

CD-1085 Transcription

Paris Forum on Antisemitism in Europe [3]. 20 March 1983.

M3: [00:00] Back in a short time. It will have to be the same kind of work which was done by the Palestinians during the last years, by sending letters to editors. And they were all refused in the beginning. Then they got one published, then they got two published. Now they get almost everything published. We have to start to do it in the same way again, to start building from the beginning.

And, as for the communities, I think that one has to try to give the members of the community a sense of not despair. We shouldn't close down anything. That would be the worst thing to do, which is discussed today in communities. Can you go on with summer camps because of security reasons, terrorism and things like that? I think the worst thing would be to close down anything at all, because that -- our enemies would really have succeeded. And one has to find way of motivating -- of giving people the inner courage to stand up, to fight back, and not to lose -- not to [01:00] say this it and we give up.

M4: I would also like to comment on what you said, [Tamar?]. Because --

F1: Of course. That was the purpose of (inaudible) (laughter).

M4: I agree with you that most people do not read newspapers.

And, consequently, most people are influenced by the television. And I think we've all had experiences where we've been out to make a speech and have found out that people were not interested in the speech, but want to discuss what was on television the day before or the day after that. You ask if we should separate between TV, radio, and press, and between different journalists. At least in Denmark, with the exception of very few newspapers, there was really no distinction to make regarding TV, radio, and newspapers. Of course, there were one or two newspapers which had decent journalists, and which really reported in a decent way. But, in general, it was just a question of who could get the most sensational headline, who could [02:00] lash at Israel mostly.

I'd also say that the comparison which you said, that we should compare Israel with Western countries rather than with other countries, is false. Because we should compare to Western countries. It should be the Western countries under -- during a war, like (inaudible). This is never done. People, and especially the press, treat Israel as if

it's not involved in any kind of war -- as if there's peace in Israel.

I think, also, it's not a question of how the press is reporting. You make a point, also, that the press were making mistakes in their reporting, but that's not even the issue here, as far as I'm concerned. In my opinion, what is happening is that you always hear negative things about Israel. At least in Denmark, (inaudible) elsewhere, but you very, very rarely hear anything positive from Israel.

F1: Why?

M4: Why? That's a good question.

F1: Why don't you ask [03:00] yourself, what happened? Why is it that the entire press is suddenly against Israel?

M4: I can also explain that. (laughter) It will take some more time.

F2: Go ahead, we've got time.

M4: Yeah. This also involves the question of inviting journalists to different countries. Now, what happened in Denmark is the fact that the journalist as a man who looks into the background of the country, and then goes and visits the country, does not exist anymore with the exception of very few old journalists. What happens is, you'll have a journalist who perhaps (inaudible), and is

told in the morning, "Now you have to go to Israel, to the West Bank, and you have to talk to this and this man about the book and (inaudible). He doesn't --

ABE: He has to be young and in condition.

M4: Yeah, and he tells -- and you can expect -- you know what kind of stories which he would bring. And this also is emphasized by the fact that, whenever journalists are invited, for instance, to Libya, also Saudi Arabia, also Syria, [04:00] they come home and they never make an article which criticizes this country. Why? Because if they do, they know that they will be hit on their professional base. They know that the Arab world -- at least that country -- will become pretty closed to them. Whereas, in Israel, if Israel invites a journalist and even pays for the trip, they'll come back, and they say, "Now I have to prove that I'm an independent journalist, and I'll do that by hitting on Israel." So, Israel has really paid a very, very high price of being a democracy. And as far as I can see, getting absolutely nothing out of inviting journalists to Israel. And I mentioned this while I... Sorry?

M3: They shouldn't do, maybe.

M4: Well, maybe they should not invite anyone. I mean, we've had instances where they invited one of the most pro-Arab journalists. I don't know what they expect, really -- to

change (inaudible). You mentioned that Israel was an example of the fact the press should have not have too [05:00] much importance, because the press in Israel was never even seen --

F1: Yeah, I just wanted to put things in proportion about the press, saying that we should not think of ourselves as being too important. I mean, giving this as an example.

M4: Yeah, that Israel is a very bad example, because the people of Israel know the situation is in the West, and people in Denmark do not know the situation in Israel, and are influenced to a much greater extent. I mean, when you talk to children who have just seen pictures on the television, you get the impression that everything they see goes right into their brain. There's no filtering away of facts, no interpretation at all. That's why I think that the press -- and I agree with [Stefan?] completely, that the press has done tremendous damage to Israel and the Jewish cause.

Now, the question is, how can you change the situation? And I think there are two things which need to be done. The first thing is, to make the press report on Israeli affairs in a reasonable way. I'm don't want them trained to [06:00] clap their hand whenever Begin says something. This, of course, is not what I want. But I want fair treatment of

Israel. And the second thing is equally important, and perhaps easier to achieve -- is to have a reporting on what happens in the Arab countries. Because the way things are now, with Israel being singled out, people get the impression that Israel is the only crook in the area, or you might even consider saying, in the world. And this, of course, creates anti-Semitism. There's no doubt about that.

