishes, what the hell that was just a year, 1870-71. Basically, no major world war, no huge conflagrations, assemblages of millions of men, billions of dollars, equipment, supplies. Europe was relatively quiet, militarily; very busy, economically, growing into capitalism. Very busy, politically, growing into nationalism. Those are the two movements of the 19th century and the Jews took part in both movements, totally and vigorously.

M3: Do you think that if by the luck that Congress was not held in Vienna [indistinguishable] probably the worst in the country as far as emancipation. Do you think the Jews might have done any better if it had been located in another country?

Herbert A. Friedman: Possible. It's a good thought. Vienna was a tough place. Vienna is to this day a tough place. Austria-Hungarian empire, well, that doesn't exist, but at that time, it was the strongest reactionary... it was the successor of the Holy Roman Empire.

M3: They never really gave the Jews their emancipation, I mean, the Jews, as far as I knew, still did not have emancipation.

Herbert A. Friedman: That's correct. Austria's played a hard line all the way... Austria refuses the whole reparations thing that the... the Germans have paid reparations after the Holocaust, the Austrians won't play a nickel. They say they are a victim country of Hitler.

M4: Well, maybe one can, just like their cheap shots, maybe one can take a look at, why with Waldheim.

Herbert A. Friedman: [Laughs] I'm not sure about that Waldheim. That was Brad, wasn't it?

M4: It seems like, if you read anything about it, forget what caused that, the Austrians are very arrogant to challenge Waldheim, you are being arrogant.

Herbert A. Friedman: You're trying to tell them how to vote.

M4: Exactly. Whether Waldheim was guilty or not guilty of the accusations.

Herbert A. Friedman: Well, you want to know something, maybe they were right. I mean, you know, is there a principal which you don't mix into the internal affairs of another country, in their elections? I don't know. Listen, I'm not sure about the Waldheim thing. The thing about the Waldheim thing that gets me ...

M3: I think the doctor was the worst of the [indistinguishable]..

Herbert A. Friedman: Yes, that is a historic fact, everybody agrees with that. The Waldheim thing is disturbing only because, to me, personally, of Wiesenthal's position. Wiesenthal's an Austrian. Wiesenthal isn't saying anything.

Okay, anyway. I've had long talks here, by the way, I haven't had time to bring you up to date on everything. I have had long talks with Israel Singer, who is the Director General of the World Jewish Congress, who has been steering this thing, and with Edgar Bronfman, who is the Chairman of the World Jewish Congress, and Bronfman said to singer go, tackle the guy. So Singer is doing it. I'm not, I'm not sure how strong the case is.

M5: Herb, as an aside, why did it take so long to surface? Did this information just come into the possession of the World Jewish Congress?

Herbert A. Friedman: I think the answer to that question is yes, and the reason it just came in is because they went looking for it. It's been there for forty years in the U.N. file. It's been there in the U.S. archives. It's in the Austrian and the Yugoslavian Archives. So, it's there, and nobody pokes. I think, I think—I think, I'm not sure, in this Jewish organizational world of ours where everybody needs a leg up on somebody else, maybe somebody made a suggestion to the World Jewish Congress,

hey, let's tackle this one. And bingo, they've gotten a lot of publicity as a result.

M5: Because of the election?

Herbert A. Friedman: Yeah, I think that's how it happened. I think somebody was just sharp and clever. But, as far as, y'know, being very, very technically legal and correct, [1:06:00] I don't know what you are accusing the guy of.

M5: Just lying.

Herbert A. Friedman: Yeah, lying. Just falsifying his own record that he wrote in two books and several memorandums about his own personal biography. Anyway, we've got to get back. Another trend started in Eastern Europe. Now, don't forget. All of this emancipation I've been talking about, everything that's on that list, if you look back at that schedule, Court Jews in Western Europe, Moses Mendelssohn, Napoleonic Sanhedrin, emancipation in Western Europe, in England, all of that's West. Shift now, shift gears, shift over to Eastern Europe. In Eastern Europe we haven't got 40,000 Jews, we haven't got 60,000 Jews, you've got

a million and a quarter packed in there in that restricted area between Poland and Russia, Poland and Russia, which is called the Pale of Settlement.

M5: This million and a quarter, what percentage would be descent of the Khazars?

Herbert A. Friedman: Khazars! Well, you know, Brad, if you take the previous analysis we made, the great majority. Because, from the time of the Khazars in the 8th, 9th, 10th century, we are now up to the 18th century that is 1,000 years later. I mean, look at the multiplication factor.

If, indeed, we believe that the majority, if we believe that the source, let's use that word, the source point, for Eastern European Jewry was the Khazar conversion, if we believe that, and that is questionable, you know that, we've been through it all. I've told you about that Arthur Kestler book which is called *The Thirteenth Tribe*. He believes that the Khazar conversion was the seminal source. Other people don't. But if you accept it, then the answer to your question has to be the majority. If you don't accept it, then you say the Khazars are a stream that contributed some, but that the majority comes

from Babylonia and the East, when the Babylonian epoch ended at around the year 1,000. The Talmud was written there, Saadia Gaon, the Siddur, the Prayer Book. By the year 1,000, Babylonian Jewry had completed its creativity, the impetus died down, the adrenalin died down, people began to move toward Europe, upward, north and west. So you had an infiltration from Babylonia. Small stream of conversion out of the Khazars. And a small stream coming from West to East after the Crusades in the 12th and 13th century. So that by the 13th, 14th, you had the Accretion from three separate sources of Eastern European Jewry.

