

Mr. Chairman, Professor Toynbee, ladies and gentleman, first, let me clarify that I'm here in my personal and not in my official capacity. Indeed, over the past 48 hours, since Professor Toynbee agreed to this debate, I have done very little in nature of my official capacity and have been more or less traversing beyond space and time a few thousand years of history back and forth, trying to disentangle civilizations and fossils.

Mr. Chairman, in this hall last week, an analogy was made, a comparison was drawn and a word was involved, evoked, a word also enshrining a concept. The word of morality. Morality is a word of great significance touching the destiny of individuals, of nations, of international community, but it was invoked by Professor Toynbee in even a broader canvas, in the canvas of history, in terms of history, spiritual coherence, and purpose. I agree fully with a remark made by Professor Toynbee and reported in the press as to the nature of the world crisis at the present time.

All agree today that this crisis lacks adequate definition. The common man, like the statesmen, realize that in mankind's hands is reposed the crucial alternative of self-destruction or of redemption, of a new insight into history's purpose or of oblivion, and all realize that only through a decisive leap forward in the spiritual consciousness of mankind can the answer be found to this human dilemma. In the attempt at civilization in our time, and I'm using a phrase of Professor Toynbee, this leap forward must come from a deeper sense of morality. Before this body last week, Professor Toynbee, according to the newspapers of Montreal, compared, from a moral standpoint, the attitude of Israel to the Arabs in 1947 and '48 with the Nazi slaughter of 6 million Jews. Let me say a word on this comparison.

I must first say that the Professor clarified that he was not comparing the two events statistically but he insisted, so the papers say, that the moral comparison is valid.

Secondly, he is quoted as having said that the Jews had no historical right to Israel. Now, as far as one aspect of this analogy, the Nuremberg international court made a finding that in the summer of 1941 plans were made for the final solution of the Jewish question in Europe. This final solution, as we all know, embraced in fact, the putting to death, in circumstances of unprecedented cruelty, of 6 million of our people including over a million children. It is a crime which human imagination still finds difficulty in grasping, but, in the biblical phrase, the earth cannot cover the blood in which it is soaked. There was here cold-blooded planning. There was government responsibility. There was execution to the magnitude of 6 million and there was the result that a third of the Jewish people was wiped out. The great centers of its religion, of its thought, its culture, its social, national movement, were obliterated.

Professor Toynbee himself has denounced this crime in incisive terms. Indeed, till the end of days, mankind will brood the significance of this specter, unprecedented, of man's inhumanity to man and as for my people, our mourning is endless. It is a mourning to eternity.

Let us take the other side of the analogy. In 1947, over two thirds of the members of United Nations took a decision on partition with separate Jewish and Arab states. The Arab representatives on the spot announced they would resist and within days an armed attack began against the Jewish community in Palestine. Writing on that period the then United Nations Secretary General, Mr. Trygve Lie, in his book *In the Cause of Peace*, page 163, says, "From the first week of December 1947 disorder in Palestine had begun to mount. The Arabs repeatedly had asserted they would resist partition by force. They seem to be determined to drive that point home by assaults upon the Jewish community in Palestine."

On January the 21st, 1948, the British representative of the United Nations, Sir Alexander Cadogan, told Security Council that for the Arabs in Palestine, the killing now transcends all other considerations. On the 16th of February 1948, the United Nations Palestine Commission reported to the Security Council that powerful Arab interests, both inside and outside Palestine are defying the resolution of the General Assembly and are engaged in a deliberate effort to alter by force the settlement and villages they're in.

And again in April '48, the commission referred to continued threats and acts of violence. With the expiry of the British mandate on the 15th of May, the Arab armies invaded, informed the United Nations they were intervening in Palestine with the object of establishing right and order in place of chaos and disorder. The nature of this right and order was immediately defined by the Secretary General of the Arab League, Azzam Pasha, speaking in Cairo, I'm quoting a BBC broadcast 15th of May '48, he says, "The world would now see a war of extermination and momentous massacre, which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and crusades." It was a war. There was heavy suffering on both sides, casualties, military and civilian. Through this war, large numbers of Arabs in Palestine were uprooted. At the same time, through this war, large Jewish communities throughout the Middle East were uprooted. On both sides there was heavy suffering. Large numbers of Arabs left the country in order to come back in the wake of the victorious forces.

No international authority has defined responsibility for the Arab refugee problem. It is our contention, and we can sustain this contention through Arab and other, including British, sources, the refugee problem was the result of the war proclaimed by the Arabs and the result of an appeal by the leaders to leave in order to return. As an Arab newspaper in Jordan put it, "They told us to get out so that we can get in. We got out, they did not get in." But let's look at the results. There's analogy in terms of morality, Professor, of the Arab population there are now 200,000 in Israel enjoying equality and every right side by side with their Jewish fellow citizens. I represent these Arab citizens just as I represent Jewish citizens because they're all Israeli citizens.

In the refugee camps, it is true, there are large numbers of Arab refugees. At the same time, quite considerable part of them have been absorbed in the economy of neighboring countries. But even those in the camps, despite their suffering, there are many of them working and over the past 13 years their number has increased. In any event, there's a difference even between a parasitic existence and between total extinction. They continue to suffer because the Arab governments who originated this suffering refused to relieve it by cooperating in the settlement of the Arab refugee problem. It is the same line of suffering died right down since '47, with the same source. Professor, there is a relationship between the two events to which you referred. The relationship is that in both cases, the Jewish people was assaulted. In one case, a third of our people were destroyed. In the other, we resisted as a self-defense and under a merciful providence we succeeded.

The second point of relationship is that through the experience of this Holocaust in Europe our will strengthened, that we would do everything in our capacity, but never again should such a tragedy befall our people. But how can the two events, of the destruction of a third of our people and of the Arab refugee problem created through a war started by the Arabs themselves, how can the two be mentioned in the same breath? Should we pass an amendment to Article 51 of the charter of United Nations on the right of self-defense? An amendment which says if you are attacked you may resist. But remember, no matter what you suffer in the process, if the man attacking you suffers, you'll be condemned by history. You'll be condemned as having been affected by Nazi influences.

You speak, Professor, with respect, of Gandhi, of his concepts. You link him across the span of history to Yohanan ben Zakkai, one of our great masters of the law at the time of the destruction of the second temple. But I would say this, that as far as I've read, that Gandhi, while opposing activist self-defense, never denounced those who pursued it. What should we have done, allowed the Nazi experience to be repeated, be butchered?

Now the criterion of moral defensibility I submit in all respects, sir. In this case, it is vague and indiscriminate. Morality, unless specified and clearly defined, does not strengthen morality, but weakens it. Indeed, one might say it is a case of neutral moralism. Ernest Renan has spoken of [foreign language 00:10:03] but here you don't even have the nuances. You have two entirely different contexts of right and wrong. Professor, I would appreciate if you could clarify for me and for those present, what exactly you meant by this statement, which was quoted in the Montreal press. 2

Boxers shake hands before they fight. Now, perhaps rather a good example for ambassador and professors, and [inaudible 00:00:09] give such an entertaining performance as boxers might do, but still this is a very important and serious occasion. The ambassador has said their own one or two other questions which he and I both want to discuss in your presence. The big one and the first one is this question of the parallel that I drew in a book that I published in 1954 between what the Nazis did to the European Jews and what the Israelis did to the Palestines and Arabs which was brought up in one of the questions that were put to me at the meeting the other day in [inaudible 00:00:47]. I answered, yes, I had written that. I said yes, in the terms, which I stated it in print in this book of mine, I still held it.

Now, the ambassadors were anticipated one point in telling kindly that when I originally made this statement and then I repeated it the other day, I did say at the same time that I was not making a numerical comparison because obviously there was no numerical comparison between figures run into millions, figures to run into three ordinals to four figures. The second set of figures, I'm talking about the massacres of Arab civilians behind the lines during the war between the Arab states and the Israeli forces in 1948. Every increase in numbers produces an increase in suffering, but it's impossible to be wicked or criminal more than 100%. Let me put the point blank there. If I murder one man that makes me a murderer. I don't have to reach the thousand mark or the million mark to be a murderer or already. I wonder if there any Egyptians in the room. I know the number of Egyptians in Montreal, is there any Egyptian present, perhaps not.