F2: I (inaudible). But please don't forget that we have a whole session tomorrow, which will be devoted to the issue. And I think we should clean up our desks (inaudible).

M3: I believe it is good what Tamar said about the lady in England (inaudible). In my opinion, we'll be exactly a new (inaudible) [07:00] in the midway between what our Scandinavian friends told, and Tamar. Because I think it's a little hard for me to mirror that the press is responsible for anti-Semitism or even for anti-Zionism. My point of view is reverse. I believe that the attitude of the press is only a symptom of what is going on. And why do we concentrate on press? Because only the press leaves traces. What people tell in the streets is not written, it's not broadcasted. So, what we keep in mind is what's been written on paper -- maybe even more important than what goes out on television. What's written on paper, even 10 years later, I can hold in my hand and show you.

I would say that, (inaudible) a little point of precision, is that the responsibility of Israel is not [08:00] little in the matter of how the press reacts. First of all, propaganda with the Israel embassies is very stupid, I should say. Secondly, I know from journalists of Belgian television, that the pictures on the television set have been shown during the Lebanon War came from Damascus. And why did they come from...?

F1: (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

M3: Sorry. And why did they come from Damascus? It's because, at the moment, Israelis will let the television pictures go from Israel into Europe. So, we don't have to wonder if these films will come from Damascus are not very objective. But I would say that, on the other side, the (inaudible) is, in a way, whitewashed press, is not quite right. Because as a militant anti-Beginist, I was, [09:00] anyway, very shocked by the attitude of the press, because the cooperation between the press here and the President of Israel isn't right. The problem is not that they criticize Begin. I believe they didn't enough criticize Begin. But it's like -- been said before, the way they did it.

And, really, it's not only the press. The best example I can give of that is the declaration of García Márquez. What did García Márquez, who is the literature Nobel Prize, said, "If the Nobel Prize of death would exist, I would give it to Begin and Sharon. To me, saying that Begin and Sharon are murderers isn't so shocking. They are the biggest murderers of the world (inaudible), at least." And he was not the only man in the press who said such nonsense.

And, secondly, to precisely [10:00] my point of view, I would let speak in my place the editorialist of the biggest newspaper in Belgium, who wrote a few weeks ago, after the problem of the snow in Lebanon, in which the Syrians stopped the help to come to rescue the people, he simply asked the question, "What would we have said if the Israelis had done the same thing?" He's not a Jew, he's not a Zionist, or anything. He made a tiny *mea culpa*, and asked, "What would we have done?" So, if this journalist asked himself the question, I should say we could also ask ourselves the question. That's about the...

Another little point I would say is the example, how the Lebanon War has been treated. In Belgium, for instance,

[11:00] on the television, there has, twice, been a big broadcast about Lebanon during two hours, one at the beginning of the war, one in August. And in both cases, they sent one crew in Lebanon and one crew in Israel. And the crew in Israel did the job right. They took a microphone, they asked questions, and they weren't satisfied with the answers. They began to picking on the person to answer, and so on. That's what a journalist is supposed to do. On the contrary, the crew who went to Lebanon took a microphone, it was just as if they would have said to the man of the PLO, "You can have the mic. Just say what you want to say." And that's too (foreign) -- I don't know the expression in English.

But I think, at the other side, [12:00] it's not a good thing we should concentrate too much on this problem of the press, because I think concentrating the issue on the press would give, in some way, the impression that Begin is innocent. Because the poor man is so much attacked by the press, that in certain ways, it kind of serves him. In the Jewish public opinion, he slowly gets the image of someone who didn't do anything wrong. And I believe, contrary to what [Abe?] said, we can do something about making the difference between Begin and the Israeli state. And not

only to fight anti-Semitism. Just because it's our -- the idea of some of our people, just even the (inaudible) would not have spoken of [13:00] the Lebanon question. I absolutely don't agree with this war. And it's not only a question of will you even believe that I am different from that. I am different from that. And I want to say it (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: But the question was, can you do it and maintain Jewish support inside the country for Israel?

M3: I believe I can. And I believe the best servants of the Jewish --

(break in audio)

-- the people of (inaudible), because it's only people who provoke a kind of reversal in the attitude of the press, for instance. People who were very anti-Israel before the great meeting of (foreign). And they began, a little bit, to change opinion after this manifestation. So, I believe that men like [Marty Peretz?] and so on, are much better objective servants of Israel than Begin is.

And the last point I would say is that, to me, I already said one word about this, this [14:00] morning.

Practically, one very dangerous issue is the issue about the last war. And there is something that is very dangerous to me, even much more dangerous than the anti-Zionist movement. But actually it's the fact that people begin, each year, a little bit more to forget what happened during the war. And that I believe that some people say it's no use speaking more about what happened during the war. And I believe it's not true. Because the Barbie case clearly shows people don't remember. And there has been, on Belgian radio, during one week, a broadcast about the Barbie case. And people could phone. It's not a poll. It's very interesting also. People can take their phone, and during one hour, people could phone to the station and [15:00] just tell what they wanted to tell. And about -- among 10 people, I believe, eight didn't speak at all about what happened to the Jews during the war. And that's, maybe, I believe, the most dangerous thing, because it's, kind of, the last obstacle for anti-Semitism to take off really freely. It's what happened during the war. It's a real, kind of, hard break for anti-Semitism to develop.