So you have one main source of the Khazars, but you've got three streams of sources, which I have just delineated. And you're at a million and a quarter, which is, at 1800, now, by a century later, you're at three million, and they lived in that restricted area and there was no breeze of liberation blowing from the west. There was nobody offering them citizenship. There was nobody offering them emancipation. Instead, the Czar was offering them 25 year conscriptions for 13-year-old kids who were being picked up on the streets by the Czar's officers.

Now, in Eastern Europe, there were also Jews like Moses Mendelssohn, we began with him in Western Europe. There were also Jews who said, hey, listen, our people in Eastern Europe

must modernize themselves. They've got to come into contact with the secular world. They cannot remain ghettoized. So, a movement started in Eastern Europe with the very good Hebrew word *Haskalah*. Now, *haskalah*, you all know the word *sechil*, *sechil* means wisdom. *Lehaskil* means to become wise, to learn. *Haskalah* is knowledge. Particularly with reference to modern Western secular knowledge. Hasidism is what shaped the Jews in the Pale of Settlement, in the southern part. Let me remind you that there was another movement called Mitnagdik movement, that came out of the northern part, the strict rigid intellectuals of Vilna, that's me, remember, I told you, um, uh, were not Hasidism. We were against it. Hasidism was too emotional, too vague, too dancing and singing and not enough book learning. And in the Yeshivot up in the north in Vilna there were the Mitnagdik who were the opponents of Hasidism. But they were the minority. The majority were Hassidic. Into that matrix, in which the Jews were living, there came a few people to attempt *Haskalah*, or enlightenment or modern culture, whichever way you want to translate it, the aim of which was to create a new Jewish character which could take its place in modern society.

And, uh, the names are important, you don't have to remember them but there was Krochmal and there was David

Lutatouv and there was Isaac Baer Levinsohn and they were all called *maskilim*, Haskalah maskilim is the noun of the progenitors of this movement and the people who were pushing it. There was an intellectual aspect to it that they should learn Russian, the same thing as Mendelssohn, you need to learn German, the people have to learn Russian or you have got to learn one of the modern languages of the country you live in, Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian, some language. You see now, here the language was Yiddish, there was, in Eastern Europe, a national language, totally universal, everybody spoke it, and not as in Western Europe. And the maskilim were saying, that's fine, Yiddish is fine, not trying to displace it, but you people must learn a modern European language of the country you live in. The only way to do that is to set up modern schools, you've got to get out of the old Yeshivas and the Cheders and the Talmud Torahs.

So, the official haskalah program as outlined in Isaac Baer Levinsohn's book *Bet Yehudah*, had five points to it, and some of them were, had to do with learning, and interestingly enough, a couple of them had to do with work, because the effort of the haskala movement was to take the Jew away from being a herring peddler in the ghetto and turn him into an artisan.

M3: Herb? Were the Jews in Eastern Europe [indistinguishable] in trying to create this movement, were they aware of what Mendelssohn was doing in Western Europe?

Herbert A. Friedman: Yes sir, yeah. The handful of maskilim were totally aware of all the Western currents. Yes. And, in their wisdom, they did not try to duplicate them exactly in Eastern Europe, but to modify them to fit Eastern Europe, but they wanted the same objectives, yes.

Here is the five point program. Number one. Modern schools are to be established for children of both sexes. Bingo. I mean, as early as 1800. Theological seminaries are to be set up in the cities of Warsaw, Vilna, Odessa, and Berdichev. Students are to receive instruction in *secular* subjects in addition to Jewish studies. So you see there, now they are trying to get a balance, they are not trying to destroy, uh, Jewish identity. No, no. They just want to add another dimension to it.

Next, that a chief Rabbi and counsel be appointed to have charge of the spiritual life of Russian Jewry. That didn't exist. That's an organizational clause, because a chief Rabbi and a counsel are simply a, uh, a hint at a building of a

structure. You remember the old structure that existed in the beginning of the 16th century called the [Hebrew], the Council of the Four Lands that we once studied, one time back? That had disappeared. There was that internal mechanism. It lasted about a hundred years and then it fell apart. Now, what they are saying here in the 19th century, these Jews need an organizational structure, never mind maybe the Czar wouldn't let them have it. Never mind that maybe they'd have to fight like hell to get it. The maskilim were saying that we need it. Next.

M4: Herb, did that have a political purpose as well?

Herbert A. Friedman: I don't think so. I think it had an internal control purpose, to set standards for the raising of the Jews into a modern consciousness. I think it was purely internal. I think it had no political overtones or ambitions. They couldn't think that far. The political thought came only sixty years later with the growth of the Zionist movement. And by the way, all the political energies of those millions of Eastern Jews went into that one Zionist movement, there was no competition, there was no opposition. Okay, now, the next point. The official program is that competent preachers be obtained to

instruct the people. Now that has reference to external manners. Dress, garb, spitting, etc. And ethics, ethics. These are new elements that never were in the consciousness of the ghetto. What the hell difference what you looked like and what you dressed like and what were manners and, none of that mattered. You were slopping around in mud. There were no sidewalks and [1:18:00] there were no streets, and you knew what the fiddler in a little township looked like. And all of a sudden somebody was coming along and saying keep your boots clean and wear a scarf around your neck properly and don't spit into the herring barrel. And so they sent competent preachers. They are not talking about pre-Rabbis, they are talking about *madrichim*, guides, instructors. Next point, this is interesting, at least a third of the people be encouraged to engage in agriculture. Bingo, your first move toward economic independence. Never mind the Jews couldn't own land yet. I think Nancy's looking at the tape, I think the tape's okay Nancy. Learn some kind of profession, by which you can make a living.

