



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

MS-763: Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman Collection, 1930-2004.

Series I: Wexner Heritage Foundation, 1947-2004.

Subseries 2: Writings and Addresses, 1947-2003.

Box
69

Folder
18

"Jewish Identity." 8 September 1986.

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

JEWISH IDENTITY

BY

HERBERT FRIEDMAN

PART I

AMERICAN JEWISH
ARCHIVES
(Including Autobiographical Remarks)

September 8, 1986

Detroit

זכר אלה יעקב וישראל

PART ONE - PERSONAL INTRODUCTION

First of all, let me welcome you in a non-dramatic fashion, simply saying that it is good to have you here, without making any big, long emotional speeches. A very important thing is happening here on the 8th of September, 1986. How important it is we will know five years from now or some future time, and don't anybody be impatient. The fruits will fall from the tree continuously.

I would like to thank some people who helped me in putting his whole project together. Wayne Feinstein was very helpful and friendly at the beginning when he was still here and I went to him for assistance in bringing together some of the professional people in the community. I had a conversation with ten of them, all of whom submitted names and we started out this process with sixty-odd names which were thrown into the pot from all sorts of sources. I want to thank all of the Detroit professionals who helped. After Wayne left, Michael Berk continued the attitude of helpfulness and came down to Columbus once to watch how that group went, so he could report back. I would lastly like to thank Joel Tauber who, when I first came, was Chairman of the Board of the Federation. A meeting was called in which there were present eleven members of the executive committee who wanted to know what this program was all about, why Detroit should come in on it, and they wound up being enormously positive and

friendly. They were all uninvited to join the seminar as students, despite their protestations to the contrary, because they were all much too old. Accepting that put down graciously, they relaxed and I would like Mike to take back to them my thanks for having helped get this thing started.

Let me make some announcements now that everybody is here. Number one, you were mailed a package of Wexner Heritage Foundation bookplates. Do me a favor please, and take the responsibility of pasting them into all the books that are sent to you as the year goes by. You shouldn't have been burdened with that task, we should paste them in as we mail you the books, but somebody in my office goofed while I was sick.

Secondly, you will be receiving postcards, requesting your intention as far as attendance at the December retreat is concerned. The reason is that Scanticon, the Conference Center right outside of Princeton where this is being held, has given us until September 30 to give them a firm figure. So you are going to get a postcard asking you if you intend to come, and if you intend to bring a spouse. Spouses come on their own financial steam. Members of the group come as guests of the group.

The Conference Center is 45 minutes from Newark airport and we will arrange for transportation from Newark down to Scanticon. The cast of characters is set. We will have Professor Yehuda Bauer, the head of the Department of Contemporary Studies at the

Hebrew University. He is a world-recognized authority on the Holocaust and the period of illegal immigration to Palestine which followed. He is the author of many books. Major General (res.) Shlomo Gazit, former head of military intelligence, leaving active service after 28 years in the I.A.F., became President of Ben-Gurion University. Recently, he became the director-general of the Jewish Agency. Quiet, low-key, the type of Israeli one likes automatically, non-fanatical in any direction, totally well-informed, Shlomo Gazit will make a special trip to the U.S. to be with us.

Another person one the program will be Rabbi Gordon Tucker, the Dean of the Rabbinical College of the Jewish Theological Seminary. We asked him to talk about the manner in which rabbinical students are recruited, taught, and sent out into the community to work. In the Wexner Heritage Foundation, when we talk about community leadership, we know that one of the elements of leadership is the Rabbinical element. And the status of the Rabbinate of today is not what it was in the days of yesteryear when there were giants on the scene. Today one hears complaints, as between rabbis, other communal officials, and laymen. The Rabbis say that the Federations have taken over the role of leadership and the Federations are saying that Rabbis default. The Rabbis are saying: please use us for something more than giving an invocation, because that is demeaning and time-wasting. The tensions are legitimate, real, and there is justice on both sides. In many communities there are Federation-Synagogue joint

committees seeking solutions. But the important matter is the quality of the rabbinical manpower. The Dean of the Rabbinical School is just as disturbed about it as we are, and he is going to talk on that subject when he comes to the retreat.

The fourth person we have is Professor Marshall Goldman, from Harvard and Wellesley, who is one of the greatest experts in the American academic world on the Soviet Union, and on the situation of Russian Jewry. Goldman speaks Russian fluently; is totally acceptable to Moscow; is invited to teach every year at Moscow University. He is not an organizational man who is propagandizing for a certain point of view, who says we should treat the Russians this way or we should treat the Russians that way or we should not do anything, but be very quiet. Marshall Goldman sits there on the side and he says: look, here are Gorbachev's characteristics. Here is the kind of person he is. I know him. Here is what I think is the best way to approach him and why. And Goldman, in a very quiet, analytical way, will give you as much of the lowdown as you can hope to get from one man. When I asked him to come on down to Scanticon, he said that he had a previous commitment to lecture the day before in Vienna, but would come to us on the Sunday morning, and that will be the climax of our week-end. We will break out after lunch on Sunday.

The last announcement has to do with an additional assignment for next time. I would like to add a book called "Judaism as a Civilization", whose author is Mordechai Kaplan. The book was

written in 1942, has long been out of print, and was reprinted two years ago in honor of the author's 100th birthday, when he was still alive. He was one of the seminal thinkers of this century, having founded the Reconstructionist movement in Judaism. The assignment is to read pages 173-224, and the concluding chapter, pages 511-522.

I read somewhere a very simple sentence which to me is the essence of what we will be trying to do here for the next couple of years and maybe for longer than that. The heart of a young person's education is to know who he or she is. And where he or she is going. To know who you are - that is your identity, and to know where you are going - those are your goals. If you know your identity and you know your goals, then you have achieved absolute maximum equilibrium in life. You will have no personality problems, no psychological problems, no problems at all. If you know where you are going, then you are not sitting on your behind twiddling your thumbs at 25 and saying what do I do now? I don't want to work for Daddy; and the Wall Street boom will be over and there will be no jobs down there at a quarter of a million per year for new graduates of business schools. What do I do? You must seek the answers to those two questions - identity and goals. Who are you, who are we as a people, who are you as an individual and where are we going as a people? The search goes much deeper than all of the cliché words such as "survival". We are fighting for survival - survival for what? You must define it. Okay.

I have been asked why the Wexner Heritage Foundation has insisted upon such a small group for its seminar in each city. What is the difference, goes the question, if you have 20, 25 or even, 30 people. I would like to tell you, and this is the first item on the outline. It is Roman numeral I.A - The Value of Studying in Small Groups. One of my role model figures is the President of Yale University, which I attended with a great deal of amazement and joy in the early years of my life. There was numerus clausus at the University when I entered in 1934; 3% of the student body was Jewish. 750 freshmen constituted the entering class. They were mostly socialites, rich, hand-picked, creme de la creme.

So you had 20 Jews around you, and there was no critical mass for Jewish self-expression. There wasn't enough yeast in the dough to cause the bread to rise. Harvard had just gone through its extraordinary period when 25% of the student body was Jewish, and President Elliot in the 1920's decided that was absolutely unconscionable, and he was going to cut it to 10%. He managed to do this within a very few years. It has crawled back up today, to 30% and President Elliot is twirling in his grave. Yale's timing was quite different. Yale began slowly and steadily to permit an increase in the quota so that today the entering freshman group of Jews is about 25%. President Giamatti of Yale has just left the Presidency of the University and is now commissioner of baseball for one of the leagues, I

forget which one - National, I think. He and I have become good friends over the years and I take pleasure in quoting from his final baccalaureate address, given last June. This is what he said, about the business of functioning in small groups.