TANENBAUM: I agree with your observation, Madame Chairlady, that we seem to be preoccupied with the one issue of the press coverage of the Lebanese War. And while I recognize that Lebanon was a hallmark in terms of how people look at

Jews, this [16:00] is Tamar's -- I understand this is Tamar's discussion. And I'm not certain that thrashing it out today will be helpful to Tamar, because we're not coming in with a unified opinion. We're not coming in with a rehearsed position on this thing.

But, having said that, a few points, Tamar. Number one, (laughter) -- before I speak, I want to say a few words. (laughter) In America, there is a medium which businessmen use, that it is -- what is the bottom line? What is the end result of all of this activity? And I would simply point out what I pointed out this morning. Despite the fact that the television media was simply horrendous in its coverage of the Lebanon-- or, let me put it this way, modify it a little. It could have been more objective. It did give, in the opinion of many unbiased observers, a distorted [17:00] picture. And the fact is that -- the assumption is that most people get their news from television. Yes, they do. But I think you're minimizing the distinction between television and the influential journalist. After all, television is the medium for the great, unwashed masses. And I don't mean to be elitist. But the opinion-molders, the movers, the shakers of society, still read, in America, the *New York Times*. They read the *Washington Post*. They

read the editorials. And it is these people that worry me, not the average factory worker who gets his opinion, but the man who belongs to organization A, the National Council of Churches, who gets his opinions formed from the daily editorial. He is the one who is in a position to do something significant. And the press -- and I want to repeat that I made exhaustive studies of the editorials in the United States, and it is [18:00] extremely difficult to come to any indictment of the American press in terms of the editorial. Because you can take the *New York Times*, which ultimately supported the invasion, but was shocked and horrified about the siege of Beirut, the purported innocent victims, and so forth. And, as I said, after the street demonstrations, there was such a reverberation of support for Israel, not only in the *New York Times*, the citadel of American Jewry, from the *Dallas, Texas, Times Herald*, and so forth.

F2: Well, then you'll agree with Tamar. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

TANENBAUM: Now, no, wait just a second. No, no, no, no, no. I'm trying to get -- this is a long-winded way of saying --

F1: Yeah, the Jewish way. (laughter)

TANENBAUM: The bottom line --

F1: Yes, where is it?

TANENBAUM: The bottom line has been, as the Gallup poll showed, that support for Israel, in America at least, is just as great today as it was before Lebanon.

F1: So, you prove (overlapping dialogue; inaudible). The press is not the problem.

TANENBAUM: So, the question, then, is -- [19:00] the question is, then, are we being unduly concerned? Was it a passing phenomenon? Is the attention span of most people not of long duration? But now, (laughter) to raise the point that Abe raised -- and we had a very serious discussion in the men's room, about... I am absolutely astounded on the lack of discussion over an aspect of terrorism. Because I had the feeling, and I do monitor the situation throughout the world to the best that I can possibly do, that there was an overriding concern in the European communities over acts of terrorism directed against Jewish institutions. And I remember the press of the United States was replete [20:00] with rhetorical questions, if you will, after Copernic and after the Munich bombing and a few other bombings, about the rise of international fascism, about the rise of a new black International.

F1: (inaudible)?

TANENBAUM: Well, you know, (laughter) I'll tell you. One man, and it wasn't Abe --

F1: In the American press or in the European...?

TANENBAUM: The American press. The American press. And, by the way, this, on top of the then-released report about the increased incidence of anti-Semitism in the United States, the average American Jew --

F1: Was scared.

TANENBAUM: -- was scared. He thought there was, in fact, a new wave of --

ABE: World anti-Semitism.

TANENBAUM: No, well, a revival, if you will, of a fascist International, coupled with the undeniable fact -- the undeniable fact that PLO supporters and left-wing terrorists [21:00] and right-wing terrorists all received training in guerilla warfare and in acts of terrorism, sometimes side by side with the (inaudible) Institute in Moscow. And one began to get the impression that there is a tidal wave of terrorism about to be released against Jews. And, in a sense, is ratifying, for me -- because I couldn't convince the America audience without difficulty that there isn't a resurgence of fascism in Europe. And I come here, and listening from you trained observers, and as Abe says,

there's hardly any mention of it. Thank you for reassuring me. I can go home and breathe easy. (laughter)

M3: No, no, there is a difference here with two points that I think that you should understand.

M4: It's not spoken of in the press in Europe. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

F2: (inaudible) and then you speak.

TANENBAUM: (inaudible) [22:00]

F2: [23:00] Yes, (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: OK. (laughter) Temporarily, (inaudible). I paused for a breath -- station identification.