And the last thing, I don't really understand, but it's cute. That Jews be discouraged from ostentatious display and luxurious living. I don't know who was living that way, but you know, every time we had one rich Jew with a wooden house, and

why the hell he should be discouraged from that, I don't know, but...

M5: Herb, of the million or so Jews living in this area, what percentage of the population... do you have any idea?

Herbert A. Friedman: Of the total population?

M5: Yes.

Herbert A. Friedman: Oh, I would say, in the Pale of Settlement itself, to which they were confined, which is that strip of area running north to south from approximately close to east, what is today east Prussia, down to what is today the border of Romania, if you have the map in your head. I am using today's places. That was a strip of maybe 100 miles wide and 300 miles long. Very few other people except some Polish peasants. Most of it was Jewish ghetto, towns, and shtetls, and a lot of empty land, which was owned by Polish absentee landlords, who weren't living there, and Jews were managing it for them. Now that's that that strip, but now, that strip was part of Poland on the West and Russia on the east, so I can't answer you as to what the total

population of Poland and Russia was at that time, but, uh, to take a ballpark figure, it doesn't matter whether its 30 million or 40 million, a lot of people on the Russian side, fewer on the Polish side, and this Pala settlement right in the middle. But that had almost nobody else in it. I would say if you got a million and quarter Jews in the Pale, you probably have another half million Polish peasants. Probably the Jews outnumbered anybody else inside the Pale.

Um, Eban has a good sentence which makes the bridge from haskalah this movement, to the most powerful movement of the century which grew up -- the movement of Zionism -- nationalism. Here's your sentence. "The haskalah in Russia succeeded in bringing forth a new concept of national renaissance. It aroused among Russian Jews an aspiration to free inquiry and a love for knowledge. Among religious Jews, it helped to convert objects of mere traditionalism into objects of thought. The haskalah" here's the key sentence, "prepared the way, not only for modern Hebrew literature, but for that modern triumph of the Hebrew spirit, [Hebrew], the love of Zion. Haskalah laid in the groundwork, actually, for the Zionist movement."

M3: Herb, there is a sentence there, I guess it is critical to the bridge which I think I have missed entirely. Go back up one sentence that says although it may stress general enlightenment, and vague liberalism, it initiated a spirit of specifically Hebrew revival, how did that come about? What was the connection?

Herbert A. Friedman: Language, language, Hebrew writings, there were dozens of Hebrew journals written, dozens of Hebrew novels written, [indistinguishable] essayists began to write in Hebrew, Lillian Bloom wrote in Hebrew. The revival of the Hebrew language, everybody believes, took place in Israel when, what's his name, Ben Yehudah insisted upon speaking nothing but Hebrew. No! The revival of the Hebrew language took place long before there was anybody in Palestine. It took place in the Pale of Settlement in this period in the early 1800's. Reviving the language, the tremendous repercussions were the creation of the state of Israel.

M3: Herb, when did the first Russian Jews from the Pale start going to Israel, to Palestine?

Herbert A. Friedman: Do you know what I suggest we do? Let's go to that second map. Go to the second map which says 'Zionism 1860-1939.' I will tell you the answer when. There are about fourteen boxes and they are numbered in sequence. Find box number one which is numbered on the right hand side, the box at the top is number three, in the center, come down to number one, there you've got your first date.

In 1860, you see it there? [**inaudible**] Find it. Got your eye on it? [M: It's on page 63 in the book, we've only got half a map]. Box number one, 1860. See it? That's the date. A conference discusses the possibility of a Jewish home in Palestine. Look at the name of the little town to which that number one points, you see it, Thorn, in Prussia? That's where it started. Now, number two is over to the left, move from that town of Thorn to the left you see a town by the name of Frankfurt Oder, 1861, the Zion Society founded. Move upstairs, up above to the top, number three, 1882, you've got a big jump. 1882, Leo Pinsker wrote a book called *Auto Emancipation*, urging the Jews to seek a national retreat preferably on the banks of the Jordan. Pinsker said simply, hey you people, you want to, uh, you want to be a nation? You've got to do it yourself.

Nobody's going to give it to you on any silver platter. So he wrote the title *Auto Emancipation*.

Number four is a drop down, under number one, in a little town called Katowitz, 1884, Lovers of Zion movement. Shift way over to the left to Paris. Ten years go by, and that's where the bulls eye hits, in the Dreyfus case in Paris where Theodore Herzl carne from Vienna, and you all know that story too well, no need for me to repeat it to you, and Theodore Herzl comes to the conclusion -- in the very France in which the Jews said they are not a nation, Theodore Herzl comes to the conclusion that the Jews had better begin to think of themselves as a nation once more, because the devastating shock of his sitting through that Dreyfus case, watching that terrible, vicious anti-Semitism, which resulted from it, violent [speaking French], he says, my God, if this can happen in France, which he said, the place that *started* giving the citizenship, the freedom to the Jews, what the hell, it can happen anywhere. We'd better get out own country.