Well, let us suppose that some of the Egyptians in Montreal were here at this moment. They would say to me, how do you being an Englishman defend the slaughter in the fall of 1956 of civilian inhabitants of the Egyptian town of Port Saeed by bombards in the air which ran into four figures on the admission of the British government itself which I sent somebody to investigate. He couldn't get it down below four figures if I remember right. I suppose I have to answer why that's not murder. We only kill people up to four figures now to be a murderer, you must to reach the million mark. Now, there are Germans over there, they reached it. They murdered several million people. So they're murderers, but we the British were not murderers. Now, what did you think of that answer, what would Egypt say and what would the world say now.

I think that applies to all around to all cases. Now, the massacres, I must use the word to which I'm referring. I was not making this comparison, referring to the fighting between the armed forces, the Arab states and the Israeli forces. The situation was that the Arab state smart side Palestine did make war on Israel. I do not defend that. At that time, what is now the territory of Israel was inhabited by the local Arab population been there for many centuries, and by the Israelis who come in since 1917 the victims were the local Palestinian Arab population. Now, we come to this point of morality. I utterly agree with ambassador that this is the essential point and the point which concerns the future as well as the past. Now, I've mentioned a case is painful to me to mention this British case in 56 to show that I can look at the things my own country has done as well as what other people have done.

But I do think if there's any point in my, what I've said about the numbers that in point of morality, some of those massacres by Israeli armed forces in Palestine do combine so to speak moral quality with what the Germans did. What we hate in, what the Germans did was, it was planned beforehand, carried out cold bloodedly with

tremendous cruelty and with a purpose. Now I'm afraid. I know that all those points applied to the massacres which in numbers they don't compare. But I think in quality do compare with what the Nazis did anyway, by certain Israeli armed forces, the stern gang for instance, and the [inaudible 00:05:10]. I don't know how far the Haganah was also implicated. I've heard it stated and I never heard it denied, but after at least one of those massacres that of the civilian population of all sexes and ages today I have seen to the West of Jerusalem.

The Israeli Armed Forces went around in cars with loud speakers, speaking in Arabic and said, we have done this to people of this place. You don't want that to happen to you get out. Now, every civilian population that is in a war zone or is in danger of death, very wisely does get out happily. After Hitler came to pine Germany, a minority, unfortunately only a minority of the Jews in Germany did manage to definitely often to leave Germany in time. Now the Germans, they couldn't take their lives in longer, but they could indeed taken seas and held a property. No one thinks that where the European Jews who got out of Germany at that time forfeited their legal right to their property as a result of having managed by prudence and foresight to save their lives and their family lives by getting out in time. If we take another case, in 1940, when the Germans invaded France, several million French people from Northern France fled from Northern France to the south.

For the same reason that the Arab population of the war zone in Palestine in 1948, fled from Palestine. No one, I think would dream of saying that by fleeing as all civilian populations do try to fly from a war zone, those French people forfeited their title to their land, property, houses, and so on in Northern France. If the Germans were to put in a claim today, as we invaded the country and these French people were ill advised enough to run away, we have legal title to this property in Australia or other shame and illegal. We don't possess it now that seem pretty fantastic. But as you realize, the positions in Israel today is that by farther larger part, I suppose of the land in Israel is legally still the property of that civilian Arab population of Palestine which fled from Palestine during the war between the Arab states outside Palestine and the Israelites.

The property that does rightfully belong to the Israelites, is the property that they bought in the 30 years of the mandate or long before that. I think, if I'm right, the first agricultural Jewish settlements in Palestine go back to the 1880s the Rothschild settlements. Now, they paid very handsome price, very off of that land and that land is obviously not illegally, but morally and fairly their property. If I'm right in my figures, a smallish proportion of the total land in the area now held by Israel by farther larger proportion and also the houses movable property, fruit trees, and so on is still the rightful property of the Palestinian refugees who are now living outside the homes that often within sight of them and are living under conditions of misery and present of purposeness. Let me now make a general point which concerns not Arab human nature or Jewish human nature, but I'm afraid of human nature of all of us.

As I say of all of us, let me begin again with my own country. In the second world war, the civilian population in my country, Britain was severely bombed. What did we do within 11 years of that to the end of the war was four to five. In 1956, we bombed in an aggressive attack on Egypt without declaration of war and condemned by the world having done it. We bombed the civilian population of particularly Portside some extent to [inaudible 00:09:25] I think as well and slaughtered certainly more than a thousand innocent people, probably rather more than were slaughtered in those massacres by the Israeli Armed Forces in 48 of Palestinian Arab civilians during the war in the Israelis and the Arab states. This is a tragedy of human nature. What is the real tragedy is that people who have suffered a thing who had experience of it should inflict that suffering on other people cause human imagination is a very sluggish thing.

It's very hard to realize at secondhand what it means to suffer these things. But of course the British people, just during one war, they suffered this bombardment just for a few years, the Jewish people have suffered murder,

robbery, expansion from their homes, not just for a year or two, but for centuries running into about 2,500 years should we say. The more experience one has of what this means? I would say, the more it is morally incumbent [inaudible 00:10:39] and not to do the same thing again. The temptation to work it off and exasperated is no doubt greater, but the moral duty to resist the temptation is at its maximum.

One curious feature about the effect of this comparison I've made. I've been surprised at the Vietnamese of the reaction to it in the Jewish community. I've wondered myself why, when just felt to be rather preposterous comparisons, you obviously feel it to be, you haven't said he has a silly man saying a silly thing. Why bother about it? It says to leave it to learn, but the reaction has not been like that. It's been very vigorous. I think I'm going to say rather controversial thing that any psychologist would tell you the reason. I would say that rather inadvertently in this comparisons I've drawn, I have given the Jewish people a piece of what psychologists call shock treatment. I have said aloud in startling words, I think something that your conscience is each of you who belong to the Jewish community of the world are whispering inside each of you.

Now let my voice fade out from and listen to another voice, but I'll quote "I am certain that the world will judge the Jewish fate by what it will do with the Arabs." Now, as I say, those aren't my words. There are the words of a man famous in all your minds, Chaim Weizmann, who I had the honor to know when I was a young man who was the first President of Israel. They were spoken or written in 1949 after the war in the Arab states and Israel when Dr. Weizmann was the first President of Israel, but I would ask you, don't let my voice fade out, let even Dr. Weizmann's voice fade out and listen to your own inner voice inside each of you. Because after all, who was it, who were the first to wake up the human conscience. I would say it was the Prophets of Israel and Judah.

I do not believe that any person of Jewish religion can ever escape from his own conscience. What's more, I don't believe any Jew ever wishes to escape from his own conscience. I believe it has been the glory of the Jews since the time of the prophets and perhaps before. In all controversial questions between Jews or between Jews and the rest of the world, there have always been Jews who have had the spiritual insight and the moral carriage to stand up and criticize their people. We shouldn't know what the criticisms of the Jews in the eighth and seventh centuries BC where if we hadn't got the writings of Jewish critics who had criticized them. So I would leave you with your own consciences and with the existence of these Arab refugees who now number 900,000 because many children have been born in Exile. So as I say, I leave it to you to think over in your own consciences, what is to be done about this situation because we have opened a problem and we have not yet solved it.

AMBASSADOR: First of all, let me, so I fully agree on the virtue of self-criticism. If I may sum up your words with your permission, I think there are three broad points. In the first place, I understand that you agree that the Arab Armies assaulted Israel when it came to life. In other words, what Israel was doing, it was doing is a self defense.

