

Judd Teller

One of the highlights of the recent annual meeting of the National Council of Americans for Progressive Israel—Hashomer Hatzair in Hightstown, N. J., was an address by Dr. Judd Teller—a Borochovist analysis of the American Jewish scene. It was a brilliant tour-de-force, and we are publishing it in full. Dr. Teller was the founder and guiding light of the successful American Histadrut Cultural Exchange Institute, from which he has gone on to become the consultant on Israel to the International Council of B'nai B'rith—Histadrut's significant loss, B'nai B'rith's happy gain.

The Reality of American Jewry

BEFORE discussing the implications of Zionism, the Zionist analysis of the American scene today, I would like to give a brief review of the major Zionist ideological trends, a bird's eye view.

It has generally been assumed, and it has become part of the myth rather than substantial Jewish history, that Theodor Herzl was the great ideologist of the Zionist movement. The fact is that Herzl was a great methodologist, he was a great pragmatist, he set forth a political program. You will find very little in his writing that has enduring value, and it is not the kind of analysis that could apply to Jewish conditions in historical terms to the past or the present.

It is strictly an ideology, if we can call it an ideology at all, that arose under certain conditions in a certain decade, in the 1890's within the Central European context. But Zionism as a Jewish philosophy and a consistent philosophy of Jewish life and conditions in historical terms has two roots, one the religious root and the other the socialist root.

* * *

Religious Determinism

The Hassidic movement, which centered on Palestine, and all the false messianic movements were, in terms of their day, not merely nationalist movements but socialist movements as well. They sought a re-ordering of Jewish life. They sought a re-ordering of the Jewish social structure. The messianic movements of the past—including some that disenchanting and disappointed the Jews and even ended in some

renegades—were nonetheless, egalitarian movements. When the Shabtai Zvi movement was launched, it was a movement that actually abolished private property. There was a sharing, and there was a changing of family morality too and it all centered on the return to Zion. And the essence of it was, first, a social revolution, and second, the fact that the messianic religious movement believed in determinism in Jewish history.

That determinism meant the return to Zion.

It was Ber Borochov, the major ideologist of Socialist-Zionism, who actually picked up that particular tradition of determinism in Jewish history that held that the return to Zion was inevitable and could not be changed. He believed in it to such an extent that in his early years, at the beginning of his outline of his ideology, he opposed joining the Zionist movement. He opposed working with other sectors of Jewish society—with the bourgeois sectors—because he said that the return was inevitable and at some point, the bourgeois sector would, due to certain economic, social and political pressures, be forced toward Palestine anyhow. In his later years, towards the end of his life, he did advocate joining the Zionist movement.

Now, we are most interested, of course, in the Borochov approach. On what what did he base the inevitability of the Jewish return? He said that there were two kinds of pressures against Jews as a minority group in society. One was artificial pressures; the others were the inevitable pressures. Artificial pressures included social discrimination, ancient prejudices, even pogroms and violence. All these could be

checked; they did not necessarily grow out of incontrovertible economic and social conditions.

There was, however, another pressure, he said, which one may or may not label as anti-semitism, a natural pressure growing out of conditions that cannot be changed—economic conditions or social conditions or a certain development of society. For that kind of pressure—and here I add my own interpretation—it is necessary that a Jewish community be first of all, very numerous, a very large community, the kind of community that is visible, that constitutes a bloc in society. Secondly, it must be the kind of community that is welcomed by the particular host country at a certain time and then reaches some point where it has discharged all its functions in that society for its economic and cultural development. And at that point the society, having achieved its full development, will find new forces arising in it that begin to claim their place, and the Jew suddenly finds himself superfluous. He has accomplished his function and hence he must vacate his place—not necessarily due to official antisemitism but to the fact that he is alien within the society, not really indigenous, because of various historical factors. And at that particular point, it is possible that the first kind of antisemitism, artificial antisemitism, then become part, or the methodology and the means of that natural pressure.

* * *

"Native Cadres"

I think we have seen this kind of development in the Soviet Union. We see it today in Poland. At one time the Soviet Union did need the Jewish manpower, it did need the Jewish scientist and the civil servant. Then a point was reached in the various Soviet republics when something which Khrushchev called the "native cadres" arose and qualified to replace the Jew. Now you have in the Ukraine, through natural processes, Ukrainians claiming certain positions, as you have in most of the Soviet republics. The fact that the government then resorts to the artificial kind of antisemitism to appease some of these pressures does not change the fact that the pressures were inevitable and they occur.