By the way, in his book which he wrote, the *Judenstadt*, he never said anything about Palestine. Herzl was a totally assimilated Jew. He didn't know nothing about prayers, I mean, knew nothing, nothing. But he was an astute politician and he

said hey, it's clear. We'd better have our own country; I don't care where it is. He suggested it in the Gaza Strip, he suggested it in Sinai. He took the suggestion of the British to do it in Uganda, he didn't care.

After a while, he saw that the Russian Jews *did* care and they wanted only Palestine, so obviously he wasn't going to fight that, that was okay by him. But that started the whole business. Well, from now, the rest of it you know. There have been dozens of Zionists Congresses. You can go over that whole map see all those boxes. Herzl tried to get a charter from the Turkish sultan, uh, to establish the country, the Turkish sultan wouldn't do it. He tried the Kaiser. He had a meeting with the Kaiser in the Jaffa Gate in Jerusalem. The Kaiser was sitting up on a horse, Herzl was standing down below. They talked for an hour, can you believe that, [1:29:00] and the Kaiser looks down at him and he says no, I won't try to persuade the sultan. A couple of years later Herzl at the age of 44, died of a broken heart. It didn't make any difference. The movement went on. So, the answer to your question is this: If you shift over past the Dreyfus affair and we go to look at the establishment of the Zionist movement, which on that chart is the last item down there, and if you've got those notes which you are following

very carefully, then let me take you to page 18 in the notes. Let's get the names of those books clearly in our minds because that's what started it.

Zionism was a national movement. The Jews recaptured [1:30:00] their sense of nationalism. 1806, Napoleon's Sanhedrin, by 1866, they were back in the swing. Two books were written. In 1862, Kalischer wrote a book called *Drishat Zion* in which he, an Orthodox Jew, quite different from the Orthodox Judaism of today. The Orthodox Jewish Zionists in the 19th century were just brilliant, flexible, lovely, part of the whole stream, they were not negative, antipathetic, nit-picking, I mean, the way the whole problem has developed today. [Laughter] He said ...somebody's laughing at me. [Response: I love your description]

I haven't begun! I'm really so ticked off, you haven't heard, you don't know what's happened to me this past month [Laughter, **inaudible**]. Today, it's terrible. In those days, Rabbi Tzvi Hersch Kalischer writing [indistinguishable] *Drishat Zion*, the very first book ever written on the subject, called *Longing for Zion*, says "rebuilding the ancient soil of Israel is fulfilling the Messianic promise." Period. Full stop. That's it. It's positive.

It doesn't matter whether it's true or not, it is going to be true. It is true dreaming. Moses Hess was the next guy to write, and he got charged up by the Italians. And he said, Garibaldi and Mancini are building a country here in the 1860's. All these crazy Italian provinces are going to be nationalized in one big country. If these absolutely anarchic, mad, Italians can do it, can't the Jews do it? So he wrote his book called *Rome and Jerusalem*. So if they're doing it in Rome, we will do it in Jerusalem. And there was a big charge, and it was a real practical example that if the Italians can do it, we can do it, and the book had a wide distribution and it gave a push to the idea. Then, it took 20 years, in 1882, Pinsker wrote that book I told you, *Auto Emancipation*. Now that came out of a very specific situation, and I told you I would get to Russia and what happened there.

Uh, 1881, Alexander II was assassinated. Alexander II was a liberal king, a liberal Czar. He tried to, uh, um, ameliorate slavery, for Russians, nothing to do with Jews. He tried to reduce the influence of the United Russian Orthodox clergy. He tried to bust up, uh, all kinds of negative influences, and he was a good man. He got assassinated. Alexander III comes along, and it is a total, uh, switch, Alexander III is a despot.

Alexander III had a Prime Minister by the name of Pobedonostsev. Pobedonostsev was a vicious madman, pre-Hitler type, who had a very clear program as to how to get rid of the Jews. You kill 1/3 of them, you convert 1/3 of them, and you toss out 1/3 of them. These, by the way, are called the 1/3 laws. They are also known as the May laws, because they were promulgated in the month of May 1882, never forget that. And by the way, if you want a watershed year and somebody says to you when was the major massive migration of Jews from Eastern Europe to the United States take place, the exact dates are 1881, immediately after the assassination of Alexander II, when you could see the handwriting on the wall. 1881 - 1914, World War I, when ships could no longer sail safely on the Atlantic, but '81-1914, you are talking about 33 years. In those 33 years, three million Jews came to the United States. An average, a hundred thousand a year passing through Ellis Island, Castle Garden, and Galveston and Baltimore, coming in to the United States.

[Break in audio]

[Cut off] --the dates for the first Aaliyah]. So, 1882, that year that Alexander III came in with the 1/3 laws, the

death laws, that's the year Pinsker said *Auto Emancipation*, let's get the hell out of here, let's make our own country. Now, the figures that you've asked so clearly, three million to the U.S. versus 3,000 to, to Palestine, seem so totally warped, skewed, and impossible, that nothing could ever come out of the 3,000. And yet, of course, it all came. The seed of nationhood came out of those 3,000. They didn't eat, they hungered, and they got malaria.