"Indeed my shipmates, there is in this ancient place a powerful surge to connectedness, people being connected with each other". Founded by congregationalists, Yale has always been marked by an instinct for groups, assemblages, aggregations. The place effortlessly generates congregations and while Yale has been, and I trust forever will be hospitable to the entrepreneur of the mind, the solitary genius, the happy loner, the intellectual and social landscape is nonetheless dotted with small bands and teams and caucuses and societies and committees and gaggles and clutches. Their size is never fixed, but ideally, never varying much between the dozen and the dozen and a half. Such a span, embraces most singing groups, theatrical groups, publication staffs, joint research efforts, senior societies, all seminars, a large number of clubs and organization and the board of the Yale Corporation itself.

The minute I started reading those lines I thought about the formation of these groups, one of whose main objectives it is to bond a group of people. You will serve yourselves better and you will serve your community better if you are inside a corpus of people who are able to move mountains.

Giamatti does point out that there is a danger in this because it may lead to parochialism, to smugness on your part, and it may lead eventually to being intolerant toward anyone who doesn't hold your ideas. We are trying to create a group in which an ideology will be formed, and this effort contains within itself the possible seed of intolerance. Therefore, what is the antidote? Open-mindedness in a liberal education is the way to avoid indoctrination. Here is where we have to understand each other. I would like for you to create an ideology; shape a point of view; reach a conclusion about a set of priorities, which you think is important for the life and health of your community. National Jewish life rests very simply on the foundation of what happens in the local community. That is where the real action takes place. That is the battlefield.

I want you to have an ideology, I want you to have a point of view, I want you to have a set of priorities, but I want you to achieve that by mutual discussion and not arrive at it by indoctrination. By so doing, you will not become intolerant of somebody else who doesn't hold the same point of view. You must take a position. Otherwise you are a fence-sitter, and a fence-sitter is not a leader. But, having taken your position, never be intolerant of another who holds a different position. Try to bring the other person around to your point of view, not by indoctrination and not by force, but by the persuasion of the intellect and by the persuasion of the heart, the mind, and the emotions.

This balance, lastly, will turn out leaders who care for more than themselves, and that is the main objective. You have got to get out of your own skin. It is natural that inside your own skin you should care for yourself, your wife, your family, your kids.' But if that is all you care for, you are nothing. How many times have you heard that famous saying from the Pirke Avot: "If I am only for myself, what am I." So, if you achieve that balance of having a strong point of view, yet not being intolerant of others who don't have it, and seek to persuade, then you will display the characteristics of a real leader.

When President Giametti finished, a professor by the name of Yaroslav Pelikan arose and called him a genuine conservative, which shocked everybody, because Giamatti is known as a liberal in the political sense. Pelikan went on to explain the conservatism of Edmond Burke, who believed that society was a contract, a partnership, not only between those who are living, but including those who are dead, and those who are yet to be born. Society is a contract in perpetuity between all the generations -- the past ones, and present ones and the unborn ones of the future. A man who believes that is a conservative because he is attempting to conserve the past for the sake of the future.

I read that and suddenly thought how reminiscent it was of our own Passover Haggadah which says "in every generation each of us

should feel as though we ourselves have gone forth from Egypt, as it is written...and you shall explain to your child on that day it is because of what the Lord did for me when I went forth from Egypt". It is stressed over and over again, it is the central theme. And remember that other passage in Deuteronomy, much less well known, in which Moses makes his final speech before death. Forbidden to enter the promised land, he is across the Jordan, standing atop Mt. Nebo, the exact location of which no one knows to this day, so that Moses has never become a figure of worship because there are no pilgrimages to his grave. Just before he died he reminded the Israelites that G-d had made a covenant with them, a brit, cut into the flesh. "This covenant is made not with you alone (Deuteronomy 29:13,14) but with those who are standing with us today before the Lord our G-d, and those who are not with us today", that is, those who are already dead or those who are not yet born. The covenant is made with every generation or eternity. So we are a people living in history, possessing a sense of connectedness in time with all generations of eternity from the beginning to the end.

Pelikan concluded that the trouble with much so-called conservatism in the academy, no less than in politics, is that it does not always have a clear conception of what is to be conserved. Conservatism of that sort is nothing more than a fancy name for ignorance. Thus forced to the necessity of defining what we were trying to conserve in this program of ours,

I came to a list of six elements of knowledge which give us our ideology, our *raison detre*, our sense of uniqueness:

1. Bible
2. History
3. Religion
4. Law
5. Philosophy
6. Land of Israel

That is the agenda; that is what we have to learn. We will learn it best in small groups. You will read and think and discuss over and over again, in the course of two years. The many aspects of these six subjects will be presented to you by various teachers. Gradually the material will coalesce in your minds and gradually you will develop a personal Jewish philosophy of life for yourself which will sustain you the rest of your days, and which will enable you to inspire and lead others.

Under point B of the introduction, I said that I would tell you something about my personal life and beliefs. You will then know who I am, what I believe, and you can give whatever weight you choose to the things I will say. You will see how the events of my life shaped me and some of those elements might be useful to help shape you.

In my professional life I have considered myself a civil servant of the Jewish people. I don't know any more about G-d or other

mysteries than you do. Most Jewish people are doubters and worriers and struggle to find certainties in which to believe. I knew from the beginning that I had not become a Rabbi in order to explain G-d, or good and evil, or life after death, or any of those great theological questions. I don't know the answers to those questions. I conceived of this profession as a vehicle through which to serve the Jewish people as a civil servant.

When I graduated Yale University in 1938, Hitler had been in office 5 years. I was disturbed at what I saw was the apathy and the indifference and the fear of the entire American Jewish community, let alone its leadership. There was only one leader at that time who amounted to anything - a man by the name of Rabbi Stephen S. Wise. He was urging a boycott against Germany and mass meetings in Madison Square Garden and protests in the streets. He was shouting for people to wake up, while the rest of the American Jewish Community was frightened of anti-semites like your Father Coughlin here in Detroit. This demagogue had a weekly radio program, scaring everyone half to death, creating a pogrom atmosphere through his preaching. The Jews felt their own weakness. There was no great strength in most of the central Federated organizations, which were just starting to work. The national organizations were pussyfooting urging silence. They came to be called, in a Yiddish expression, the Sha Sha Jews. So I said to myself, what can I do in my life, what can I do to help wake up this Jewish community, how can I find a platform from which to energize others? The platform seemed to me to be the

pulpit as a place from which one could talk and somebody might listen. So I entered rabbinical school.

The war came along very quickly. Our studies were accelerated, we stayed at school eleven and one half months each year and finished our Rabbinical curriculum in three years instead of the usual four or five. I was sent out to a congregation in Denver, where I was to serve a one-year ministry, which would then qualify me for a military chaplaincy. Incidentally, I have held only two congregational posts in my life - one in Denver and one in Milwaukee. I spent four years in the Chaplaincy in WWII. After Milwaukee I went into the UJA and became the CEO and did that for the next 25 years of my life.

The period in the army was extremely crucial in the shaping of my ideology, and personality. I was in Germany with the 9th Infantry Division, 3rd Army, General Patton, and the smell was in the air. There was no way to avoid it. The German cities were destroyed and there was powder and dust and brick and pollution. When the war was over I found myself near Munich, which stank from the 50,000 dead bodies buried under the brick. Just a few kilometers north of Munich there was Dachau with its own numberless cargo of bodies to add to the smell.

I was recruited into the Haganah, an underground military organization operated by the Yishuv, the community in Palestine, which was making an effort to rescue the Jews from the continent

of Europe. The Haganah's primary role was defense inside Palestine but at that time the British were running the country and Haganah was not fighting the British in the same way that other terrorist organizations were fighting the British, namely, by hanging British soldiers. The Haganah decided that it had to try to rescue some of the remnant, so it organized the Aliyah Bet, or "illegal" immigration section, which loaded ships with refugees and sent them eastward toward Palestine, against the British blockade.