Well, there was more to be sentiment in that because of course the United Nation Declaration of Independence and so on was, I suppose from the Arab point of view of provocation was on the basis of United Nations decision, and every United Nation's record attest to that including those I've quoted. On July 15th, 1948 Arab position having reached what it had in terms of threat to peace the United Nations Security Council that considered the situation in the category of threat to peace and said they might have to apply article 39, in terms it was to be done in the situation, but you would admit professor, I mean, that is.³

The fact that they did attack us, you've got to see it in that context. Now you argue that facing up to this attack, our people committed two grave atrocities. Number one, the Deir Yassin incident. Number two, driving out Arabs and turning them into refugees. And now, before I deal with these two points, I will in a moment, very central to your thesis is that the Nazi impact of persecution on the Jewish people brought them to do such atrocities. And

you've mentioned the British action bombing civilians in Port Said in 1956. Now professor, in volume four page 128F of your study of history, you say that in the history of man's attempt at civilization hitherto, there has never been any society whose progress and civilization has gone so far that, in times of revolution or war, its members could be relied upon not to commit atrocities.

And you quote here, this was written before world war II, behavior of the German army in Belgium in 1914, the British Black and Tans in Ireland in 1920, the French army in Syria, German National Socialist storm troops at home in 33 before world war II, and the Italian Black Shirts. Am I correct, sir, in assuming that you feel that this is in a record down history. Now you said that because of the bombing of Britain by the Germans, the certain state of mind, some impact, some scar developed in the British consciousness and that reflected itself in the bombing of Port Said. Now the Black and Tans in Ireland was 1920, well over 13 years before Hitler came to power and there are many such incidents I could recall. It could even take during world war II, British bombing of Berlin.

Yeah, certainly.

Now, would you agree with me that all these incidents have an element of cruelty, which is quite comprehensive in your terms? Whether it be the bombing of Berlin in world war II, whether it be earlier, the Black and Tans, whether it be Hiroshima, whether it be even the treatment of the early American Indians. Right through this, you feel that there is a sense of atrocity.

Now, how do you relate all this to Nazism? Secondly, you agree that there are also Arab massacres of Jewish civilians. I can give you details. If you will come to Israel, I will show you the graves and frightening cruelty. And long before Deir Yassin, which I'll refer in a minute. Where these also in the category of Nazi atrocities? And if so, why don't you that both sides did things in such a category? Why do you choose us? Why do you single us out? Why don't you write of Britain and of almost every country of the world, according to your own definition. And finally a word in Deir Yassin, I suggest the refugees will talk it later as a separate part. But in Deir Yassin I would say this: Deir Yassin took place after a series of massacres, such as the destruction of 50 Jewish laborers in [inaudible 00:02:51], December 1947. Convoy after convoy. The well known convoy, [inaudible 00:02:57], in which we lost 40 people. The blowing up Ben Yehuda, 50 people killed in Jerusalem, 70 wounded.

An enormous provocation, it was a city under siege. In your own survey of international studies, written by Dr. Kirk under your editorship, he quotes the commander of the [inaudible 00:03:15] at the time as having said that his men suffered appreciable casualties. And those responsible for that action have claimed that the Arab residents of the village were warned to leave the houses and that this tragedy developed through hand to hand fighting and indeed the commander of the operation was killed. But I would add, be that as it may, this action condemned in most vigorous terms by the Jewish agency at the time and the message of regret was sent to King Abdullah of Jordan. We heard no such expressions of regret for Arab massacres, although they were undertaken within the category of armed defensive against us. So to sum up, sir, what I would ask you, do you agree that there is lie linking every act of atrocity committed by soldiers, various countries and down the ages? If so, would you agree that this odium of a Nazi impact would be attached to all such nations, not only to Israel? And including to the Arabs, what they did to us, particularly since they attacked us and we were operating in self defense. And on Deir Yassin and the refugee matter, we will talk a bit later.

Yes. Well I suppose the Arabs could match atrocity [inaudible 00:04:29]. You could give many more instances of Arab massacres of Jews and they could give many, many, I suppose of-

By the way, sir, if I may just interrupt you. At the end of the first week after the November 29th resolution, 105 Jews were killed and many were injured. And one week, right after resolution in December 1947, this is on record.

But there were things on both sides. Now, about my own country, as you say, no volumes published between the wars. I did mention things my own country had done of this kind. And if I'd not published this volume in two years before the aggression against Egypt, I would certainly have mentioned my country's aggression in this context. I couldn't because I wrote and published in '54 and the thing happened in '56. There is a thing which the Indians called karma, which is the chain of moral evil. It's a generalization of what I tried to suggest before, there's something in human nature which makes us pass on, against other people, the evil that has been done to us. I agree with the ambassador that this is a very general and a very horrible thing in human life. But I also feel very strongly that, as the Buddha felt when he emphasized this chain of karma, but that is not an excuse.

We can't just say, "Well, this is part of human nature. Everybody does it or has done it at some time, therefore we can all get away with it and, in mutilated speak, condone what each of us does." We have to break this chain. Now coming back to the Israel case, I know very well that there are many people, no doubt a majority in Israel, who were horrified at those massacre done by some Israeli armed forces. And the Israelis are a rather small minority of the people of Jewish religion in the world. And I'm sure that the majority of Jews in the world, as far as they knew about this, were also horrified and their responsibility. One has a slight responsibility for what anyone's co-religionists do. I feel a slight responsibility for what my Protestant Christian co-religionists of European race are doing at this moment in South Africa. And a much greater one for my English Protestant co-religionists are doing in Rhodesia and Kenya, but these degrees of responsibility are limited.

I would make the point that all Israel has implicated itself, so to speak, in the results of that flight... Partly flight, partly expulsion, to a smaller extent, massacre, of the Palestinian Arabs because they have taken and held the land and property, which is legally and rightfully still that of the Arabs. Now, putting it bluntly, this is robbery and I'm sure it is on the Jewish conscience. And this is a continuing thing which has to be cleared up. First of all, by the Jews and themselves, primarily the Israelis. But it also does concern all Jewish communities all over the world who make Israel's existence possible by their financial and also by their political support. Particularly the Canadians and United States citizens who are Jews by religion. Who have the greatest financial power and the strongest political say in this matter. So we have this continuing question of how to break the chain of karma. How to prevent the wrong that has been done, which was bred, I agree, by previous wrongs from breeding further wrongs in its turn.

I have been in the refugee camps in the Gaza Strip and I've heard the songs that the children sing in their schools. If you wanted to see what it was like to be a Jew, say of 13 or 14 years, after Nebuchadnezzar exiled the Jews, go to the Gaza Strip and study the spirit and state of mind of the Arabs there. They're saying just the same things, feeling just the same things that the Jews felt then and have continued to feel later. "This was our country. We mean to return."

Professor-

Pardon me if I come back to the original issue. I said I'll lead with the refugee matter in a minute, but the original issue was the question of comparing what we did morally to what the Nazi's did to us. Now I think it's been established that there was a war of aggression against us. I've given some background to the Deir Yassin massacre. I will deal later with the refugee matter. But from what I understand from the quotation I gave and from what you've now elaborated, would you agree professor that this stigma of comparison, moral comparison, applies not only to our people, but to those Arabs who were responsible for massacres? The ones I detailed and many more,

I can give you a list, to most of the nations of the world, who at any time, their soldiers in war, even in self defense, have been guilty of atrocity?

I distinguish sharply though. This is difficult, but this is one of the necessary and valuable conventions of human society, between suffering, death, mutilation caused in fighting between organized and uniformed armed forces and massacres by people, often civilians behind the front.

Accepted. I'm referring... Any instances in history, and when you talk here of atrocity, you do not mean acts between the combatants.

No.

You mean atrocities committed by military people against civilians.

Yes.

And you've quoted certain allegations against us, which I'll deal with separately. But suppose from your standpoint, extreme standpoint, and so our propaganda claims that we were guilty of the atrocity in that form. But do you admit, sir, that the similar guilt attaches to nearly every country in the world? For, at some time or other, you yourself have said in your quote, "No society... It's members can be relied on not to commit atrocities in time of war or revolution." And again, I say, even if it's in self defense,

I agree that most societies have committed atrocities, but I do not think that condones atrocities.