You, you've all heard of Isaiah Berlin. Isiah Berlin is the great guru at Oxford, once British ambassador to the United States in 1940. He, uh, he's got a good line. The Jews in Eastern Europe were very secure inside the Pale. They were not worried about emancipation. They were not worried about appeasing the Gentiles, they did not want to look like them, they fought against the *haskalah* movement, it never became a wide spread movement. And Isiah Berlin says, "the problems of the outside world affected the Russian Jews to a far smaller degree within their own vast insulated ghetto. Their imprisonment brought with it one immense advantage. Namely, that the spirit of the inmates remained unbroken, and they were *not* as powerfully tempted to seek escape by adopting false positions as their socially more exposed brethren. False positions being

based on snobbery and the desire to be acceptable to Western Christians." The big solid bulk of the Russian Jews, even though they did not go to Palestine, even though only a tiny handful of the most dedicated, crazy pioneers went, and the three million Russian Jews went to America. The three million Russian Jews were not tempted, they were not going to assimilate, they were not going to disappear, and they created the state of Israel from America.

Now, um, the whole Zionist movement started with that tiny group of Russian *biluim* [speaks Hebrew]... Come out of the prophet Isaiah, "O house of Jacob, let us go up." Up, that's Aliyah. The first Zionist Congress met in Basel, in Switzerland, in 1897, and already there were 18 Jewish settlements in Israel and one agricultural school, Mikveh Yisroel. Mikveh Yisroel is the start of it all.

I want to tell you three sentences. Mikveh Yisroel is a agricultural farm village which exists, to this day, near Holon, south of Tel Aviv. It used to be closer to Jaffa. Mikveh Yisroel was started as an agricultural school by a French Zionist named of Charles Netter with twelve French boys, Netter was a Frenchman from Paris, and he brought twelve French Jewish teenagers over, bought two *dunim* of land, which is a half an

acre, and started a farm and agricultural school and out of Jaffa one day on a camel came some Bedouins and they shot the first kid, a twelve-year-old boy.

Mr. Ben Gurion once said to me, just before he died, he died in 1973, in December, two months after the October War. Mikveh Yisroel was started in 1871, 102 years earlier. He said to me, our war to create the independent Jewish state for the modern Jewish people began in 1871. I said, there was no state, there was no nothing, there was no movement, there were a couple of biluim. He said, creation takes place in blood. Everybody is born in blood, there is no other way to get born. The blood of that boy started the creation of this state. A hundred and two years. It is not unknown that there have been 100-year wars earlier in history. We're in a hundred year war. So, we started in 1871, we are now in 1973, it goes on. We are winning it. [1:41:00] And that is the whole story, 1871, Mikveh Yisroel. '71, the Dreyfus thing didn't happen until '87, so that's another fifteen or so years. The people kept coming, one by one, one by one. Herzl couldn't get anywhere, he couldn't sell the idea to Baron Hirsch, he couldn't sell it to Baron Rothschild. He couldn't sell it to the Czar, he couldn't sell it to the Pope, he couldn't sell it to the Turkish sultan. He

couldn't sell it to anybody. And so, he got the idea that he would try to sell it only to the Jews. And Herzl organized himself with a little tiny secretariat of two people and paid for himself all expenses for calling the first Zionist conference in Basel in 1897.

The first Zionist Congress that I ever went to was in 1946, at the end of the war, there was a Zionist Congress in Basel. [1:42:00] I came down from Germany with twelve chaplains. But that's a whole other story. It's the first one I ever went to -- I'll tell you a secret, it's the last one I ever went to.

[Laughter]

Anyway, Herzl died. He didn't make a damn bit of difference. Through Herzl, the Jewish people overcame its passive role as they endured. The Jews began to shape their own life, take their future into their own hands, Herzl restored them to strength, courage, and purpose.

I said I'd finish at seven-thirty. Pretty close. [inaudible] Okay, there are a lot of things I left out. I wanted to tell you about the migration to the New World, that's nothing; we can get that in next time. Um, ah, I have a feeling now we are back on the history track, and that is a good feeling. Uh, we have four more to go, um, next time is going to

be the whole Palestine thing, from the WWI, the peace conference, Woodrow Wilson, down through the Balfour Declaration, and we will come right down to, uh, WWII, that's next lecture, number six. The one after that is going to be the Holocaust. Now, let me tell you very quickly what I want to do about that. You've all heard about this new big thick Martin Gilbert book, *The Holocaust*? Or, if you didn't hear about it, Martin Gilbert has written a book on the Holocaust, which I have read. It's, whatever, 700 pages, now. It's the best. It's the best. And we are sending it to all of you, and you will keep it. And you won't have to read it for that assignment, because you can't. But, it's a permanent book for your library. The great books are Davidovich and Reitlinger and Hilberg, but those are the books of the '60's.

M: You know, that nine and a half hour epic is coming next week.

Herbert A. Friedman: *Shoah*.

M: And I think most of us will be seeing it.

Herbert A. Friedman: You will be seeing it in two segments? You realize of course, you realize that you will see nothing in it except the testimony of people alive. [Yeah]. It is a spectacular thing. Claude Lanzmann did it mostly with money from a guy by the name of Jack Lang who was the French Minister of Culture in the previous government, a Jew, and almost got no money anywhere else in the world for that. Uh, ah. But, it's great.