I was down in Southern Bavaria toward the Austrian border, running trucks through the woods, looking for Jews who had been liberated and were wandering, kids who didn't know their names, older people who were totally traumatized and shellshocked and I would just gather them in the back of the truck. My primitive plan was to collect as many Jews as I could and look for places to put them. Any place that had four walls and a roof, which was quite rare, became what we called a DP camp, a displaced persons camp. The following story is typical of how a camp was established. It happened to a fellow-chaplain, Abraham Klausner.

He found a hospital once, which was the greatest treasure in the world, in a little village called St. Ottilien outside of Augsburg and there were 1,200 German wounded in that hospital and it was as clean and neat as a pin. He walked in banged his .45 Colt on the table in front of the German Commanding Officer, a doctor with the rank of Colonel. Klausner was a Captain and the

German was a Colonel, yet the former represented the victor and the latter saluted me and said, "At your command, Captain." Klausner ordered him to empty the hospital of its Wehrmacht patients, saying that this place was now requisitioned by the United States Army, and he wanted it clean as a whistle would be back tomorrow, 24 hours to install Jewish DP's. The next day there were 1,200 Germans out on the gravel all in order, lying on the ground. The place inside was spic and span, every bed made. One could have given Klausner Buckingham Palace and it would not have meant as much as that hospital.

I had been doing that sort of thing for several months, finding an old German army barracks, or a stable where Russian prisoners had been held, or anything similar. We soon had a thousand Jews here and another thousand there, and as we continued collecting, we soon had some tens of thousands, and the Army began to feed them 2,000 calories a day.

One day, while in the small town of Bad Tolz, Bavaria, I got a call from a lady who invited me to meet her in room 203 of the Royal Monceau hotel in Paris. I was 28 years old, so what the hell, wouldn't you go? I went. When I knocked on the door, she kept me on the threshold, in the corridor, and asked: "Will you work for us" and I said "who is us?" And she said "The Haganah." Sometimes a question confronts you at a moment when you don't have any data, or any basis for forming an opinion, and nowhere to turn for advice. Your intuition, purely and simply,

has to guide you and you know somehow that this is a fateful moment and you must reply either yes or no, with no further conversation. Those are the rare moments when your whole life changes - such are the moments of pure magic. I said yes.

She kept me waiting in the corridor on the threshold. She went across the living room of this suite, to the bedroom and beckoned. A short man with a shock of white hair, walked across the living room, as she said to him, "This is Friedman, who says he'll work for us". He shook hands with me, said thank you, turned around and walked out without another word and I didn't see him again for a year. She explained to me that he was Mr. Ben-Gurion, the leader of the Haganah.

Then she sat me down, told me I could take my coat off gave me a cup of coffee, gave me my marching orders which were that I should get myself a house in Berlin - that little tiny island inside the big Russian zone of Germany. The house should have four walls and a roof, almost an impossibility to find in the destroyed city, and was to serve as a Jewish Chaplain's Center, which was a wonderful cover for the Haganah. I was to commandeer (steal) six large trucks and enough gas tickets for a year, because every night this convoy, capable of carrying 300 persons, was to leave Berlin at dusk, drive through the Russian zone of Germany to the Polish border, to a town called Stettin, where Jews had been brought from the East by the Haganah. We arrived at Stettin around midnight, loaded our "illegal" passengers, and

returned to Berlin by dawn. The Haganah was filtering all the Jews it could gather from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Russia, etc. westward to the American zone of Germany.

They were coming into the U.S. zone through two routes. The Northern Route, brought them from Stettin down to Berlin, where they were kept in 3 camps, as many as 5-10,000 at a time, and then smuggled out of Berlin through the Russian and British zones, finally down into the American zone. Ultimately, those who were trying for Palestine on the small Haganah vessels went through the French zone down to the Mediterranean coast of the Riviera on to the Italian coast, to the ports of Genoa or La Spezia.

The second or Southern Route started in Lower Silesia in Poland, down to Prague, eastward to Bratislava in Hungary, westward into Vienna, across to Salzburg and into the U.S. zone of Germany to Munich. So the two big entry points were Munich and Berlin. I ran the Berlin operation and we pulled almost 100,000 people through in a year. By the end of 1946 more than a quarter million Jewish DP's were living in 64 camps in the U.S. zones of Germany and Austria. There were also some living in a few camps in the British zone.

The price that was agreed upon between us, the Haganah, and the Russians and the Poles, on each side of the border, who each took a slice of the bribe -- was one carton of cigarettes per Jew. A

few bottles of vodka also passed hands. One carton of cigarettes on the black market was \$150. Since the volume was 300 persons each night, we were talking about \$45,000 worth of cigarettes every single night, night after night after night... Where were we going to get the cigarettes? The GI's got a ration at the PX of one carton a week, ten packs. A pack of cigarettes went for \$15. A pack of cigarettes bought a soldier a bottle of whiskey, or a woman, or a used Leica camera. A carton of cigarettes bought a whole set of Rosenthal china, 200 pieces of it and the G.I. who bought it made up a wooden box and sent it back home to his wife, girl friend, or mother. What was going on in the black market, using cigarettes, was totally incredible. It was chaos, it was anarchy.

There were approximately 2,000 Jewish soldiers in Berlin - Americans, Russians, French, and British. I was the only Jewish chaplain in the city. And I ran around that town like a crazy man, scrounging cigarettes. My father and his friends back home were sending me mail bags full of cigarettes, which cost \$2.50 a carton in the United States. Every day I used to get 15-20 big mail bags full of cigarettes and the Army postal inspectors used to come over and count them and I would explain I was not a black market millionaire, but was using them for our own private work. Finally I decided to tell the highest Army authorities what the Haganah was doing. General Joseph T. McNarney and his successor, General Lucius Clay, Commanders of the American Forces in the

Occupied Zones, were sympathetic and incredibly helpful. Our operation became much easier.

I returned to the U.S., after being involved in organizing the passengers for the ship Exodus, was demobilized and went back to being the Rabbi in Denver. After such experiences, it was very difficult. How could one settle down and give book reviews to the sisterhood? It doesn't work. So I was out on the road four days a week making speeches for the UJA as a volunteer. I became the chairman of the National Speaker's Bureau in 1948. That same year I was running all the dynamite out of Dupont in Wilmington, Delaware, to myself in Denver. This constituted the "heavy artillery" with which Israel was fighting the War of Independence during 1948-1949. Teddy Kollek was the head of the Haganah in the United States, working out of a small hotel in New York called the Hotel Fourteen, next door to the Copacabana nightclub on East 60th street. The hotel served as headquarters for some ladies of the evening. The members of the Haganah staff, and their volunteers, moving constantly in and out of the hotel at all hours of day and night were lost among all the other male traffic going in and out. The Haganah functioned peacefully inside that hotel for a lovely two years in the United States.

There were two great periods of my life - almost 25 years as CEO of the National UJA, and almost ten years living in Israel - both of which were too full and complex for me to detail here. Now I am with the Wexner Heritage Foundation, once again happily

working on the basic matter of building leadership. Thus, still playing the same trumpet. Find leaders, recruit them, shape them, build them, teach them, and surround the whole thing with an aura of class.

Does the Jewish community want to have a campaign of 35 million dollars in Detroit? They can have it. It is no reflection on anybody who didn't achieve it before. It is all there to be achieved now, at anytime, it just depends on a whole certain set of operating principles and a whole certain set of beliefs. Out of these beliefs and ideology come the methodology by which you do it.

