MS-630: Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler Digital Collection, 1953-1996. Series A: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1961-1996.

Box Folder 2 4

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1983-1994.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the American Jewish Archives website.



RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER • UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS
PRESIDENT 838 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N.Y. 10021 (212) 249-0100

January 10, 1994 27 Tevet 5754

Judith Love B'nai B'rith Campaign Office 823 United Nations Plaza New York, NY 10017

Dear Judith:

Thank you for sending me those pictures of the Cuomo meeting. I only wish I were more photogenic.

I appreciate your thoughtfulness very much.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely,



B'RI NAI

CELEBRATING 150 YEARS OF SERVICE

150TH ANNIVERSARY COMMITTEE

GENERAL CHAIRMAN JACK J. SPITZER

VICE CHAIRMEN JOSEPH H. DOMBERGER JOEL S. KAPLAN

DIRECTOR DR. MICHAEL NEIDITCH

DIRECTOR 150TH ANNIVERSARY CAMPAIGN JUDITH LOVE

HONORARY PRESIDENTS of B'nai B'rith

HON. PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK CHICAGO, IL

DR. WILLIAM A. WEXLER HERZLIYA, ISRAEL

JACK J. SPITZER SEATTLE, WA

GERALD KRAFT INDIANAPOLIS, IN

SEYMOUR D. REICH NEW YORK, NY

INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT KENT E. SCHINER

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT DR. SIDNEY M. CLEARFIELD January 7, 1994

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler Union of American Hebrew Congregations 838 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10021-7064

Dear Rabbi Schindler:

Enclosed are some photographs from the B'nai B'rith dinner with Governor Cuomo last December. I thought that you would appreciate this memento from a lovely evening and I am so glad that you and Rhea were able to join us.

Sincerely,

redwas so good to see you again.

h mar

December 20, 1993 6 Tevet 5754

B'nai B'rith Foundation 823 United Nations Plaza New York, NY 10017

Attention: Judy Love

Dear Friends:

Enclosed herewith please find my contribution marking the 150th Anniversary of B'nai B'rith and the establishment of the Mario M. Cuomo Fellowship. I am pleased to be a part of this special simcha.

With warm good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Alexander M. Schindler

cc: Jack Spitzer

12/9

November 30, 1993

From: Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

To: Paul Rockfeld

Please let me have a check for \$2,500. payable to the B'nai B'rith Foundation. This is in honor of the 150th Anniversary of B'nai B'rith and the creation of a Mario M. Cuomo Fellowship. This can be taken from the subvention contingency line.

Send the check to me for transmittal.

To: Edie Miller FROM: JUDY Love as per LACK SPITZER

> Mr. S. Daniel Abraham and Mr. and Mrs. Aaron Gural inoite you to celebrate with them the establishment of the Mario M. Cuomo Fellowship and the 150th Anniversary of Brai Brith at dinner with Governor Mario M. Cuomo 6:30 p.m. Thursday, December 9th, 1993 200 East 65th Street Apartment 36N

R.J.V.P

\$2500 Suggested minimum contribution November 30, 1993

To: Rabbi Schindler

From: Edie

Jack Spitzer called. He hopes that you and Rhea will attend the December 9th dinner of the B'nai B'rith Foundation. He reminded me that you pledged a \$2,500 for the B'nai B'rith Foundation. It is to be sent to Judy Love at the New York office. Have you requested same from Accounting? Or should I do so?

Jack will be leaving for Washington this afternoon and will be at the Capitol Hilton until Sunday should you wish to speak with him.

Julian Mi





July 7, 1993

FROM: Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

TO: Rabbi David Saperstein

COPY: Rabbi Daniel B. Syme, Rabbi Eric Yoffie

Subject: ADL

No UAHC statement was made concerning he ADL, but I did issue my own statement in response to several inquiries made to me by reporters. To the best of my knowledge, my response was carried only by the San Francisco Examiner.

My instinctive reaction then (this was at least 2 or 3 months ago) was to be supportive of the ADL. I told the reporters that I knew the leadership of ADL, both professional and lay, that I respected them, and that I was confident they would countenance nothing that is illegal. I suggested further that it is entirely possible nonetheless that there is a "loose cannon" in their operation, an individual or lay leader who acted in a certain way without specific authorization. That such a "loose cannon" might be operating even in my own shop.

But as I indicated, all of this was quite some time ago. It received but scant press attention and I have no objection whatsoever if we were to issue another supportive statement.

MEMORANDUM

and a

April 27, 1993

FROM:

Edith J. Miller

TO:

Rabbi David Saperstein, Rabbi Eric Yoffie

COPY:

I went to the Presidents' Conference meeting to where the ADL situation was discussed. I thought the two of you would be interested in the enclosed brochure from ADL.

The Presidents' Conference is issuing a statement to be on record in support of ADL and they have urged that the individual member agencies also issue statements.

Abe Foxman spoke of security, for in this situation the ADL files are looked upon as some kind of mysterious, spying dossiers. In reality, most of their files are clippings, copies of statements, etc., even as all of us keep informational files with press clippings, copies of speeches, etc. etc. These certainly cannot be looked upon as dossiers unless someone is looking to make trouble. Abe suggested not only sensitivity about our organizational files, but also some security measures.



OPL

November 19, 1991 12 Kislev 5752

Rabbi Leon Klenicki, Director Department of Interfaith Affairs ADL of B'nai B'rith 823 United Nations Plaza New York, NY 10017

Dear Leon:

Thank you for your thoughtfulness in sharing with me the collection of essays by Jewish theologians on Christianity. It is an important volume and made all the more so by your careful explanation of the background which led to its publication. I am grateful to you.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely,

OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION National Chairman MELVIN SALBERG National Director ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN Chairman, National Executive Committee DAVID H. STRASSLER Associate National Director JUSTIN J. FINGER Executive Associate National Director PETER T. WILLNER Honorary Chairmen KENNETH J. BIALKIN SEYMOUR GRAUBARD MAXWELL E. GREENBERG BURTON M. JOSEPH BURTON S. LEVINSON Honorary Vice Chairmen LEONARD L. ABESS DOROTHY BINSTOCK **RUDY BOSCHWITZ** EDGAR M. BRONFMAN MAXWELL DANE MAX FISHER BRUCE I. HOCHMAN GERI M. JOSEPH MAX M. KAMPELMAN SAM KANE PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK PHILIP KRUPP SAMUEL H. MILLER BERNARD D. MINTZ MILTON MOLLEN BERNARD NATH ROBERT R. NATHAN ANITA PERLMAN

SYDNEY JARKOW
NAT KAMENY
LUCILLE S. KANTOR
IRVING SHAPIRO
JOEL SPRAYREGEN
WILLIAM VEPRIN
Vice-Chairman
National Executive Committee
ROBERT G. SUGARMAN
HONOTARY Chairmen, National
Executive Committee
DAVID A. ROSE
RONALD B. SOBEL
HONOTARY Treasurers
CHARLES GOLDRING
BENJAMIN GREENBERG
MOE KUDLER

THEODORE H. SILBERT SIDNEY R. YATES

Vice-Chairmen

Treasurer ROBERT H. NAFTALY Assistant Treasurer MICHAEL SCHULTZ Secretary MICHAEL NACHMAN

MICHAEL NACHMAN Assistant Secretary MEYER EISENBERG

President, B'nai B'rith KENT E. SCHINER Executive Vice President SIDNEY CLEARFIELD President, B'nai B'rith Women HARRIET HORWITZ Executive Director ELAINE BINDER

DIVISION DIRECTORS
Civil Rights
JEFFREY P. SINENSKY
Community Service
ANN TOURK
Development
SHELDON FLIEGELMAN
Finance and Administration
BOBBIE ARBESFELD
Intergroup Relations
CHARNEY V. BROMBERG
International Affairs
KENNETH JACOBSON
Leadership
Assistant to the National Director
MARVIN S. RAPPAPORT
Media and Marketing
MARK EDELMAN
Washington Representative
JESS N. HORDES

General Counsel ARNOLD FORSTER



Held Line

November 12, 1991

Rabbi Alexander Schindler UAHC 838 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10021

Dear Alex:

I'm delighted to share with you a book that will be of your interest. It is a collection of essays by Jewish theologians on Christianity.

The planning of this volume has been inspired by the thought of the Jewish French theologian Emannuel Levinas. He said that "the existence of God is sacred history itself, the sacredness of man's relation to man through which God may pass." Toward a Theological Encounter:

Jewish Understandings of Christianity was edited with this specific purpose. It is time to initiate a new stage of the Jewish-Christian relationship entailing a theological understanding of the "other" as a subject of faith. I feel that, for the first time since Nostra Aetate opened up conversations in the modern era between the Catholic Church and the Jewish people, some Jewish theologians reveal their thinking towards Christianity. The essays are a frank expression of their views projecting a joint attempt to understand the sense of Christianity in God's design.

I preceded the book with an introduction that I have enlarged in a version to be published at the \underline{SIDIC} magazine in Rome. As soon as I have a copy of the long version, I will send it to you.

The book is part of the Stimulus Book Collection developed by Stimulus Foundation, a not-for-profit organization, and is published by Paulist Press. The Foundation wishes to further the publication of scholarly books on Jewish and Christian topics that are of importance to Judaism and Christianity.

Stimulus Foundation was established by Mrs. Helga Croner, an erst-while refugee from Nazi Germany who intends to contribute with these publications to the improvement of communication between Jews and Christians.



We are planning now an interfaith theological meeting to discuss this book and I will keep you informed of the details.

With best wishes.

In friendship and prayer,

Rabbi Leon Klenicki

Director

Department of Interfaith Affairs

LK:sjs

encl.





RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER • UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS

PRESIDENT 838 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10021-7064 (212)249-0100

February 21, 1992
 17 Adar I 5752

Mr. Abraham Foxman National Director Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith 823 United Nations Plaza New York, NY 10017

Dear Abe:

Just a brief note of appreciation for your promptness in sending to me the material on loan guarantees in response to the myths and facts which have been published in newspapers across the country.

With gratitude and warm personal greetings, I am

Sincerely,

OFFICER OF THE NATION COMMISSION National Chairman MELVIN SALBERG National Director ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN Chairman, National Executive Committee DAVID H. STRASSLER

Associate National Director JUSTIN J. FINGER

Executive Associate National Director PETER T. WILLNER

HONOTATY CHAITMEN
KENNETH J. BIALKIN
SEYMOUR GRAUBARD
MAXWELL E. GREENBERG
BURTON M. JOSEPH
BURTON S. LEVINSON

Honorary Vice Chairmen LEONARD L. ABESS DOROTHY BINSTOCK RUDY BOSCHWITZ EDGAR M. BRONFMAN MAXWELL DANE MAX FISHER BRUCE I. HOCHMAN GERI M. JOSEPH MAX M. KAMPELMAN SAM KANE PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK PHILIP KRUPP SAMUEL H. MILLER BERNARD D. MINTZ MILTON MOLLEN BERNARD NATH ROBERT R. NATHAN ANITA PERLMAN THEODORE H. SILBERT SIDNEY R. YATES

Vice-Chairmen SYDNEY JARKOW NAT KAMENY LUCILLE S. KANTOR IRVING SHAPIRO JOEL SPRAYREGEN WILLIAM VEPRIN

Vice-Chairman National Executive Committee ROBERT G. SUGARMAN

Honorary Chairmen, National Executive Committee DAVID A. ROSE RONALD B. SOBEL Honorary Treasurers

Honorary Treasurers CHARLES GOLDRING BENJAMIN GREENBERG MOE KUDLER Treasurer

Treasurer ROBERT H. NAFTALY Assistant Treasurer MICHAEL SCHULTZ Secretary MICHAEL NACHMAN

MICHAEL NACHMA Assistant Secretary MEYER EISENBERG

President, B'nai B'rith KENT E. SCHINER Executive Vice President SIDNEY CLEARFIELD President, B'nai B'rith Women HARRIET HORWITZ Executive Director ELAINE BINDER

DIVISION DIRECTORS
Civil Rights
JEFFREY P. SINENSKY
Community Service
ANN TOURK
Development
SHELDON FLIEGELMAN
Finance and Administration
BOBBIE ARBESFELD
Intergroup Relations
CHARNEY V. BROMBERG
International Affairs
KENNETH JACOBSON
Leadership
Assistant to the National Director
MARVIN S. RAPPAPORT
Media and Marketing
MARK EDELMAN
Washington Representative
IESS N. HORDES

General Counsel ARNOLD FORSTER



February 18, 1992

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler President Union of American Hebrew Congregations 838 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10021-7064

Dear Alex:

As you can see from the enclosed memo, we advised our regional offices to respond to the ad and provided them with a suggested response. Feel free to distribute the model letter.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Abraham H. Foxman National Director

AHF:yn Encl.

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

OF B'NAI B'RITH

823 United Nations Plaza New York, N.Y. 10017

MEMORANDUM

To:

Regional Offices

From:

Kenneth Jacobson and Bluma Zuckerbrot

Date:

January 29, 1992

Subject:

Advertisement on Loan Guarantees - Campaign for a Sound

American Foreign Policy

As many of you know, ads against loan guarantees have been appearing in major newspapers around the country. The ad, signed by the previously unkown "Campaign for a Sound American Foreign Policy," contains numerous errors of fact and distortions about loan guarantees.

Attached is a suggested response to the ad should it appear in your region. Please use it intact or as the basis of a response.

cc: Ann Tourk

International Affairs Committee Middle Eastern Affairs Committee

Suggested Response to Ad on Loan Guarantees

To the Editor:

The advertisement "Myths & Facts: Why the US Must Not Provide Unconditional Loan Guarantees to Israel" is replete with factual errors.

First, Israel's request for loan guarantees is purely a humanitarian project to help resettle the enormous influx of Soviet and Ethiopian immigrants. Attempts to link loan guarantees to the peace process distort Israel's humanitarian effort to provide safe and secure haven to the immigrants.

Secondly, the ad completely distorts Israel's creditworthiness. Israel is asking the U.S. government to co-sign loans because with the government as guarantor, Israel will be able to obtain private commercial loans at more favorable interest rates and with extended repayment periods.

There is little reason to doubt Israel's ability to repay the loans. In its annual deby repayments to its creditors - international banks, private American banks, government bonds and the U.S. government - Israel has never defaulted on a loan and has never missed a loan payment.

Thirdly, the U.S. taxpayer will not pay for this program. The only cost involved is a small percent to be set aside by law in the event that Israel cannot meet its debt obligations. Israel has indicated that it is prepared to cover this cost.

Contrary to the assertions of the ad, loan guarantees to Israel have no impact on domestic loan guarantee programs. The 1990 Budget Enforcement Act has enacted rigid barriers separating the domestic, international operations and defense areas of the budget. Consequently, the impact of any new program is limited only to its area of the budget. Even if loan guarantees to Israel would not come to pass, the budget allotment for domestic programming would not increase. And, in fact, loan guarantees to local governments are granted in far larger numbers than to foreign ones.

Finally, loan guarantees to Israel will stimulate the American economy in a number of ways. Already, a number of U.S. housing and construction firms, suffering from a depressed economy at home, have been awarded contracts in Israel. In 1990 alone, U.S. companies won 75% of tenders, leading to contracts worth an estimated \$250 million.



MYTHS & FACTS: Why the US Must Not Provide Unconditional Loan Guarantees to Israel

MYTH: This is a "humanitarian" project not linked to the peace talks.

FACTS: Unconditional US aid, including \$400 million in previous housing loan guarantees granted on condition that they not be used to build Jewish settlements in Israeli-occupied territory, has been used to free up other funds to see tlements, where tew immigrants wish to go.

The money will be used to "create facts" in Israeli-occupied territories in a blatant attempt to foreclose the land-for peace option presented by UN Security Council Resolution 242, endorsed unconditionally by six successive US presidents

Unrestricted loan guarantees to Israel would halt the current Arab-Israeli peace talks. These US-sponsored talks offer the best hope in 44 years of ending the Middle East dispute that underlies virtually all US problems in the region.

MYTH: Israel has a good credit rating and has never defaulted on a loan.

FACTS: If Israel had a good credit rating, it would not need US government loan guarantees.

- tarael's long-term government debt not backed by US pledges receives a "triple B minus," the lowest investmen: grade rating on Standard and Poor's index.
- Israel is rated D (on a scale of A to F) by the Export-Import Bank.
- Israel's short-term debt is so unsafe that, by US law, money market funds may not invest more than five percent of their total assets in it
- Since 1949, according to the Congressional Research Service, Israel has received \$53 billion in US economic and mulitary aid, much of it in the form of loans, which Congress later quietly forgave.
- · While Israel waits for outstanding loans to be forgiven, the US pays the interest on them because the Cranston Amend ment provides that US economic aid to Israel will never fall below the interest owed to the US that year.
- Israel, in fact, does not repay principal or interest on its US government loans. The US unxpayer pay both

MYTH: \$10 billion in loan guarantees will cost the US taxpayer nothing.

FACTS: Members of Congress who repeat this myth to their constituents almost invariably are recipients of campaign contributions from some of the 114 deceptively named pro-Israel PACs active over the past 16 years.

- A minimum cost to American taxpayers, based upon Israel meeting all of its obligations, is \$3.1 billion. Realistic estimates based upon inability by Israel to repay part or all of the principal and interest, range from \$29 billion to \$116.51 billion
- The loan guarantees would enable Israel to borrow money, at US taxpayer expense, on terms not available to Ame, watt cities, counties or states.
- Instead of using US funds to obtain Jewish immigrants, the Israeli government is using Jewish immigrants to obtain US funds

MYTH: American public opinion supports the loan guarantees.

FACTS: In a September ABC/Newsweek poll, 86% of the US public supported postponement of loan guarantees. In a December Wall Street Journal/NBC poll, US voters named Israel the principal obstacle to Mideast peace by 41% to 29%.

Sponsored by The Campaign for a Sound American Foreign Policy, P.O. Box 53294, Washington, DC (202) 745-0701

DC 20500, with copies to their representatives in Congress. (For	ent, The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW. Washington agentions, US Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For representatives, or information, mail your name and address on the coupon below.
□ Enclosed is my check to the Campaign for a Sound American Foreign Policy to help fund advertisements similar to this one. I would like to be put in touch with organizations: □ Administering study trips to Middle Eastern countries. □ Conducting "calls on Congress" or other grassroots lobbying on this issue. My interest. □ non-denominational* □ Jewish □ Muslim □ Christian □ Unitarian □ Other (specify below) *Persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put in touch with a coordinator in their home state are invited to telephone "Partners for Pes *" at (202) 745-0701	□ Enclosed is my \$19 check for a one-year subscription to the Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, a 96-page monthly magazine from which this information has been derived. □ Enclosed is my check for \$11.95 for Steatth PACs. Lobing-ing Congress for Control of US Middle East-Policy, a 221-page book naming all Middle East-related PACs and listing how much every candidate for Congress has taken from them. □ I'm enclosing \$25 for both the subscription and the book make checks for either or both payable to Washington Report. PO Box 53062, Washington, DC 20009 or, for subscriptions and purchases only, telephone 1(800) 368-5788).





RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER • UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS
PRESIDENT 838 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10021-7064 (212)249-0100

February 4, 1992 30 Shevat 5752

Mr. Abraham Foxman Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith 823 United Nations Plaza New York, NY 10017

Dear Abe:

The enclosed item which appeared in the <u>Cleveland Plain</u>
<u>Dealer</u> on January 27, 1992 was brought to my attention.

Do you know of any response to this scurrilous material?

With warm good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

NORTHEAST LAKES COUNCIL - UAHC 25550 CHAGRIN BLVD. - SUITE #108 CLEVELAND, OHIO 44122

216-831-6722 FAX-216-831-2737

FROM:

Rabbi David S. Hachen

TO:

Rabbi Alexander Schindler

DATE:

January 31, 1992

SUBJECT:

Newspaper Piece

COPIES:

Al Vorspan, Rabbi David Saperstein, Rabbi Eric Yoffie

Add to ROC

Dear Alex:

The enclosed piece was printed here in Cleveland in the Plain Dealer on January 27, 1992. I wonder whether anyone in the Jewish Community has responded to this scurrilous material. I would guess that this piece was printed in papers across the country.

I would appreciate any guidance you can give me in this regard.

All is going well here in Cleveland. We are looking forward to the visit of Mel Merians this weekend. Love to Rhea.

As ever,

MYTHS & FACTS: Why the US Must Not Provide Unconditional Loan Guarantees to Israel

MYTH: This is a "humanitarian" project not linked to the peace talks.

FACTS: Unconditional US aid, including \$400 million in previous housing loan guarantees granted on condition that they not be used to build Jewish settlements in Israeli-occupied territory, has been used to free up other funds for settlements, where few immigrants wish to go.

- The money will be used to "create facts" in Israeli-occupied territories in a blatant attempt to foreclose the land-for-peace option presented by UN Security Council Resolution 242, endorsed unconditionally by six successive US presidents.
- Unrestricted loan guarantees to Israel would halt the current Arab-Israeli peace talks. These US-sponsored talks offer
 the best hope in 44 years of ending the Middle East dispute that underlies virtually all US problems in the region.

MYTH: Israel has a good credit rating and has never defaulted on a loan.

FACTS: If Israel had a good credit rating, it would not need US government loan guarantees.

- Israel's long-term government debt not backed by US pledges receives a "triple B minus," the lowest investment grade rating on Standard and Poor's index.
- Israel is rated D (on a scale of A to F) by the Export-Import Bank.
- Israel's short-term debt is so unsafe that, by US law, money market funds may not invest more than five percent of
 their total assets in it.
- Since 1949, according to the Congressional Research Service, Israel has received \$53 billion in US economic and military
 aid, much of it in the form of loans, which Congress later quietly forgave.
- While Israel waits for outstanding loans to be forgiven, the US pays the interest on them because the Cranston Amendment provides that US economic aid to Israel will never fall below the interest owed to the US that year.
- Israel, in fact, does not repay principal or interest on its US government loans. The US taxpayer pays both.

MYTH: \$10 billion in loan guarantees will cost the US taxpayer nothing.

FACTS: Members of Congress who repeat this myth to their constituents almost invariably are recipients of campaign contributions from some of the 114 deceptively named pro-Israel PACs active over the past 16 years.

- A minimum cost to American taxpayers, based upon Israel meeting all of its obligations, is \$3.1 billion. Realistic estimates, based upon inability by Israel to repay part or all of the principal and interest, range from \$29 billion to \$116.51 billion.
- The loan guarantees would enable Israel to borrow money, at US taxpayer expense, on terms not available to American
 cities, counties or states.
- Instead of using US funds to obtain Jewish immigrants, the Israeli government is using Jewish immigrants to obtain US funds.

MYTH: American public opinion supports the loan guarantees.

FACTS: In a September ABC/Newsweek poll, 86% of the US public supported postponement of loan guarantees. In a December Wall Street Journal/NBC poll, US voters named Israel the principal obstacle to Mideast peace by 41% to 29%.

The Campaign for a Sound American Foreign Policy, P.O. Box 53294, Washington, DC 20009

DC 20500, with copies to their representatives in Congress. (For senato House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515.) For further inforto the Campaign for a Sound American Foreign Policy.		
Foreign Policy to help fund advertisements similar to this one. Was	Enclosed is my \$19 check for a one-year subscription to the chington Report on Middle East Affairs, a 96-page monthly azine from which this information has been derived.	
□ Administering study trips to Middle Eastern countries. □ Conducting "calls on Congress" or other grassroots lobbying on this issue. My interest: □ non-denominational* □ Jewish □ Muslim □ Christian □ Unitarian □ Other (specify below) *Persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons interested in non-denominational lobbying or wishing to be put the persons in the persons	Conclosed is my check for \$11.95 for Stealth PACs: Lobby-Congress for Control of US Middle East Policy, a 221-page k naming all Middle East-related PACs and listing how much ry candidate for Congress has taken from them. "menclosing \$25 for both the subscription and the book (make cks for either or both payable to Washington Report, PO Box 62, Washington, DC 20009 or, for subscriptions and purses only, telephone 1(800) 368-5788).	
Cleveland Plain	- Vealer	





RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER • UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS
• PRESIDENT 838 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N.Y. 10021 (212) 249-0100

December 13, 1990 26 Kislev 5751

Mr. Abraham Foxman Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith 823 United Nations Plaza New York, NY 10017

Dear Abe:

The enclosed was sent to me. Note the anti-Israel, anti Jewish slant of this publication. I am sure this Institute is known to you, but just in case it isn't, here it is.

Sincerely,



NEW YORK REGIONAL OFFICE

Serving New York City & Westchester-Rockland-Putnam Counties

we further

NEW YORK REGIONAL BOARD

Chair STEVEN S. FADEM Associate Chair LAWRENCE YERMACK Vice Chairs ALAN C. LOWENFELS ROBERT MACHLEDER ELLIOT GENE SANDER

WESTCHESTER-ROCKLAND-PUTNAM

REGIONAL BOARD

PAM SCHAFLER

ROBERT FRIEDLAND

Vice Chairs LISETTE NAYOR SIDNEY REIFF BENJAMIN SCHAFFER

NEW YORK REGIONAL STAFF

Regional Director HARRIET S. BOGARD

Associate Director DR. MICHAEL A. RIFF

Assistant Directors
SUSAN A. BERGER
MARI BLECHER

CAROL GOLDNER-FASMAN

Director, A World of Difference-NYRO

SIMA ROSENBLUTH

NATIONAL COMMISSION

National Chairman BURTON S. LEVINSON

National Director ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN

Chairman, National Executive Committee RONALD B. SOBEL

Associate National Director

JUSTIN J. FINGER

Honorary Chairmen KENNETH J. BIALKIN SEYMOUR GRAUBARD MAXWELL E. GREENBERG BURTON M. JOSEPH

DIVISION DIRECTORS

Civil Rights

JEFFREY P. SINENSKY

Communications
LYNNE IANNIELLO

Community Service CHARNEY V. BROMBERG

Development

SHELDON FLIEGELMAN
Finance and Administration

PHILIP SHAMIS

Intergroup Relations ALAN BAYER

International Affairs

KENNETH JACOBSON

Leadership

Assistant to the National Director MARVIN S. RAPPAPORT

General Counsel ARNOLD FORSTER

A WORLD OF DIFFERENCE December 26, 1989

Rabbi Alexander Schindler 838 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10021

Dear Rabbi Schindler:

As per our recent conversation, the New York Regional Office will, for review and evaluation, obtain the tapes of the program, UPRISING: Videotapes on the Palestinian Resistance currently being shown at Artists Space, 223 West Broadway.

We will, of course, keep you apprised of our findings and any subsequent actions.

Sincerely,

Harriet S. Bogard Regional Director

HSB:BGC



B'NAI B'RITH INTERNATIONAL

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

1640 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 857-6553

SEYMOUR D. REICH

December 8, 1988

6553 Juffer

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, President Union of American Hebrew Congregations 838 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10021

Dear Alex:

Thank you for your letter of November 29th recommending that B'nai B'rith consider adopting the Soroka Hospital as a project in Israel.

I received a letter from Arnold Forster, dated November 1st, "introducing" me to Dr. Shimon Glick, and I am enclosing a copy of the letter I sent to Dr. Glick on November 4th.

As you can see we are in the midst of a campaign to raise capital funds for a contemplated B'nai B'rith World Center project to be located in Israel, and it would not be appropriate for us to adopt another project in Israel at this time.

My best wishes.

Sincerely,

Seymour D. Reich

SDR:ee

cc: Jack J. Spitzer
Thomas Neumann



RABBI ALEXANDER M. SCHINDLER • UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS
PRESIDENT 838 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N.Y. 10021 (212) 249-0100

Phre

November 29, 1988 20 Kislev 5749

Dr. Seymour Reich 101 Park Avenue New York, NY 10016

Dear Seymour:

This is on another matter entirely different from that which we have been discussing of late. I recently received a letter from Dr. Shimon Glick, that is to say a copy of a letter addressed to Jack Spitzer, in the hope that Soroka Hospital might become a project of International B'nai B'rith.

I don't know what influence you can bring to bear on that, but if B'nai B'rith would like a project in Israel, I can think of no better choice.

As you may know, I was hospitalized at Soroka and it is quite an extraordinary institution. It serves the entire Negev. It is open to Arabs as well as to Jews. Furthermore, the hospital serves as the medical school of Ben Gurion University.

Its medical staff is really superb. It compares to the best I have ever encountered anywhere in the world.

Unfortuately, because it is located in the Negev, and because it does not have the kind of international backing which Hadassah Hospital and Tel Hashomer of Tel Aviv receive, its facilities are woefully inadequate. They simply do not have the machinery that they require for the more serious cases, and they need someone to give them a sustaining hand.

Dr. Seymour Reich November 29, 1988

Page 2

Dr. Glick, incidentally, is the Dean of the Medical School and he is an extraordinary human being. Not only highly skilled and knowledgable wiht an international reputation, but a wonderfu Jew and a fine ethical human being.

If there is anything that I can do to speed this project along and enhance the possibility adopting Soroka, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Alexander M. Schindler

Encl.

November 29, 1988 20 Kislev 5749

Dr. Shimon Glick
Dean
Ben'Gurion University
of the Negev
P.O. Box 653
Beer Sheva 84105 Israel

Dear Shimon:

I will do the best I can with B'nai B'rith. Offcourse, I know its leaders and I'll try to exercise my influence, although it is not exceptionally great. Still, the present President of B'nai B'rith has been nominated to be the next Chairman of the Presidents' Conference and he realizes that, to some extent at least, I was responsible for his being chosen.

Don't get your hopes too high, but I certainly will give it an honest try.

Incidentally, in this connection, you ought to know that Rhea and I and Phil Bernstein (who was also a patient at Soroka) raised approximately \$30,000.00 for a machine to be given to Dr. Ovsyscher for use in his office. I think the machine is a little bit more expensive than that, but Eli spoke of the possibility of getting some matching funds from Israel. We wrote him and wondered that the status is. The money is lying some place either in New York or Israel, but we have been promised by one and all concerned that it will be kept in escrow and that nothing will be deducted from it.

Why don't you have a chat with Eli and wee where the matter stands and see what we can do it expedite his getting the machine. Should we order it here, should we order it there? We really don't know. Dr. Shimon Glick, Dean Ban'Gurion University of the Negev

Page 2

All the Lery best to you and to Lounda, of course. Rhea and I sund you all our affectionate regards.

Sincerely,



KUPAT-HOLIM

Health Insurance Institution of the General Federation of Labour in Israel

קופת חולים של ההסתדרות הכללית של העובדים בארץ ישרומל. המרכז האוניברסיטאי למדעי ושרותי הבריאות בנגב University Center for Health Services and Sciences in the Negev

פקולטה למדעי הבריאות FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

ת.ד. 653 ת.ד. BEER SHEVA 84105 באר שבע ISRAEL ישראל TEL. 057-39068: 60821 'טל' Dept. of



11 November, 1988

Rabbi Alexander Schindler, 6 River Lane, Westport, Conn. 06880, U.S.A.

Dear Rabbi Schindler,

I am enclosing a copy of a letter I sent to Jack Spitzer and Arnold Forster, which speaks for itself.

If you have any influence within Bnai Brith or have friends that do, and can do some lobbying for this kind of undertaking, I would be most appreciative. Such a step could be revolutionary for the hospital and for the Negev, and could be the start of a new dynamic phase for the institution.

I hope you can be of some help in this matter.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

Shimon Glick, M.D.

Dean

20 October, 1988

Mr. Jack Spitzer, P.O.B. 2008, Kirkland, Washington 98033-2008, U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Spitzer,

This week the Rothschild Hospital was renamed the B'nai Zion Hospital, as an expression of the fact that the B'nai Zion group has adopted that hospital and supports it.

When I heard this on the radio, it struck me that B'nai Brith does not have a similar project in Israel. May I be presumptuous to suggest that B'nai Brith International select the Negev as a focus of interest and as such that it adopt the Soroka Medical Center as its project. Hadassah Women's Organization, of course, has its distinguished medical center in Jerusalem. I think it would be appropriate for B'nai Brith to undertake a similar project.

The Negev is, of course, the frontier of Israel and represents the future of this country. Over the past decade, it has been neglected, with serious consequences. The population of the Negev is relatively underprivileged and is more in need of outside help than perhaps any other area of the country.

The undertaking of such a project by B'nai Brith would have a significant impact, I believe, in launching a desperately needed revival of the Negev in the spirit of Ben Gurion's dream.

The medical school of Ben Gurion University, with which the Soroka Hospital is intimately connected, is world famous for its educational innovations. Thus, B'nai Brith would be putting itself into the forefront of world medical education.

I hope you will be excited by this suggestion as I am and will find a way to make it a reality. It may be grandiose, but it is feasible and realistic.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

Shimon Glick, M.D. Dean

cc: Prof. Elata Robert Arnow January 11, 1988 21 Tevet 5748

Mr. Seymour D. Reich, President B'nai B'rtih International 1640 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Seymour:

The upcoming Symposium on an International Peace Conference sounds very exciting. You have certainly put together an exceedingly fine panel of participants.

Alas, it is not possible for me to be with you and I do regret that fact. I am schedule to be speak at a member-congregation in Los Angeles that every day and thus cannot be in Washington. I know you understand and I ask that you convey my regrets and my good wishes to the speakers.

With warm regards, I am

Sincere.y,



B'NAI B'RITH INTERNATIONAL

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

1640 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 857-6553

SEYMOUR D. REICH

December 31, 1987

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler Union of American Hebrew Cong. 838 Fifth Avenue New York. NY 10021

Dear Rabbi Schindler:

It gives me great satisfaction to invite you to a Symposium on the question of "Should Israel Participate in the Proposed International Peace Conference?", to be held on Friday, January 22nd from 9:00 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. at the B'nai B'rith International Headquarters, 1640 Rhode Island Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C.

The Symposium will focus upon whether the proposed Peace Conference will result in Israel being coerced into giving up the territory occupied in 1967 without receiving the full peace it so deeply desires, or will be a significant first step on the path to formal peace treaties with Jordan and perhaps other Arab states. The impact of the current unrest in Gaza on the proposal conference will be assessed. Analyses of the peace conference proposal will be energetically presented by four of the most knowledgeable observers of the Middle East, individuals who themselves have had the most serious involvement in the Arab-Israeli peace process:

Mr. Lawrence Eagleburger, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs from 1982 to 1984:

Ambassador Philip Habib, Personal Representative of the President for the Middle East from 1981 to 1983;

Ambassador Meir Rosenne, Israel's Ambassador to the United States from 1984 to 1987; and

Professor Emanuel Sivan, Editor of <u>The Jerusalem Quarterly</u>, and Director of the Foreign Policy Planning Council for Israel's Prime Minister, 1984-1986.

The depth of your interest in the Arab-Israeli conflict is such that I very much want to have you present at this symposium. We will begin promptly at 9:00 a.m. on January 22nd, and will conclude at 12:15 p.m.

Because of the stature of our panelists, I anticipate a large attendance, so I encourage you to respond quickly to this invitation. Please call (202) 857-6580 and ask for Helana Neumann, who will take the reservations for this event.

I look forward to greeting you on January 22nd.

Sincerely,

Seymour D. Reich

SDR/vb 0508A Hipar Bin November 9, 1987 17 Heshvan 5748 Mr. Jack J. Spitzer Chairman The World Center for Jewish Unity B'nai B'rith 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW Washington, D.C. 20036 Dear Jack: Your letter of October 26th awaited my return from the 59th General Assembly of the UAHC in Chicago. As you can appreciate, a great deal of mail was on my desk, and this is my first opportunity to respond to your gracious invitation to serve on the board of The World Center for Jewish Unity. Mush to my regret, I must decline. I am already involved on too many boards and I feel it is not responsible to lend my name to important undertakings if I am unable to give of my time. I hope you understand my position and accept my declination in the spirit in which it is given. I do wish you and all involved in the work of The World Center for Jewish Unity the best as you undertake your critical work, With warm regards to you and Charlotte, in which Rhea joins, I am, Sincerely, Alexander M& Schindler

The World Center for Jewish Unity

sponsored by B'nai B'rith

October 26, 1987

Honorary Chairman

Hon. Philip M. Klutznick Chicago, IL

Cabinet Chairman

Jack J. Spitzer 9725 S.E. 36th Street Mercer Island, WA 98040 (206) 232-3510

Deputy Chairman

Dr. Stanley M. Wagner 560 So. Monaco Parkway Denver, CO 80224 (303) 388-4203

Co-Chairmen:

Dan A. Bavly Tel Aviv, Israel

Joseph Domberger Munich, Germany

Gerald Kraft Indianapolis, IN

Isaac Gilinski Cali, Colombia

Murray Shusterman Philadelphia, PA

Fred Simon Worms London, England

(Cabinet in formation)

B'nai B'rith International

1640 Rhode Island Ave., NW Washington, DC 20036 USA (202) 857-4980

Seymour D. Reich President

Dr. Daniel ThurszExecutive Vice President

Sidney H. Closter Secretary Rabbi Alexander Schindler Union of American Hebrew Congregations 838 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10021

Dear Alex:

Jewish life today suffers from perilous fragmentation. The antagonisms, misunderstandings, and conflicts between religious practices, postures and structure; between political positions and parties; between Israel and the Diaspora undermine our peoplehood. The plague of disunity is, in great measure, as insidious as outside threats to our survival.