I'm going to send a film, well, I'm going to come and I'm bringing you a film, which I think of all the hundreds of films, the classic. And it is called "Night and Fog". And it is thirty-five minutes, and we are going to show it. I'm also going to bring a hundred slides, which I have accumulated in that period, the destruction of Berlin at the end of the war, the destruction of the Warsaw ghetto, I will show you what the Warsaw ghetto looked like. The original pictures that I took, uh, in Auschwitz. And so, a whole selection.

COMMENT: Are these the pictures that you have taken, Herb?

Herbert A. Friedman: Yeah, most of them. I have got about a hundred slides that I have selected out of many, many hundreds. [1:46:00] And I will put them in a drum and I will bring them.

COMMENT: Sounds exciting.

Herbert A. Friedman: Yeah, they'll be good. Now, the other thing I wanted to say is that I will be going through all of my notes on the Holocaust, and instead of a reading assignment in Martin Gilbert's book, um, what I am going to do is get my miscellaneous handwritten, messy notes typed up in some kind of a folder and I will send you a folder of a dozen pieces. You don't have to read them all. So, a couple of speeches I wrote, an analysis I made on the big thick Shirer book, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*. Oh, and by the way, we are sending that to you also, in case you don't have it. That's in paperback. I want you to have two basic things, the Shirer book, which is a classic, it's unchanging, and the Gilbert book, which is the newest and the best of all the thick Holocaust books. So, those two are on your shelf. A set of papers from the how come the question of, why wasn't there more resistance, the question of how did Hitler take control of the German mind, how, uh, what

was the early organization of the party. Interesting bits and pieces, we will type them up neatly and I will send you that folder. That's four weeks from now. The one after that is the long old story of the creation of the state of Israel from birth to present which is 38 years' worth. And all the major trends. And the one after that is the last one which is the growth of the American Jewish community, and a little world demography.

So those are the next four lectures. We are teed up, I have gotten the next one already written, and so I am really looking forward to a good completion on the series. Uh, you've delayed your supper, and so, what I suggested to Bob yesterday when we talked was, you guys start eating and let me talk to you about the overseas trip and you talk to me between bites.

COMMENT: Let us take a little a break for a few minutes? Let's all do that, and we'll call you back.

Herbert A. Friedman: Call me back.

[Break in Audio]

[inaudible conversation]

Herbert A. Friedman: [...] a group of people in order to analyze the specific security aspects, I am being very exact. I did not want to go into any generalizations about terrorism, or about being deterred from travel by terrorists and we shouldn't give into it, because that is the wrong political stance, nor did I want to get into stuff like we shouldn't go to Spain, because Spain wouldn't give America overflights. I mean, none of that geopolitical considerations, that's got nothing to do with us. We are not playing on that level. What I wanted to try to determine for myself, in my best judgement after an awful lot of experience of traveling that I've had for 30 years under all kinds of military and security conditions was whether this trip as constituted is safe as it can reasonably be. Without taking you through all the details, like whether Air Iberia, uh, x-rays luggage going into the hold, or whether Air Iberia or Air Morocco carry armed sky marshals, or all the other things I went into. After a pretty good survey I have reached the conclusion that from my point of view, it's a go. And I reached, and that's my conclusion. So, I said to the people, that's, uh, what we decided last Tuesday, and I'll get back to you, because I will be in Columbus next Tuesday, and we will take the temper of the group, and see what they want to do, because basically they are

going to make the decision, not me. I am just, uh, the manager of this thing and I know now what I want and I have my own security arrangements for Spain, Spain. Morocco will be the safest place on earth to be, and Israel is Israel. If you are a British 28-year-old kid, you can get shot, uh, at the garden gate, so what are we going to do about that? Okay.

The next day, I had a long, lovely call from Les, who, by the way, didn't know about this meeting that I've had and the conclusion I've reached. But he's been worried about it and wondering about it and doesn't know what to do, and we were talking, you know his style. And he said look, I think my bottom line, me personally, bottom line is that I really don't want to be responsible - and that is the word he used - for sending this group. I mean, it's not that I am paying for it, but I am the initiator. I am offering it, I am responsible for it. God forbid if anything happens to anybody, it is on my head for the rest of my life, and I don't think I want to be in that position. And, you know his style, he is not blunt, he is not abrasive, he is soft and gentle, but that is the essence of the message. I said, in my soft and gentle way, well I thought we'd go. And he said, well, uh, we can think it over, can't we? And I said yeah, let me get out to the group next Tuesday. Now, I didn't get to you,

but we are discussing it as though I am there. He really is not trying to tell you what to do, but he really feels that the trip should be postponed. Now, in the face of that, and I am not sure what postponed means, I really don't know, and we don't have the time tonight to go into whether we can postpone it into June, July, September, I mean, the next program is geared to start up September 8. That's a fixed date. Obviously, that can be changed to. That is my drawing board date for starting in the five cities. So, I don't know what postponed means, but it can be next year.

Next year, I have a trip on the drawing board that I won't tell you about for July '87, it is going to be a knockout. So, I don't know what postponed means. We may pass completely, we may not. Les frankly said to me, do you think the group may feel cheated out of a nice year-end reward that they have earned? I said no, these are very sophisticated, very intelligent people. [inaudible, laughter]. I disabused him of that. We stand as follows. He doesn't want the trip to go. Gordy comes barging in on me and saying, you can't take the damn trip anyway for health reasons, whether you think you're crazy enough to do it, uh, for anyway. You shouldn't do it for security reasons, but -.