Rule #1 is that you must struggle and plan and organize to achieve goals. Nothing happens by chance. Nothing is handed to you on a silver platter. If you don't plan and organize and work hard and fight for what you want to try to achieve, you are not going to get anywhere, you are going to obtain some mediocre result.

Rule #2. In the Diaspora, local community Federations must develop a clear set of priorities. All too often they don't have it. Everything is important, they think, so they try to do everything; and it hardly seems that some things are more important than others. Well, in life you know that is not so. In real life certain things are more important than other things. In communal life it should be that way, but it is not yet,

because altogether too many of the strong community organizations don't know how to say no in a major way, they will say no only in a minor way. For example, they will quibble and argue with some beneficiary which needs \$3,000 or \$30,000 or whatever. The committee process whereby you try to decide whether to give somebody the relatively small amount they are looking for becomes endless. You have just raised, whatever, \$4 million or \$12 million. What is all the fighting and time-wasting about?

Take the opposite kind of case - what I call a major matter. Assume your community is spending 1 1/2 million per year on your old folks' home and a trend of thought develops in favor of cutting it all out. Period. Full stop. Some people say: this federation is just not going to handle the problem of the aged. It is a problem for the Federal Government; or m for the State Government; or for middle-class Jewish families to handle themselves. Most middle-class families can afford, even if it might be with some difficulty, to carry their own elderly parents. What is this nonsense about an old folk's home? We've never had old folks' homes in Jewish life. What was an old folks' home in a Polish Shtetl? A high-raise apartment house with alarm bells? The Moshav- Zkanim in a Polish Shtetl might have been a room in the back of the Shul where a person totally alone, with no one to take him in, might have a bench near an oven so he could keep warm and would be given a list of different houses where he could go to get some food. That was the way we

took care of our elderly for centuries. In the main, elderly persons were sheltered in the homes of their own families.

I am not suggesting that anyone should close down the Federation old folks operation. What I am saying is that Federations work across the board and they try to do everything and that derives from the desire to say yes to every thing. That is not having a sense of priorities. There must be an order of priorities. If the community thinks that a first priority is the aged population, why are the leaders spending only a million and a half dollars a year? Perhaps they should be putting three million a year into this item, since the elderly population is growing. Conversely, if they think the priority is not the past, because everybody in that old folks' home, biologically, is soon going to be dead; but if they think the priority is the future, then invest the 3 million dollars into your Jewish school system. I mean, the Federation must decide where its priorities are. The decision cannot be made by the UJA or the Council of Federations. The decision has got to be made by you, locally in your town based upon your sense of what is right and wrong. Don't just go along in a routine fashion. Analyze, in a mature fashion, what is the most important thing to be doing at any given period, and concentrate on that. And remember that priorities change.

Point three. Just as the local community is the center of organized Jewish life in the Diaspora, so Israel is the center of global Jewish solidarity and survival. That is a cardinal point.

Let me state it brutally. Every one of the Jewish communities in Turkey or Italy or Scandinavia or a dozen other places could disappear, (heaven forbid), and Jewish people would not die. But if the 3.5 million Jews in Israel were defeated and forced to flee outward into the Diaspora pool, I am not so sure that the Jewish people would survive, creatively, affirmatively. I think Israel now is a place where we have put so many of our eggs in that one basket that we had better make very sure it is unbreakable, or else we have gambled wrong and should have never re-created the sovereign state at all.

The fact of the matter is, we wanted that land, we turned down other offers that were made to us for other places, rich places like Uganda. Just think of all that uranium, oil, water, food. We didn't want it, we wanted the rocks of the ancient homeland. So we took the rocks. Israel is the merkaz ruchani, the spiritual center of the Jewish people. It is the heart, the soul, and we must protect it and strengthen it with all our might.

Point Four. I believe that a network of superior high schools, both boarding and day, is the best instrument by which to develop knowledge of and pride in Judaism, thus reducing destructive assimilation and intermarriage. I am talking about a network of Hebrew High Schools. How many do you think we have in the whole United States today, the rich America? We haven't got a hundred. Have you got one in Detroit? I don't know. High school. No?

You have got to be kidding. A hebrew High School up to grade 12. You have two? Two Hebrew high schools? That's marvelous. Well, these are the four main things I believe in. There are other items on a secondary list, but let's concentrate on these. Let's stop here for a second and see if you have any questions you'd like to ask.

Question: You were an officer in the American Army, while serving secretly in The Haganah. What was the attitude of the Army toward that?

Answer: The attitude of the top army brass was marvelous. I was posted as a military assistant to a civilian who was named the Advisor on Jewish Affairs to the Commanding General of the European Theatre. That person was a wonderful man named Rabbi Philip Bernstein of Rochester, New York. He developed wonderful relations with the top brass and used to invite them to our house near Frankfurt for many long discussions about what Zionism, and the DP's were all about. This echelon of the army consisted of an intelligent group of people, well educated, very good minds. These two and three star generals were fifty-year olds, not a Jew among them, but they were willing to listen.

When I said before in a half sentence that the army was providing two thousand calories per person per day, just translate that into dollars, and you can see that the army was

maintaining the Jewish refugees body and soul. We used to ask them, why they were doing it, and we got all the right answers. Most of them believed in the Bible, in God, in Jesus and in Christianity and they understood that their religion came from Judaism. Forty-five years ago these men were talking that way. So they were sympathetic and they were friendly and they knew that they had a Jewish problem on their hands. They wanted to know how long these Jews were going to remain with them.

We answered with a question: did they think that these Jews wanted to stay in camps here in Germany? The best "camp" we could find for them was some stable where the Nazis kept Russian prisoners or some place with straw on the cement floor, or an old German army caserne. You think these Jews liked that? Can they go "home"? Home in quotation marks. We explained clearly why there was no home to which these people could return. There was no going back. All of Eastern Europe was a cemetery. So they had to go forward. Forward was the land of the dreams - Palestine.

President Truman came through in 1946 with a letter to General Lucius D. Clay, the Theatre Commander, authorizing him to pay for the transfer of a hundred thousand Jewish DP's to Palestine, as a humanitarian gesture. The British were going to give up in Palestine. That was clear. The British were maintaining a hundred thousand soldiers in Palestine, and at the same time another hundred thousand soldiers in India. Both places wanted

their independence. The British Empire was bleeding from every pore. Yet they refused Truman's request.

I haven't got time to take you through the whole story of a conversation that Rabbi Bernstein and I had in Whitehall in London in January of 1947 with Ernest Bevin, the foreign secretary. This was a totally incredible day. His profanity was unbelievable, and his opposition even more so. We came back from London and reported to General Clay that there was no chance in the world that Britain would ever agree to Truman's letter of a hundred thousand Jews coming out of the camps to relieve the army of its pressure in Germany. The Jews would have to wait, and the army would have to be patient, maintaining its support, until a political solution would be found.

Another story. Alfred Rosenberg, the philosopher of the Nazi Party, had gathered in a warehouse in Offenbach belonging to I. G. Farben, the large chemical firm in Germany, three million books and religious objects, looted from every synagogue in Europe and from every Jewish home. They were all thrown hodge-podge in this tremendous depot. One day a man came in from Palestine by the name of Professor Gershom Sholem, the famous scholar of mysticism. He was given ninety days by the Army to go through that warehouse, at the end of which he had selected thirteen hundred items which were irreplaceable: precious medieval manuscripts, gorgeous illuminated Haggadahs, incunabula, an incredible treasure. He put them in five large packing cases,

marked them carefully on the outside, told me about them, and tearfully asked me to take care of them, because he had been refused permission to take them to Palestine. Left in the warehouse, marked, they were vulnerable. They would have brought heavy money on the black market. So, rather than let someone else steal them, I stole them. I took them out of Offenbach in a JDC ambulance on New Year's Eve when everybody was drunk anyway. I slept with them for two nights in a freight car to Paris, where I learned from the Haganah office that Dr. Chaim Weizmann's library was being sent to Palestine on a boat from Antwerp. Trucking the five cases up to Antwerp; relabelling them as part of Weizmann's library but for the attention of Professor Sholem; I returned to Germany dead-tired but righteous-feeling.