F2: (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

M7: No, I want to comment, also, on the press. Maybe it's not the topic, but (overlapping dialogue; inaudible). It became (inaudible) topic. I think in [Holland?] there's no difference between television and written press, but I want to pinpoint that (inaudible) the written press is very important, because the opinion leaders read the written press. And they have no time to watch television every day. And I can't follow the -- I can't follow the (inaudible). Anyhow, most of them -- the situation (inaudible). I mean, what was done in Lebanon by Israel wasn't very nice. More than 10,000 people died, a lot of wounded people. Many civilians were wounded. And if people in the streets and,

also, opinion leaders, see the pictures, see the stories about it, whether there are some falsifications in it or not, they are shocked by it. And mothers are shocked seeing these mothers crying, and seeing houses in flames. And you can't expect something else, I think. It was the first time that Israel fought a war in an inhabited area. And it was the first time, I think, that people realized how damaging such a war could be. It is wrong to say that the press made [24:00] so many mistakes in reflecting this terrible war. And the problem -- the real problem, I feel, is not the way the press reflected the war in Lebanon, but the way the people who had already anti-Semitic feelings took the images, took the things which happened in Lebanon, to become more anti-Semitic, and to express themselves against the Jews, against the existence of the state of Israel, against the sincere wishes of Israel for its security. And one of the examples we mentioned before, that such a situation happened also in Holland, but maybe not so much as in other countries, is the renewal of anti-Semitic [25:00] statements by clergymen, who saw the chance to start again propaganda and anti-Jewish feelings. But, please, don't reverse the whole thing. Don't say the press is guilty. I say that we have to accept what happened. And

we have to see how we can make our position better at the moment, not by blaming the press.

F2: Thank you, [Bernard?], (inaudible).

M2: Let me pick up (inaudible) statement. I mean, the media obviously became a focus of uneasiness. The question is, first, whether they were right in distorting the reporting. And even if they did it, whether it's wise -- what you brought up -- whether it's wise to fight one's allies, so to speak. And let me just give you a few examples of other experiences from the Austrian scene. [26:00] Sometimes I work for *Profil*, which is the equivalent of *L'Express* or *Der Spiegel* in the Austrian scene. Let me explain what I think was the reason for this press coverage which we found.

First, there was the higher expectations towards Israel than to any other country in the Middle East. Israel always and still is pictured as the outpost of democracy, humanity, Western culture. And it still is. When there was 400,000 people rallying in Jerusalem during the war, it got very wide press coverage. It was very widely covered in TV. And it was a kind of release, because finally -- it's the only place in the whole Middle East where somebody can go to the street and demonstrate for Arafat. It's not in the

Arab countries, where there were no demonstrations in favor of Arafat. It was in Jerusalem. This was -- or not in --

F1: [27:00] It was not in favor of Arafat.

TANENBAUM: But not in favor of Arafat. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

M7: Arafat pointed that himself, that the biggest demonstration in favor of the Palestinians was in Israel and not in America.

M2: The same with the reported (inaudible). Again, Israel was the only real democracy in the whole Middle East. Even Chancellor Kriesky, who is not a friend of Israel, pointed out again and again, Israel is the democracy. It's the only democracy. So, people are looking, searching for proofs for this. And there is, obviously, high expectations, which I find is good. And which makes for another yardstick than, say, for -- as in relation to Iraq or to Syria or to Libya. I mean, you wouldn't expect very much, as most of the journalists do not expect very much from these countries.

The other thing is, things not very heavily reported on Israel. [28:00] For example, the whole stories with weapon exports to the Khomeini regime, to the rebels in Nicaragua, in Honduras. All of these dirty and dark stories were almost not covered. And I have been present in the

discussions in the newspaper, and they said, "Well, let's not cover it. We do not know enough, and maybe it's not good for Israel." So, you have (inaudible) as well. For example, the Red Cross helped, send from the Austrian Red Cross to the Middle East, had a lot of trouble with Israeli administrations. They didn't cover this. The popularity gains Begin had in Israel -- tremendous popularity gains during the first weeks of the war, were not well reported. Because they said, "Well, you had the same phenomenon, the Thatcher phenomenon, during the Falkland Island War." So, this is common. You know, one shouldn't [29:00] complain too much about being treated by the press in an ineffective way if it's only because they expect more from you than less.

I feel not so good about the 49% you reported in the recent Gallup poll, again, in favor of Israel. I wouldn't pick this as proof that everything is as before. Many people, many Jews say, "Israel will never be the same for me again." And this attitude is very strong. A myth is broken, so to speak. And this broken myth of Israel as the outpost of democracy, of humanism, behaving different than like all the other states, does not hold any longer. And this kind of --

TANENBAUM: Jews or generally?

M2: Jews in general. And that's the point. And, you know, maybe now they again favor Israel over the Arab states in the conflict, [30:00] but it's not the unconditional and positive emotional relationship which there was before. And it has to do with facts, and not just with the (inaudible) press reporting. Because, otherwise, it wouldn't have had this impact on young Jews, as it has. So, obviously, it cannot be only the press who were responsible for this. But it has to do with what happened there, and this (inaudible) isn't always saying, "Yes, but..." "Yes, but, I'm..." You know, "I do not want not Begin," before it says "but..." It doesn't help. It doesn't help to focus all the criticism on the media while, at the same time, seeing that the Western public opinion, more and more, disassociates from the national consensus in Israel regarding almost all the issues in the Middle East conflict. And this, after a while, must cause strains, as they showed up [31:00] in the Lebanon War.