And Gordy, "you shouldn't do it because of of-of American geopolitical considerations." I would've thought that you would give the terrorists a kick in the behind if you go. But anyhow, so, the mood at the moment is this: I have a suggestion to make, which is since the physical danger or risk, *risk*, not danger, risk, exists mainly in Spain and Morocco as far as aircraft, airports, baggage, bombs, etc. And, conversely, any risk in Israel has nothing to do with all those factors, but only with the fact that there are three terrorist gangs running around in Jerusalem right now this week shooting aimlessly, a suggestion that could be made is that we go only to Israel, only, and that, and I drew up an itinerary, not an itinerary, a suggested group of topics, which I showed to Gordy on Sunday, and he thought they were quite good, and that we go to Israel with that list of topics which I'll read to you, and we do it for whatever number of days and for which days we can get aircraft, because everything is loaded in El Al, right down into the summer, but we'll get space.

For those number of people who want to go, and I know Miriam and Birney were just there, or just going there. They weren't going to Israel with us, because they'd just been there. Maybe other people have just been there. So, I don't know any

details of what we are talking about in terms of number of people, but that whoever would like to make a trip to Israel for the purpose of the following agenda: a, do our Hartman study. We were going to do three mornings of four hours each, twelve hours, and finish the other two Maimonides letters in the original book --we read one, at the Hartman Institute, and I had Abraham Infeld here, who was the Executive Director, and we talked about the layout, about how many faculty people they would need and how they would break us up into groups. And so, we have a Hartman item on the agenda. Number two I would constitute the itinerary, the agenda, the following way: Do the whole West Bank problem, the West Bank problem is the problem of a future state. Partition is what began the whole state of Israel. Partition in the West Bank is going to be the ultimate end. The man who expresses that point of view best is a man by the name of Maron Benvenesty. I thought we'd get ahold of Benvenesty, take him with us for two days, go through the West Bank with him, go through the main roads north-south, and the one road east-west, crisscross it. Go with the maps. Go with the charts. Understand the West Bank problem once and for all with a guide who has a pre-conceived solution with which, uh, half of the population agrees and half of the population disagrees and

he is the best man you can listen to and you can agree or disagree with him, see it on the ground, listen to the arguments, analyze them and know the subject.

The subject is going to remain high up on the agenda of the State of Israel for the next decade. So that is a West Bank element that we can put in for one, two, or three days as much as we want. There is a second element which is the subject of terrorism, and I would organize a seminar at the Center for Strategic Studies at Tel Aviv with General Aharon Yariv who is the head of that center, who is a world-class figure, as most of you know. And Yariv will set up a day, a *yom iyun*, a study day, as they call it, will take one whole solid day. Having seen the territory in the West Bank, and what motivates this terrorism and analyzing all of the groups and I would urge you, by the way, every single person, to try to get a hold of a copy of today's New York Times, because Tom Friedman has written down for the first time, on a full page, the name of every single terrorist organization and its known leader. That's like a table of contents of a book. And I would bring Tom Friedman of The Times in on that day of discussion on terrorism. So, one subject West Bank, two, subject terrorism. Three subject, this is the final one. The composition of the next Israel government in

which the turnover takes place in October, and the terms of the economic solution, because the next government is going to rise or fall, not on warranties, not on terrorism, and not on the West Bank, and not on nothing, *except* economics. And Mr. Peres probably might wind up as the Minister of Finance. And Mr. Peres, I want to hear from him as to his plan for a Middle Eastern Marshall plan. Which Reagan is bringing up in Tokyo next week. A 30 billion dollar Marshall plan to be focused on solving the problem in the Middle East. Not by war, not by PLO, and not by nothing but by economic growth of the countries involved.

M: There was a reference made in a Wall Street Journal editorial today, Herb. Did you see it?

Herbert A. Friedman: No. They did refer to it already? Okay, so it's surfacing already.

I had Leslie met with Peres, we were together a couple days after I got sick. I was smart enough not to know what happened to me. So, we went, Shimon and Les, we talked about that thing, and Shimon was kind of optimistic about it. Uh, he's gotten some good readings from the French, the Germans, and the British. But the heavy dough has got to be poured in by the Germans and the

Japanese. So, it is going to come up in Tokyo. And, that's the future. Uh, Shultz has got 750 million bucks ready to hand over to Israel in cash if he thinks that the inflation is really under control. If he thinks that the, Israel is willing to bite the bullet, take the unemployment, take all the tough stuff that goes with it and get the damn economy down to some... well, you need those cash injections. Anyhow, I'm sorry, I'm going into too much detail. There is an agenda of good stuff that could be done in Israel.

Those are three heavy topics, and terribly important for all of your understanding of the next long-medium, long-term, not just short term. So West Bank, so terrorism, so economic future and government change are three and Hartman, Maimonides is four. So, if you want to take six days, seven days, eight days.

My suggestion is, ease off on the Spain, I'll back off, Les doesn't want to do it anyway. Ease off on the Spain, Morocco, cancel everything out. Think of whether you want to do an Israel thing all by itself. If not, we postpone that too, nothing is, you know, written in stone. [Response: Have you ever considered a career in sales?]