At various times, and I refer specifically to 1848, to the liberal revolutions in Europe, and later in Russia and the Communist Revolution, Jews joined the revolutions. They had two ways of joining them. The first was by assimilat-

ing with the revolution and pretending that they were part of the indigenous population. The other was with a clear Jewish program, with clear Jewish demands, with a clear Jewish platform and not somehow confounding the Jewish interest with the general interest.

In 1848, some Hungarian Jews merged completely with the Hungarian revolution. But when they demanded the right to serve in the National Guard which was then organized by Kossuth, the leader of the revolution, they were refused. When they demand full rights of that revolution, the revolution denied it to them and said they were not mature enough. Eventually, the Jews did benefit from the revolution, but not as fully as other groups. There were reservations at the outset and throughout the process of revolution that were carried over into succeeding constitutional governments.

* * *

Apparent American Exception

In Czechoslovakia, in 1848, the Jews were ready to join with the Czechs, but the Czechs indulged in pogroms, and somehow the Czech revolution joined with anti-revolutionary forces to reject the Jew. And thus the Jews who mistook other peoples' revolutions not as allied revolutions but as their own, found themselves fully rejected.

There was also in Europe—and in that sense Europe differed from the United States—a clash between minorities allied against the central or the imperial government, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, for example. These minorities clashed, and among them the Jews were the least popular and consequently suffered in the process.

In the United States, the situation appeared different, because of certain organic differences in the structure of American society—which did not, however, change the historic tendency and tradition but merely provided a slightly different framework which caused Jews to believe that America was exceptional. There were various aberrations at various times but Jewish immigrants, comparing their condition here with that in other countries, tended to see proof that the Jewish condition in America was completely exceptional in the 2,000 years of Jewish diaspora. They did not study the roots, nor did they investigate them. They did not investigate, explore or delineate the distinctions.

However, we did have our aberrations here. There were only 50,000 Jews in the United States during the Civil War, a number which

pretending that
us population.
wish program,
a clear Jewish
founding the
interest.

merged com-
evolution. But
o serve in the
organized by
ion, they were
rights of that
d it to them
enough. Even-
the revolution,
s. There were
throughout the
ried over into
ents.

he Jews were
ut the Czechs
ow the Czech
tionary forces
he Jews who
s not as allied
nd themselves

l in that sense
ates—a clash
the central or
ro-Hungarian
rities clashed,
the least pop-
n the process.
tion appeared
ic differences
ociety—which
toric tendency
led a slightly
d Jews to be-
l. There were
es but Jewish
ndition here
d to see proof
rica was com-
ears of Jewish
roots, nor did
ot investigate,
ons.

rrations here.
n the United
umber which

certainly could not influence the fate of the United States one way or another. Yet, the Abolitionists and the slave-holders, both the North and the South, had their manifestations of antisemitism and there were efforts to single out the Jew as bearing the blame for the war. In the Union, the Jew was accused of supporting the South; in the South he was accused of supporting the North, and the legend of Rothschild and Rothschild's gold was brought in. However, it could not have much impact on the fate of the Jews in America because it was a myth without roots in reality; 50,000 Jews did not matter.

Then the Populist movement arose in the United States at the end of the century. It was a kind of National-Socialist movement in the latter-day sense. (I generalize when I use the term, of course.) It was a movement of agrarian revolt, and it was in many respects an anti-industrial movement. It was also largely an egalitarian movement, and for a very brief period it was a movement that allied itself with the Negro, but only for a very brief period.

That movement was substantially antisemitic,



in its literature, in much of its ideological writing. It would be quite easy right here to quote personalities to me who were not involved at all in antisemitism but the reverse, and one can refer to Jews such as Louis D. Brandeis who had a great impact on what evolved from the Populist movement, namely, the Progressive movement. But basically, the Populist movement was antisemitic. Its myths were antisemitic myths: Jewish gold, Rothschild's gold. However, the difference between it and similar movements in Europe was that here the Populist movement's base was in areas removed from the concentration of the Jewish population. The Jews were in the East, the Populist movement was in the West, Middle and South. So the Jew was not really relevant to the crisis and he was also not visible there, so that those who tried to make him mythically relevant to the crisis would necessarily have had to provide proof.

Then, even more important, the various minorities, the immigrant groups that came to this country, had a great deal of space. They could spread out. The Jews spread out in one area, the Swedes in another, the Germans in a third. But most important was that, unlike European countries, there was no economic competition between the Jew and the other white minority groups in the United States. The Italians went into menial occupations, the Germans were artisans, the Irish took hold of the civil service, they were the cops, the politicians. The Jews were in the garment center and in the professions. There was no clash at all. There was a clash between two other minorities in the United States on the basis of occupation and occupational-economic rivalry—that between the Negro and the Irish. But the Jews were completely out of this.