The solution is a complex one. It must begin by building bridges of communication, of dialogue, of understanding. Let us start by creating in Jerusalem, the heart of the Jewish world, a World Center for Jewish Unity. To be built on a site overlooking the old city, the objective of the World Center will be to bring together these disparate elements of Jewish life to evaluate, to discuss, to learn, to resolve.

Sponsored by B'nai B'rith, whose 144 years of service have been fashioned by persons of every facet of Jewish life, the World Center's program and activities would be enriched by your participation on a worldwide Advisory Board, whose member's knowledge, experience, and commitment to Jewish unity, will be an invaluable resource.

It pleases me to be able to advise you that Dr. Abram Sachar, Chancellor of Brandeis University and Teddy Kollek, Mayor of Jerusalem have agreed to co-Chair this Advisory Board.

May I invite you to serve as a member of this Board, now being formed, with the understanding that we will not make onerous demands on your time. Won't you please respond to this cordial invitation indicating, hopefully, your agreement to join in this challenging and exciting endeavor.

With warmest regards and best wishes for the New Year, I remain.

Sincerely,

Jack J. Spitzer

Chairman

JJS/qbw

apple

June 10, 1987 13 Sivan 5774

Mr. Abraham H. Foxman ADL 823 United Nations Plaza New York, N.Y. 10017

Dear Abe:

Thank you for sending my your exchange of correspondence with Shlomo Aveneri Which I finally had a chance to read on my return from Moscow several days ago.

Needless to say, I fully agree with you. Your views accord with mine to a tee. The Jerusalem Post story certainly did not do you justice.

In any event I am delighted to know that we think alike in this as we do in so many other spheres.

With warm good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Ho Aler Fot leson Pla prise on the week OFFICERS
National Chairman
BURTON S. LEVINSON
National Director
NATHAN PERLMUTTER
Chairman, National
Executive Committee
RONALD B. SOBEL

NATIONAL COMMISSION

Associate National Director ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN HONOTARY Chairmen KENNETH J. BIALKIN SEYMOUR GRAUBARD MAXWELL E. GREENBERG

HURTON M. JOSEPH
Honorary Vice Chairmen
LEONARD L. ABESS
RUDY BOSCHWITZ
EDGAR M. BRONFMAN

EDGAR M. BRONTMAN
MAXWELL DANE
LAWRENCE A. HARVEY
BRUCE I. HOCHMAN
GERI M. JOSEPH
MAX M. KAMPELMAN
PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM
SAMUEL H. MILLER
BERNARD D. MINTZ

BERNARD NATH ROBERT R. NATHAN ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF WILLIAM SACHS S.O. SHAPIRO

MILTON MOLLEN

THEODORE H. SILBERT SIDNEY R. YATES Vice Chairmen DOROTHY BINSTOCK BEVERLY DAVIS NAT KAMENY

SAM KANE STEPHEN B. KAY IRVING SHAPIRO Vice Chairman, National

Vice Chairman, National Executive Committee HOWARD P. BERKOWITZ

Honorary Chairman, National Executive Committee DAVID A. ROSE Honorary Treasurers

CHARLES GOLDRING BENJAMIN GREENBERG MOE KUDLER

Treasurer ROBERT H. NAFTALY Assistant Treasurer

Assistant Treasurer PETER M. ALTER Secretary

LARRY M. LAVINSKY Assistant Secretary MELVIN FRAIMAN

President, B'nai B'rith SEYMOUR D. REICH Executive Vice President DANIEL THURSZ

President, B'nai B'rith Women IRMA GERTLER

Executive Director ELAINE BINDER

DIVISION DIRECTORS

Administration
HAROLD ADLER
Civil Rights
JUSTIN J. FINGER
Communications
LYNNE IANNIELLO

Community Service SOL KOLACK Development SHELDON FLIEGELMAN Intergroup Relations

THOMAS NEUMANN Leadership

Assistant to the National Director MARVIN S. RAPPAPORT

General Counsel ARNOLD FORSTER



May 26, 1987

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler Union of American Hebrew Congregations 838 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10021

Dear Alex:

Further to our conversation, enclosed are the exchange of letters with Avineri and an unedited text of the debate.

Would appreciate having your comments.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Abraham H. Foxman

AHF:saj Encl.

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION

*PETER M. ALTER, Detroit, MI MISHA APTER, Sherman Oaks, CA ANTHONY ARKIN, Durbin, South Africa *RHETA BANK, Larchmont, NY SOPHIA BENDER, Houston, TX MICHAEL A. BERENSON, New Orleans, LA STEPHEN BERISH, Stoughton, MA
*HOWARD P. BERKOWITZ, New York, NY MAURICE BERKOWITZ, Ft. Lauderdale, FL ELI BERNSTEIN, Interlaken, NJ *KENNETH J. BIALKIN, New York, NY *ELAINE BINDER, Washington, DC *DOROTHY BINSTOCK, Pittsburgh, PA DAVID M. BLUMBERG, Washington, DC MICHELLE BLUMENTHAL, Dallas, TX CARRIE BOCK, Mamaroneck, NY IRA "BOB" BORN, Bethlehem, PA ELI BOYER, Los Angeles, CA *AVRON I. BROG, New York, NY MEYER BUSHMAN, Philadelphia, PA BEVERLY DAVIS, Palm Beach, FL *LESLIE DAVIS, Denver, CO THEODORE DINERSTEIN, Houston, TX *MEYER EISENBERG, Washington, DC ELMO ELLIS, Atlanta, GA JANE G. ESKIND, Nashville, TN RICHARD J. ESSEN, Miami, FL MILTON FERMAN, St. Louis, MO *JOSEPH J. FISCH, San Diego, CA MICHAEL FISHER, East Sydney, Australia *ARNOLD FORSTER, New York, NY "ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN, Bergenfield, NJ *MEIVIN L. FRAIMAN, Belmont, MA H.A. (TONY) FRANKEN, Rancho Mirage, CA GLEN PAUL FREEDMAN, Dallas, TX ERNA GANS, Northbrook, IL *LAWRENCE GELB, Boston, MA *IRMA GERTLER, Dallas, TX MICHAEL GILDESGAME, Arlington, MA DANIEL GINSBERG, New York, NY MARCIA GLASSEL, Hillsborough, CA MORLEY GLUSKOTER, Frontenac, MO CARL GOLDBERG, Bethesda, MD MARCIA GOLDSTEIN, Flushing, NY *SEYMOUR GRAUBARD, New York, NY NORMAN GRAY, Denver, CO *MAXWELL E. GREENBERG, Los Angeles, CA MILTON GRISHMAN, Biloxi, MS

RUTH HARVEY, Santa Monica, CA THOMAS HOMBURGER, Chicago, IL *JEROME B. HOMER, Hollywood, FL HARRIET HORWITZ, North Miami Beach, FL JOHN E. JACOBS, Detroit, MI MILTON JACOBS, Bellevue, WA HAROLD JAFFA, Southfield, MI
*BURTON M. JOSEPH, Minneapolis, MN *NAT KAMENY, Bergenfield, NJ *SAM KANE, Corpus Christi, TX *STANLEY A. KAPLAN, Chicago, IL KAGEY KASH, Los Angeles, CA *JAMES KAUFMANN, Atlanta, GA *STEPHEN B. KAY, Boston, MA JOSHUA KHEEL, Los Angeles, CA *IONATHAN KISLAK, Miami, FL PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK, Chicago, IL WARREN B. KOHN, Belmont, MA SUE KOLLINGER, Dallas, TX *GERALD KRAFT, Indianapolis, IN CHARLES F. KRISER, Northfield, IL DANIEL KROPE Trieste, Italy CHARLES KRUMBEIN, Richmond, VA *DOUGLAS KRUPP, Wellesley, MA JUDITH KRUPP, Wellesley, MA ALEX KYMAN, Beverly Hills, CA *LARRY M. LAVINSKY, New York, NY HERBERT LEMELMAN, Brookline, MA PHILLIP A. LEON, Ontario, Canada *BURTON S. LEVINSON, Beverly Hills, CA HYLA LIPSKY, Rydal, PA STUART LOCKMAN, Birmingham, MI ABRAO LOWENTHAL, Sao Paulo, Brazil LUIS LUKOWSKI, San Jose, Costa Rica RAYMOND S. MAISLIN, Houston, TX THOMAS D. MANTEL, Indianapolis, IN ALLAN B. MARGOLIS, Miami Beach, FL ART MARSHALL, Las Vegas, NV I. BARRY MEHLER, Washington, DC HOWARD MICHEL, Bellevue, WA *DONALD R. MINTZ. New Orleans, LA ARDEN MUCHIN, Manitowoc, WI *MICHAEL NACHMAN, Rye Brook, NY *ROBERT H. NAFTALY, West Bloomfield, MI NATHAN I. NAGLER, Oceanside, NY SHERWIN NEWAR, Houston, TX ARTHUR PEARLMAN, Hialeah, FL CARL PEARLSTEIN, San Francisco, CA THEODORE F. PERLMAN, Westmont, IL

*NATHAN PERLMUTTER, New York, NY AMITI PILOWSKY, Santiago, Chile GERALD M. QUIAT, Denver, CO JEFF RABHAN, Richmond, VA *SEYMOUR D. REICH, New York, NY ALVIN J. ROCKOFF, New Brunswick, NJ *DAVID A. ROSE, Wellesley, MA *MYRA ROSENBERG, Los Angeles, CA HARVEY ROTH, Greensburg, PA *MELVIN SALBERG, New York, NY WILLIAM SAPERS, Boston, MA MARTIN SAVITT, London, England *MICHAEL E. SCHULTZ, New York, NY IGNATZ SCHUSTER, Tel Aviv, Israel DALE SCHWARTZ, Atlanta, GA BETTY K. SHAPIRO, Washington, DC *IRVING SHAPIRO, Liberty, NY RONALD SHAW, Woodbridge, CT *ROBERT SILVERBERG, Denver, CO WILLIAM SIMON, New York, NY HELEN SMITH, Austin, TX *RONALD B. SOBEL, New York, NY JACK J. SPITZER, New York, NY JOEL SPRAYREGEN, Chicago, IL HAROLD J. STANGLER, Carle Place, NY GEORGE STARK, Houston, TX MARIO STAWSKY, Montevideo, Urugua *ALVIN J. STEINBERG, Kensington, MD HARRY STERLING, Denver, CO *LAWRENCE E. STEINBERG, Dallas, TX WALTER P. STERN, New York, NY HERBERT STONE, Metairie, LA *DAVID H. STRASSLER, Great Barrington, MA ELIAS STRUM, New York, NY ROBERT SUGARMAN, New York, NY LEONARD SUSSMAN, Rydal, PA ELBIO SVIDLER, Buenos Aires, Argentina SAMUEL J. TENENBAUM, Columbia, SC *DANIEL THURSZ, Washington, DC CHARLES TOBIAS, Detroit, MI GLEN TOBIAS, New York, NY BERNARD TRIEBER, Randallstown, MD WILLIAM VEPRIN, Beverly Hills, CA BERNARD WEISZ, Cleveland, OH *WILLIAM A. WEXLER, Herzylia, Israel MARTIN Z. WIENER, Toledo, OH JEANETTE WISHNA, Overland Park, KS *IAMES M. WOLF, Albion, NE MORRIS YOFFE, Boca Raton, FL

*Members of National Executive Committee

HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS OF NATIONAL COMMISSION

ROBERT ADLER, Tamarac, FL WILLIAM M. ALPER, Coral Gables, FL A. ALBERT ALPERSTEIN, Chevy Chase, MD HERBERT BARCHOFF, New York, NY LOUIS H. BARNETT, Ft. Worth, TX NATHAN C. BELTH, New York, NY DAVID BERGER, Philadelphia, PA ISADORE E. BINSTOCK, Pittsburgh, PA BERNARD BROWNSTEIN, New York, NY HENRY COHN, Dallas, TX MERLE D. COHN, Seattle, WA ELLIOT COLE, Washington, DC GRACE DAY, St. Joseph, MO LOUIS DEGEN, Rancho Mirage, CA ETHEL EPSTEIN, New York, NY ROBERT FEINERMAN, Pacific Palisades, CA HERMAN FINEBERG, Pittsburgh, PA ELLIOTT W. FINKEL, Pittsburgh, PA DONALD FLAMM, New York, NY GERALD A. FLANZBAUM, Warren, NI LOUIS FREEDMAN, White Plains, NY WARREN FREEDMAN, New Rochelle, NY **FREDERICK GASH, New York, NY MARC K. GILBERT, Hollywood, FL S. REGEN GINSBURG, Philadelphia, PA

MORTON GODINE, Brookline, MA LENORE MAZER GOLDBERG, Hollis, NY EDWARD GOLDBERGER, New York, NY ALFRED GOLDEN, Miami Beach, FL JACK GOLDFARB, Woodland Hills, CA CHARLES GOLDRING, Los Angeles, CA JOHN L. GOLDWATER, New York, NY BERNARD S. GREEN, Washington, DC BENJAMIN GREENBERG, New York, NY LEO GREENLAND, New York, NY PAUL GROSSINGER, Grossinger, NY HYMAN HAVES, Pacific Palisades, CA BEN HYMAN, Atlanta, GA LOUIS G. ISAACSON, Denver, CO SYDNEY JARKOW, New York, NY HERTA H. KAHN, Chicago, IL MARTIN E. KANTOR, Great Neck, NY IRVING KAUFMAN, Palm Beach, FL PHILIP KRUPP, Boston, MA BERDIE KUDLER, Los Angeles, CA MOE KUDLER, Los Angeles, CA ROBERT LATZ, Minneapolis, MN RALPH LAZARUS, Cincinnati, OH RICHARD M. LEDERER, JR., White Plains, NY CY LESLIE, Woodmere, NY

RAY LEVENTHAL, Cleveland, OH SIMMY LEVEY, South Orange, NJ MILDRED LEVINE, Hewlett Harbor, NY BERNARD M. LEVY. Rockville, MD. JOSEPH L. LICHTEN, Rome, Italy FRIEDA LOWITZ, Beverly Hills, CA LESTER A. MACKTEZ, Providence, RI ALEXANDER MILLER, Southbury, CT EDWARD MILLER, Denver, CO BERNARD D. MINTZ, New Orleans, LA EMIL MOGUL, New York, NY BERNARD MOLLEN, Highland Beach, FL ISRAEL MOWSHOWITZ, Jamaica, NY MAYER U. NEWFIELD, Birmingham, AL NORMAN N. NEWHOUSE, New Orleans, LA RAQUEL H. NEWMAN, San Francisco, CA BERTRAM R. PALEY, Milton Village, MA ARTHUR PEARLMAN, Hialeah, FL ANITA PERLMAN, Chicago, IL JEFFERSON E. PEYSER, San Francisco, CA BURNETT ROTH, Miami Beach, FL MARVIN D. ROWEN, Tarzana, CA IRVING RUBINSTEIN, SR., Palm Beach, FL J. HAROLD SAKS, Puyallup, WA SAMUEL SCHEFF, New York, NY

NORMAN J. SCHLOSSMAN, Highland Park, IL LEO SCHNEIDER, New York, NY ARMUND J. SCHOEN, Chicago, IL EVELYN FOX SCHREIBER, Beverly Hills, CA HERBERT D. SETLOW, Woodbridge, CT SAMUEL SHLEVIN, Pawtucket, RI MURRAY SHUSTERMAN, Philadelphia, PA MARCIA SIEGELAUB, Westport, CT MATILDA SIMS, Lauderhill, FL JOSEPH SONNENREICH, New York, NY WILLIAM A. STERN, Greensboro, NC MELVIN M. SWIG, San Francisco, CA GEORGE J. TALIANOFF, Miami, FL A. RAYMOND TYE, West Roxbury, MA LESTER J. WALDMAN, New York, NY NORMAN WALL, Pottsville, PA EUGENE WARNER, Las Vegas, NV EVELYN WASSERSTROM, Kansas City, MO LAWRENCE J. WEINBERG, Beverly Hills, CA HARVEY L. WEISBERG, Southfield, MI EDWARD WEISS, Cresskill, NI WILLIAM M. WOLFF, Palm Beach, FL MORTON H. YULMAN, Palm Beach, FL LOUIS ZARA, New York, NY

**Consultant, National Executive Committee

HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS OF NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ELI BOYER, Los Angeles, CA MERLE D. COHN, Seattle, WA RICHARD J. ESSEN, Miami, FL CHARLES GOLDRING, Los Angeles, CA IOHN L. GOLDWATER, New York, NY

NORMAN GRAY, Denver, CO KAYGEY KASH, Los Angeles, CA IOSHUA KHEEL, Los Angeles, CA PHILIP KRUPP, Boston, MA MOE KUDLER, Los Angeles, CA THOMAS MANTEL, Indianapolis, IN BERNARD D. MINTZ, New Orleans, LA DAVID A. ROSE, Wellesley, MA BURNETT ROTH, Miami Beach, FL GEORGE J. TALIANOFF, Miami, FL MARTIN Z. WEINER, Toledo, OH

STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

LESLIE DAVIS

Budget MICHAEL A. BERENSON Civil Rights

Community Service DAVID H. STRASSLER Develonment

MICHAEL E. SCHULTZ

ALLAN B. MARGOLIS

JEROME B. HOMER

Intergroup Relations DONALD R. MINTZ International Affairs MELVIN SALBERG

Leadership MICHAEL NACHMAN ALVIN I. STEINBERG

LYNNE IANNIELLO Director, Communications

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Reply To An Israeli Friend

by Abraham H. Foxman

The following was written by Mr. Foxman, associate national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and head of its International Affairs Division, in response to an article on American Jewish reaction to the Pollard affair by political theorist Shlomo Avineri. The article was published in the Jerusalem Post and subsequently attracted widespread media coverage.

Mr. Avineri, professor of political science at Hebrew University of Jerusalem and former director general of Israel's Foreign Ministry, wrote that American Jewish spokesmen were deeply upset by the Pollard affair and were quick to denounce it because of the sensitive issue of dual loyalties that it evokes.

This, Mr. Avineri said, suggests that American Jews, despite all their "material success and intellectual achievements, may not be seen by non-Jews as being truly American." He went on to say to American Jews: "You always told us Israelis that America was different. Of course it is. But you still feel now as vulnerable as Soviet or Iranian (exile). You too have to be emancipated. For all its achievements and Land."

Dear Shlomo:

Much to my dismay, your article, "Letter to An American Friend: Soured Promise," (Jerusalem Post, March 10) reveals that self-deception in the wake of the Pollard affair cuts much deeper in Israel than I had imagined.