I didn't say so, sir.

No.

No, I agree with you on that. But you do agree that this same element, this comparison, can be applied on a universal level to any country which in war its soldiers have committed atrocities against civilians?

Yes, atrocities are atrocities and murder is murder, whoever commits it.

And that would apply also, sir, in case of Arab atrocities against Jewish civilian population?

Of course.

Yes. And Black and Tans?

Of course.

For United States, early Indians.

Yes.

Whole realm is limitless. In other words, what you were saying, if I now understand it, was that within a general category of denouncing violence or atrocities by military people against civilians that Israel, in your opinion, was not separate from the rest of mankind, but was guilty of the same thing as others?

Of course I don't think that Israelis are different from mankind. I'm not anti-Semite to think they're not human.

No, I meant the country.

Pastor, what I meant was this, what you're saying is that Jew Israelis cannot claim to be stand above the rest of mankind because what they've all done, in time of war, even in self defense you've also done. Would that be correct, sir?

It's curious me to defend the Germans and the Nazis of all people because my country suffered in two wars of aggression by the Germans. But they too are human and what the Nazis did is not peculiar. I mean, well, it's not peculiar in the sense that the ambassador has explained that this, unhappily, is something that is in all human nature and we have to break. Now, why I brought up the case of Israelis in this connection was simply the fact that I was writing about the Palestine Question and about the Question between Jews and Gentiles in the world.

But it would apply to any other nation too.

And, as the ambassador's quoted, in other places in my book I brought up cases which I took my examples from the British and the French.

Well, I think from that point I could just say, if I may now in a more academic sense, I feel that in analyzing atrocities in history, there are gradations. I feel the Nazi onslaught, what they did, is something quite specific. Can it be compared to any other atrocity in human history? But you, sir, disagree.

[crosstalk 00:13:37]

No, I understand. In terms of let's say the gradations of morality, how can I explain to you? Take the people in Israel who went through the hell which were the Nazi death camps in Europe, the remnants. And coming out of those death camps, they tried to get to Israel, Palestine at the time, and many of them on ships were held up by the British Navy and arrested or sent over to Cypress, put into camps. Now let's take a man on a ship like that. He'd gone through the hell, saw what the Nazis did to him. You'd be surprised, professor, if you speak to these remnants today, although they felt at the time that the British attitude was one of cruelty, and certainly political blindness, but they did not equate it with the Nazis.

Yes.

These same people who went through the Nazi experience, Holocaust, who escaped from it, their soul was not so shattered as to equate further evil as being a Nazi level. And it is these same people you say who were so influenced by the Nazis, that they did similar things to the Arabs. But I think that we can leave this point now, with your permission. I think that the fact that you've set in the universal context, shows it is a distinctive view of yours. That Israel is at one... Or rather, if I may quote the point, "That Israel is not separate from rest of nations of the world."

[crosstalk 00:15:01] Israelis are different from other human beings? Yes, actually.

In other words, the Nazi Pell lies across the world before the Nazis came this business of atrocity and cruelty, and after they've gone.

With your permission, Professor, I would suggest we go to the second point.

Yes.

And actually, as I open, you referred to... I must add, one slight observation, the question of land holdings. I would say that any study of the British mandatory land registers will show that 70% of the land, which is now Israel, was government owned, belonged to the government, to the mandate, formally to the Ottomans. It never belonged

to any separate Arab political entity in Palestine down the ages. The only times Palestine was a separate entity was twice under Jewish rule, and once under the Crusaders.

Are you talking about a private property?

A private property. And on the private property, which was taken through the war, we have promised and are ready to give full compensation. This has been promised time and again, by the United Nations. And in this respect, I can speak officially, although here I'm in a person capacity. But Professor, let's come back to this question of the historical connection to which you referred your co-living said Israel is no historical right, Jewish people to Israel. May I say some facts in this respect?

Yes.

Number one, the continuity of Jewish residents in the land of Israel never ceases any time in history. And I can quote your records on that, century after century. Secondly, the return to Israel has been central in our religious faith, in our prayers, in our festivals, in every aspect of our national aspiration. Thirdly, the international community is recognized ability of that right. Balfour Declaration, League of Nations, United Nations. Fourthly, even the Arabs at the beginning did. There was a message from Emir Feisal to Dr. Weizmann. He headed the Arab delegation to the peace conference in Versailles. And there's an agreement between them, and another letter on that agreement, Emir Feisal writes that he welcomes the Jews home.

Yes, I was there. I was in on it. Yes.

Well, I hope that I haven't misquoted any-

No. No, quite right.

Well, at least I have very clear testimony on that. So, you cannot put it in the category of saying that a title which went up [solescent 00:02:19] in c. 132... It does not. That has been a continuous link in aspiration century after century. Some of our greatest religious thought and work has been produced there: the Mishnah, Jerusalem Talmud, Midrash, the Targum, Masorah, and down, right down to the Shulchan Aruch, which is a basic code of Jewish law. All produced century after century and continuous residents there. And time and again our people hoped to achieve independence, but that didn't work out. In 1917, a new motive began, a new momentum, but it was there all the time. You speak of the first settlement being in 1881, I can show you documents of Jewish settlements and towns and Palestine of those days from the 10th century.

[inaudible 00:03:05] in the 16th centuries-

But even earlier. Saadia Gaon, Benjamin of Tudela, of the 12th century. Maimonides, Yehuda Halevi, 12th century. Nachmanides, early 13th century. Continuous residence. [Graboustor Farkey 00:03:20] author of [Kaft of Oferra 00:03:22], continuous residence all the time. And the whole motive of our life was linked up with that. We feel that the present revival of third Commonwealth of Israeli is of indication for mortal prophecy. That has been our course down the ages. We've traversed the value of death. And now, under graceful Providence, we've come to the uplands of fulfillment. That's how we see our history. It was not snapped.

You feel that we are a fossil and went off somewhere and sort of fell on the skating ring and used Montreal terms. We didn't. We didn't. We remained vital and alive and creative. And may I Sir, at this stage express some surprise, in your book you don't refer at all at a line of Jewish creativity. And by the way, Einstein also belongs to that collective fossil category.

The ambassador raised two questions as now. One was the question about the Jewish claim or title to Palestine. And the other was about the word fossil that I've used, not only about the Jews, but quite a number of different people. For instance, the Parsis and various Christian sects and some extent the Greeks.

So you do differentiate between fossilism, I've been reading your books, and archaism. Parsis and we, are the fossil category. Archaic, you've got there the Greeks and the Turks, in terms of the Turks, and the Norwegians and the Irish. I'm not going to deal with the Irish problem. I was thrown there.

No. Don't just bring that into it. No.

No. I have a feeling that they'll both be well able to look after themselves. I leave that to the Irish Ambassador.

No, I think the Israeli often says too very well. But, that become seriously now back to this question of the Jewish title. Now, what is remarkable about the Jews? What is, I suppose, made the Jewish communities exist today is as the ambassador truly says, the fact that they didn't lose their memory of their Homeland. In this they were exceptional among the people who are uprooted and deported by the Syrians and Babylonians, all that time ago in the 8th and 7th and 6th centuries BC. The next kingdom all had the same religion. The kingdom of Israel didn't like the people of the kingdom of Judah, managed to maintain its corporate identity in exile. As we know, the 10 tribes disappeared, less the British Israelites are right in saying the British are the lost 10 tribes. And I don't think they are right about that.

Today, the kingdom of Israel is represented only by a few hundred Samaritans, some in Jordan, some in the prison state of Israel. And all the other peoples of Syria, temporaries of Judah and Israel, have completely disappeared. Whereas, the Jews have kept identity. And they've kept it by the memory of Palestine. I mentioned just now that I think the Jews of today and tomorrow are going to be the Palestinian Arab refugees, because they are in just a state of mind in which the Jews were immediately after the exile by Nebuchadnezzar. And Palestine seems to have some magic over people's minds that once they have lived in it. The Arabs have more recently than the majority of the Jews, who motions never can let hold of that land.