The C. I. D. had me dead to rights. They had the license plate of the JDC ambulance, the number of the freight car, the number of the truck that I took from Paris, and they had me. I mean they really had me.

I related the whole story to Rabbi Bernstein, who urged me to confess everything to General Clay. He said, "Okay, we must get the cases back from Palestine. They belong to the Fine Arts Section of the U.S. Army." I begged him not to subject them to the risk of another voyage. They are over in Palestine, just leave them there. I suggested that the United States Consul General in Jerusalem open the packing cases, in the presence of Professor Sholem, check the inventory, to see if there was even

one document missing. If the contents were intact, then leave them there, under the custody of the U. S. Army, until some ultimate disposition was made. General Clay said there was a Professor Finklestein in the United States who said the treasure should not all be sent to Palestine, but some should be sent to America to the museum and the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary.

After further discussion, Clay agreed to leave them in Palestine. It all worked out very well. It was clear that nobody had stolen everything. The transfer took place in 1947, and they were brought into the library of the Hebrew University up on Mount Scopus. In 1948 we lost Mount Scopus, in the War of Independence. Scopus remained under Jordanian control for the next nineteen years. And the manuscripts were up there. Except they weren't up there. There was one Israeli company of a hundred and twenty men who were left up there on Mt. Scopus as a symbolic Jewish presence. Every two weeks they were brought down and a relief company was sent up. During the course of nineteen years all 1,300 manuscripts were brought down, one by one, hidden under clothing. They formed the basis of the rare book collection at the Hebrew University National Library.

When General Clay was convinced that I hadn't stolen anything and there was no personal gain involved, he ordered all court-martial charges cancelled, but also ordered me to leave the European

Theater, and be honorably discharged from the service. His last word was - "You did well, but enough is enough."



PART TWO

THE SEARCH FOR IDENTITY IN MODERN TIMES

In the outline, Capital A denotes "Napoleonic Sanhedrin and Emancipation". That phrase, might sound like Greek or Sanskrit if you didn't know the reference.

Napoleon was sweeping all over Europe almost conquering Russia. And yet he kept his eye on what was happening in France, back at home base. One of the things that he wanted was to make peace with all of the religious groups in France. If he had peace with them and there was to be no stab in the back from them, then he could feel more secure about his imperial designs. Clearly he understood the business of ingratiating himself with the religious factions in the country. So the first thing he did was to make a Concordat with the Pope. In 1801 he made Catholicism the official religion of France. which it is to this day. As for the Protestants, there was an old, long Huguenot tradition of protest in France. So he didn't make a clear, clean-cut deal with the Protestants. He granted them recognition as an official religious group.

At this point he had to decide how to deal with the Jews. He made a speech in which he attempted to ingratiate himself by saying that if he were governing the Jews he would rebuild the temple of Solomon in Jerusalem. In other words, he would make the Jews as important as the Catholics by giving them their

Vatican. Then they would be a big world religion. But he backed off by saying he didn't rule them. Further he would have to determine one thing: and here was the nub of the whole matter. He would need to probe the loyalty of the Jews to France. And here we are face to face in 1806 with the eternal basic question - are the Jews loyal to the country in which they live or are they loyal to some other separate sense of Jewish identity which has its own nationhood? They have their own separate religion. They have a different language. They're different from everybody else. And here, ladies and gentlemen, we are faced with the fundamental question which our emancipation has imposed upon us for the past two centuries. What are we? Are we the same as all other Americans? Or are we the same and yet different in certain aspects? And does anybody want to face the fact that we are different? Or would you rather bury your head under the rug? What are you comfortable with? This question of identity is not easy. It's not a simple question and hasn't really been solved from Napoleon's time to this. At times we say we are like everybody else; at other times we say we are different from everybody else, and the third way we phrase it is to say we are the same as everybody else, but there are some differences.

Napoleon took the bull by the horns in a very clever way. He called a meeting which he named an Assembly of Jewish Notables. A hundred and twelve people were invited, including outstanding businessmen and financiers as well as rabbis and scholars. They arrived in Paris at the Hotel de Ville, which is the city hall,

on July 26, 1806. There was an honor guard in uniform, brass bands, drums, and big speeches. A friend of Napoleon, a count, Louis Mathieu Mole, greeted these 112 notables, all of whom were in full dress, with a coldly insulting speech of welcome. Jews were charged, he pointed out, with being usurers and these charges were well founded. Nevertheless, the Emperor Napoleon would offer the Jews an opportunity to remedy these practices themselves without any punishment. If you admit that you are usurers, then you will police yourselves. In fact, he went on, the emperor would preserve for the Jews their totality of rights as Frenchmen, providing that they prove themselves worthy of these rights. And what was expected of the assembly of notables was that they should define their attitude toward France by answering twelve questions. And then everybody went indoors and Count Mole put the twelve questions on the table. What were they?

- 1) Are Jews permitted to have more than one wife?
- 2) Does Judaism permit divorce?
- 3) Can Christians and Jews marry?
- 4) In the eyes of the Jews are the French brothers or strangers?
- 5) What behavior does Jewish law prescribe for French Christians?
- 6) Do Jews born in France consider France their country. Would they die for it in the army? Would they do anything it wants, does it command their highest

loyalty above anything else? Are they willing to defend it and obey its laws?

- 7) Who names the rabbi?
- 8) What police jurisdiction do the rabbis exercise over the Jews?
- 9) Are Jewish electoral forms and police jurisdiction prescribed by Jewish laws or merely by custom?
- 10) Does Jewish law prohibit the Jews from entering the professions?
- 11) Does Jewish law encourage Jews to practice usury among their own community?
- 12) Does Jewish law encourage Jews to practice usury among the Christians?

All of the questions were really designed to focus toward one point. Napoleon was asking: What kind of people will you be if I make you French citizens? Do you want to be like all other Frenchmen? Are you willing to intermarry with French Christians? Are you willing to cut out all of your bad habits like usury? That's what you've been doing for thousands of years. That's how you live, by your trickery and your wits. You kept the nobility under your thumb because you had the money and they always had to come to you and borrow it from you. Are you going to be honest, are you going to obey French law? Or are you going to be subject to the secret law of your rabbis? So all the questions, in what ever form they were put, all came down to the same focal point: loyalty.

The Assembly of Notables discussed for three weeks and then came back with very skillful and dignified answers. They summarized: of course Jews considered France their country and Frenchmen their brothers. Of course they were willing to defend France to the death. Of course the rabbis exercised no police jurisdiction. Their authority was purely spiritual. Of course the Jews were monogamous. The question of mixed marriage was the most complicated. For the rabbis were in conscious bound to oppose marriage outside the faith. But the laymen managed to come up with a compromise answer. The Bible, the notables declared, forbade marriage with heathen peoples in ancient times. Yet, inasmuch as French Christians of the nineteenth century were manifestly not heathens, the prohibition did not apply to contemporary France. As for usury, while money lending was not forbidden in the Talmud, Jewish law was equally explicit that only a fair rate of interest might be charged.

Napoleon was satisfied with the answers. He had received the professions of loyalty he wanted. Now he wanted a dazzling show with the full weight of religious prestige and ceremony. On September 3rd, 1806, he issued a summons for the convening of a Sanhedrin. The Jews were speechless with amazement. This would be the first Sanhedrin in approximately fifteen hundred years. Its answers would become modern Jewish religious law. The news spread all over Europe with hosannahs of joy.