* * *

Minorities Didn't Compete

So taking all these matters into consideration, there was no occasion for the antisemitism Borochoff defined as "artificial" to become indigenous and put inevitable pressure against the Jews. It was this that caused the exception. Then there was a community of faith between the Jews and all other minorities. The power structure was Wasp (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant), the dominant culture was Wasp; the discrimination in immigration and in education affected all groups at the same time, equally.

The Jews were affected more by quotas and *numerous clausus* in the universities and colleges and in the various professions because they were more numerous there. They had greater social aspirations. But they were not the target because they were Jews; they were part of the whole non-Wasp immigrant assemblage against which the Wasp was using artificial discrimination, in Borochoff's interpretation of the term. And up until the 1930's and 1940's, the Jews were, therefore, completely irrelevant to American crises.

Then along came the 1930's and the Jew did become relevant in the area of foreign affairs. In this area, the Jew was anti-Nazi and, consequently, a "war-monger." In foreign affairs, the Irish, long, long the allies of the Jews in municipal government in a number of states, were anti-British, therefore strongly anti-war—not isolationist but anti-war—and a very articulate minority strongly pro-Nazi, led by

church figures such as Father Coughlin and some bishops.

More important than the foreign affairs factor, however, is the relevance in the domestic field. In this field, the Jews had no relevance at all to the crisis. They did not control the banks which caused the foreclosure of farms, as they also did not in the 1890's when the farms were foreclosed and confiscated in order to hand the land over to the railroads. When there is no domestic factor, no economic element in the picture, the pressure which grows out of such circumstances does not exist and the danger is not visible. It may be potential, but it is not visible. Yet it was sufficiently potential in the 1940's when, it will be recalled, a Lindbergh constituted quite a threat, and if not for Pearl Harbor, it is not quite certain whether the America First Party might not, at some point, have taken hold of the country, and whether Franklin D. Roosevelt would or would not have won his fourth term.

* * *

The Urban Crisis

Then 1948 came along, and American Jews moved forward as universities began removing their quotas, and by the mid-1950's the quota system was gone. Suddenly, Jews found that medical schools were open to them. Brandeis University was first conceived in the late 1940's, but by the time it was founded, I do not think there was a need for it. America needed our manpower. It did not have enough doctors, engineers. When the economic requirements are such, professions that are closed to a discriminated group are suddenly open to it, and so Jews became engineers.

In view of all this, Jews began to entertain the illusion that America was, in fact, exceptional. The Zionist movement in particular failed. Some of its top leaders became the advocates of this ideology, of an Israel and a Jewish State for other Jews. There was even a discussion within the rabbinate, which went on for years, over which was the more important center, Israel or American Jewry. Ridiculous, but there it was.

And then suddenly we come to the situation of our own day. This situation should have been foreseen at least a decade earlier, when the civil rights fight was launched as a non-violent movement. I want to state at the outset that it is a complete distortion—and I think the Jewish

establishment is guilty of the distortion because of ignorance and lack of prescience about this matter—to see the tension with the black community as the only danger threatening the Jew, and the rise of the black community as the only economic threat to the Jew. What we suddenly find, although it has existed since World War II, is that the future of American society depends on the resolution of the urban crisis, and on the success or failure to resolve that crisis this republic will stand or fall.

For the first time, Jews are relevant to this crisis. It is not in the midwest; it is in New York, it is in Chicago, in Boston, Detroit, Los Angeles; it is in all the cities where the American Jewish population is heavily concentrated. It is a mistake to believe that the clash and the economic rivalry here occurs between Jew and Negro. It also occurs between the Jew and other minorities, white minorities, in the big city, and it would be a fatal mistake for Jews to permit themselves to focus their entire attention on one flank of the front and disregard the dangers from the other flanks.

What is the situation as the Negro, the Italian, the Irish, the Puerto Rican view it today? Because the Jew has not been admitted into the corporate industrial structure of American society, he has, since 1948, infiltrated another corporate structure—the voluntary, educational and cultural corporate structure of America. There is a Jewish presence in all the big foundations, the big universities. Now it is this particular corporate structure (forget the Jewish businessman in Harlem; that is the least of it) that is most visible to the deprived or aspiring minorities, white or black. They do not see Detroit, they do not see the banks, the Wasp institutions, but they do see the public school, the mass media, the theatre, the radio, the newspapers. And suddenly, they see in concrete form the fleshing of the myth of Jewish power over American society.