But anyway now, what about this claim? I would say that if one has that historical and emotional relation to a country, one has a certain claim to have the freedom of that country. But under one condition, that one doesn't carry one's claim to a point where it is going to cause some hardship, wrong, and injustice to the existing inhabitation of the country. There is a thing in law, and I think in all forms of law, called the statute of limitations. Which, for the sake of producing the minimum amount of hardship and suffering, says that a legal claim does expire after such time.

Now, if we take AD 135 was a time when, except in parts of Galilee, the solid Jewish population in Palestine was uprooted by action of the Romans, which I don't defend. I don't have to defend the emperor Trajan unfortunately. If we take that date and say the statutes of limitations doesn't apply even to people who lost their hold in 1835, what happens to Montreal? Well, the Algonquins had it only three or four hundred years ago, less than 400 years ago. Is that to go back to them? It's much less than AD 135. Is England to go back to the Welsh?

Yes.

Kid. Well, of course it would lead with hardship, that's all I can say. You'd have to deport about 50 million English and turn them into refugees.

5

Now, here I come to the Balfour Declaration. I may say, I'm extremely critical, myself, of the Balfour Declaration. I mentioned just now that I was, as a young man, working for the British government during the First World War on the Turkish Empire, which at that time, of course, included Palestine. So I had certain inside knowledge of what happened at that time. I'm critical of the Balfour Declaration. I'm still more critical of the conduct of the British Mandate during the next 30 years, because I think we never took a line or made up our mind one way or the other. And that was, I think, extremely hard on both the Jews and the Arabs. But anyway, the Balfour Declaration is central to this point of title. Even though it's a short document, many of you probably know it by heart, I can't remember the exact words, but there are two sentences really it consists of.

The first is "Britain undertakes to uphold and support a Jewish national home in Palestine." The second clause is, "provided that nothing is done to harm the interests of the existing inhabitants of the country," which at the time the declaration was made, in 1917, were more than 90% Arabs, of course. And I blame the Balfour Declaration because the word "home" was vague. But it was made very clear, as I know directly from seeing the documents at the time, as a young temporary official in the British Foreign Office, that it was made perfectly clear and was accepted by Dr. Weizmann at the time that home did not mean state. Because if home meant state, then the first clause of the Balfour Declaration would've been incompatible with the second clause in it, which was equally an obligation of equal power and validity equally incumbent on the British government who had made the declaration that no harm should be done to the rights and interests of the existing inhabitants of the country.

I do think, I suppose everybody would think, that the Jews had a claim to a national home, but I do think that national home could not without the detriment we've seen, 900,000 refugees, to the interest of the existing inhabitants of the country, take the form of an exclusively Jewish state. It might have taken the form of a Palestinian state which included both Jews and Arabs on a footing of equality. You might say that was a theoretical possibility and once the country had been opened to Jewish immigration on terms decided not by the existing population themselves, but by the British government, the situation was going eventually to get out of hand. It's true that all regimes and peoples in Palestine since 1835 have tolerated and recognized the right of Jews to live in Palestine. There have always in Jerusalem been pious Jews studying the law in this place, which is the most sacred place for Jews in the world.

And Turkish was even tolerated there too. I don't know what the crusaders did, if anybody didn't tolerate it was probably the crusaders, but I don't care about that. But throughout history, on the whole, that has been so. Now, the national home was the enlargement of that, studying the law by about... Well, there are 50,000 Jews there [inaudible 00:03:25] in Jerusalem at the time and about 12,000 agricultural settlers, I think, in 1917. That was rather than an old-fashioned form of Jewish national home. And the intention of, I think, the Zionist movement as led by Dr. Weizmann, and of the British government as represented by Mr. Balfour, was to broaden the basis and to modernize the Jewish national home by allowing more immigration, by letting the Jews have the right, as of right within to settle in Palestine. Limited numbers because of this other obligation Great Britain had undertaken not to harm the interests of the existing inhabitants of the country.

Have a university, have all the apparatus of modern civilization. Now, I blame the Balfour Declaration in this sense, that I think a lawyer could prove that the two obligations undertaken in it were incompatible, but perhaps it's only hindsight, perhaps you can't blame the British government at the time too much for not having foreseen this at the moment, though I do blame them all the same. Both communities were going to interpret this in ways that were incompatible with each other. Palestine has made it into a mandate of the so-called A class, which were to be prepared for sort of government and complete sovereign independence. The Arabs, being more than 90%, actually thought that when Palestine became independent it would be an Arab state with a Jewish minority. Jews,

or some of the Jews was very consciously minded from different branches of Zionists and other Jews over this, interpreted the national home as merely a kind of halfway house towards a Jewish state.

Some, I'm afraid, said even if that's not what the British meant we're going to use this as a lever for having a Jewish state in the end. Very human, I'm not blaming them too much for that. But anyway, I myself think that the Balfour Declaration was right in putting this limitation. You may say it's like the pound of flesh and the drop of blood in *The Merchant of Venice*, that if it was for no detriment of the interest of the 90% non-Jewish existing population, you couldn't have much of a Jewish home. You could have a cultural one, but you certainly couldn't have a political one. I think that was the conditions were accepted by the Zionist organization at the time and were laid down by the British, and which gave the Jews something that was very near their heart's desire, and did on paper safeguard the interests of the existing inhabitants of the country, which on all grounds of law and morality one should do.

On the statute of limitations, which certain legal connotation and it also has, in this context, a connotation history. I'd like to quote you, professor. In your study, you say, "The Jews live on, the same peculiar people, long after Phoenicians and the Philistines lost their identity like all the nations. The ancient Syriac neighbors of Israel have fallen into the melting pot and have been reminted in the fullness of time with the new images and superscriptions, while Israel has proved impervious to this alchemy performed by history in the crucibles of universal states and universal churches and wanderings of the nations."

Extremely eloquent description, if I may say so, of Jewish survival. This statute of limitations was not recognized by history. We are the only people today in the Middle East speaking the same language, practicing the same religious faith, living in the same category of aspiration, spiritual continuity, as our forefathers thousands of years ago as those who were exiled from there. There's nobody else from 132 of the Common Era in that category in terms of continuity.

Well, it was, Mr. Ambassador, recognized by history. It wasn't in necessarily a practical sense that-

The Balfour Declaration.

No, by 1917 more than 90% of the population of Palestine were not Jews. That is the work of history de facto. Another work of history de facto is the continuing memory of the Jews of Palestine and memory of Palestine, the hope for return. But the Balfour Declaration, see, takes account of both these-

Yes, I appreciate that. On the question of historical association, you recognize, professor, that there was a continuous Jewish residence in the land of Israel. The return became the goal of the national life down the ages. It is also a fact that the Arabs never had Palestine as a separate political entity. It was controlled from remote caliphates for a number of centuries. It passed from hand to hand, 13 conquests down the ages. As the Middle East came to life, in terms of the development of new nations, a process beginning after World War I, which has continued to our time and was consummated in the '40s and early '50s, the international consciousness recognized that the Arab peoples deserve nationhood and deserve independence, deserve to achieve independence from the torpor of centuries and conquest. And eight Arab states came into being, covering an area of close to two millions square miles. They've achieved independence, a status without precedent possibly even in the golden days of the caliphate.

Within that category of the Middle East, it was recognized the Jewish people, having longed and lived for its return, should establish itself once again independence and freedom in the land of Israel. Now, you have an interpretation, sir, of the Balfour Declaration based on your association work of the time in the British government, but surely you will acknowledge that Lord Balfour himself, Lloyd George, prime minister of the

government, Winston Churchill, surely they should know what was meant by the Balfour Declaration, and they've clearly stated so down the years. And indeed, Emir Faisal, who you met at the Peace Conference, he too recognized implicitly in his whole approach.