Your central thesis is that the Pollard affair unveiled a pervasive and underlying insecurity among American Jewry, manifested by the need to put distance between ourselves and Pollard's criminal behavior in the eyes of the gentiles. This reaction, you say, is typical "galut" mentality, exposing the American dream as just another nightmare of Jewish exile.

For someone who has spent so much time visiting and lecturing in the United States, your misreading of American Jewry is astonishing. Of course we were outraged by the Pollard episode. Of course we were quick to call for a thorough investigation of the spy operation (which, to our regret, your government was so slow to undertake) and punishment of those accountable. But you grossly misinterpret our response. We

(more)

raised our voices out of concern for Israel's security and the damage done by the Pollard case to U.S.-Israeli relations and not, as you suggest, to ingratiate ourselves with the "goyim".

It was not "galut" mentality or fear of an anti-Semitic backlash from the Pollard debacle that brought resounding criticism from American Jewish leadership. It was because Jonathan Pollard violated American law purportedly on behalf of an ideal we cherish -- love of Israel. In so doing he and his co-conspirators committed a grave breach of trust against Israel's most important ally and affected our own ability to help forge close U.S.-Israeli ties. What we reject is the inference that support of Israel legitimizes criminal action against the U.S.

You ask why American Jewish leaders felt compelled to distance themselves from Pollard and when did we last "pontificate on matters of criminal justice?" The fact is American Jewish organizations have a long history of participating in the U.S. judicial system, even on non-Jewish issues. Whether it be filing amicus curiae briefs in trials against accused Nazi war criminals or on religion-state controversies, calling for prosecution of racist groups or demagogues who threaten the public order, or on a host of related issues affecting minority rights in a pluralistic society, our voices have been heard. Pollard's actions were morally indefensible on an issue of vital concern to American Jews, U.S. trust and friendship toward Israel. That is why we spoke out. I am, above all, amazed by your failure to distinguish between the position of American Jewry and that of other Diaspora communities. Are you serious when you compare us with Jews in Egypt under Nasser, and in Iran under Khomeni, or the persecuted Jews living in the Soviet Union? Do you really believe we see ourselves, in any remote way, in so precarious a situation? Or, Shlomo, are your projecting your own illusions of "ghetto Judaism" onto a free, if not guilt-free, Jewish community, one which is well accepted in the mainstream of American life?

The Pollard case has not sent American Jews running for shelter.

Yes, we were outraged by the act of Israel operating a spy ring in the heart of the U.S. defense establishment. But not because Pollard was a Jew. We would also be incensed if Pollard had been a Catholic or

Christian Scientist. It is the monumental stupidity and breach of faith that so disturbs us, not the religion or ideology of the American spy.

You impugn our motives as infused with anxiety about an antiSemitic backlash. Fifteen months have passed since Pollard was arrested
and the Israeli spy operation was exposed. In all that time, there has
been little, if any, anti-Semitism resulting from this sorry affair.
Nor is there any indication that Pollard's sentencing will trigger such
malice.

The fact is that the Jewish experience in America is far too secure to be undone by a single event such as the Pollard scandal. In government, science, education, business, the arts, in all walks of life, Jews have made a notable and welcome impact on American life.

Our attitude is not one of self-righteousness, smugness or complacency. True, there has been anti-Semitism and we continue to remain vigilant against the ugly forces of extremism, bigotry and hatred. But the wolf is not at the door. We are not sitting on our luggage anxiously expecting a pogrom.

At the root of your misconceptions about American Jewry lies an antiquated approach toward Zionism. You claim "Zionism grew out of the cruel realizations that for all their achievements and successes, when the chips are down, Jews in the Diaspora become vulnerable and defenseless, are seen as aliens — and see themselves as such." Shame on you, Shlomo, a prominent student of political thought, to view Zionism largely as an ideology of refuge from the outside world.

Zionist ideology is far richer and more diverse than the version you put forth. Indeed, the one Zionist thinker you quote, Ahad Ha'am, was a notable proponent of the broad, positivist view of Zionism. For Ha'am, the establishment of an independent Jewish state would "breathe new life into the Diaspora communities and preserve their unity."

Soured promise

THE POLLARD case is causing unprecedented unease and malaise among American Jews. Why?

I agree with you that we, here in Israel, have to clear up our own mess. There is no doubt that some branches of our intelligence apparatus have run wild and that some very senior officials and politicians will have to pay for the folly and irresponsibility involved in the affair.

As in the Iran-Contra affair in the United States, it appears that both our countries have a penchant for letting cowboys run sensitive intelligence operations. A weak and rather uninformed president in your case, a divided government lacking central control in ours, seem to invite that kind of free-wheeling operators

But in the Pollard case, something more profound is now surfacing: a degree of nervousness, insecurity and even cringing on the part of the American Jewish community which runs counter to the conventional wisdom of American Jewry feeling free, secure and unmolested in an open and pluralistic society.

Let me not mince words: some of the responses of American Jewish leaders after Pollard's sentencing remind me of the way in which Jewish leaders in Egypt under Nasser and in Iran under Khomeini ran for cover when members of their respective Jewish communities were caught

spying for Israel.

I know these are harsh words: they are nonetheless true. American Jew-ry has prided itself on being a free community of fiercely proud Jews living in an open society, in which being Jewish was considered as American as apple pie. How many times have American leaders told me that America is not another Exile, that you do not live in Galua, than you can aspire to the highest office in the land, that you are not a minority but constitute an integral ingredient of the multi-ethnic and multi-religious tapestery that makes the American matrix such a unique historical experience for Jews

And what do we see now? A nerson who happens to be Jewish (isn't this your favourite phrase: "happens to be Jewish?") is caught spying for Israel. You would expect that in a free and open society no guilt by association should be presumed and that nobody, except Pollard himself, should be held responsible for his

Instead, we see some senior American Jewish leaders falling over each other in condemning Pollard and distancing themselves - and the Jewish community - from him. When did American Jewish lenders lastly pontificate on matters of criminal justice?

Look for yourself: one American Jewish leader says that "Pollard pleaded guilty in an American court to a serious crime. He received due process and a just punishment.

Shlomo Ayineri

Another states that he is "disturbed" by some feelings of sympathy he finds among fellow Jews for Pollard and says that "there could be no possible justification for Pollard's despicable crime." A third opines that not since the Rosenbergs' trial have American Jews been so severely compromised.

Don't you feel these gentlemen are protesting too much? I, at least, am reminded of some Jewish reactions in France during the Dreyfus affair: "He is guilty - we are not, we

are good French patriots.

WHY DO American Jews qua Jews have to feel the need to distance themselves from Pollard? Shouldn't they be saying that the fact that one Anterican Jewish person convicted for spying for Israel (or, for that matter, for the Soviet Union) is no skin off their nose – and that's that. I do not know Colonel North's

religious affiliation - but have any of his co-religionists distanced themselves from him? And did any Wasp have to distance himself from Alger Hiss's perjury and presumed spying for the Soviet Union? Why are only Jews defensive and uneasy in such cases?

Yesterday, on the phone from Los Angeles, you told me "the consequences of the Pollard affair will remain with us for the rest of our lives." Is this what the American dream is about - guilt by association, collective responsibility?

I hear American Jews talking about being accused of "dual loyalty. Who, among non-Jews, has accused you of that? Only Jewish people have used this phrase in the context of the Pollard affair - because you, not the non-Jews, somehow feel. deep in your heart, that despite all of your material success and intellectual achievements, you may not be seen by non-Jews as being truly Americans.

This anxiety is deep in your soul, and it is in the soul - and not in external circumstances - that Galut resides. Galut is ambivalence. alienation, homelessness. When the going is good - when being Jewish and supporting Israel go together with waving the American flag - who would be as stupid as not to wish to have the best of both worlds? But when the going gets tough, then the test arrives of being accepted, of really being equal, of really being proud and not having to look over your shoulder.

When Gore Vidal said some months ago in his vituperative pole-mic Commentary that you are not really Americans, you all recoiled in horror. Today, American Jewish leaders, by their protestations of over-zealous loyalty to the United States at a moment when nobody is really questioning it, are saying that America in the long run is no different from France and Germany. When you have to over-idenitify, there is no other proof needed that you think that your non-Jewish neighbours are looking askance at your Americanism. You are condemned by your own protestations of loyalty and flag-waiving.

ZIONISM GREW out of the cruel realization that for all of their achievements and successes, when the chips are down Jews in the Diaspora become vulnerable and defenceless, are seen as aliens - and will see themselves as such.

You always told us Israelis that America was different. Of course, it is. But you still feel now as vulnerable as Soviet or Iranian Jews. Of course no one will put you in jail or legislate against you: but you are afraid that Jews will not be able to get responsible positions in your bureaucracy, that Jewish employees in the defence and intelligence branches will be under some kind of handicap, that Jews will be denied access to sensitive positions. One Jewish spy - and look how deep you find yourself in Galut.

Don't misunderstand me: in no way am I condoning what Israel did in the Pollard affair. With other Israelis I support the call for an unequivocal investigation into our stupidities and lies, and let heads roll

if necessary.

What we did was unforgivable not because of its impact on American Jews, but because of the consequences for Israel-U.S. relations. Neither is this letter written with schadenfreude, despite the fact you may feel that it is. Like all Zionist analyses, it is written with grief and dismay about the ways of the world. But the truth of the matter is

simple: You, in America, are no different from French, German, Polish. Soviet and Egyptian Jews. Your Exile is different - comfortable, padded with success and renown. It is exile nonetheless.

The test of really belonging and real equality is when the going is tough. And when the going got tough, your leaders reacted like trembling Israelites in the shietl, not like the proud and mighty citizens of a free democratic society. It is very easy to clamour at elegant wine and cheese parties, for the freedom of Soviet Jews. But you too need to be freed from Galut from the inner bond, from what Ahad Ha'am called 'servitude within freedom.'

You too have to be emancipated from Galut and alienation; and for all its achievements and promise, America, it now evidently appears may not be your Promised Land.

Shlomo Avineri is professor of political science at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and a former directorgeneral of the Foreign Ministry.

BNAI BRITH HILLEL FOUNDATION

OF

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY

16 April 1987

Rabbi Yosef Goldman: My name is Rabbi Yossi Goldman, and
I am the director of B'Nai Brith Hillel Foundation at Hebrew
University. Hillel, as you may know, is part of an international network, with centers in over 400 university campuses
throughout the free world, serving Jewish students. In Jerusalem,
many will remember that Hillel House for over 20 years was
located nearby, not far from here on Balfour Street. Following
the Six Day War, we relocated with the University to Mount
Scopus, where we have a thriving and successful students for
students and faculty.

Hillel plans and develops and provides a whole range of educational, cultural, social and spiritual programs and activities for the University community. As such we are committed to the notion of <u>Clal Yisroel</u>, open and free discussion of issues confronting Israel and the Jewish people, religious pluralism, and a strengthening of Israel/Diaspora relations.

And now a few words about why we are here this evening. Over the past 16 months, we have all followed with great dismay the fallout and repercussions that resulted with the imprisonment and conviction of Jonathan Pollard in the United States. If anything positive could be said to have come out of this horrid affair, it is the soulsearching and healthy debate it sparked within our community within Israel, and in America. We are indebted to Professor Shlomo Avineri for initiating this debate in his incisive if controversial letter to an American friend, which appeared in the Jerusalem Post on March 10th, and Abraham Foxman's thought-provoking reply a few days later in the same newspaper.

The issues raised by Shlomo Avineri and A. Foxman continue to occupy central stage on the Jewish public agenda,

with numerous articles in the Hebrew, English, and International press, as well as on Israeli and U.S. television. I believe that critical to this debate seems to be the question as to the deeper meaning behind the American Jewish response to the Pollard Affair. Does it prove that American Jews do not really feel "at home" in America? And is it therefore a vindication of Zionism's classic notion that nowhere but in Israel can Jews feel truly safe? Or, is American Jewish reaction merely an expression of concern born out of love for the State of Israel, for continued U.S. trust and friendship toward the Jewish state? Owing to the great importance of this issues and to public interest, B'Nai Brith Hillel Foundation at Hebrew University is privileged to bring to you this evening a debate between Shlomo Avineri, Professor of Political Science at The Hebrew University, and a former Director General of the Foreign Ministry, and Abraham Foxman, Associate National Director, Anti Defamation League of B'nai Brith. The topic of their debate is, "Is America Exiled?". The format for this evening will be as follows. Each speaker will address the issue for about 15 to 20 minutes; then there will be an opportunity to respond to each other; and following that, our speakers have agreed to take questions from the audience. Professor Avineri.

(Applause)

<u>Professor Avineri</u>: Thank you very much. First of all I'd like to thank Beit Hillel for this opportunity. Beit Hillel usually meets on Mount Scopus and as a member of the faculty of the University, I want to commend Beit Hillel for the wonderful job it is doing in discussing some of the more controversial issues in Israeli and Jewish life; and doing it always in the spirit of Beit Hillel.

My immediate impulse, when I was asked to discuss the topic "Is America Exiled?", was to be very brief, and say, "yes", and then sit down. On second thought, I thought this is not going to be a very good idea. And therefore I am not doing it -- but I would like to start by some preliminary remarks.

One of the debates which on an intellectual level occasionally comes up, between what we call "the Zionist position", and the position which one occasionally hears in the United States. It is the following: the traditional Zionist approach views Israel as a center, and Diaspora (or Galut, or exile) as a periphery. At various levels of sophistication and articulation, we occasionally hear an American view -- I wouldn't say the American view -an American view that says that basically due to the uniqueness of the American experience (and there is no doubt that the American Jewish experience is unique), one cannot really talk about a center and a periphery. How can American Jewry be a periphery to Israel? The view is that we really have today two centers. And one might like to use historical or theological parallels, one speaks about Yrushalaim and Pompedita; one speaks about Eretz Yisroel and Bavel. I would like to start by accepting the premise that we can talk about two centers, that there is something in the United States experience, in the richness of Jewish life there, in the freedom -- almost without parallel -- in which the Jews live as Jews within the United States, which can be similar to the Babylonian experience. But this only begs the question, because all Jewish sages who lived in Babylon never questioned the fact that Babylon

was exile. They continued to pray, "Next year in Jerusalem."

I would like to make it very clear that to my mind -- and this may be very simplistic -- that so long as Jews do pray, "Next year in Jerusalem", certainly anybody who says "next year in Jerusalem", regardless of what he means by that, still thinks that he is in Diaspora. Otherwise, he doesn't mean what he says. This may not cover very secular Jews who never pray and never say that -- but I want to preempt by saying that if you say "Next year in Jerusalem", you know that you are in exile.

And it is for this very reason that traditional reform in its most extreme and radical way in the 19th century, excised that line from the prayer. Most Jews who pray today do not excise that line from the prayer.

Now, why do I basically feel that what we discussed is an issue transcending the Pollard Affair? There are moments in history where things that are considered dormant or have been conveniently pushed under the carpet, come out. And there are moments of truth. In one way, I was very much surprised by the response to my letter. Not that I expected American Jewish leaders or just American Jewish people to be very happy with what I said; but I think I'm not overstating it when I say that what I said in that letter is what most Israeli Jews feel about American Jews. I also happen to know that this is also what many Israeli leaders feel about American Jews. Some of them -- I'm not going to embarrass anybody here -- but some of them have said to me privately after my letter was published, "The question is this. Why is it the case that American Jews and Israel have not spoken candidly to each other?" And it is about speaking candidly which I think this debate is. It is a debate within the

family. I don't have to say again that some of my best friends are American Jews. I've said it many times in the last few weeks, so I'll say it again. It is a debate . . .

(Interruption)

· · · Er, Abe is a friend from 20 years you know . . .

We have had in the last thirty years a tacit pact between the American Jewish leadership and the Israeli leadership, of not bringing out an issue over which we know we disagree. There were political reasons for that, financial reasons for that; there is an interlocking of interests. The American Jewish leadership as a leadership has a political standing in the Untied STates only because it is connected in some way or other to Israel; if it had just, been the leadership of the American Jewish community dealing with Jewish community affairs in the United States, it would not have the entry to the White House; it would not have the kind of visible position which no other religious or ethnic or cultural group in the United States has. And the Israeli political leadership has a built-in interest of having the forum of the American Jewish leadership open to it.

There was not much openness in the debate. Pollard brought out the fact that there is an issue. Now why, if I may try to understand, was there such anger -- and I'm just focusing on the anger -- within the American Jewish community, about Pollard? Why so much public criticism? Now, American Jewish leadership has committed itself in the last years to a position which is not an easy one. It has said, "We support Israel, and we support the government of the day in Israel. It is not up to us to criticize the policies of the Government of Israel. Because it is

Israelis who are out there on the line. They have to make the decisions. They have to live with the consequences. And basically, I agree with that position. During the Begin years I had arguments with some of my best friends in America who are on the Left, who were saying the same things about the Begin government; but I told them, "I don't think you should say that in America. It is one thing for me as a citizen of Israel to say it in Israel, but it's another thing sitting in, wherever you are, saying it." And the same applies to the Right. I disagree with somebody of Gushen Min if he is here; if he is in Beverly Hills I feel a little bit uncomfortable about Shlemut HaAretz preached from there. It cuts both ways.

Now, the American Jewish community went through difficult periods, where it had to defend publicly Israeli policies with which it was not really in agreement. And here comes the great paradox. Israel can annex the Golan Heights, and the American Jewish community may not be very happy, but it will support it. Israel can put settlements on the West Bank, and the American Jewish community — or some of them — may not be happy, and they will not publicly dissociate themselves from Israel. Israel can bomb a nuclear reactor in Iraq (and this may or may not be a good thing — I think it was a good thing): many American Jews were not happy, but they did not dissociate themselves publicly from Israel.

The only times, to my memory, with the exception of voices after Sabra and Shattila -- which was a very extreme case -- but not the Lebonon war itself... Many American Jews were not happy with the Lebonon war, but they did not publicly dissociate themselves from Israel. The only time the official leadership of the American Jewish

Israeli Government policies, and made a point of publicly dissociating themselves, was in the Pollard Affair.

We can put settlements on the West Bank and Annex it; we can go to war; and the American Jewish community will hold its peace. On Pollard, it spoke out.

Why?

Because, the argument says, it put the American Jewish community in a difficult situation. Why are you put in a difficult situation unless you feel that you are in Galut. If you are not in an ambivalent position.

People are saying this will bring out antisemitism.

People are saying it puts the American Jewish community under a cloud. Let me read you a letter. I received from a Jewish person in Greece. It's a copy of a letter he sent to the Jerusalem Post which was not published, like about 400 other letters which were not published on this issue.