On February 4, 1807, the Sanhedrin gathered in Paris, with eighty members, not seventy one as in the traditional body. Forty-six were rabbis, all the rabbis who could be mustered in France, the rest were laymen. On nearly every issue the Sanhedrin endorsed the answers of last year's Assembly of Notables. Napoleon again was not disappointed. Once again it was affirmed that the laws of Moses and the rabbis were exclusively religious in their application. France alone could claim the political allegiance of the French Jews. No one else, no rabbis, could do so. Only French government officials could claim the political allegiance of French Jews. The decisions of civil tribunals were declared to have priority over those of religious tribunals. This priority was made the basis for the answer on intermarriage. For the rabbis disdained this time to give theological justification for mixed marriages. The delegates reaffirmed the love they bore their fellow Frenchmen and they encouraged Jewish participation in all occupations and professions. They publicly condemned money lending at high rates of interest. In April 1807 the Sanhedrin was adjourned. Abraham Furtado, a member of the Sanhedrin who had been president of the Assembly of Notables a year earlier declared: "We no longer form a nation within a nation. France is our country. Jews such today is your status. Your obligations are outlined. Your happiness is waiting."

The Sanhedrin's solemn renunciation of separate Jewish nationhood, and its definition of Judaism as merely a religious

sect, was truly of water-shed importance in Jewish history. It set the tone for western Jewish life for the next two centuries to come, right to our very day. When one of Napoleon's commissioners wrote later that the Jews by their own declaration ceased to be a people and remained only a religion, he perceived the significance of what the Sanhedrin had done, even more accurately than did the Jews themselves. They had said: we are no longer a nation - we are only a religious sect. That decision of the French Jewish community led the way for German Jews to elect the same path. They formulated the phrase - "Deutsche Burger aus Mosaische Glauben." "German Citizens of Mosaic faith."

This was the way they figured they could buy their way in to a normal life in the German community. Their logic carried them ultimately to baptism, for if one went along with assimilation and intermarriage, why not go all the way and convert? Moses Mendelsohn's family had done this in Germany back in the eighteenth century. Moses Mendelsohn was the first Jew to translate the Bible from Hebrew into the German language in order to teach the Jews German, in order that the Jews could participate in German daily life. But he never in his wildest dreams thought that it would lead to the conversion of his entire family.

Do a time leap to the United States in June 1943. A meeting of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Reform) was debating

the issue of whether Reform Judaism and Zionism were compatible - i.e. could one be a good, loyal reform Jew and believe in Zionism at the same time? Four hundred rabbis were present at that meeting. The vote was three to one in favor of the resolution. The Reform Movement went on the line in favor of a homeland in Palestine. Ninety three men voted against the resolution and formed an organization called the American Council for Judaism. Their reasoning stemmed from the French Sanhedrin of 1807. They said in essence: We are Americans of the Jewish faith. What do we have to do with Palestine, Zionism, founding another nation? We are not a nation. We have no pretenses to be a nation. We are Americans. From 1943, when they organized themselves, until 1948 when Israel declared its Independence, they fought tooth and nail to persuade the State Department and Congressmen and Christian ministers and newspaper editors not to favor the idea of creating a Jewish state. Their chairman was a man by the name of Lessing Rosenwald. His brother was a man by the name of William Rosenwald, who later became he had of the UJA. Here were two brothers diametrically, violently opposed, who never spoke to one another on that subject.

The American Council for Judaism was beaten, yet has survived to this day. Lessing Rosenwald still funds them. They have become a completely pro-Arab lobby today. Remember the precedent for their thinking. Napoleon was offering the whole world on a silver platter, wasn't he? French citizenship, equal rights, voting, everything. All the French Jews had to do was eliminate

those few little prayers in the prayer book where we hope for Zion to be rebuilt, for the restoration of Zion. Wipe out such prayers. We are good French citizens. We are Jews only by religion and we'll even change some of the things in our religion in order to prove to you that we're good, loyal Frenchmen. They gave away their heritage. Then the German Jews followed suit, thus it was not unusual that some American Jews a hundred years later also followed suit. They thought every Zionist Jew was a treacherous American and guilty of double loyalty. Now that dirty phrase with its implied questions, raised its head. Do you feel that you are guilty of double loyalty? Loyalty to America and loyalty to some Jewish national ideal? You are not a citizen of Palestine or Israel, you are not going to live there. So what kind of feelings are you having for Israel? Emotional feelings? Are you caught in a tug-of-war inside yourself? You had better not be. You must resolve this issue. You are first and last an American, and your Jewishness is at most a belief in a certain form of religion. Such was the American Council for Judaism position.

The Napoleonic Sanhedrin and the Emancipation at the beginning of the nineteenth century raised for the first time the question of identity. The nineteenth century answers indicated that some Jews preferred to be known as a religion only. This opened the path to assimilation and even baptism. Twentieth century opinion has shifted. Since World War II and the Holocaust and the success of the Zionist movement, opinion has shifted and the

answer at the end of the twentieth century seems to be that we have accepted the definition of ourselves as a global people or a global community. That's how we define ourselves now, a global people. You are now members of the Jewish people, all capitalized, THE JEWISH PEOPLE. Now what is implicit in that phrase? Does it mean that we are a race? The answer is no.

I want to show you that there is no such thing as a Jewish race by indicating, that we have had an infusion of many races and I have listed three. The Khazars, the Berbers, and the Ethiopians. Jews have been black and Jews have been yellow. The Khazars were probably descendants of the Mongols and the Mongols stem from the Chinese. Jews are Berbers, essentially, brown-skinned, so we've got blacks and we've got browns and we've got yellows and we Jews have got in our background everything which anthropologists call race.

The Khazars are particularly interesting. They were a nomad people from central Asia. In about 700 A.D. their King Bulan was converted to Judaism. A later king Obadiah strengthened Judaism, inviting rabbis into his kingdom. The Supreme Court consisted of seven judges, two Jews, two Christians, two Mongols and a heathen: religious toleration was maintained for the kingdom's three hundred years. The crucial thing about the whole story is that this territory between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea, has a very large number of Jews to this day. This is where the Khazars lived and they expanded north of the Black Sea all the

way up into the central part of Russia, as far north as Moscow and perhaps even westward toward Poland. The question is asked often about the origin of the millions of Jews who lived in Russia and Poland already in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Where did they come from?

Arthur Koestler, who committed suicide one afternoon recently with his wife, when the weather was very good, wrote a book some years ago called *The Thirteenth Tribe*. Koestler's premise is that the Jews had thirteen tribes, instead of the Biblical twelve. The last one was called the tribe of Khazaria. And the thirteenth tribe contributed as many Jews to the world's total, or maybe more than the first twelve. Of the first twelve, ten tribes were lost. You've heard the phrase "the ten lost tribes". They were taken off into captivity by the Assyrian King Nebuchadnezzar before the first temple was destroyed, namely, in - 722 B.C., to be exact. That left two tribes in the southern kingdom, Judah and Benjamin. All of today's Jews in the world stem from those two tribes plus the Khazars, who were converted about fifteen hundred years later.

It is also true that when the Jews were driven out of Spain in 1492 some migrated eastward. Most went to Italy, Turkey, North Africa and Holland. A small number went as far as Russia and Poland. By far the largest number of Russian Jews from the 15th century onward were Khazar in origin. So there really isn't any such thing as a pure race. When people ask how Jews have managed

to survive through all these thousands of years, it has not been through racial purity. We, as a people, are a composite of many races. What has kept us intact has been what is in our heads and hearts, not what is in the sperm and the ovum.