Not the Jewish state.

Well, I haven't got the pact here. It was certainly implicit. But in any event, those responsible for the Balfour Declaration have clearly defined its purpose. It talks there of religious and civil rights of other inhabitants, and on that there's never been any question. But the basic issue here is, the Arab peoples having achieved a patrimony over eight countries and independence, millions of square miles, should not begrudge the Jewish people the state of 8,000 square miles which can work in peace and cooperation with them. Now, originally, the mandate related to both Palestine and Transjordan. In 1921, four fifths was cut off and Jordan became independent, or developed independence, the Emirate of Transjordan.

So you had a further attempt to satisfy the Arab approach. And so, over the years, the situation developed as it did. Now, if you look at it today, we hold neither land nor resource; water or any other resource, which our Arab neighbors need for survival and advancement. Only blessing can come from cooperation; not only for us, also for them. But history has set certain principles in the approach to the whole problem of the Middle East. We have down the ages prayed and believed that our restoration would come, independence would be restored, that within that context of independence, we again could make a contribution to mankind. This has taken place in our time. We believe that there are among Arab circles, people who subconsciously appreciate this. So they've got to be encouraged with any attempt to raise old claims without relevance to the present situation and we'll talk later on of the future, I think, are hardly helpful in that regard. We can either pass now, sir, to the fossil business or [crosstalk 00:11:46]

Mr. Ambassador, if I may take up this last point, the provinces of Canada stretch even further than the eight Arab countries. They stretch from ocean to ocean. So surely on the ambassador's argument, Canada should not begrudge to the poor Algonquin, such a little piece as, say, Montreal, because they've got such an awful lot left even if Montreal was given back to the Algonquins. I'm putting it in a joking form but my serious point is that the fact that those eight Arab countries are happily independent does not affect the fate of the Arabs who lived in what is now Israel, because that is not part of the Arab states. And the fact that other Arabs have their independence and can make their own future does not make the former Arab inhabitants of what is now Israel any less refugees and expatriates than they are at the moment.

On the Balfour Declaration, I must say explicitly that I know that it was clearly understood at the time that the national home was not intended to be a Jewish national state. And this was clearly stated to the Zionist organization by the British government at the time that the Balfour Declaration was issued and the declaration was accepted on those terms and the mandate was given by the League of Nations to Britain on those terms. I think Britain made an awful mess if the administration meant it. We had taken on something perhaps beyond the [inaudible 00:13:18] of any country to take on, nevermind. The Jews could not have made the mistake at the time of believing that the Balfour Declaration promised them a Jewish state.

But it is a fact, professor. Again, I say that I've read the interpretations given by those responsible for the declaration, and the consensus of world opinion of the time and the unfolding years after that. But certainly you will agree that the United Nations took a decision, in November 1947, there was to be a Jewish state in Palestine,

They took a decision later that the Arab refugees were to be repatriated into Israel.

They did not take such a decision, sir.

Not take such a decision?

No, no. They did not take a decision that the Arab refugees repatriated to Israel. And we can discuss this now, if you wish, or go on with the fossil business.

I'd like to discuss that, yes.

Very good.

The General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948, established a Palestine Conciliation Commission to deal with the whole complex of problems, which had risen between Israel and the Arab states. They were to serve as mediators and the parties were also asked in the resolution, if they wish to go operate directly in term direct contact with the view to finding a solution of all these problems. Within the context of this resolution, the refugee problem is referred to, the Commission is supposed to study the possibilities either of repatriation or a resettlement or compensation, but all this in part of a general context of a peace settlement.

The resolution talks of return of refugees as soon as practicable. And it also talks of those refugees who wish to live in peace. This resolution has been dead now since 1948, it has been dead, yes, it has been dead because the Arabs have never announced that they would live in peace with Israel. They refuse to negotiate directly, and the PCC in fact, has been a defunct body for many years now. And what is our position on this? The Arab refugee problem professor, is one of the whole complex of refugee problems. I believe that since 1940, some 35 million people have been uprooted across the world.

Yes.

Korea, Vietnam, Germany, Finland and nearly all of these problems either have been solved or approaching solution. And in no case, has the solution been through repatriation, but rather through absorption. Now, what have we said? We have said that we are prepared to pay full compensation, we have said we are prepared to consider a limited repatriation within a framework reunion of families. But the problem will never move, unless the Arab governments are prepared to cooperate in alleviating the suffering of the refugees. The fact is, our figures by the way, the refugees are about 550,000. We have basis to assume that some 160,000 have been absorbed. This is a unique problem. There's no economic difficulty money is being voted by United Nations. There's a promise of United States government for international loan.

There's no social problem because they're living among their people. The Arab living today in a camp in Transjordan, you've got a Pole living in Britain. He's living in his own surroundings, part of the environment of arising Arab nationalism, religious, cultural, identity of background and psychological. The problem will never move, until the Arab governments are prepared to cooperate in the humanitarian solution. I noticed professor, that you yourself have criticized the Arab governments.

I have, yes.

And you've said very rightly and talking of suffering, turning back to our first public conversation. Why don't they take them out of this parasitic existence? Why don't they set them up in farms and villages and homes? Why keep them there as a political weapon? You who scan history over thousands of years, you know of any other case, any

precedent of holding hundreds of thousands of people as political hostage in camps, parasitic, no future, quenching them the very sense of creativeness in them for what purpose?

So they can be ready as part of political pawn for some ultimate program to exterminate Israel, God forbid. Is that more? Is that an approach? Have you read the Secretary-General of United Nation, his report last year? He views the solution in terms of economic integration to the area. We will, of course will play our part in it. We are very upset to this continued humanitarian problem, but it's not in our hands. We can solve it. In Israel now there are 10% Arabs, 200,000. They enjoy every right with our fellow jury citizens. Do you want us to take back people who've been nurtured on hate for 13 years? On the basis of a resolution of 1948, talking of those wishing to live peace nurtured on a hate and vengeance and destruction, take them back into our state, and we have 10% Arab population, for what? They can rip us apart?

They should be [inaudible 00:04:52]. Take them out of a total Arab environment where they live, where they can create economically, socially, religiously, [inaudible 00:05:01] psychologically part bring them in to be a minority in a Jewish state. And this will help the problem of the Middle East. There is money, there is land, there is water. All that is needed is a part of that humanitarian benevolence and sense of duty to which you referred. Professor Tony B in 1948, the war of aggression unleashed Anna created two refugee problems. One related to some 550,000 Arabs. The other related to some 400,000 Jews and 70,000 Arabs. We have settled the second problem, we've absorbed over 400,000 Jews from Arab countries who were there of longer standing than the same Arabs in Palestine. We've settled them and we've taken them in as brothers. And we have settled 70,000 Arab refugees in the country.

The only Arab refugees, which have been struck off from under roles are those which we have taken into our economy. The other problem has not moved. Not because there's no money, not because there's no possibility, but purely because a humanitarian problem is being given. Put into a totally political context of animosity and hatred and the feelings of these poor people and their future. Their very life is being sacrificed on what? Some demagogue ambition of control and rule throughout the Middle East. Every international assessment of it. Every report has recommended a movement in the direction of economic integration of broadening economic possibilities. And we will play our part, there's no question on that. We long to see the problem solved as you do.

Mm-hmm (affirmative).

But it will not be solved by formulas, it'll not be solved with the context when they refuse to talk to us. It'll not be solved when these refugees are being prepared to destroy us. Only a few months ago, last month, professor Tony B a representative of the Arab refugees appeared in United Nations.

What did he speak about? The destruction of Israel, the extermination of Israel, he was probably told to do so by a certain government in the Middle East, he said so. So you tell us now, 48 they talked to coming back in peace. Now take them back after 13 years and he says, "he wants to destroy you." Why not? Let him come in rip you apart, please commit suicide. So at least the Arab armies won't have to overwhelm you from without. That sir, I think in the scan of history you will find no nation is being prepared to do. And since you said earlier, that in certain respects, we belong to a whole category of nation and our behavior in this respect too, we will not commit suicide.