"Reading Professor Avineri's remark reminded me of the American Vice President Spiro Agnew, (a.k.a. Aganoskopolous) Affair during President Nixon's administration in the early 1970's. Vice President Agnew was forced to resign from office following his plea of nolo contendere to charges of bribery, or some such related allegations. Yet I do not recall that this created any panic in the Greek American community. Little, if any, publicity was given to the incident in any Greek American publications; nor did the matter warrant any discussion by any of the Greek American organizations."

There is a definition of Karl Marx that says that a police state is not a state where everybody is being

followed by the police; but a police state is a state where everybody thinks that he is being followed by the police. Now, my understanding of Zionism is that Zionism is not a response to antisemitism. You don't heed antisemites to be in Galut, because Galut is in your own soul. If you feel that something like Pollard is making you uncomfortable, is comprising you, that it is putting a questionmark on your allegiance. If you feel as a leader, Rabbi Niel Sandberg, who happens to be the regional director of the American Jewish community on the West Coast, says, "I would like to see American Jews point with pride to the way Jews have contributed throughout history to the arts, the military, and all fields of life, and to make it clear to other people that we have helped build this thriving country. We have our allegiance with Israel, but we should indicate at the same time that our primary loyalty is to the United States." Now I am not quarrelling with somebody who believes that his primary loyalty is to the United S Lates. I believe in free choice. But why does an American Jewish person have to say after Pollard, that we American Jews have to say, that our primary lotalty is to the United States? Nobody has questioned their primary loyalties of American Jews in the United States, except they themselves. By protesting too much, and making dozens of statements like that. is really what Galut means. Galut does not mean that you are being persecuted. Galut does not mean that you are being hated. Galut does not mean that you are being discriminated against. Galut means that when the chips are down you feel a little bit insecure and not at home; that you have to overidentify; that you have to show your war metal -- as

some other letters suggested. How many Jews have died for the United States? More Jews have died for the United States then for Israel (this, incidentally, is true). Why do you have to make that statement? Nobody is questioning your loyalty. But if you feel that you have to wave the American flag, you have to wear your loyalty to the United States on your sleeve -- this is Galut. No other religious or ethnic group in the United States reacted, in my living memory, in such a way. And it is very interesting that one of the few American non-Jewish leaders who reacted mildly in public (but in private very strongly) was Senator Inawe, who said at a meeting of the Jewish War Veterans Conference, "Why don't you Jews speak up? Why do you look down after Pollard? Why do you feel a little bit uncomfortable? (And, just to remind you: Senator Inawe is of Japanese origin, and fought with the American army during World War II -- and was also injured -- at a time when we know how Japanese Americans were being treated by the United States. You need a Japanese American, or an American of Japanese origin, to tell Jewish people not to look down after Pollard?

Now, this does not mean -- and I want to make it clear again -- this does not mean that American Jewish life in the United States is insecure. This does not mean that a great wave of antisemitism is on the rampage.

of us who have seen the recent New York Polls know, that most non-Jewish Americans a) do not know who Pollard is, and b) more thought he spied for the Soviet Union than for Israel. It is the Jews who think that the non-Jews think that Pollard reflects on the Jews. This

is what Galut is.

Now why is this important? Precisely because we are in a family. We should talk truth to one another . American and diaspora Jews have on many occasions criticized a lot of issues in Israel which are not to their liking. How many times have we heard -- and in many cases I supported that view -- how many times did we hear that our electoral system is not the most ideal in the world? How many times did we hear that the way we treat minorities in Israel is not the best? How many times did we hear -and I certainly identify with that -- that the monopoly of Orthodox Jews over this country is a scandal? We have heard, and justly so, a lot of criticism out of the heart of American Jews -- about institutions, arrangements, structures of Israeli government and society. Precisely because we are a family, we are entitled to say to our American brothers and sisters, what we feel about them. It seems to me that most Israelis -- and this the raison d'etre of living in Israel -- I want to put it very bluntly: If America is not Galut, why shouldn't we all be there?

What? If America is not Galut, why shouldn't we all be there? The only reason why three and a half million Israelis are not in America is because for some reason or other we feel it is Galut. And I don't have to tell you that Galut is much easier than Eretz Yisroel. Nobody said Galut niknet bayisurim. Only Eretz Yisroel niknet bayisurim. That's why the Jewish people always lived in Galut, because Galut was always the Jewish easy way of opting out. Ifyou lived in Galut, you never had to worry about whether you sent spies or don't send spies.

The goyim are doing it for you. If you live in Galut you never have to work out a system that all your taxation will feed all your people, because you don't care for all your people; you just care for your own kin. If you live in Galut you don't have to defend your people. The goyim are defending your people, if you have the good luck of living among good Goyim. And Jewish way of living in Galut has always been finding that kind of protection which protections the Jews: the Pharis, the noblemen, who protected the Jew. There is a great nobleman that is protecting American Jews now, a great poet. This poet is called American Democracy. It is a very d-eply institutionalized protection. It is a protection and therefore one fears that sometime the protection may crack. And this is exactly what heppened in Pollard.

Protection is always on condition. You are on probation. And many Jews felt after Pollard that somehow they have contravened the conditions of their probation.

This means living in Galut. It does not mean -- and I don't want to fool myself -- that Galut will disappear.

But there is one basic difference between Galut and Eretz Yisroel, and that is _______. Maybe that Galut will remain, I wouldn't say forever, but for a long time. And there are some people who think that _______ the messiah will come. . . Oihme some people, who knows? Chaim Hazzaz wrote a play once about it. But there is a difference. In Jewish life, Israel is a value; diaspora is a fact. There is a Jewish value in Jewish life in Eretz Yisrael. There is no Jewish value in Jewish life in the United States: it could be

done anywhere else if the conditions were right. What can be done in the United States can be done in Canada, can be done perhaps one day if the world will change in the Soviet Union, if there will be freedom of worship, freedom of teaching Hebrew, freedom of prayer, freedom of Aliyah and then people don't come, then we will know we live in the free world. This is what Galut is. It is a fact; it is not a value. Therefore, nobody can do yerida from the United States. You can only do yerida from Eretz Yisroel.

Thank you.

(Applause)

Rabbi Goldman: Thank you very much Professor Avineri.

Mr. Abraham Foxman.

(Applause)

Mr. Abraham Foxman: Rabbi, Professor Avineri, and ladies and gentlemen! Based on the applause, I would be better off sitting down!

I've prepared some remarks, which, since I'm compulsive, I will share with you. But before I do so, there are certain remarks made by Professor Avineri that I think that I would like to deal with, to lend some perspective to the comments that I've prepared.

Professor Avineri, you lump and don't differentiate
American Jewish community response on such issues as the
Golan Heights, settlements, the attack on the nuclear reactor,
and the Pollard case. First, while there was no organized
or unified American Jewish criticism on the issues of the
Golan Heights settlements, Iraqi reactor, a whole slew
of others -- there was criticism. And there was vocal
criticism. And it appeared in the New York Times and the

Washington Post and the Jerusalem Post. So it's not a slate on which you say garnicht, and then suddenly the explosion. So in perspective American Jews, we didn't . . . there were plenty of organized Jewish voices who to this day challenge settlement and provide different points of view.etc.

But you're right. Pollard was different. Because Pollard, in the view of the organized Jewish community, was somewhat different in terms of a disagreement on Israel's policy, a disagreement which went, if you will, to a policy disagreement of geopolitics, self-interest, between the government of the United States and the government of the State of Israel. And so to this day you can have arguments and debates — and the State Department has positions, and your government has positions: settlements bring peace or settlements hinder peace. And you have legal documents on both sides. the attack on . . .Iraq — there were political geopolitical differences between the two allies, the two friends. Was it necessary? Did it hurt America's relationship to the Middle East, to what extent is America going to suffer as an ally, and on all these issues.

Pollard, Professor Avineri, is totally different. It is not a disagreement of policy where the State Department and the Israeli Government differed. At least from what I read, they are united in terms of the issue and the mistake and the gravity of it. But the difference in terms of the Jewish community and its unified voice, related to the fact that the Pollard affair went to the essence of the relationship that exists between the two countries. It's not a disagreement that the State Department or the Dofense Department may have. It went to the essence of a relation-

ship built thirty-nine years, yours and 'ours, laboured hard, without fear and cringing -- it developed that special relationship, based on what? Not disagreement of policy! There have been and there will be. But based on the essence of mutual trust, mutual understanding, mutual credibility. Pollard incident and the event and its aftermath went to undermine the credibility, the mutual trust, the mutual interest; which as far as we were concerned the American government will see totally different issues of disagreement in terms of policy. We didn't Schrei ChaiGivalt on Irangate -- although that also touched on your credibility.

So there are two interests involved. But this, this went to the essence, to the basic foundations, of what we jointly worked to establish in thirty-nine years. You want Greece? Well, Spiro Agnew didn't steal for Greece. But you want the relationship between the United States and Greece? I don't want it. The United States has a clear, mutual interest relationship with Turkey and Greece, and it's cold and clear and proper. Now, the Greek Americans do exercise their voice once in a while, and have a lobby, and other things, but is that what is the essence? And if you compare the other communities, the relationship between these two countries, these communities, is that special relationship, which goes beyond mutual interest. So we don't respond as other communities have on issues of this nature.

Shlomo, I don't think we put the question of American Jewish loyalty in question; I think Israel has. I think Israel in its actions in the Pollard case -- it was the one that highlighted, not we - - the question to the public. And I wonder how many American Jews waved their flags and put out their medals -- and it goes back to your metaphor that we are like

the Jews of Iran (from your article), under Khomeiny, that American Jews are like the Jews of Egypt under Sadat, and this medals -- yes, I know the story of how in Germany they marched with the medals. I don't know how many Jews preached and talk about metals. I spent a week or ten days in this country, and I've had the feeling expressed by the response to you Shlomo -- and you are right! I think the Israeli people and leadership tend to agree with you. And I say this with all the debth of my sincerity: that troubles me.

And now, to my prepared remarks.

Rabbi Goldman indicated that maybe the only positive result of the Pollard affair is that we the two communities, the American Jewish community and the Israeli community, hopefully will begin to relate to one another more honestly. Maybe we will do so more responsibly, respectfully, and constructively define or redefine our relationship. The subject this evening, "Is America Galuth" is provocative -- certainly its been with us for many many years, and academically interesting. But I'm not sure that after we resolve the question and come to some conclusion about it if we can -that it is or it isn't Galuth -- that it will accomplish very much. What consequences would that determination have, and how meanigful would it be to our relationship. When I go back it troubles me that there are so many Israelis who feel that the answer or their feeling or their predisposition is so central. Regardless of the answer we agree upon, will it change our relationship?

Professor Avineri, I accept that America is not the promised land for world Jewry -- although tens of thousands of

of Israelis who flock to the United States may believe so. America certainly is Golah -- Diaspora -- but you interchange the terms of Golah and Galuth -- and somehow there is a difference. The term Galuth seems to have a great deal of meaning, and even passion, to Israelis, and in truth Professor Avineri, it is of very little important consequence to American Jewry. For many Israelis it is a term of genai, a pegorative term. You talked about value and fact. That's different from what I read in your article. It wasn't then a value and a fact. It was a value and a value, and the second value was far from being positive. I don't know why there is a need to rationalize the being and presence, but if so, if the rejection of the Galuth is the centrality of the positive value of what is Israel, then I am troubled personally and for my children.

Do Israeli's need to reject Galuth to legitimatize, maintain or justify their experience? And if they do, to what extent does it shape the relationship between our two communities? American Jews who do not see or consider themselves as living on probation, as you say, also do not see themselves as living in an emancipated environment. But certaintly they do not perceive themselves as living in the classical sense of the word Galuth. And even if they did, the question still remains: How, if they would, does it shape the relationship between our two communities?

Yes Galuth or No Galuth is totally irrelevant to the majority of American Jews and their relationship with Israel. What shaped the American Jewish community response to Pollard and to other issues relating to the crisis, is our perception of ourselves. And we as American Jews are not squeamish about our Jewish identity. And I don't hear that in very many circles the concept that we are the New Pompidea. We are not squeamish about our Jewish identity, out attachments, support, commitments -- be they philanthropic, financial, political -- in terms of support of this country.

Our abhorrence of Pollard was because we believe it hurt Israel -- and it hurt our ability, our credibility, our voice, to help Israel. Not because we saw hobgoblins, not because we were paranoid, and not because we were imagining antisemitism.

What is important today, is for us to use this moment in our relationship to look at each other more honestly, and say to each other honestly (as you've indicated), let's learn to live with each other without name calling, or if you will, outdated political philosophical cliches. Pollard and its aftermath has left scars on our relationship. And I think we should be able to face up to them with time and understanding. Did those roques or others who planned the Pollard affair, consider for one moment the fate of American Jewry, when they planned their exploits of espionnage? Or was it because we are Galuth jews that even that question was not significant? Did the Israeli's involved worry as to the impact on American Jewry or the imagery of Jonathan Pollard in front of the gates of the Israel Embassy, whose gates were slammed while three Israelis were flown to safety? I believe we are uncomfortable with each other today because for years we were not honest with one another. It was and it continues to be today a relationship based on sloganeering. Am Achat. We are one, we are partners, we are shareholders, we are equals.

But you never really meant it, except in the abstract. For in a crisis, when a consensus was necessary, or for fund raising. And maybe while you didn't mean it, you becan to believe it. But worse still many of us in Galuth believed it, accepted it, and acted upon these slogans. And so when Pollard happened, many of us realized that we may not really be one -- or at least if we are one, we may not be equal. And when we expressed ourselves as American citizens, you became arrogant, and resorted to calling us names, of Galuth mentality, living in a soured promised land.

I believe now is the time to say that while we as a people are one -- certainly in the philosophical and in the religious sense, for we share the history, the culture, the religion, the pain, the suffering, the joy and the hope -- we are not really equal We are not equal not because we are Galuth and you are emancipated. We are not equal because our responsibilities and our liabilities are not equal to yours. And it's not a question of whether we have a right to challenge, criticize or speak out. We have a right, as long as we both live in a democracy. But the reason we have or have not spoken out before is not a barometer of the antisemitic hobgoblins that supposedly hover in our paranoia. It is a question not of right but of responsibility. Your decision-making carries with it liabilities and consequences; ours does not. Ours --No, our's also does, but not to the same degree of life and death. Yours is a prime responsibility; ours is a secondary one. And if we are shareholders, there are class A and class B shareholders. You vote. You are the total determinors

of your fate. We do not vote, but share in your fate. Neither you nor we should pretend to be what we are not. And this whole debate of Galuth, the value and the fact, the responsibility and the relationship, I think is totally out of context with the realities that I see in our relationship.

And if we begin to appreciate and respect each other honestly and realistically, it will really matter little whether American Jewry lives in Galuth or live in the promised land. Then our relationship will be defined not by philosophy or ideology, but those who live the relationship of mutual respect, and that will be the strength of our future relationship. I want my children to love Israel and be involved with her, and hopefully plan Aliyah, not because they live a Galuth life of insecurity, but because they believe this is part of their past, their present, and their future. My daughter Michaela next month is taking the B'china Yrushalmi, the Jerusalem exam, prove that she in a Galuth environment can be part of your experience; she's taking it to affirm and join in the common experience with your children, as part of our past, present and future.

Thank you.

Rabbi Goldman: Thank you very much. Professor Avineri?

Professor Avineri: I'm not sure if at this stage there is much I would like to add -- perhaps two points.

I said it somewhere, and I should probably say it again: In no way whatever am I saying in this context should be understood as if I am taking any blame off the people who are responsible for Pollard. The people who were responsible for the Pollard affair, the Israelis

involved, did not only fail to consider the consequence for American Jewry -- they did not consider the consequences for Israel. And therefore this is such a major issue. So I agree. They disregarded the consequences for Pollard, or for American Jews, not because they are Galuth Jews, but because they were irresponsible. Period. So let's get this straight.

Now, when it comes to what you said about where do we go from here, let me say that I still believe -and this is not sloganeering -- that we are one. But when we say that were are one, we do not mean that we are uniform. We are very different. We are one, and different. And let me take an example from another field of Jewish life. When I say we are one, as a very secular Jew, I feel a deep feeling of identity -- not identification -with an orthodox Jew. I know what he thinks of me. Because of politeness I am not goingto say what I think of him. Still, we are one. He looks down on me, and he is entitled to his views; and because of politeness I am not going to say what I think about him and how I look down on him and in which century I would like to place him -- and this is my view which does not detract as far as I am concerned from my caring and feeling and identification with him despite the fact that we disagree. And I think that we can have something similar between the relationship between Israel and Diaspora Jewry.

Dear Abe, yes, I think there is Galuth. And
I think that Galuth is pejorative. Just as a religious
person thinks that I as a Hofshi (as he thinks) -- he

uses the term pejoratively. And I may use some terms relating to Orthodox Jews in a pejorative way. There's nothing bad in it, so long as we are able to live together. And if you think there is something wrong in living in Eretz Yisroel, say it. And we'll disagree over it. (But obviously you don't think so.) The relationship is not a parallel relationship. The relationship is a relationship of basic imbalance. Whatever you see you say, You don't look down on Israel -- you may criticize things in Israel, but you don't look down on Israel. Because there are things in Israel that are crucial to your identity as a Jew. There is a lot of American Jewry that I love, but none of it is critical to my identity as a Jew. And this is the difference between a value and a fact -- and we can't get away from it.

I would like to see our future relationship
emancipated from one aspect. I just want to mention it
very briefly. For most American Jews, for most Israeli
Jews who are not involved in that kind of theoretical or
ideological debate, the relationship between Diaspora,
especially American Jewry, and Israel, is mediated
through a cash nexus. And I am using on purpose a pejorative
term. The cash nexus. The American Jewish financial support
for Israel. Magbiot, as Israelis use a term which I
hate, "shnob", as if voluntary taxation is inferior to
legal taxation which you have to pay on a penalty of going
to prison. I would like to see a situation in which this
relationship between Israel and the Diaspora will be emancipated from Jewish contributions to Israel. I'm saying
something very radical. And I am saying something radical

that if we think it through is not going to hurt Israel. It may hurt the American Jewish community much more than Israel. As you know, more than half of the funds which are collected by the United Jewish Appeal do not go today to Israel, but are used locally for community purposes. More than half! In some communities, it is much more than half. And we all know but do not say publicly, that if the American Jewish community would have to collect that amount of money, that half, without using Israel as a rallying symbol, it would probably not be able to do it. It is because of Israel that American Jewish community life is getting the funds for its own internal purposes. This means we are in a simbiotic relationship, that you depend on us as much as we depend on you. My guess is that you depend on us financially much more than we depend on you.