But this will go on. I mean, the (inaudible) findings. I mean, what he found is that the most -- what we consider to be radicals within the Israeli spectrum -- the (foreign) Party and the Rakah Party -- represent what is the

mainstream, even conservative mainstream, in the Western world. If it's only the fringe in Israel which represents the mainstream in the West, there must be some... As long as these two strains aren't brought together substantially, there will be this, I think, even stronger strain in the future than it was before. And Lebanon will not be the last chapter in this.

ABE: You want to define them for just one moment? I mean, you just labeled them, but you didn't define them. The two mainstreams -- the two streams you're talking about?

M2: Well, I could -- he made a very interesting list. He said that a kind of escalator --

F1: Who is "he"?

M2: [Simler?] -- [32:00] 11 conditions from total rejectionism to the (foreign) position. And he ranked Israeli public opinion and the world public opinion on this scale. And what he found is that, you know, the left fringe, so to speak, within Israel is the mainstream in almost all the Western countries. So --

ABE: It's not very clear what you -- I don't see how (inaudible) is...

F2: No, no, it's a question of (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

M2: To acknowledge the Palestinians as a people, to deal with the PLO as a representative, to draw back from the occupied territories -- all their demands represent something which, in Israel, only is represented by Rakah or by... So, this means something.

ABE: And this is more than Rakah and (foreign) and (inaudible). A big part of the (foreign) movement, it's a (inaudible). It's not very objective, because while a good part of the (foreign) [33:00] movement and so on.

F2: Yes, but it's still -- but they are still a minority movement.

ABE: That's OK, but not (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

M2: Opposition to annexation of occupied territories. Opposition to secularizing Judea and Samaria. Favoring territory concessions in the West Bank. Favoring withdrawal to pre-1970 borders within certain modifications. Recognizing the Palestinians a nation. Recognizing the PLO as a Palestinian representative. And so on, favoring a Palestinian state alongside Israel. This is a scale. And if you rank world public opinion and Israeli general mood, and general national consensus, it pulls apart more and more. And he traced it from '67 up to '82, and he showed that every single year this split becomes larger. And the international public opinion gets more and more unfavorable

towards Israel, which is self-evident if you look at this divergence.

F2: (inaudible) and then (inaudible).

M4: [34:00] I had also some comments on what you said and what you said, also, as to the (inaudible) the press. Not because I want to talk about the press, but because (inaudible) is really the most important issue. And I don't think (inaudible) very many other issues that has such an important impact on people as the press. And the first thing I want to mention -- you mentioned Peace Now. And this is not discussion (inaudible) Peace Now. But I do think that the Peace Now movement in -- although (inaudible) within the Peace Now movement, we do what we can, because we want something good for this world. Also, it helps to create very bad images. I know this is not what the Peace Now movement want. When you see them standing and demonstrating in front of the Israeli embassy, for instance, in Denmark, with a sign, "Begin Fascist," "Sharon Fascist," or something like that, [35:00] which has happened.

M6: Don't do it here. (laughter)

M4: Well, OK, this is in Denmark. And this (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

F2: Many just, since then. I'm sorry, (inaudible) because the (foreign) were involved. And we had a long talk. And they said the (inaudible) did this. That there should be a greater consultation with the (foreign) (inaudible), so that this (inaudible) were not in favor of demonstrations in front of embassies. So, this was established, that from now on, there should be a tighter concentration within the (inaudible) groups and (foreign). Because they say, "Of course, we know that these people have to do what's good for them in their own countries, but somehow we have to coordinate policy." So, this is something which has to be carried. Sorry, I wasn't (inaudible).

M4: I agree with you on this point. This is what (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) in Demark, but (inaudible). If [36:00] the (inaudible) either in Israel or in Denmark or wherever. And confirming this thing. Many people believe that Arafat is right. They don't -- at least (inaudible), consider this a sign of Israeli democracy. Now, the same thing about the war, (inaudible). (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

M5: I waited two hours for someone to say this, and I think it's important that someone says that, in the Lebanon War, Arafat was more near to being right than Begin. Maybe, maybe. I say...

F2: OK, maybe sum up, the he was (inaudible).

M4: The second thing was the fact that you said, that people were shocked by the war, and would not expecting else. I agree with you on that point. But the problem is, you only hear about the war [37:00] in Lebanon. You do not hear about the war in (inaudible) and the Morocco and the Iraqi (inaudible) in the same way. And this really has importance.

F2: So, Abe, you wanted to speak?

ABE: Yeah.

F2: Or you want to...?