Koestler's purpose in attributing that much weight to the Khazars was to influence Jews to understand that their background is mixed. Jews sometimes use the phrase THE JEWISH RACE. They don't know what they are talking about. As a matter of fact, they play into Hitler's hands. Because Hitler's whole premise was that there is only one pure race, the Aryan, and the Jews in his opinion were rats, vermin, cancer cells which contaminate society, and which should be cut out surgically.

Hitler was seeking to destroy the apparent Jewish claim to an ancient consistent genetic stream, by comparing them to lethal parasites. Why did he feel it necessary to repudiate what he thought was Judaism's implicit racial superiority and purity? Because he had to establish the claim that there was only one racially pure stock, which was the Aryan. By what peculiar stretch of imagination he made present day Germans to be the descendants of the Indo-Aryans is beyond all logic. These two stocks lived on two separate continents. The Indo-Aryans were in Asia. And the antecedents of the present day Germans were living in northern Europe, in bear skins. Anyway, that is one of the interesting peculiarities of the Hitler mind.

The point I wish to make very strongly is that even Jews have used the phrase "pure race". This should simply not be done. There are two very famous Jews who used it. That does not make it right. If you look under Roman numeral III, you will see that Martin Buber used the term PURE RACE, although of course he did not mean it in the later Nazi sense of pure blood. And so did Moses Hess. Do you know who Moses Hess was? He was a German Jew and a Socialist who wrote a book in 1862 called Rome and Jerusalem. It is the first book written in which there is talk about founding a Jewish state. Moses Hess was very much impressed by Garibaldi, Cavour and the resorgimento movement in which the Italians were talking about uniting the many provinces fully into one state. There was no modern country of Italy until 1864. It didn't exist. Hess argued that if the Italians could create a nation, why couldn't the Jews do it? Rome and Jerusalem show similarities. He argued further that the Jews are not a religious group. The Sanhedrin of 1807, 55 years earlier, had said that the Jews are only a religious group. Hess was now saying the Jews are not only a religious group, but also a separate nation. In stumping for the idea of creating a nation he used the phrase "a special race". And Moses Hess has been quoted over and over again as believing that the Jews are a race. So I am attempting to warn you in advance, should anyone say to you that Hess claims that the Jews are a special race, that he was using the term in his own unique manner. He was using it in this sentence: "Jews are not a religious group but a separate nation, a special race, and the modern Jew who denies this is not

only an apostate, a religious renegade, but a traitor to his people, his tribe, his race." He repeats the word race. He was not using the word in any technical scientific sense. Because Hitler did come along and because Hitler did make this racial definition the basis for his genocide, it is terribly important that we should understand that the word race never did or should apply to the Jewish people. It is not the category of definition for us. Race, anthropologically, is Caucasian or Negroid or Oriental. There are only five races on earth according to the anthropological scientists, and Jew is not one of them.

In the first century A.D. the Jewish population of the Roman Empire west of Palestine has been put at over 6 million, of whom a million lived in Egypt, mostly in Alexandria. Historians now agree that one person in every ten in the Roman Empire was a Jew. In the year 70, when the temple was destroyed, the Romans plowed the land with salt. They expelled the Jews, who scattered throughout the whole Mediterranean basin. Christianity didn't become the official religion of the Roman Empire until the fourth century. Emperor Constantine was converted to Christianity in 333 A.D. If the Jews had been a proselytizing religion, they would have had almost 300 years in which to conquer the world. What a different world it would have been. Can you imagine? There are 600 to 700 million Christians in the world today. Suppose there had been 600 to 700 million Jews? Unbelievable, isn't it?

The reason that Christianity spread was because of a basic decision on the part of a very small handful of people. This is why I keep saying to you all the time that small groups of people usually decide major matters. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, were the authors of the synoptic gospels of the New Testament. These are four accounts of the life and thought of Jesus, who was a Jew. They don't agree on many basic, important points. They were all written anywhere from 50 to 150 years after his death. So there is nothing strange about the fact that four biographical accounts don't always agree. The one basic fact about the evolution of Christianity into a separate religion derived from the conduct of Paul. He was a Jew, formerly named Saul, who had a vision on the road to Damascus that Jesus was the Messiah. He changed his name to the Greek Paul. And he travelled around to all the synagogues in Asia Minor, right across to Turkey, then Greece, the Aegean islands, Southern Italy, Sicily, and the North African coast. Paul was a travelling salesman. To whom could he go to preach the message about Jesus? Only to Jews. Who else would understand what he was talking about? So he went into the synagogues and talked to the Jews about the great rabbi Joshua who lived in the Galilee, performed miracles, cured people, tried to reform the corrupt priests in the Temple, and developed a following among the common people. The Romans were so frightened of him as a potential political leader that they killed him. The high priest of the Jews was also frightened of his popular strength.

Further, there is the question of liberation theology. When an individual priest in Latin America says: I am concerned about the poor people in my country, the church does not seem to care. The cupola is gilded with gold, and outside the people are starving. The church doesn't seem to care about people. The church cares about its bureaucracy, its hierarchy, its money. Priests are talking like that all over the world and attacking the church for a series of defaults of which the Holocaust is one. The lack of concern, a certain coldbloodedness toward the social problems,, platitudes when speaking about the sick, the under-privileged, the under-nourished, disturb many priests. When the Pope says to the priests that they should concentrate on matters of abortion, monogamous marriage, and this horrible gay revolution because it is against the word of God to be homosexual, many priests, let alone Catholic laymen, do not feel he is addressing the real issues. Many priests out in the field don't talk that way. The priests in Latin America are on a rampage of rebellion. The priests in Holland are likewise, and priests in Germany are beginning to catch the same libertarian diseases.

I think a rebellion is occurring within the church. It is taking a different form than the Protestant rebellion of the sixteenth century. This is rebellion based on what the priests see out in the real world to which their church is not responding, so they are attacking their central headquarters. That's a reformation movement again. It's based upon a theology

of liberation because of the peculiar socio-political and economic problems of Latin America. But the essence of the matter is that they are telling their church and its leader that it is off the track. This criticism might mean that a crack is developing in the foundation of the Vatican. One could argue that such a crack does not necessarily mean that Christianity is going to crumble. On the other hand, if the leader of the church is out of step with his hierarchy and his followers, then the whole structure may indeed be in danger. Without a central structure there is no life for an organization which has been built for 1500 years on a rigid chain which runs directly from the Son of God to Peter to every successive Pope.

One could say that even if I am right in predicting the demise of the Christian hierarchy and its structure, what might happen instead is the growth of a new structure. Just as the Protestant structure grew up. But take a close look at the Protestant structure after four hundred years. There is no structure in the Protestant world. You can't get Methodists to unite with Baptists to unite with Episcopalians. Whatever is the Protestant world? Various denominations seem to have less and less meaning in the life of the average Protestant. There is no such thing as Protestant team loyalty except in the circles of the Evangelicals and the Fundamentalists. They are loyal to their own particular television minister. Falwell, Robertson, Roberts, Swaggart, and many others have a certain number of personal followers each. But that's not the makings of a Church.

We Jews are really very different. We have no central structure to tear down. We are totally independent, autonomous. You know how hard it is to get two Jews to agree on anything. There is no external control over any individual synagogue. The president and the rabbi are the co-bosses. Hopefully they work together. There is no Board of Presbyters, Diocesan Council, or Bishop. There is nobody above the rabbi. Nobody can tell him what to do..Nobody can tell the lay leader of the congregation what to do. There is usually a Board, but the very word implies a final confrontational struggle which must be settled by a referee (The Board) and sometimes the issue goes beyond the Board to the individual members to settle in a general congregational meeting.