The political issue is a different one, the political support. But financially, bluntly: if tomorrow the UJA stops and Israel does not get the \$450 million which the UJA brings to Israel each year, it will be a hardship for Israel, but there are ways including political ways, of making up for that money. Will the American Jewish community then be able to raise that amount of money which now stays in the United States, without using Israel in the slogans, in the appeal? The answer is, "No!" And I think we all agree . . . We don't? So good, we don't.

In that case, if you don't agree, why not agree that we emancipate our relationship from the cash nexus, and talk about spiritual ties, political ties, intellectual ties, religious ties, and get away. Once the American Jewish

support for Israel was tremendous in its impact; now it is not. Most Israelis do not know it. Most American Jews do not know it; when you ask the average American or the average Israeli, what percentage of the Israeli state budget comes from American Jewish funds. The answer is very simple. Our state budget is about \$25 billion: less than one half of \$1 billion comes from world Jewry. Two percent, which I greatly acknowledge, most people don't think its 2%; some people think its 70%, 40%, 50%. Go around after you leave this hall, and ask your next Jewish Israeli friend, what percentage of the Israeli state budget is being supported by American Jewry. Will you get 2% answer? And this is poisoning our relationship on both sides. It is creating a relationship of false dependency. It is creating a relationship of gratitude or ingratitude which is not the case. And we should be able -- Israel is strong enough and its economy today is rich enough (because Israel is today, we are paying in debt servicing, almost as much as it is getting from American Government grants, and this is again something which we do not know). We live in a world of shadows, where the reality of our economic relationship is not up-front. And it does poison our relationship. It will do Israel a lot of good if it will have to do without that money, a lot of reforms that otherwise we won't have to take , we would have to take under that kind of pressure . It is not going to be fantastic pressure, it's going to be marginal; it will hurt. Very good! It's fine if Jewish organizations will help Jewish organizations here, but the relationship of community to community,

the State to the United States Jewry, we might not have needed it. Let us seriously think, precisely because our duties are different from your duties, to emancipate ourselves from the cash nexus. And then perhaps part of the debate will be in a completely different level. I just wanted to introduce this as a further element of where do we go from here, because I agree with Abe that we may agree or disagree on the philosophical issue of Galuth, and the question is what is the upshot. Some of the upshot is I think encapsulated in what I have said now, which is a preview of my second letter to an American friend.

(Applause)

Mr. Foxman: Shlomo, we don't disagree on the fact that the cash nexus does damage, possibly even poison, the relationship. I think, however, that philosophically we can argue to what extent American Jewish institutions are dependent on the Shrei Givult of Israel fundraising -- but I wouldn't state it categorically as a fact, as you do. I'd be willing to try it. I'd be willing to try.

Unfortunately, here is again the imbalance of the relationship. That initiative has to come from here. You have to say to American Jewry, Genug! I remember I came to Israel on a Mechona Kaitz of 1958 — that was the first time I came to Israel. We had home hospitality. And I would up with a group in Professor Michael Lebowitz' home. He gave us a lecture. He said, "Go home and tell your parents, don't give money to the UJA, although this is 1958, don't give money to the UJA. There is no United India Appeal; there is United Burma Appeal; they've survived and they will

survive, and you help us become emancipated!" Needless to say, no Jewish Agency groups since then has been ... But! The initiative has to come from you. I am willing to take the risk that you say is a fact, that we would have trouble. Shlomo very facilely-- and I agree that there is a misperception in terms of how much percentage . . . and I think that the psychological cost to the relationship is tremendous, whether it is the poor cousin, whether it is the rich uncle, it is horrendous. And it does interfere. But again, Rabboysai, it's got to come from you. You have to say no. But at the same time you talk very facilely about political -- well we understand there's a political. The political, even though it's got to be paid back, produces \$3 billion. And part of the ability to produce that \$3 billion, whether you like it or not, is part of the American Jewish community funds that are raised, maybe under the umbrella of Israel (because the Anti Defamation League of B'nai Brith has a program, political and otherwise and has Barah, and educational) -- in terms of support of that special relationship which delivers not 2% but a little bit more and which has throughout the years, and part of the strength of the institutions are the federations and their impact and relationship with congressmen and senators and media in terms of what we believe as American citizens is in the interest, comes out of that whether we like it or not, our fundraising pocket as well. So, it works both ways. I do think it is worth taking the risk. I do think it will clear some of the constraints in a more honest relationship. But certainly that is only the beginning. And we've got a long way to go.

(Applause)

Rabbi Goldman: Well, I am sure that there are questions in the audience. The way we are going to handle the questions is as follows: we're going to move this stand (Would you move it?) a little bit to the center (Thanks). If you would like to ask a question of A. Foxman or Shlomo Avineri, please line up behind the stand. What we're going to do is this: our speakers will gather the questions. In other words, we are not going to answer the questions immediately. (Maspik, Maspik) We will not answer the questions immediately but will gather them, and then each speaker will answer accordingly.

Before we get to the first lady who is standing there patiently, we are very grateful-the B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation at Hebrew University — is very grateful to the Center for Conservative Judaism and K'ilat Moreshet Israel for opening this beautiful synagogue to us this evening. They've asked me to announce that the Fourth Israel Goldstein Lecture on the Holocaust will take place on Monday evening, April 27th at 8:00 p.m. right here. The speaker will be Dr. Sidra Ezrachi. The topic will be "Memories and Myths: the Holocaust as History and as Fiction".

Please, before you ask your questions, please introduce yourself. Give us your name and where you are from.

Question: My name is Annette Barnet. I am past Executive Secretary of B'nai Brith Hillel in New York in 1945. First of all, you're both right from where you sit. But Abe, wasn't that a kind of a cheap shot to talk about the tens of thousands of Israelis who live in America. There are hundreds of thousands of Americans who left America; it

doesn't diminish America one bit. They live all over the world. America's value and merits are not diminished at all, and neither is ours.

My question is, don't you both think that the question of financial support of the "majority" of American Jews (which is really a small minority) will take care of itself in 30 years? You won't need a Professor Lebowitz to tell them to stop sending. Don't you think they'll stop sending because they'll be 5th generation Americans, without a memory of a Holocaust, without a memory of a jewish Bubby; and the fundraising will of necessity have a very different picture thirty years from now?

(Applause)

Rabbi Goldman: Thank you.

Question: Zvi Weinberg, from Jerusalem. I address myself particularly to Mr. Foxman. You indicated that you did not feel that America was the promised land -- and I assume therefore that you don't agree with Jacob Neusener's pieces on America being the promised land? However, I didn't hear you specifically address whether you confirm that America was indeed Galuth or not. And I think that this is important. You seem to imply that it is important whether -- that it is unimportant whether American Jews feel in Galuth or not vis-a-vis their relationship to Israel. Aed I agree with you. But I think it is vitally important to the American Jewish community to sense if it is in Galuth or not -- for its own sake. Where it is, and how it is going to live as Jews in America, and how they are going to fulfill themselves as Jews in America. The sense of Galuth will not affect how American Jews will relate to Israel, perhaps. But it will have a profound affect on how American Jews relate to themselves, and how they want to seek their fulfillment as Jews. And I think that those of us in Israel, or many of us in Israel, are concerned whether American Jews feel in Galuth or not. Not because of the implications for Israel, but because we are concerned with the American Jewish community, where it is, and what its future is going to be. For that reason I would like to address how you feel about American Jews being in Galuth or not, and its implications for the American Jewish Community where it is now. Thank you.

Question: My name is Ira Garshowitz, from Jerusalem, originally from Toronto. Before I ask my question to Mr. Foxman I will have to preface it, or course. I realize that everybody doesn't want to hear any more statements than are necessary: there's been enough said tonight. When we talk about the Am Echod and the responsibility and the partnership and the togetherness factor of the communities here (in Israel and the Jewish community abroad), Mr. Foxman, I don't have to bring up the old can of worms issue of Israel providing the blood, America providing the dollars, the class A and B shareholders with voting rights and non-voting rights as you presented it . . . I read your article in response to Professor Avineri's in the Post that appeared about a month ago. Your last sentence really threw me off. To give you the quote: "For us Pollard is a criminal; for you he may be a Zionist hero."

I just briefly want to say where I was during the Seder . . .

Rabbi Goldman: Could you ask a question? Please, ask a question.

Mr. Garshowitz: It's important. I'd like to make this point. That I was, as a North American Oleh who has gone through the Army here, I was on duty during the Seder, so I missed it. Now I don't know how many North American Jews can relate to missing the Seder, or if you havenay idea how many Israelis were not home with their families for the Seder. That's the point I want to make. As the average layman who is totally unfamiliar with the military equation when this whole situation with Pollard arose, wouldn't you feel more comfortable just not saying anything? Instead of calling him a criminal? Taking into account that for example the black community in the United States did not have to come out and make any statement about the two Marine guards who were involved in this scandal. The consequences of Pollard's spying, whether he was right or he was wrong, wouldn't it be enough for you as an American Jew to know that what he turned over to Israel, under whose auspices is irrelevant, but maybe one life, maybe a hundred lives, maybe a hundred thousand lives may have been saved? Thank you.

(Applause)

Rabbi Goldman: One minute please. With all due respect to the speaker, we are not looking for statements, we are looking for questions. So please, ask questions. Thank you.

Question: Hi. My name is <u>David Brodsky</u> from Hebrew University. I have two quick questions. The first question is to Professor Avineri specifically. It's a "what if" question, but I'd like to hear, if you could possibly answer it.

Specifically, without American Jews' help in the establishment of Israel, and without the help in the lobbying

such as AIPAC and other groups, the ADL, would you think that the value that Israel has intelligence—wise throughout the world, what they've done with the Soviet weaponry, that they've helped the Americans, that aid and economic aid, would be at the same level? Would it be higher? Would it be lower? without American Jewry? How much of an effect does that have, first of all?

And second of all, with the current atmosphere on this issue and with the government in general having problems relating to the Middle East Peace Converence, how do you think an American Ambassador can function and relate to American Jewry given that he doesn't have a government that stands behind him and he has his own views which are diametrically opposed to the Galuth mentality that American Jews have?

Question: Moshe Oman. I'm from Jerusalem -- I came to Jerusalem from the United States more years ago than I care to remember or mention at this point. I'd like to put the question to both speakers. And the question is, whether they would respond to a restatement of the topic tonight? I think that the topic is slightly -- I think that on the question of whether America is exile or not, there is more or less agreement between the two speakers. At least that was my feeling, that the issue was not whether America should be considered or defined as Galuth ornot. The question as I felt it, the specific question that was raised here, was whether the reaction of American Jewry as a whole, or the representatives and the spokesmen of American Jewry, thought

the Pollard affair was a correct or a wrong reaction. And I would like to put this in terms of a point that was not mentioned at all tonight. And that is this: that American Jewry and Israel have a great deal in common -and I think it is a correct statement to say that we are one. On most issues, on 95 to 99% of the issues that have been faced by the United States and Israel, there has been no conflict of interest between us. And since there was no conflict there was no great difficulty in giving expression to this oneness. Now, in the case of the Pollard affair, there was a conflict of interest, both nationally, and certainly in the case of Mr. Pollard himself who was involved in this. And the question was, whether Mr. Pollard did the right thing or did the wrong thing when he decided to do what he did. And I think that the reaction of the leaders of American Jewry -- and I'd like to have the response of the speakers to this proposition -- the reaction of the leaders and the spokesmen of American Jewry, on this particular question of whether Pollard did right or did wrong, was the natural reaction and the correct reaction, because Mr. Pollard when he reached the point where he felt that his responsibility or his allegiance to Israel was greater than that to the United States, he at that point should have packed his bags and come to Israel, even if that meant that Israel would have had to go without a lot of secrets that perhaps we received as a result of his activities. Thank you. Question: Ron Campius, from Montreal, Sidney and Jerusalem, with a variety of stopovers. I have a short . .

Interruption: What is your name?

Mr. Campius: Ron Campius. I have a short two-part

question. It was asserted in the Jerusalem Post the other day that the central aspect of this controversy is the popular confusion over who exactly speaks officially for Israel in the United States, the American Jewish community leaders, or the representatives of Israel?

The first part I address to Abe Foxman: to what extent do you acknowledge that confusion? And the second part I address to Shlomo Avineri: who would you blame for that confusion?

Question: My name is David Hornick. I live in Jerusalem. I have a question for Mr. Foxman. Most Israelis feel that our government indeed acted very badly toward Jonathan and Anne Pollard. Partly as an expression of that guilt, as I'm sure you know, an organization of Israeli citizens has formed and has so far raised a very large amount of money for the Pollards, is planning to send it to them or already has -- I'm not sure, has organized a very large letter-writing campaign, without necessarily -- they have not related it to the issue of whether it is wrong or right to spy-but they have very clearly said that those two are individuals who need help and who deserve mercy. Because, after all, if he is a criminal, he has been sentenced to life imprisonment, which would seem to be sufficient punishment. In you opinion, Mr. Foxman, should this Israeli organization exist? Are they right or wrong to be doing what they are doing? And should there be a similar effort among American Jews to do the same thing?

Question: My name is <u>Jacob Jupiter</u>, and I live in Florida.

I left the United States about a week ago, so I'm rather

up to date on what has appeared on the Pollard affair. And my question is for Mr. Foxman, not as an individual but as a representative of ADL. Two things have come to light. One, that the United States has spied on Israel since 1972. And I've heard nothing that ADL or the Jewish community took up publicly, the cry that Israel spied on America, and America spied on Israel. Number two, the spying that Pollard did for Israel revealed all the kinds of intelligence data which represented an enormous threat to the security of Israel, like the Iraq . . .

Interruption: How do you know?

Mr. Jupiter: If you're asking the question receptively, being willing to hear what I have to say, I will be glad to answer it. The data that appeared as to what Pollard revealed to the Israeli government -- and this was written in the New York Times -- were all the data that had to do with the PLO, that had to do with the Iraqi reactor, which had to do with matters solely affecting the security of the State of Israel. Now that's not my point that that's less of spying. But my point is that if America and Israel have truly a kind of allied relationship, I would think that America would reveal these data to Israel anyway, without having to be spied upon. That's the whole point I'm making.

And my real point is, why I haven't heard from the Jewish community in America as publicly an attack on the American government in the same way as they were defensive about it before?

(Applause)

Rabbi Goldman: We're going to take five more questions,

so Allen, you are the last one.

Question: My name is Fred Warms. I am the chairman of the B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation in England. My first question is, one, shouldn't we get the semantics right? I think that tonight's title, "Is America in the Diaspora", there can only be one answer. And that is "yes!", because diaspora means dispersion. But if we talk about Galuth, that is a completely different thing. The Russions consider themselves in Gallus, and the Syrians consider themselves in Gallus, and there is a big difference between diaspora, exile, and galuth—and I'd like the panel to confirm this particular point.

But the reason I've got up is a completely different one. I feel a question -- because I am very uncomfortable about the word "uncomfortable" as used by Shlomo Avineri. And I remember some ten years ago, you used it in my house in London when you were there. I am uncomfortable, because should not the Israelis be extremely uncomfortable about the Pollard affair? The fact that the American Jews -- and I'm not one of them, therefore I can speak freely -- have we acted as they did, to my mind is perfectly natural. The fact that the Israelis once again expected a knee-jerk reaction, an automatic approval which Abe has told you has been forthcoming automatically for the last thirty-eight years; that it didn't materialize this time shook the Israelis and therefore they became -- and particularly you Shlomo -aggressive. Now is that fair?

(Applause)

Question: Helen Simonson of Jerusalem. The temptation, you know, after these two stimulating addresses, for any Jew to keep quiet, and just ask a question, is almost impossible. But I'm going to try.

I think it's very obvious that there is a tremendous gap -- and I've been living in Israel long enough to feel the gap -- in understanding between American Jews and Israeli Jews. I think that was made very obvious by the two addresses that we heard. And with all due respect to Professor Shlomo Avineri, I had to beg to differ with him when I read his article etcetera etcetera. My question is, is it possible in some utopian future, to establish some kind of a dialogue for an understanding -oh I know the attempt was made tonight, but that's just a beginning, and I think it has to be done on a very practical, Amcha basis -- of establishing a dialogue between American Jews, American Jews living in Israel if you please, and the Israeli who goes to America and stays there and still doesn't understand American Jews, or certainly living here doesn't understand American Jewry. And I think the gap is so tremendous that we are in danger of separation that is going to redound evilly both to the Israeli Jew and to the American Jew.

(Applause)

Rabbi Goldman: Thank you.

Question: My name is Yael Schomberg, and I don't know exactly where I come from. I come from Tunisia, from France, England, so anyway.

A while ago there has been an incident mentioned on the radio about the American Jeaders inviting Jean-Marie LePeigne. And this has been something which I thought was very irresponsible from American Jewry. And

I would like both of you, if you can talk to me about the psychology of who was . . . can two people in Galuth, French people, American people, I don't know. The psychology of this incident perhaps this particular instance could actually answer the problem of "Is American Jewry in Exile?" To invite a man who is really antisemitic and who is very well known, it would be like if the French people or the Israeli people would invite the Ku Klux Clan people in Israel. So I would like both of you to give me your response about the psychology of this particular point. Rabbi Goldman: Thank you.

Question: My name is David Hartman. I'm from Jerusalem. I'd like to address both of you in a particular question.

a) Shlomo, there is an "if-then" argument. In other words, you are offering an analysis of the response of American Jewry to Pollard. Your claim is that you c annot make sense of that response unless you define that reality or the mentality of the Jew in America as a Galuth mentality. This, I think, one can argue strongly with you -- and I personally, this is not the moment because I am not entering into a debate with you -- but I think that the response of American Jewry to Pollard does not require that kind of claim. The claim could be embarrassment, the claim could be because of their love for Israel, the claim could be because it exposed the vulnerability of Jewish double loyalty, which cannot in any way analogously be compared to a Greek or to an Irish person. There is dual loyalty. That's fundamental to being a Jew, and if American Jews stop having dual loyalty

then they stop being Jewish. And that's fundamental. And what Pollard showed was that in some way we thought that never would Jews ever do this type of embarrassing thing and expose or compromise that dual loyalty -- that it was possible for them to live harmoniously with each other. However, the term Galuth, is American Jewry Galuth, is a metaphysical question, is an ideological question. If you live spiritually then you claim G-d only lives in Eretz Yisroel so therefore by definition American Jewry is Galuth. In other words, I think the question "Is American Jewry Galuth" should be distinguished from the American-Jewish response to the Pollard framework. I think that argument is an important argument. And I don't hear, Abe, how you in any way need to hedge and haw with percentages and you are disappointed -- I don't know what your disappointment is all about. I mean the question is if your grandchild will come in aliya or not aliya. But fundamentally you believe, and I know you, and I think you say this, that a full Jewish life is only possible in Israel, and that ultimately anyone who doesn't live in Israel is living a marginal Jewish existence. And you do not believe as Neusener claims . . therefore . . . I would say that the question is

- a) Why do you need, Shlomo, the thesis of Galuth in order to explain Pollard?
- b) Why, Abe, are you embarrassed to say that you are in Galuth?
- c) Why, Shlomo, do you have to compare the democracy of America to the Parrits? I think that's a strange analogy. This is not arbitrary. There is a committment to a collective life, a democracy -- and to see the sense of being at home in America as in some

way similar to the way the Jews felt in Russia, is a mistake of the Jewish experience.