I think they're two points in what the ambassador has said. One is repatriation and the other is using refugees as pawns. I think there is an inconsistency in the Israeli stand. You came for Jews repatriation into Palestine though, since long ago as 135 AD, there's been no solid Jewish population in Palestine though. I agree with ambassador

always have been, Jews in Palestine as a minority, rather small minority. And though, since I think 63 or 64 BC there haven't been a Jewish state in Palestine. And who've claimed that repatriation, not in the terms of the Balfour Declaration, a Jewish national home, but not a state, but in the extreme form of a state. But... same time, you deny to the Arabs who were forced out Palestine of the Israeli part of Palestine, as recently as 1948. The very thing that you claim is the central claim of the Jewish people. It is inconsistent.

Then using refugees as pawns. I have had opportunities talking to representatives of the Arab states within the last few years. And by the way, I think the Zionist Organization and the Israel government are rather living a glass house about this question of using refugees as pawns. Cause I think some pretty telling comparisons could be made between their use of Jewish refugees as pawns and the Arab government's use of Arab refugees for pawns. I think both the things that are testable things to do to people in the distress that refugees are in. And I think both Israelis and Zionists and the Arab states have been guilty of this, you know, the disgusting thing to do. When I've talked, I've had opportunities of talking with the Arab states. I have pointed out the policy of the West German government since the war, as you can see, I'm not partial to Germans because [inaudible 00:10:04] to Nazis, not ever. No reason to be particularly trended to Germans. But I have pointed out that the West German government, since the war, has been more wise as well as more humane, more important to be humane than to be wise, than the governments of the Arab states since 1948. The West German government had I suppose received, what the numbers round to 6 million, 8 million something-

Nine.

Nine millions that refugees from partly from Eastern Germany, partly from those territories that were part of Germany before the Second World War, which are now parts of Poland and the Soviet Union. The West German government, as far as I know, has not relinquished it's claim to one inch of territories that were German, east of the present boundary of Western Germany to German before the Second World War.

I'm not going to the question as well, the German's claims to recover this. Judge are good or bad. That doesn't really concern us here. But my point is that the West Germans have separated and this, I think they were thoroughly right. The question of claims to territory, which refugees come from and what to do about the refugees meanwhile. And Western Germany, to her credit of her heart and her head has taken the humane and sensible line of absorbing the refugees without renouncing claims to these refugees homes and territory into her life and into her industry. And one of the reasons why Western Germany is prosperous and powerful now is that she has given these refugees a chance of work and a chance of happiness and prosperity. And her voice is powerful among the nations now because of that. And I've said to the Arab states, why don't you do that? You don't have to relinquish the claim of the Palestinian Arabs to Palestine by absorbing a present into your industry a stronger position to oppress or claim later.

I'm sorry that they don't take this line, which I think it's silly of them politically, but I'm much more concerned with the humanity side. But I do think Israel is living in a glass house in drawing attention to this particular side of the Arab state's policy. Cause I think many things could be said, especially about the time immediately after the end of the World War about Jewish refugees who were directed for political and not humanitarian reasons to Palestine. When they could have had immediate homes and a much better future, I would say in Australia or in the north American continent. And I think politics were played with the Jewish refugees, just they being played now with the Arab refugees. I condemn both.⁷

Dr. Yaacov Herz...: I'll just say, Professor, on this question of politics and refugees, I've seen all the criticism of the attitudes of various governments after World War II, that they had no room for our refugees. I believe even you yourself have mentioned it in some context that they did not open their gates to refugees.

But I must, and this I do on basis of personal knowledge, I must reject emphatically any suggestion they were used as political pawns. The fact is that tens of thousands came to other countries, United States to Canada, across the world. Those who came to Israel came because they sought independence and freedom and they sought restoration and they felt that they could only overcome the experience of what had happened to them in the hands of the Nazis in a life of creativity with their own people.

But I would say this, as far as the comparing the two problems, you would not refer to the facts, sir, that we have taken in a million refugees, that these include over 400,000 refugees from Arab countries. There was an exchange of populations here, very much like the Turco-Greek exchange after World War I. We've taken over 400,000 Jewish refugees and we've taken in and absorbed economically over 70,000 Arab refugees. You can't turn... Arab refugees. I can show you United Nations documents on that. You can't turn back the clock of history, can't try to exterminate the people. You can't feed refugees for hatred for year and year after year, and then expect Israel to take them in to destroy us from within.

What I would suggest, sir, if I may, and with respect and view of the very deep humanitarian interest you take in this problem and I see that from the suggestion you have made to Arab leaders, and I fully understand your motive, at least this form of parasitic existence, this debasement, basic debasement of humanity should cease. Rights is one thing, but also life as it is lived is another, at least that should cease.

I would suggest that whenever you're free, if you could come to visit Israel so that we could show you on the spot, Professor, whom we've absorbed, how we've absorbed them, both Jewish refugees and the 70,000 Arab refugees that I spoke of. I feel that when you're there, when you have the sense of the area, when you have the sense of region, when you see the area of Israel, what we have done within it, when you see the vast area of the Middle East, and this is part of it and the endless opportunities to solve the problem neighboring countries, I would like very much then to hear your judgment, sir.

May I suggest that time is running short, we go onto the famous fossil thing, Sir. Because I'm sure the audience would notice, Sir...

That's a piece of comic relief, really. The fossil thing...

As you have said, Professor, this type of fossil has almost entered the international vocabulary since you used it in the context you did. And as I understood from reading your works over the past few days and nights, I should say, there are fossils, and they also peoples in the archaic sense. And I said earlier, we seem to be in both. We're both a fossil with the [Farsis 00:00:41] in India. And when it comes to archaism, we have a link with the Norwegians, the Greeks, the Turks, and the Irish. Well, I would say that at least in the archaic angle, I've got associations from childhood. As far as the Farsis, I'm afraid, I have no acquaintance.

They're very interesting people.

Professor, may I say this?

Yes.

I'm not a historian. Your thesis has been challenged by historians of great eminence and writers. There's quite a vocabulary of reply to, they call it various terms. [Etona B 00:01:15] thesis. Etona B heresy.

Don't I know it? Yes.

And I understand [crosstalk 00:01:23] The heresy.

Yeah.

There's also the Professor on the Fossil.

Yes.

And...

There's another one. Yes. With two books of [inaudible 00:01:34].

Yes. And there's also Judaism, fossil of faith, something like that.

Yes.

I would only ask you. I'm a diplomat representing my country. And my experience in this field is contemporary times. I've not studied deeply history as you have. But I would ask you in all objectivity as a historian, Sir, if I may... Our concept of our life down the ages. I can sum it up in a verse from Psalms. It is [foreign language 00:02:04]... "I shall not die, but I shall live."

A fossil doesn't die, but he also doesn't live. Here we part ways. And as we live and through our survival down the ages, we see the hand of Providence. We have the sense of survival under Providence, and we move ahead as we prayed to spiritual fulfillment.

Here lies the basic difference between us. You say to us, "You did not die." Why is not clear. "But you did not live." No continuity in terms of creative life and thought. You've sort of slipped out of the stream of civilization. Some remote island, got stuck there. Now and then your voice is heard as the shrieks of the passing ships. And we say, no, we have been in the stream. We have been in the stream in a distinctive sense. In our survival, in our prayer and our hope, and our attachment to our land, and in our belief in the fulfillment of immortal prophecy. But that is at issue, and I not a historian. As I say, others are debating that with you.

But I would ask you as a modern Israeli, when representing my country, and one who has seen the country come to life in independence... From the academic historical analysis point of view, as you scan the canvas of history, Professor... Is there no significance in the following facts which cannot be denied?

Number one, that the ancient peoples of the Middle East, we are the only one living in continuity today in the Middle East, speaking the same language, practicing the same religious faith.

You mention the Farsis.

Well, I'm talking with the Middle East.