Let us return now to the condition in the Mediterranean world, before the spread and growth of Christianity. We spoke about a large, Jewish community scattered across many countries. Look at this map showing the North African littoral. This area is today called Libya. Moving westward we come to Tunisia, Algeria and finally to Morocco. Sometimes welcome, sometimes merely tolerated, sometimes savagely persecuted, the Jews created trading communities and contributed substantially to the commercial, economic and cultural life of the towns in which they lived.

Look at the various dates here. In 320 B.C. Pharaoh settled 30,000 Jews on Cyprus, to protect the northern frontier of Egypt.

Right here in Cyrenaica, which is today Libya, in 115 A.D., there were further Jewish revolts, with thousands killed. In 535 A.D., legislation prohibited the practice of Judaism throughout the Byzantine Empire. By the middle of the 6th century Rome was finished. The Huns, Goths and Visigoths came down from the Northern part of Europe, crossed the Alps, crossed the Po River up here, sacked Rome, and all the Italian peninsula. The eastern part of the Roman Empire became known as the Byzantine Empire, and the capital city here, that was called Byzantium, later Constantinople, is now called Istanbul, the capital of Turkey. So Jews were not allowed to practice Judaism in the Byzantine Empire.

From 200 B.C. to 200 A.D. there was an active Jewish community in Tunis here, next to the city of Carthage, which was right across from Rome. This community was active in overseas trade for more than four centuries. All of this cross-hatching on the map shows areas of Jewish dispersal and settlement between 500 B.C. and 300 A.D. - 800 years, during the time of the Greek, Carthaginian and Roman Empires. Here, this dot with a circle shows towns with flourishing Jewish communities from Roman times down to the Arab conquest. The Arab conquest was, you know, in the seventh century. Mohammed got started in 622. During the seventh century Islam spread across North Africa like a fire, jumped Gibraltar into Spain, jumped the Pyrenees into France. From the start in 622 to the finish in 724 up here in the middle of France at Tours, during 100 years, the Arabs, by fire and by sword came

across all of North Africa, got into Europe and if they hadn't been stopped by Charles Martel, the grandfather of Charlemagne here, in the year 724, they would have continued to the heart of central Europe, Christianity would be finished and Islam would be the religion of Europe. These are key points, key dates, key battles.

Now, in the middle of it all these Jews were living in the territories conquered by Islam. Earlier this year (1986) I was in a destroyed Roman town in Morocco in which there once was a large Jewish population. It is near the city of Rabat which is the capital of Morocco, where the king's main palace is located. Jews converted the Berbers in Morocco to Judaism. Berbers later on came to live only in the Atlas mountains, which are right down here, in the sub-Sahara. Living together in small villages and towns, one could see Jews living side by side with Berbers who were somewhat darker, who painted their faces blue, tattooed their faces with blue ink. The Jews and the Berbers were talking the same language, worshipping together and I simply offer this as another piece of evidence of the fact that it is incorrect to call the Jews a race. How many Jews who migrated into Israel during the 1950's and 1960's came with Berber blood in them? Scores and scores of thousands! There is no such thing as pure blood.

We don't need to spend much time on the question of Ethiopians. That matter has been settled. Israel's esteemed chief Rabbis

twenty years ago decided they were indeed Jews, but then it took our esteemed bureaucracy another twenty years before it would admit them to Israel. This is one of the nasty episodes that we have to live down. Everyone makes a big deal of the heroic operation last year, Operation Moses, rescuing the Jews out of Ethiopia. Where were we 30 years ago? We took the Jews from Yemen, from Iraq, from Cyrenaica, from Tripolitania, we took them from every corner of the Arab-Moslem world. Why didn't we take the Ethiopian Jews? Because of religious bigotry. And for us to make a big deal of it last year, when a clandestine air shuttle took them from the Sudan, over to Belgium and back to Tel Aviv, was somewhat shameful. So we got eight or ten thousand out of Ethiopia. But how many tens of thousands have we lost during the decades of dithering? You feel a twinge in your heart when you know that the people you love and the land you love has done something which is noble, from one point of view, but less than noble from another. And this business of religious bigotry is one of the key issues that you and I must be around long enough to face down and eliminate. As for the matter of race, we know and accept black Jews as well as all others.

So, we are finished with Roman numeral three. Now Roman numeral four. It is clear that we are a religion. It is obviously difficult to summarize in a few words an ancient faith with a vast literature, but I have made this three-M definition of Judaism for myself, which satisfies me. Our religion is based on a monotheistic sense of Godhead, which is one M, monotheism; a

moral code for advancing civilized life, which is another M, moral; and a mission to spread this ethical monotheism unto all nations, which is the final M. Monotheism, morality, mission. This is a kind of generalized rubric which serves to keep the main thoughts clear and also serve as a basis for an explanation of Judaism to non-Jews.

Now we come to Roman numeral five, to the most difficult part of defining our identity, namely, nation or nationality.

Ever since the emancipation, we have been loyal and equal citizens of whatever was our place of residence. I don't think there are many Jews who have been traitors in the last two hundred years to the countries in which they live. Dreyfus was accused of being a traitor to France. They did everything they could do to him; disgraced him publicly in the plaza in front of the Invalides; put him on Devil's Island; broke his health, broke his reputation, and later on admitted that they were wrong and he wasn't a traitor at all. The real spy was a Major Esterhazy who had sold those documents to the Germans.

There was the Rosenberg case in the United States in the 1950's which is a very mixed-up story as to whether they were or were not traitors. They received the death sentence, followed quickly by execution in the electric chair, so there was really no way of making a real investigation, going through a long appeals process, allowing extensive press attention, etc. The Rosenbergs

did give plans of the atomic bomb to the Russians, yes. The Russians were almost on the verge of reaching that stage of development in their own research anyhow.

I think that the issue of dual loyalty is raised only when you are dealing with how Jews feel vis-a-vis Israel and the United States. It is nice to say that dual loyalty isn't really a problem because there is not any confrontation between Israel and the United States. If your son is asked to serve in the Army of the United States, he will do so. If he is asked to defend the United States in anything that does not involve Israel, he will do so. The conflict would come only if the United States and Israel actual clashed on a battlefield, and no one expects that.

However, you have to think about scenarios as they might develop over the next quarter or half century. In the course of your lives you will see 90 years and 100 years as a common lifespan. You people are in your thirties. So you are talking about 2/3 of a century to go, which will take you to 2050. It will take you into space colonization. It will take you into things you can't even visualize now. Certainly with your imagination you can make up scenarios in which Israel and the United States will come perilously close to colliding if not actually colliding. What you have seen in the first 40 years of the existence of Israel are periods of deep-freeze and periods of deepest friendliness. The deep freeze at the time of Carter and Begin was very serious. Carter just didn't like him. He thought Begin lied to him.

Carter felt that Begin had promised not to put any more settlements into the West Bank during the autonomy period; but Begin said promised any such thing - merely a 90 day pause. The two men never did repair their relationship.

Let us look at the kind of scenario which can develop into open animosity, not merely deep-freeze. The United States has an ally in Pakistan. The United States praised Pakistan a few days ago for the manner in which it handled that hijacking. Right outside the capital city of Karachi there is a nuclear reactor coming on stream. You remember what Israel did in July of 1981 to the nuclear reactor in Baghdad? Okay. You can be assured that if the Karachi reactor is ready to come on stream and hard information is available to Israel that nuclear weapons material is being produced in that reactor, Israel will be sorely tempted to destroy it, for Pakistan is a strong force in the Moslem rejectionist group, and Libya is the largest financial factor in the reactors construction. So Pakistan is an enemy of Israel, in a certain sense. Yet Pakistan is an ally of the United States. There could be a real honest-to-God conflict between Israel and the United States over Pakistan. It could take many forms. Where would the Jews of the United States stand on such a matter?