(Applause)

Question: My name is Allen Rothman, from Jerusalem, and I'll get to my question right away. Most of the discussion this evening has examined the relationship between the Israeli and the American Jewish community as accentuated by the Pollard affair; I'd like to hear some comments, especially from Mr. Foxman, on this relationship in the light of another "affair" so to speak, which I think is of equal importance, and it is being discussed daily here. And that is, the potential aliyah of Russian immigrants to Israel or to America, and if the Israeli government policy will be another source of embarrassment or the opening of some new arguments on the horizon.

Mr. Foxman: I took notes on the questions that required a response from me.

The first question dealt with financial aid, that we don't have to worry because it will stop in thirty years. Where are you? I'm an optimist. I don't buy malthusian rejections on what will happen to American Jewry. I think there were people twenty years ago who said this was the generation that witnessed the Holocaust that -- oh, yes, two generations ago -- we said this was the generation that witnessed the Holocaust, that witnessed the rebirth of Jerusalem and Israel, you know, the next generation. Look at the next generation of American Jews: Diaspora! Golah! Galuth! Exile! It doesn't matter. You have a young, Jewish vibrant leadership throughout the

country that care, that come here, that give of themselves, time, money, etc. I am an optimist. I believe in the institutions. I don't believe that they are C'moh Jerusalem, but the Institutions are vibrant. Another generation will grow. This generation which twenty years ago we had no hope for, is raising a generation of children who do relate, do respond, and care. So we're going to have to face the problem, in this generation. You're going to have to say, "enough", and we're going to have to deal with it.

The next question that I have is, going back to the gentleman who wants to know how we feel about Galuth. I'm sorry. We're not hung up on it. We do not need to resolve for ourselves as American Jewry the question. I think most American Jews, if you ask them and they think about it, will agree that they are in Diaspora. But so what? The fact that they are or they aren't, should not mean that they will not have Jewish institutions. It does not impact on whether they send their kids to Jewish school in any case. It's not central to their Jewishness. Central to their Jewishness is their relationship to Israel. To you here it is very important. It isn't. It is not a subject of debate in organized, creative American Jewish life, whether they are or they are or they are not in Galuth. And it does not impact one way or the other in terms of the vitality of institutions or the future of it. And very honestly, I don't want to raise that question, because I don't know what it will achieve. Some and let's discuss how meaningful all those institutions are, what they mean to the future, yes. But

whether we believe ourselves in Galuth and therefore are ______, I think is irrelevant.

The gentleman who went to the Seder in the army, I don't know how to deal with. And I think you yourself said, we don't compare -- I don't know -- very few American Jews have to celebrate a Seder not at home if they wanted to celebrate a Seder. Pollard is a criminal: you may not like the sound of the word, but he is. He violated American law. For another purpose -and I'll deal with a couple of these. The gentle an from Florida, Mr. Jupiter, you say with such certainty two things: You say with such certainty that Americans spied on Israel, and why is the ADL and other Jewish organizations silent? I don't know. As a case that has been proven, as a case that has been brought, do you want us to speak out? And if yes, and if yes, think of heishman on effesh. What's the relationship. So if Chas m'chalil America spied on Israel, Israel will sever its relationship with the United States? That's what is at stake? Think about it. First of all, the claim has not been proven. If it's been proven, you have a right to ask American Jewish organizations where is your voice.

And then as Professor Avineri indicated to you, we are not aware of the facts that you are aware of, in terms of how essential the data was etc. But it is not for me to give scenarios. A Jonathan Pollard who found information as you claim -- there are fourteen ways to deal with it. There are ways of going to the supervisor, challenging, asking, you quit the job and go public, and you can embarrass. . . But you know, you are assuming -- I don't know the answer to these questions.

And here you want to make value judgments in terms of what should or shouldn't be the American Jewish community's response.

Mr. Oman, the reaction of American Jewish -- I think we've answered it. We felt that our response was correct. Professor Avineri and some others here felt it wasn't. I don't know where to go beyond that.

Who speaks for Israel? Israel speaks for Israel. Your representatives, your ambassador, your counsel, speak for Israel. We the American Jewish community speak on issues relating to Israel, which we believe mesh in America's interest, or which we believe America should recognize and accept because it is in its interest. You want the truth? American administration officials in this and other administrations have said it's easier to deal with the Israeli representatives. Because we don't have a monolithic point of view, and we sometimes take a further position. But there is no real confusion. The Secretary of State knows exactly, if he wants to know what the position is, your representative in Washington has problems, but that's another issue in terms of determining what a policy is. It is very clear to the State Department, to the Pentagon, to the Administration, who speaks for Israel. The American Jewish community's voice on Israel and the Middle East is an American citizenry's voice. And it is a cacaphony of voices, depending on the issues which relate to different calibrations. There really is no confusion. There may be confusion here, but there is none there.

Money for Pollard? I think it would be cata-

strophic if Pollard would in the next few months or few years be lyonized in this country as a hero. Whether or not your government -- and again it goes into many questions of rogue or not rogue and what responsibility he has -- I think if you projected now for whatever reason a campaign which in effect is putting him up on a pedastal, saying that he did right, I think it would continue to hurt the relationship between the peoples of the United States and of Israel, and I think it would be counterproductive. The same thing of course goes for the United States.

I think I've dealt with Mr. Jupiter. Dr. Warms, Fred, I think we agree on Diaspora, but we disagree on Galuth. And the subject was Galuth, not Diaspora.

Mrs. Davidson, we are beginning the dialogue. I resented your saying that we are not Amcha. I believe this is part of the debate and discussion and the dialogue with Amcha. And certainly with you. Yes, we have to begin.

Yael, I would not like, because -- you raise the question of LaPeine, a very serious question -- I'm not sure now is the time to explain to the audience the background to the story. I will just say one fact. I agree that a meeting of this nature, for those of you who don't know, Marie LaPeine is the head of the National Front Party in France: he came to the United States, and a meeting was organized for him for leaders of the American Jewish community. Many of them showed up and met. It is interesting -- and this is off the record -- it was done in the greater interest of Israel. I think it was a mistake, but let's deal with that personally; I don't think we have to discuss it with anybody else.

Duvy, thanks a lot (Duvy Hartman). You know how I feel. You stated it: whether I like it or not, I am not here to bare my personal soul. I am here to a certain extent to speak organizationally. And of course, to me personally, it is Golah, Galuth. I teach my children, I bring them here, I teach them in the spirit, that I hope that they will make the choice. It would be a happy moment in my life if that is the choice that they make. We schlepped them, we schlepped them, we schlepped them, and a year ago, my daughter said, "Do you think it's possible that I could go to Israel for the summer?" And we said, well, we don't know, financially and all. We went into the bedroom, my wife and I. We hugged each other, and said "It worked!" 'Of course. But that doesn't answer the question between the communities, their self-perceptions.

My personal feeling is relevant to me in my relationship to you, but not necessarily institutionally.

Finally -- I don't think I have to answer finally. Oh! The question of Aliyah from Russia. I don't think -- yes, there is disagreement, yes, there is a conflict, I don't think it is of the nature of Pollard. It does raise an irony. We, American Jews have been criticized and attacked for the Chutzpah of coming here and sharing with Israeli leadership, with the Israeli public, what we think -- not what the government should do -- but what we think the fallout of Pollard is; and if asked, we make some recommendations. And that was terrible, and that was overstepping the bounds, even though the ADL took thirty-nine years to

do it. And nobody finds any problem with the Prime Minister of your country coming to the United States, ignoring the American Jewish community, going to the Secretary of State, going to members of Congress, going then to the Jewish community, telling us what he asked them to do, and that we should be supportive of changing our legislation. I don't think it's going to be a major problem. I think if properly presented, I think the American Jewish community, while uncomfortable, may. be quite supportive, as the goal for Soviet Jews to come to Israel. And there are many ways of expressing it. There is a Soviet Jewish community in Brighton. I think if the American Jewish community was explained to and educated, I think that we could be investing money, and those Soviet 'Jewish kids living in Brighton Beach could spend summers in Israel, and we could make scholarships -- and all of that would deliver a message. I think there will be support in the American Jewish community short of tampering with legislation. And here, I have a problem coming to my Congressman and saying to him that I want him to change him to change the law on refugee status which only applies to Jews and Jews from the Soviet Union. You know, it's unreal. It's not a question of double loyalty. I think it's asking too much. Yes, call upon American Jewry to help you make Israel more attractive. They don't want to go, so they don't want to go. But not in terms of changing legislation. If the confrontation continues on changing legislation, we'll have a problem. But certainly not a la Pollard.

Hag Samayach!

(Applause)

<u>Professor Avineri</u>: First, I agree with the first lady who asked the question about whether the contributions will stopof themselves. I agree with her that they will not. I don't think this is the case.

Ted asked me two questions, one that has to do with the Ambassador in Washington. Since I am not going to be the Ambassador in Washington, I don't think I have to answer that one. But the other question, about the degree of American Jewish help to Israel, I would agree with whatever you said. But I want to pointout one issue, which somehow got lost in the debate about Pollard. American Jewish help to Israel in 1948 was very significant. Much of it was against American law. To remind you, in 1948 the United States imposed an arms embargo on arms shipments to the Middle East. It didn't hurt the Arabs, because they were getting all their arms from the British and the French. The only arms we got from any government at that time, and nobody likes to remind curselves of that, was from the Soviet Union. And the Soviet Union doesn't boast about it; the Arabs don't boast about it; and some stupid Zionists don't boast about it. But it is a fact. But there were also arms which were smuggled from the United States with the help of some very prominent and sometimes very notorious American Jewish people. And American Jewry in its own way at that time lyonnized those people. And they contravened American law. This is an interesting reflection on

(Interruption)

down to survival, your primary allegiance is to Israel, not the United States. Thank you.

This means living in exile, precisely. And
I agree that the question of Pollard was not survival etcetera
etcetera, but when it comes to survival I feel reassured.
And I had no doubt about it. This means that Israel is
a value, and the United States or any other diaspora is
a fact.

I fully agree with what Abe said in response to some of the questions regarding Pollard. Since I think that what the Israelis who tutored Pollard were wrong, evidently, what he did was wrong as well. I have no doubt about it. And I suggest that in the complex debate which we have with the United States, which we Jews in the United States nad Israel had among ourselves. we don't make Pollard the issue. To me, Pollard was not the issue. To me, I don't expect American Jews to support Pollard. My criticism grew out of the fact that they were distancing themselves from Pollard. There was no reason to distance oneself, because there is no question of collective guilt. Whether this guy is a criminal or not is up to the United States courts to decide, and whatever their decision, it's their decision. Nobody has to say, "yes, the courts are right". I didn't expect them to say the courts are wrong, but why do you have to say the courts are right, unless you feel what I suggest is a feeling of insecurity? And here, we disagree. I suggest that we stop with this kind of Jewish self-righteousness, this United States was spying on Israel business. Let me -- I'm not having any information which you do not have on this issue -but a lot of people here know a lot of things, obviously,

which I do not know: if the United States would spy on Israel, I suggest that we catch that spy. I'm not sure we are going to give him a life sentence, it's not the most dangerous thing to Israel, but there are criminal ways of dealing with that. But let's not get self-righteous about it, about non-existent or non-caught American spies. Not every time when a Jew and a non-Jew argue, not every time the Jew is right. This is also Galuth mentality.

Sometimes we can say we made a mistake, we are one, those Americans, those terrible Americans, they happen to be right. Too bad! We made a mistake, and this is my promise. Worse than a mistake. And I'm afraid that the political system in Israel will pay for that mistake, the internal political system. I don't want just as Abe felt, that this is not the time to go into the LaPeigne affair, but let me make a very political statement with regard to that. Jews can be left-wing; Jews can be right-wing. And I happen to agree with some more than with others. But I don't think that you have to be that right-wing to feel comfortable with fascists and anti-semites. The initiative of bringing in LaPeine to meet American Jews was done from a very right-wing Zionist Jewish angle -- with this I may disagree but it is within the Zionist family -- but you don't have to reach out to fascists. And therefore I think it was a mistake. But then again, we have to go much deeper into that issue, because some of the details may not be clear.

David Hartman. Why Galuth? I think, wait a

second. David, I think that we may disagree about the meaning of Galuth, because our metaphysics is different. To me Galuth is not a metaphysical something. To me Galuth is a very physical journey. Trushalayim shelmata. I have very little contacts with Yrushalayim shel ma'arav. I am talking about the terrestial Jerusalem. And to me Galuth is the rest of Galuth. I know that you think differently, and your thoughts may be much richer than mine. But that's how I feel about it. But you also live in another one of which I put . . .

(Interruption)

. . . Okay. To me, Galuth is, and the issue is not metaphysical, but it has connections with the way people practically react to real situations. And that's why I did feel that the American Jewish response to Pollard was in the context of what I call Galuth, which means unease, which means that a certain moment, that there are so many moments of discomfort. You do not feel at home. You feel that you have to prove yourself more than anyone else around. And why do I need to use the term Galuth? Because otherwise there is no argument for Aliyah. There is no argument for Aliyah at all. And since I would like to see Aliyah from the United States -- and again, I am not fooling myself, I am not expecting four or five million or a hundred thousand or fifty thousand. I would like simply to see five thousand a year. Dayenu! And I, now some may come for the metaphysical reasons which are the deep religious reasons which I do not share. And I welcome all of them, despite the fact that I may disagree with the havoc they

are occasionally creating in our political system. But there are others. And I think we have to face the issue of what it means, not to live a full Jewish life, which I don't know how you do before the coming of the messiah anyway, but what does it mean that you live in a context of self-determination? And here we come to the basic issue of what Zionism is. Or at least my understanding of Zionism. What does self-determination mean? Selfetermination means that you determine the boundaries and the language and the grammar of your public life. Now, we may be doing it in Israel the wrong way, but we are doing it. The public language and the grammar of public life, and the boundaries of what is permissible and what is not permissible in public life, in the United States are not determined by the Jews. They are determined by the great democracy which is the United States.

And the response of Jewish leaders under, in the wake of the Pollard affair was a response, a legitimate response, within the grammar and the language determined by the non-Jewish political structure. This means not being self-determined. This means being determined by others. The question what is permissible for a Jew in Israel is determined by Jews. What is permissible for the Jew in the United States is determined by a majority which is non-Jewish, which may be benevolent, which may be liberal, which may be Jew-loving, which may be pro-Israel, but non-Jewish. In a way, the United States Jewish community went during Pollard through an analogous — not identical — crisis that French Jewry went during DeGaulle. During the '50's and early '60's,

it was so easy to be pro-Israel in France and be a French patriot, because the French were supporting Israel, and the French were fighting the FLN, and Nassar was an enemy of Israel just as much as he was an enemy of France, as considered by most Frenchmen. The moment of truth came for many French Jews when DeGaulle in 1967 dissociated himself from Israel publicly. And I know that many French Jewish leaders cringed and went silent. The situation is quite different, but there was a moment of truth. Now this is not exactly the same, but here for the first time we had put to the test the allegiance to Israel (not on the question of survival -- this I think I grant you) where the interest, and the comfort, and the feeling of being at home of American Jews in America and their allegiance with Israel, were in certain, in a certain tension. And that is where I think a lot of things snapped.

That's where it became clear that there is an issue of -- whatever you call it -- dual loyalty, hegiomonic allegiace or paramount allegiance, whatever you call it, or a moral code, that the relationship of American Jews to Israel is not like the relationship of the Italians to the Old Country. This is not the old country! This is a very new country, and the political allegiance is very political -- it's not just religious and cultural. As David said, the political part of Jewish life, there is a public aspect of Jewish life, there is a Jewish republic which is the universal republic -- it's not just a community of believers or a community of soul-salvation which is the Church.

One final word about the question of Soviet Immigration. On one hand, I was deeply ashamed when the Prime Minister of Israel went to the United States and asked the American Government to revoke the status of Refugee for Jews coming out of the Soviet Union. I want all Soviet Jews to come to Israel. I don't want them to come to the United States. But I think that in this century, no Jewish Prime Minister should ask any free country to revoke the status of refugee to a Jew under any circumstances whatsoever.

(Applause)

You haven't heard all of it yet. On the other hand, I think we should be aware of the fact that Jewish Emmigration from the Soviet Union will be paradoxically possible only if the Soviet Union will be convinced that most, not all but most, Soviet Jews, would go to Israel. Because in its strange way, for the Soviet Union, Jews asking to come to Israel is repatriation, just as ethnic Germans living in the Soviet Union asking to go to West Germany. You see, they could also go to East Germany -- but they're not so happy there -- if they want to get out of it they want to get out of it, so it's West Germany. And the Soviet Union, much to the unhappiness of East Germany, accepted the idea that repatriation is to West Germany. Very strange, but it accepted it. For the Soviet Union to accept the idea that Jews can freely emmigrate to the United States is unacceptable politically, because this means that there are probably 250 million people who want to get out of the Soviet Union! And

the only ones who can get out are Jews, to get out to the United States. This is not acceptable. The Soviet Union, given its own political constraints, can live with what will be a trickle, whatever the figures may be, of Jews going to this land in the MIddle East. Repatriation. Being visible, Soviet Immigrants in New York is unacceptable. Because this then creates pressure for an open-door policy for all Soviets who want to leave. And we don't know how many there are -- but there probably must be some, who want to leave the Soviet Union.

And again, we had an argument which started ten years ago, when there was a great wave of emmigration of Jews from the Soviet Union. We had in Israel, the Israeli government, an argument with American Jews who said that Soviet Jews coming on visas for Israel who go to Vienna, should be given freedom of choice. Freedom of choice which is basically in a free society, not what you have in prison. When you are in prison you are being taught that the only way of getting out of that Prison is going to Israel, you can't say, "Yes, but I want to go to the United States." Because you are not confronted on freedom of choice. And the Soviet Union clamped down on emmigration because most of these at one stage went to the United States. And the American Jewish community which was pressuring Israel to allow freedom of choice, not to put too much pressure on the people in Vienna, was in a way responsible for shutting the gates of the Soviet Union. It is a very difficult situation.