ABE: Yeah, no, a couple of things. I have a couple of questions, really. I think the last and next-to-last point that was made, (inaudible) about world opinion and Israeli opinion. Actually, is it true? Such polls as we have don't seem to show it, certainly not in the United States, and I'm not sure in other countries either. And as I mentioned before, we have had virtually no discussion here of polls with regard to popular attitudes inside toward anti-Semitism, etc., etc. And those polls we've had with regard to Israel show some recovery, perhaps even as in the United States, perhaps you will find the same thing in your countries now that Sabra and Shatila are over. And you will find, perhaps, there is some kind of reversal. [38:00] It will be interesting because none of you others seem to have taken a

poll in most recent months with regard to it. You might even find that Lebanon was a watershed the other way. You might find that there is some kind of a... I pose it as a possibility. I wouldn't exclude it. I don't say it's going to happen, but look out for it, as one kind of chance. All I'm saying here is that I don't see that kind of evidence around this table for the (inaudible) theory as it was advanced here. That's the first thing. But what it points out is, we only have to, perhaps, study our public opinion in different ways than we had been doing now. So, this is one kind of conclusion one might draw, perhaps, as to how we ought to be doing it in a more organized basis.

The second mentioned was (inaudible) students. Now, I remember when a student couldn't get up in a French university to take a pro-Israel position, ever. He would be thrown out not only of the law faculty, but almost anywhere. It was almost [39:00] impossible some years for a pro-Israel student to get up in a French university. This is not the case any longer. So, here we have an improvement. In Great Britain, I'm curious. I also have the impression, despite the difficulties you face with pro-Arab professionals, almost, that you have there. It's still -- I would say it's probably better. My guess is that it was a

few years ago. I would like your opinion with regard to that score, and with regard to universities elsewhere. In other words, there has been something of a comeback of the Jews in being able to express their views in universities, which was not the case some years ago. It was almost impossible some years ago. So, here, again, there is, perhaps -- and maybe it's getting worse again. I don't know. But the last few years saw some kind of a regain in Jewish faith, in Jewish expression, in Jewish possibilities. So, I'd be curious, again, to hear with regard to that kind of -- what's happening with regard to it.

I was terrified [40:00] by the (inaudible) training centers, the one mentioned that (inaudible). I know because it's happening in other countries. Because if this is happening in other countries -- and I think we all know all about this -- then we're in real trouble. Because this combines the economic need of the immigrant or the *lumpenproletariat* or what you will, with a -- gives them a material gain and the ideology at the same time. And if this --

M6: I didn't understand quite well, this training centers?

Again?

ABE: They're giving people training in carpentry, with jobs -- like (inaudible). And at the time, they're giving them ideology. Now, if this is happening anywhere else, I think this is something very important. This is something very important to watch out for. So, I certainly would like to immediately draw attention to it, if it happens anywhere else. Let me now come, for a moment, to the press.

F2: It's press, no. (laughter)

ABE: (inaudible). I don't really (inaudible), but [41:00] maybe tomorrow's discussion as well. Now, everybody knows Jews have a paranoia about (inaudible). But sometimes, as Dr. Kissinger said with regard to another situation, a little paranoia is justified. And I would contend, Tamar, that the underlying ground, the parameters in which the press discusses, did move to a certain extent. I also agree with you 100% that we should not berate the press. That, in certain respects, it's more of a symptom than it is... And it is a terrible, self-defeating tactic anyway. As a tactic, whatever you may think, it's a terribly self-defeating tactic to berate the press as a threat. So, I certainly wouldn't want to see that happen tomorrow, in that sense. But there was some shifting of the parameters of discussion about Israel among the press. Over and [42:00] above the legitimacy of that, I would say it did

occur, and how one expresses that is difficult, but I think it can be done. Now, perhaps it can be done in terms of what was pointed out from the Italian scene. And perhaps this also leads us to another possible technique that we would have to consider (inaudible) for the future, and has worked in other areas.

Here was the press after a horrible event -- the bombing of the Rome synagogue -- said maybe you have some responsibility. In other words, there was some self-examination. There was some self-examination. In a few other places, examination was forced upon the press by the screaming and the criticism of the Jewish community. But, generally, it didn't become self-examination. It became self-defense. I think we have to avoid creating a self-defense syndrome rather than a self-examination syndrome. This is an important matter of tactics and strategy.

And whether we can get the press to self-examine, [43:00] I don't know. We finally made some progress with textbooks -- Catholic textbooks, and prejudice in textbooks, when we got the people themselves to examine them. It may be that, even the '68 generation is ready now, after it already died down, that we could start doing some quiet discussion with

even those people are TV in the Scandinavian countries and other places, and so forth. Not, again, in terms of attack, but in terms of, "All right, let's look at it. How good were you as a professional, as a journalist, in doing this kind of a job?" It's a possibility. I don't know what it... But it seems to be one alternative method that we might be able to...

The other aspect of it is, in many ways, a more difficult aspect than (inaudible) trying that too. To help Israel in its PR. Now, the great difficulty here is that it is the basic position that's taken by the government leaders that becomes the natural thing that is mentioned or criticized [44:00] or discussed, and so forth, and so on. But even within the limits of what they could have done, let us say, recognizing that Arafat and the others were making press available, they did a fairly lousy job, in those terms. As one of our studied showed, we can make that available to you. We interviewed a number of journalists who worked in the field, and the Israelis did not do a very effective job from that point of view. Contrariwise, I think we also have a responsibility, as some people pointed out. And I don't know if it's true. Perhaps we can find out from people who covered it. You had a situation where, although the PLO is

presumably open... There was one piece in Commentary recently which argued that what the PLO had done was, over the years, kill off and drive out and attack physically those journalists who reported unfavorably on the spot, or made their life so difficult that they [45:00] did not dare to report as fully as they should have done. Now, it's a question, and a legitimate question, to the agencies, even though it's a post-question at the moment, as to whether that actually was so. Because there, again, is a parameter where one is entitled to ask the agencies whether or not they didn't dare send in correspondents who were afraid or not.