Yeah.

[Rabbi Jose Ben Halafta 00:04:01], to whom you devote much attention...

Yeah.

He and Rabbi [Kivan 00:04:04] [inaudible 00:04:04], they came to life. They could live with us. They would not find a dichotomy which snapped them asunder. There's a continuity of experience. I'm just raising this for your attention, Sir.

Yeah.

Secondly, that after this passage through Valley of Death down the ages, and you yourself have described in your book, you caucused the ashes of diaspora... As we've come to life in our time, we've come to life without rancor. Despite all that has passed between us and our Arab neighbors, I can assure you, and you will see this if you come to Israel, there is no rancor. There's no hatred. There is grief, but there's a hope for peace every day. And there's a confidence that will come. Nor is there rancor to nations across the world and systems and doctrines whom we've met and had a dialogue at times, a very serious one and accompanied with tragedy for us down the ages.

This very vitality of life and survival without rancor, this too I would submit has a certain significance in terms of historical analysis. Certainly after these thousands of years, we've assembled our people from 70 lands, the Yemenites from the remote deserts of Yemen who were cut off for over 2000 years from the stream of civilization, with the [inaudible 00:05:31] dwellers of Morocco, Jews from East West Europe, Nazi death camps, the remote hinterlands of India... They've all come together. And they found a combination spontaneously. Has that link at no vitality? Was that a fossil? Is that how a fossil reacts, all these particles of the fossil come together, and they feel one?

I'm just finishing, Sir. Finally, the question of democracy. And after all this experience, we are the only viable democracy in terms of the Israel-Arab complex in the area. And finally, the fact is that today many new nations from Africa and Asia turned to us for guidance, for cooperation. They find in our experiment, in our enterprise, they find something which draws them as a link. So we do have a message for the world, and not Sir, as you've suggested, that our message ceased sometime 2,300 years ago.

And may I just finish by saying... What I'm trying to say is being expressed very vividly... Professor Lewis Mumford in his *Conduct of Life*, he says the binding force of an ethical force based on purpose has been dramatically confirmed in the history of the Jew. Its practical consummation in our time perhaps merits our special note. We believe that our survival is an index of the supremacy of spiritual over material value. We believe in all humility, and thanks to a grateful Providence, that it has a relevance to the broad experience of mankind today. I would ask you, Sir, in all respect, whether you don't think all these elements have any basis on which you could possibly reconsider your concept of us as a fossil, non-creative, which suddenly fell out, neither died nor lived for the past 2,300 years?

There's rather a curious point about this word fossil that... I've never used it of the Jewish people alone. I've always used it of a whole class of peoples. It's a right academic point. Well and, sorry to inflict my theories of history on you. I've tried to map out kind of a picture of civilizations. And I find that there were several generations, or series of civilizations. Some of which died out perhaps several thousand years ago. Others are alive today. But I did find that of the civilizations that died out quite a long time ago, certain exceptional communities, the Jews, the Farsis, one branch of the Buddhists, a certain rather obscure Christian sect, the Monophysites and Nestorians... I don't know if you know about them, anyway, were surviving representatives of a civilization whose other members had become extinct in a sense. Not as human beings. They were, become extinct, but they've become absorbed into other civilizations, races, peoples, and so on.

None of the other people whom I've labeled as fossils has ever complained. I thought this, pointing out to these people had these great survival powers rather complimentary. And the only complaints I've had have been from Jews. And they've complained as if I'd stuck the Jews with this label alone and not the other people. I don't know why this is particularly. I think fossil is... All our labels are more or less imperfect. It's quite true. It doesn't convey the idea that communities surviving from a previous civilization are [inaudible 00:09:24] still alive. Because human beings that are surviving are alive, and they do things. And that's quite right about this. I've got a long section about this word fossil in a forthcoming volume of reconsiderations or second thoughts that I'm publishing. Which says a great deal about Jewish history as a matter of fact, coming out on 4th of May. Sorry to advertise my own works.

I said, "Could we take some word for a living creature?" Yesterday, I was thinking about this. All South Africa, they found an antediluvian fish called a [coelacanth 00:09:59]. Could I substitute the word coelacanth for fossil? Would that be any more attractive to people I'd label falsely? I thought probably it wouldn't. And after all, the coelacanth is a very archaic form of life and the [inaudible 00:10:14] present-day Jews by naming them archaic in the full stream of life. But isn't it true that, from the time of the Roman wars, really, the time of Philo of Alexandria, or in the time when the Christian Acts of the Apostles were written, see the position of the Jewish community in the Greek or Roman world... They were, as they are today in the Western world, they were living very much in the stream, as the [ambassador 00:10:44] says, of the common life of that civilization.

Under the shock of the Roman wars, I do think that the Jewish communities withdrew into a kind of shell. They gave up writing and speaking Greek and went back to Hebrew, or rather Aramaic perhaps. And for many centuries, they remained encased, partly by their own world, partly by the bad treatment they received from Christians, especially Western Christians. I think, And it's only since the Napoleonic time almost, you might say, except in some very early enlightened countries like Holland and Tuscany, which began doing this in the 16th and 17th centuries, that the doors were open to the Jews, and they were brought back into the full scheme of life.

The tragic point... But this again is that... I think on both the Jewish side, as well as on the Gentile side, there have been certain reservations about forming a single community. I suppose Jews feel that the Gentiles haven't really entirely received them into the Gentile community and Gentiles feel that the Jews have not entirely come into the Gentile community. But comparatively, compared to the situation before say, about 1800, the Jews in present times have of course become part of the general stream of life and have played this enormous part in it. And-

Defossilized, Sir?

Yes, you can defossilize, just as you can defrost a car.

That's very interesting.

Yes, I have never denied this. And I haven't found another word to express what I mean. This is a particular category of communities. And from the, so to speak, scientific or sociological point of view, it does need a name. Find me a better name, and I'll use it.

Professor, what about the points I raised earlier? I think... Do you accept that these considerations of vitality, I mentioned earlier, related to Israel's return and restoration, have they anything to do with the defossilization? Are they signs for you, historically speaking, of a vitality?

I think, of course, that the gentile westerners invented nationalism, which I strongly dislike, and that the Jews caught this disease from the western gentiles, which is very unfortunate.

Well, it's been long, a long, long disease with us and many, many, many physicians have tried to cure us down the ages.

Yes.

Though we refuse to be cured.

Yes, yes.

The point, Professor... What I mean is, I'm not talking... Now, I know that you're opposed to the modern state. You want a moral state. Well, I mean, there are many people also in Israel who think that we must move to much more world cooperation without giving up on independence, a different matter.

Yes. Agreed.

But what I'm saying is, the attributes which have been shown now by the people in Israel... Now, not talking of the state in the formal sense, the attribute of survival, of vitality, of democracy, of lack of rancor, of sense of peace, of cooperation, of this growing pattern with new nations of the world. After 2,000 years of exile, do you think historically, this has some significance?

But I've never denied that the Jews always been alive. And I've never denied that... I have criticized some forms about how Israel was taken, but I have never denied the vitality.

But what I would say is this... That this creativity, and I take it right down to modern times. What I'm very happy about is that you agree today that the fossil has become defossilized. Now, the problem is not so much now finding an alternative term for the fossil, since it became a fossil till now, to finding a term for the new creature, which has been defossilized.

I may say in conclusion, just in this point, I do hope Sir, before you pass another judgment, before your new book comes out, if possible... You would visit Israel and weigh up the process of defossilization in your context, and see this vitality, and compare it in historic span. And then let us have your conclusions. I hope you will be able to come. And I'm sure our people very happy to show you the country and to answer any questions. And we have no objection at all. View neighboring countries, and have a broad Middle Eastern viewer situation.

Thank you. Of course, totality is not enough. Morality, we must come back to that. [crosstalk 00:15:07]

On the morality issue, you yourself have agreed that we are like other peoples. That, again, can be looked into when you visit Israel.

Thank you. Thank you very much...