(Interruption from Audience)

I'm sorry, when there were 50,000 Jews in 1979 coming out

of the Soviety Union the majority went to Israel -- I'm sorry (MORE Interruptions from Audience) . . .

Sorry sir, I am aware of the statistics. The percentages became highest in the last years, not in 1979 -- and I suggest you check it.

The Soviet Union is not negotiating with the United States about immigration to the United States. It is negotiating about possible immigration to the Israel. It doesn't make the Soviet Union a part of the Zionist conspiracy, but there is a strange case here. And once there is going to be again large immigration to the United States, the gates are going again to be closed. And this poses a very deep dilemna to us, and I was trying to suggest what are the horns of the dilemna. On one hand I do not want Israel through administrative measures to close the doors of the United States to any Jew who feels he wants to go to the United States. I feel very uncomfortable about that. On the other hand, given Soviet reality (Soviet reality will allow emmigration to Israel but will not allow massive emmigration to the United States) -- and we have to navigate between those two horns of the dilemna. And we have to be conscious of that. And no easy sloganeering either way will help us out. So I am ready to criticize our Government and our prime minister when they do something which I think is very incumane and very non-Jewish. But I think that I would like to see as much support -and we get it -- from the American Jewish community, to understand what the conundrum is. The conundrum is that

we will get Jews out of the Soviet Union only if most of them will come to Israel, not if they will go to the West, as this is unacceptable to the Soviet Union. This is the world in which we have to function.

Let me say one last element about dialogue. I think we are -- and I agree with Abe -- now dealing with the dialogue. Chaim Orlozov once said that things in the world, in the Jewish world, are divided between the urgent things and the important things. The Jewish people, the State of Israel, because it is under extreme pressure, we go from one crisis to another, and always discuss the urgent things. And the urgent things are urgent. But there are also important things in the sense that they are fundamental, that they have long range consequences. We should be able to take enough time away from the urgent things to deal with the fundamental things. This cannot be left only to politicians; it cannot be left only to people who are involved in the daily affairs, not because they are incompetent but because naturally their interest lies in the urgent issues. If we have started here a little bit of a dialogue which I hope will continue and everybody in the American Jewish community and in Israel, Amcha, intellectuals -- not just the political figures and the bureacrat who deal with it daily, will deal with it. Ve hayazischareynu.

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Rabbi Goldman: Thank you very much to our speakers for a very fine debate, dialogue. I'm sure it is only the beginning as Prof. Avineri has just said. Thank you all for coming. Shalom, lehitrayot, Hag Sameyach.

February 27, 1984

Dr. Marver H. Bernstein Chairman, Search Committee B'nai B'rith International 1640 Rhode Island Ave., NW Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Marver:

I've been giving thought to your request of February \$6 and have come up with but one name. It is someone who has indicated an interest in a career change and so I feel that I can share it with you. The person I refer to is Rabbi Sanaayy Davids of Temple Emanuel of Worcester, Massachusetts.

You might also contact the various Placement Services of the synagogue movements. They would be in the best position to know the qualifications and or interest of rabbis within their own groups. The Placement Service of the UAHC-CCAR is located at the offices of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, 21 East 40th St., New York, NY 10016. Rabbi A. Stanley Dreyfus is the Director.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Alexander M. Schindler

Mer

B'NAI B'RITH INTERNATIONAL



1640 Rhode Island Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 857-6600 TWX 710-822-0068 / Cable BNAIBRITH WASHDC

February 16, 1984

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler President Union of American Hebrew Congregations 838 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10021

Dear Alexander:

I am writing to you to seek your help in identifying a highly qualified executive to serve as International Director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations in Washington, D.C. This position is one of the most important ones in Jewish life today. The B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, on more than 300 university and college campuses in the United States, serve tens of thousands of Jewish students and provide a vital Jewish presence and influence for students and many faculty members throughout this country and in several countries abroad.

The International Director should have the following qualities and experience:

- (1) Knowledge of campus communities and the needs and interests of Jewish students.
- (2) The ability to provide policy guidance and general direction for a highly decentralized operation.
- (3) An acute understanding of the magnificent way that B'nai B'rith through its lodges, units and chapters and the Jewish communities, through their Federations, provide financial support for the work of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations.
- (4) Sensitivity to the importance of local Hillel boards who devote their energies to the work of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations.
- (5) A clear understanding of the fundamental importance of the Hillel Foundations in the programs of B'nai B'rith and the commitment and skills to maintain a creative relationship between Hillel and B'nai B'rith executives.
- (6) Administrative experience at an executive level in a complex organizational setting.

I urge you to send your suggestions to me, preferably within two weeks of your receipt of this letter. Your communications will be treated as

confidential. If you prefer to talk with me, please call me at my home in Washington, D.C. (202) 537-1857. Please write to me at B'nai B'rith International, 1640 Rhode Rhode Island Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 Attn: Ms. Julia Graffam, who is secretary to Dr. Daniel Thursz, Executive Vice President of B'nai B'rith International.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Marner

Dr. Marver H. Bernstein

Chairman

Search Committee

MHB:ew

OP 1/3B

March 17, 1983

Mr. Sol Kolack Eastern Area Director ADL of B'nai B'rith 72 Franklin Street Boston, MA 02110

Dear Sol:

Rabbi Schindler is out-of-the-city and he asked me to respond to your letter of March 15, You were most gracious in letting us know that Bob Siff was in touch with you and Rabbi Schindler thanks you for all your efforts. He certainly does agree that it's time to move on to other things and that the complaint he lodged just be kept on record.

And so how are you? It's a long time since 1967 and the wonderful summer in Israel. It's a time I'll never forget and a group of people who Bemain with me in memory - and in some cases continued contact, especially the New Yorkers in the gang! From time to time I see people with whom we spent time that summer - Israelis and Americans - and it's always a special reunion. I've been back in New York for II years but I still stay in touch with many of the people at B'nai B'rith in Washington, it was a place of many beautiful times and memories. But I have to admit, New York is really IT for me, there's no place like it!

I hope all is well with you and express fond regards and best wishes for a sweet and beautiful Pesach.

Sincerely,

Edith J. Miller
Assistant to the President

NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL BOARD

Honorary Chairman HON. DAVID A. ROSE

STEPHEN B. KAY

Committee Vice-Chairmen

ALAN B. LARKIN Community Service

PROF. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ

Civil Rights

HERBERT LEMELMAN Associate Chairman

RICHARD MORNINGSTAR

Program

ROBERT FANGER Media

Area Vice-Chairpersons JANET SLOVIN

ALAN PEMSTEIN, Associate Chair. Central Massachusetts

STEVEN SHULMAN

New Hampshire

SAMUEL SHLEVIN

JEFFREY GORDON, Associate Chair. Rhode Island

ALAN ADES

Southeastern Massachusetts

LOUIS LISMAN Vermont

IRWIN and RONA CHASE Western Massachusetts

LEWIS GOLDBERG Maine

Treasurer

PHILIP KRUPP

Associate Treasurer MELVIN FRAIMAN

Chairman, Society of Fellows STEPHEN BERISH

LAWRENCE GELB, Associate Chair. NORTON SHERMAN, Associate Chair.

New England Members

of National Commission

STEPHEN BERISH MORTON R. GODINE

STEPHEN B. KAY WARREN B. KOHN

PHILIP KRUPP

LESTER MACKTEZ

HON. DAVID A. ROSE

WILLIAM SAPERS SAMUEL SHLEVIN

DAVID STRASSLER

New England Regional Director SOL KOLACK

Civil Rights Director

LEONARD ZAKIM

Assistant Directors

MARTIN S. GOLDMAN LESLEY WEISS

National Chairman MAXWELL E. GREENBERG

National Executive

Committee Chairman

KENNETH J. BIALKIN

National Director

NATHAN PERIMUTTER

Associate National Director ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN

NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL OFFICE

Anti-Defamation League



72 FRANKLIN STREET, SUITE 504 **BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02110** Telephone 542-4977

March 15, 1983

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, President Union of American Hebrew Congregations 838 Fifth Avenue New York, New York 10021

Dear Alex:

Bob Siff of Worcester called to indicate that he was the one who reported the story about Nazis at the Weston Nurseries in Hopkinton, Massachusetts. He indicated that he got the information third hand. So we checked with the third hand source and we were told that a few elderly German employees made "no response" to questions about World War II. Nothing else.

I am sure that you will agree that we should go on to other things--keeping a record of the complaint in our file.

Thanks for your interest and cooperation.

With warm regards.

Sincerely,

Sol Kolack

Eastern Area Director

SK/dh

cc: Abraham Foxman

March 7, 1983

FROM: Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler

TO: Mr. Robert Siff

The enclosed letter from Sol Kolack, Eastern Area Director of ADL, is self-explanatory. Do you want me to send him additional information or do you wish to pursue the matter with him directly? Just let me know.

Fond regardds

Encl.

NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL BOARD

Honorary Chairman HON, DAVID A. ROSE

Chairman STEPHEN B. KAY

Committee Vice-Chairmen

ALAN B. LARKIN Community Service

PROF. ALAN M. DERSHOWITZ

Civil Rights

HERBERT LEMELMAN Associate Chairman

RICHARD MORNINGSTAR

Program

ROBERT FANGER Media

Area Vice-Chairpersons

JANET SLOVIN

ALAN PEMSTEIN, Associate Chair. Central Massachusetts

STEVEN SHULMAN

New Hampshire

SAMUEL SHLEVIN

JEFFREY GORDON, Associate Chair. Rhode Island

ALAN ADES

Southeastern Massachusetts

LOUIS LISMAN Vermont

IRWIN and RONA CHASE

Western Massachusetts

Maine

Treasurer PHILIP KRUPP

PHILIP KRUPP

Associate Treasurer MELVIN FRAIMAN

Chairman, Society of Fellows STEPHEN BERISH

STEPHEN BERISH

LAWRENCE GELB, Associate Chair.
NORTON SHERMAN, Associate Chair.

New England Members

of National Commission

STEPHEN BERISH MORTON R. GODINE

STEPHEN B. KAY

WARREN B. KOHN

PHILIP KRUPP LESTER MACKTEZ

HON. DAVID A. ROSE

WILLIAM SAPERS

SAMUEL SHLEVIN DAVID STRASSLER

New England Regional Director

SOL KOLACK

Civil Rights Director

LEONARD ZAKIM

Assistant Directors
MARTIN S. GOLDMAN

LESLEY WEISS

National Chairman MAXWELL E. GREENBERG

WAXVELL L. GREENBERG

National Executive

KENNETH J. BIALKIN

National Director

NATHAN PERLMUTTER

Associate National Director ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL OFFICE

Anti-Defamation League



72 FRANKLIN STREET, SUITE 504 BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02110 Telephone 542-4977

March 2, 1983

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, President Union of American Hebrew Congregations 838 Fifth Avenue New York, N. Y. 10021

Dear Rabbi Schindler:

Abe Foxman sent me a copy of your letter re ex-Nazis working in the "Western" Nurseries in Hopkinton, Massachusetts. There is no "Western" Nurseries; I believe you mean Weston Nurseries.

Since there is no Jewish community in Hopkinton, I need a little more information from you. Who reported this information to you? What are the Reform congregations of which they are members, and can I be in touch with any of the folks who have contacted you?

I have one contact in Hopkinton, the minister of the Episcopal Church. This should be helpful if I had some additional information on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

97

SOL KOLACK Eastern Area Director

SK:E1

February 16, 1983

Mr. Abraham Foxman Anti-Defamation League 823 United Nations Plaza New York, New York 10017

Dear Abe:

I've received a number of telephone calls in recent weeks from members of our Reform congregations of the Massachusetts area who report to me that there are a bunch of 'ex-Nazis,ex-S.S. men' who are working at a nursery in the Greater Boston area. They seem to be keeping out of the way but reports of their exploits have trickled through various gardners who do work with them. It may pay to investigate this whole matter.

The name of the nursery is The Western Nurseryes in Hopkinton, Massachusetts. As I understand it, these nurseries are near Framingham.

The name of one "Rudi Bundy" is also been mentioned in that connection. Why don't you have your Boston area director look into this and see what he can find out. Although they have raised no row apprently, so far they do represent a potential danger and we ought to know what the facts are.

I would appreciate your letting me know what you find out.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely,

Alexander M. Schindler

cc: Robert Siff

Dictated but not signed

apl February 28, 1983 Mr. Abraham H. Foxman ADL 823 United Nations Plaza New York, New York 10017 Dear Abe: Thank you very much for your response concerning my inquiry. I know of no link between the AARP and the Americans Against Arms to Israel. Several recipients of their mailings sent these inquiries to me. Since they bear the same postage meter stamp, they assumed that there was a connection between the two. It may well be, of course, that the AARP sold or made their lists available to the Americans Against Arms group. Obviously I have no further evidence then this coincidence of the receipients of the mail. It is only circumstantial evidence and I suppose there is very little that you can do about it now. However you might keep this inquiry in your records in case others inquire. A frequence of such coincidences would indicate collusion. I thank you very much. Thank you also for sending me the handbook on Pro-Arab Propaganda in America: Vehicles and Voices. With warmest regards, I am Sincerely, Alexander M. Schindler

NATIONAL COMMISSION
OFFICERS
National Chairman
KENNETH J. BIALKIN
National Director
NATHAN PERLAUTTER
Chairman, National
Executive Committee
BURTON S. LEVINSON

Honorary Chairmen SEYMOUR GRAUBARD MAXWELL E. GREENBERG BURTON M. JOSEPH

Associate National Director ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN

Honorary Vice-Chairmen LEONARD L. ABESS RUDY BOSCHWITZ EDGAR M. BRONFMAN MAXWELL DANE LAWRENCE A. HARVEY BRUCE I. HOCHMAN JACOB K. JAVITS GERI M. IOSEPH MAX M. KAMPELMAN PHILLIP M. KLUTZNICK CARL LEVIN HOWARD M. METZENBAUM SAMUEL H. MILLER MILTON MOLLEN BERNARD NATH ROBERT R. NATHAN ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL WILLIAM SACHS MELVIN H. SCHLESINGER S.O. SHAPIRO THEODORE H. SILBERT SIDNEY R. YATES

Vice-Chairmen GRACE DAY NAT KAMENY PHILIP KRUPP LARRY LAVINSKY DAVID A. ROSE JAMES E. WOLF

Vice-Chairman, National Executive Committee DONALD R. MINTZ

Honorary Treasurers CHARLES GOLDRING BENJAMIN GREENBERG

Treasurer SAM KANE Assistant Treasurer ELIAS STRUM

Secretary MARTIN L.C. FELDMAN Assistant Secretary

MELVIN SALBERG

President, B'nai B'rith

JACK J. SPITZER
Executive Vice-President

B'nai B'rith DANIEL THURSZ President, B'nai B'rith

Women DOROTHY BINSTOCK

DIVISION DIRECTORS
Assistant National Director
Community Service

Community Service ROBERT C. KOHLER Administration

HAROLD ADLER

Director of Development SHELDON FLIEGELMAN

Civil Rights JUSTIN J. FINGER

Communications LYNNE IANNIELLO

Assistant to the National Director Leadership DANIEL S. MARIASCHIN

Program
THEODORE FREEDMAN

General Counsel ARNOLD FORSTER

ADL FOUNDATION

Executive Vice-President
BENJAMIN R. EPSTEIN

XYX



February 24, 1983

Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, President Union of American Hebrew Congregations 838 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10021

Dear Alex:

Thanks for your recent letter and the samples of anti-Israel propaganda received by your constituents recently.

We are familiar with the group known as "Americans Against Arms to Israel" and its Executive Director, David Sadd -- who holds the identical position with the National Association of Arab Americans, the pro-Arab lobbying outfit in Washington, DC. I'm taking this opportunity to send you a copy of our recently published handbook "Vehicles and Voices: Pro-Arab Propaganda in America," which I am sure you will find useful. (By the way, we would be happy to supply copies of this handbook to such friends or affiliates of UAHC as you may deem appropriate.)

Our staff is also familiar with the new magazine known as <u>Soviet</u> <u>Life</u>, a transparent propaganda effort sponsored by the Soviet government, as reflected in the material itself.

Unfortunately, it is not clear from your letter just what the connection is between these two propaganda mailings and the AARP (the American Association of Retired Persons). You indicated that your complainants believed these mailings to have come to them by way of the AARP mailing roster -- but the materials reveal no tangible link to the AARP. The postage meter stamps on these envelopes, as you noted, both contain the postmark "Merrifield, VA," and we have seen other mailings from "Americans Against Arms to Israel" bearing that postmark. However, Merrifield is apparently a large post office complex that processes many bulk mailings from various organizations, publications and mail-order operations. Without further evidence of AARP involvement, it would be difficult for us to make any sort of informed representation to that organization at this point. Of course, we would be glad to follow up further if additional information is available.

Kindest personal regards,

Abraham H. Foxman

Sincer

AHF:saj Enclosure February 10, 1983

Mr. Abraham H. Foxman, National Director Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith 823 United Nations Plaza New York, New York 10017

Dear Abe:

Since I do not know which staff person at ADL this inquiry should be directed to, I am taking the liberty of contacting you. I hope you will forward this to the person in charge of such matters and that I will get a response.

As I travel about the country I have received a number of complaints from our constituents that they receiveannti-Israel propaganda which apparently has come to them via the AARP mailing roster. I asked for evidence and was sent the enclosed envelopes and materials. You will note both items come from the same mailing address, Merrifield, VA., but the P.B. Meter number differs. Yet, there might be some connection and since literally 10's of 1,000's of Jews are members of the AARP, the sale of their lists is most distressing and if this is indeed the case a protest should be lodged.

I would appreciate hearing from ADL in this connection.

With warmest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

Alexander M. Schindler

encl.

February 10, 1983

Mrs. Mervin Katz 199 Ann Rustin Drive Ormond Beach, FL 32074

Dear Doris:

Thank you for sending me the requested envelopes. Although the office of the organizations are identical the postage meter is not, one number is 747280 and the other is 748514. Still there may be a connection and I am going to ask ADL to investigate this matter.

With warm regards, I am

Sincerely,

Alexander M. Schindler

Mrs. Mervin Katz 199 Ann Rustin Dr. • Ormond Beach, Fla. 32074 The 4, 1983

Dear Rathi -There are the AAA I eten we de eussid also a secret madej fra Sniet Like with Laws note celladed alease let us kron et freid disgesilen Shaken -

February 28, 1983

Mrs. Doris Katz 199 Ann Rustin Drive Ormond Beach, FL 32074

Dear Doris:

Enclosed is a reply which I received from ADL concerning that matter which was raised when I was in Daytona Beach.

Warm regards.

Sincerely,

Alexander M. Schindler