So I would say that, with the passage of time, we can actually come, now, to a more reasoned discussion with the press. And I hope that's what we have tomorrow. And knowing this table, I would expect we would. But, at the same time, trying to raise in the press's own mind some doubts about whether or not it did its own professional job in the way it should have done it -- I think that's about the best we could possibly do in this kind of a situation tomorrow. But if we come back to the other subjects, what I would like to hear something about is what is popular opinion today with regard to Jews. Nothing about Israel -- about this

(inaudible). [46:00] Because -- one last word -- I'm sorry. Every poll we've had since the end of the war -- every one, in France, particularly -- has shown a decline in anti-Jewish stereotypes. If I go back from '49, the first ones we had, to today, anti-Jewish stereotypes have gone down regularly, consistently. "Would you let your brother marry a Jew?" or "your sister marry a Jew," etc., etc., In fact, we have a situation with intermarriage -- society is accept Jews so much that the problem is keeping Jewish communities together.

M2: It's not so sure.

ABE: Well, that's the question I'm raising.

F5: (inaudible) speaking of (inaudible) domination of the press, I would like to ask a question of my colleagues here about the (inaudible) domination. What have been the reactions of the press to the incidents against the members of the multilateral (inaudible) -- multinational (inaudible)? Because, in Italy, also, legitimate newspapers [47:00] have been heavily guilty about the Israeli's (inaudible). So, this shows you the (inaudible).

M6: Not very much.

F5: Have you seen (inaudible). (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) This has been popping up, but that was before the multinational -- the Dutch can tell you that it started

with the United Nations force. I mean, it started a long time ago. People who came from Holland and Ireland -- at one point, the Israeli government even considered asking them to withdraw the Dutch because it felt that it has a very bad effect, because they all became pro-Palestinian. In other words, again, we must ask ourselves why did it happen?

M4: Well, but, even longer with the (inaudible) service the Swedish.

F5: Yeah, the Swedes are the same story.

F2: But this is -- I think that we have to (overlapping dialogue; inaudible).

M3: These are our training centers, that I wanted to mention. Because young people and soldiers, they join, (inaudible). And they come anti-Israeli. [48:00] (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

TANENBAUM: We've got trouble. (laughter) Abe, has it ever been different in the history of recorded history?

ABE: Yeah, but for a few years, we thought we were going (inaudible).

(break in audio)

F2: (inaudible) Who had the last word? (overlapping dialogue; inaudible) Now, who wants the first word after coffee? I'm sorry, we had the -- we had many -- no, no, go ahead.

F4: No, what I wanted to say is to answer, very (inaudible), very -- not completely, but one of the questions Abe mentioned, before we had coffee. In the past, about polls, and what the people -- [49:00] the common-people opinion about Jews and so on. As far as I know, there were no polls in the past few years in France on this topic. But what I hear is that the Jewish community, in its specificity, is quite well-accepted. And it's like all the things that were said in the last few years, on the right to be different, and so on, applied on the Jewish community, too. And, out there, it's quite acknowledged that the Jewish community is a specific entity, and that it has a very specific interesting problems. Where the question is not so clear is on the way -- and the people feel about Jews as Jews, as to say, as a religion. I don't really (inaudible) well-known. As to say, it still appears [50:00] as a very unknown, mysterious -- some kind of a [freemasonry?] of people helping each other and so on. And people that are very well-represented in a few professions. So, the Jew is accepted as a Jew, but they don't know what is a Jew,

(laughter) and what it implies. (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

F5: (inaudible) I must, just, would like to say something about this problem of the mystery around Judaism. An interesting thing in Italy today -- I'm sorry, I'm (inaudible) Madame Chairman. But this is something I would -- I can from the (inaudible) Catholicism. I think it's worth saying this. Anti-Zionism is widespread, but Judaism is fashionable, particularly in Catholic circles. It's being so fashionable that we have trouble in buying our supply of matzo before Pesach, [51:00] because it's so fashionable to be in (inaudible) in Judaism. (laughter) But unless we go in the Jewish Quarter and get our matzo and our Passover wine in time, the [commons?] would be buying out all of it.

(laughter) No, the big question is (overlapping dialogue; inaudible). Will be sitting with them, and (inaudible) both friars and nuns, are holding Passover Seders. The big fashion is to be Jewish now. Jewish is beautiful. And this is true at the highest (inaudible).

F4: Mysterious is beautiful.

F5: Yeah, and not even so mysterious, because they act out that -- well, I think there is something in the background of this, because I'm not the person (inaudible) towards the recuperation of Judaism as a pre-Christian value. In a

certain sense, there is a (inaudible) of Judaism, and a kind of (inaudible) of it. And I think this is behind it. It's not just a love of Judaism, but there is a (inaudible) of Judaism on the side of...