Not really, do you think I might make it? [**inaudible**] I might have a future. So, look, you guys gotta tell me what you want. It's really your decision and I'm not saying that tongue in cheek. Les and I started from two different positions. By the way, Gordy's position is absolutely no, absolutely no, no, no. And then when I got finished and I showed him the draft that I had written of the Israel trip, he said alright, that's great, but you can't go. So I said well, why can't I go? And he said, well, that's got to do with your health. I said, we are talking two months off, come on. So then I talked to them and I said, if I'm not going to go, who is going to lead the group?

M: Herb, a trip without you makes absolutely no sense at all.

Herbert A. Friedman: Well, Neil, don't jump the gun on that. Please. Don't jump the gun on it. A trip with me would be better than without me, and a trip is better than no trip. I appreciate the sentiment. I do. [**inaudible**]

M: The bottom line. What is the likelihood that you think you'll be able to go?

Herbert A. Friedman: I wish I knew. I honest-to-God wish I knew. We are sitting here on the 29th of April, we are talking about the 29th of June. That is two solid months, that is 60 days. If these doctors don't get me settled in 60 days, I am not going to sit here at this desk, doing the next four lectures this way as well as this went. I think this went okay by the way, didn't it? [It went great, yeah it went great]. But that's not contact between you and me. Contact is love and eyes and together and so I have got to get back to you.

M: Herb, I think that there is a larger feeling to this whole thing. It has to do with the element of this group starting together and this group finishing together. And what you wanted to achieve that we have been successful -- able to achieve. In terms of putting together a group elite, I'm not sure, but bonded, I can vouch for. I think that issue of your health is a non-issue in the sense that we assume you are going to be strong as a bull and would be able to go. [Okay] But the greater issue, however, is that without going around the room and polling, there is not a unanimous feeling that we should go to Europe or Israel this summer.

M2: There is *not* a unanimous feeling?

M: I think it makes really no difference whose on which side of the issue, the issue that it is not unanimous. My feeling is that because it is not, that that in itself is reason enough to say that we will defer this trip for another year because I think it is so important to the group that we travel as a group and are able to further consolidate that feeling of oneness that is so instrumental. And I don't know if I speak for the group, but what I detect is that is the feeling of the group.

Herbert A. Friedman: May I make a suggestion? I think you are at an absolutely crucial point. If the group is divided in its opinion, no trip should take place on a basis of a vote of 6 to 4 or 3 to 8 or 9 to 2 or any kind of divided. This isn't the kind of a matter to where that you take a vote and a majority rules, because you are absolutely right, this is a bonded consensus and I think it should be as close as unanimous, without forcing anybody, as possible. If there is a split, if there are differences of opinion, if there are some others who have some fears, if there are some husbands who feel that it

would be divisive, four guys want to go, three, six guys don't want to go.

What the hell, that splits the group apart, which is the opposite of what we've been trying to achieve. In other words, I'm not saying that unanimity is mandatory, but what I am saying is, almost unanimity is preferable. So you make, uh, a strong case. I would like to make the following suggestion. Let me go now, you people decide among yourselves. Call me tomorrow, but let's decide. That we have to do.

Because if it's go, I have planning to do. If it's no go, I have no planning, but I have just to dissolve. I don't think we ought to delay, you are there tonight. The next point will be three weeks from now. So if you could, what I would like to suggest you've still got some time, stay together, talk it through, sensibly, the way you just started, reach a decision. Our two choices apparently are, no go at all, or go just Israel. I don't see any other alternatives.

M: What about doing Hartman to the U.S., he's coming to Vermont in July anyway.

Herbert A. Friedman: The answer to that is yes, July, you're right. He is going to Berkeley in August. He will be in Berkeley from August until December. We have got all the time in the world to do Hartman in Columbus.

M3: Herb, the two major points of this summary are security concerns and your ability to function. And be with us. [2:10:00]

Herbert A. Friedman: The latter point, I am functioning. If I get knocked out of the box by some kinda surgery it's 10-20 days. I will recover. Then, they might not let me go on the trip. If I were to make an assumption now, I would assume that I can't guarantee going. I will fight him tooth and nail. And you know me, my makeup and my constitution.

M2: The issue is, what we can provide Leslie with comfort because I, I've talked to him and I know how sensitive he is to our health and welfare. And then there is the issue that we talked about before about going as a group or not going as a group.

Herbert A. Friedman: That is very crucial. That is a very strong point. [2:11:00] I am not concerned about the security. That is my strange peculiarity. I never have been in my whole life. I'm answering Nelson's too, he asked me two questions, the security and my ability to go. The latter I can't predict, it's not in my hands. The former is a point of view ...yeah.

[inaudible] ... he said Bob, what he said to me was God forbid, and I said what are we talking about? It is a twenty million to one shot, a damn lottery.

The thought about just Israel occurred to me after my conversation with him last week. Really, Norman, you can talk to him. Ask him that question; ask him what he thinks about that. If you want it. My point is...

M: It doesn't matter whether or we are in Spain or we are in Israel, you are scared to death these times.

Herbert A. Friedman: Well then, don't push it. Listen, you guys make your decision. [inaudible]

M: Do you see any difference in the degree of security in Israel between now and three months ago, four months ago? [**inaudible**]

Herbert A. Friedman: No, I do not. Those gangs were wandering around three, four months ago. There have been murders in Jerusalem every single day.

M: When we are ready to make an independent decision. [2:13:00]
We'll call you tomorrow.

Herbert A. Friedman: Do me one favor please, will someone take the attendance tonight? [laughs]

END OF AUDIO FILE