TANENBAUM: [52:00] And what does that mean for us non-biologists?

F5: It means that they want to possess -- no, no, it's more than absorption. It's really to interact, to digest Judaism, and make it part of their own [patrimony?] by calling Judaism "pre-Christian" -- a pre-Christian value.

TANENBAUM: One question -- how many -- because somebody mentioned earlier and it dropped out. I'm sorry. It's a little bit irrelevant, but I'll ask it anyway. What do people think is the number of Jews in Italy? And if each one of you will tell us around the table. Because somebody used it as an index of anti-Semitism. I'm not quite sure that's true.

F5: In Italy, it's about between half a million and five million. And we have 55,000. (laughter) Between half a million and five million.

TANENBAUM: Why is that a huge? Which *Haggadah* do they use at the --

F5: The one they come to buy at the Union of Jewish Community (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: Then, when they say (foreign)...

F5: I don't know how (inaudible) they get about these things.

TANENBAUM: Then I would be very worried [53:00] they --
they're...

F5: They said they had the wine, the *Haggadot*. (overlapping
dialogue; inaudible)

TANENBAUM: I'm puzzled. (inaudible) operating on the
assumption that to be anti-Israel, anti-Zionist, is, ipso-
facto, to be anti-Semitic. (overlapping dialogue;
inaudible)

F5: I'm (inaudible) the opposite.

TANENBAUM: Well, there's a widespread inclination wherever I
go to treat attacks on Israel and attacks on Zionism... The
literature is filled with it now, as being identical with
attacks on Jews. I mean, one can read some symposia after
symposia where a (inaudible) or some other distinguished
(inaudible) on the American scene make -- the international
scene -- make that equation. [54:00] I'm puzzled about what
happens in Italy to the anti-Zionists -- but they love
Jews. How does that happen?

F5: I know, it's what I was trying to say.

TANENBAUM: I'm trying to find out why.

F5: We are trying to detect the signals -- what are the real
signals behind this. This is an operation which is

underway. So, I think it's either they're trying to nullify the Judaism -- after all, it's such a small community. But either they nullify Judaism, and they're so (inaudible). Or they want to establish a... We don't know. We are waiting to see what... These signals are two-years-old, maybe. And we're trying to detect them. We can only capture them now. And (inaudible).

M7: To come back on your questions, first, the position of the Jews in Holland, and whether is a (inaudible) prejudice against the Jews or not. I can't judge it very well. I [55:00] only know that, after the Second World War, Jews were accepted everywhere in Holland. There were a lot of mixed marriages. And Jews were not singled out because of their Jewish-ness. But today, there is a lot more attention to Jewish affairs, Jewish (inaudible), Jewish writers and Jewish artists. And everywhere it is specified that they are Jews. And they have Jewish (inaudible). And I am afraid that the more that they're specified, there more there is attention and the more there is a certain kind of feeling that it is an element in the Dutch society.

You had a second question about the training center. I just spoke about it [56:00] before the coffee break. We haven't any training centers like England. But we have the UNIFIL.

The UNIFIL -- United Nations operation where young Dutch men -- soldiers -- can go, where they get a reasonable salary. And they like to go there because they can earn money. Otherwise they will be certainly unemployed. Once being there, they become from neutral to mostly anti-Israeli. And there are several explanations for that. One of the explanations is that the environment in Lebanon is so bad, people are complaining that it is the guilt of Israel [57:00] that they live in poor conditions. And then they come to Israel for their holidays, and they see a rich society which is wealthy. And so, also, they tend to give responsibility more to Israel than to the underdogs in Lebanon. And, which has to be mentioned, the second part of your question, there is not, like in other countries, of course, a Palestine committee, which tries to send young people on a regular basis to Lebanon, to Palestinian camps, to let them work in medical fields. And when they came back, they were very much anti-Israeli. Now, that has stopped because of the Israeli invasion. And the people who were there during the Israeli invasion -- they brought [58:00] the worst stories we had ever imagined. That's my...

F2: Now a few words from (inaudible).

TANENBAUM: Could we go around the table now? Because I think we're suppose to have the, sort of, suggestions, I believe.

F2: Yeah, but not everyone has spoken more than once. And some...

TANENBAUM: No, well, start there, and then...

F2: No, Heisenberg had asked to speak.

TANENBAUM: Sorry, no, because I thought you were going to --

F2: And then, let -- shall we do this? Would you rather speak (inaudible)?

HEISENBERG: (foreign)

F2: (foreign)

HEISENBERG: (foreign) (overlapping dialogue; inaudible)

TANENBAUM: By the way, how many Jews do people think there are in Holland?

M7: Certainly more than 30,000. And they are always amazed when you say 30,000. But I don't think a half million.

(overlapping dialogue; inaudible) [59:00] Maybe everywhere, except in France, where there are many Jews. I would like only to make one point. It's maybe a little out of the subject, but there has been a lot spoken about Catholics, not a little bit. There's been quite some things said about that, and I believe that, indeed, Catholicism has a very important role in the origin of anti-Semitism. And we shouldn't --

END OF AUDIO FILE