* * *

The 'Jewish' Professions

We concentrate on what Stokely Carmichael might say; we should also concentrate on what Truman Capote says. A Wasp writer, he has said in writing and on television that there is a Jewish cult in American writing, that there is a Jewish school. Oh, he does not object to Jewish writers and Jewish writers contributing Jewish writing. What he objects to is to their

control of magazines, of publications and of criticism. Louis Lomax, a Negro writer, an opportunist and a man of some influence, says exactly the same thing: the Jews control American publishing and American mass media. The Wasp on the one hand, the Negro on the other.

Let us state the various professions in which the Jews are important: social work, civil service, medicine, teaching. The Negroes are not the only ones aspiring to these positions. The Italians are decades behind the Jew and they are aspiring to the same posts. The Irish are now developing new aspirations. We may not now see the clash and the rivalry simply because everything is centered on black power. But anyone who studied carefully the New York school crisis could see the exploitation of the Jew by certain white minority groups who at this moment allied themselves with the Jew, who wanted the Jew to stand in the forefront of the struggle against community control from which these certain whites would be the real gainers. The discrediting of the school system in New York City to such an extent that federal aid would be given to private schools is in the interest of the Catholic community and of pious Protestants.

* * *

Public Relations vs. Realities

The destruction of the school system is not in the interest of the Jewish community. Even in terms of population, the Jews have a stake in the school system. Now for Jews who were in the forefront, as the teachers' union indeed had been, in the struggle for better schools and for some form of community control—to be maneuvered overnight into a position where the Jewish parent suddenly found himself opposing the Negro community with the Italians and the Irish silent, was a very disturbing massive psychosis.

The Jewish establishment has been too concerned with studying attitudes rather than studying problems, measuring the degree of antisemitism in this or that community and creating favorable public relations. All public relations programs are worthless when they run into the rock of realities. Public relations programs are mere advocacies and rhetoric, but when there are realities, they must be regarded as realities. You cannot ignore them, which is what the Jewish establishment has been doing. And this is the great danger: on the one hand,

alienation between Jew and Negro; on the other hand, the exploitation of the Jew by white minorities—and then eventually, the Jew finding himself in left field and these white minorities possibly aligning themselves with the Negro for certain purposes against the Jews.

That this could happen to a community like the American Jewish community with its liberal record is shocking. That with all our mechanisms for community relations we should end up as the foil for other people's machinations is, in fact, catastrophic.

Now a bit about Negro antisemitism: I read an article in *Israel Horizons*, a review of Negro



antisemitism, Jewish relations, and so on. I did not agree with everything in that article. But there was a great deal, about 80 per cent of it was very sound. And that 80 per cent dealt frankly with the nature of Negro antisemitism. It said that it existed but urged Jews not to exaggerate. It is one of the assertions of Negro nationalism and Negro grievances. It is not necessarily the central assertion, but here I add my comment: it might become the central assertion.

Now Negro antisemitism does not come from the Negro masses. The Negro mass still has not yet reached the point of aspirations when it can seriously clash with the Jew. Negro antisemitism rests with the Negro middle class. An authority on the Negroes, such as Frazier, said in the 1950's that the amount of antisemitism in the Negro middle class (and he himself is a product of that class) is unimaginable, except that the Negro has learned to dissimulate. He has learned to present one face in public and another in private. So has the Jew: we have an entire public relations establishment and community relations agencies which present our public face but not our private face. This is the way of minorities.

The Negro intellectual today—and I speak of the intellectual in his 20's, not the intellectual in his 40's—is antisemitic. Le Roi Jones is not an extreme example. Harold Cruse, publishing

two books that have the character of *Mein Kampf*, is not an extreme example. I think he is a typical example.

The misunderstanding here, the tragic misunderstanding, is that the entire new generation of Negroes now coming of age is a generation that "knows not Joseph." They are completely unaware of the Jews' role in the civil rights struggle from the 1920's onward, in fact earlier, from the days of the founding of the NAACP. They are certainly unaware of the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee efforts in the late 1940's and 1950's. I do not know whether making them aware of this would be very helpful, because they claim that the liberal betrayed them, that these efforts were misleading. Now if Jews were the masters of these efforts, they stay doubly condemned. This is the dilemma.

* * *

Philanthropy Denigrating

How do we handle this dilemma? We cannot—and this is where I disagree with the article in *Israel Horizons*—handle it with philanthropy, for several reasons. One of them is a very practical one: the American Jewish community cannot carry that burden; it is the government's. Secondly, anyone familiar with Negro history, from Abolitionist and pre-Abolitionist days, and with the various movements of revolt in the American Negro community, is well aware that philanthropy was always the red rag in the face of the bull. It was always the thing that the Negro most resented. He felt he had rights, and that philanthropy was patronizing and an insult.

Jews involved in philanthropy are offering the Negro the kind of assistance he does not want. He claims reparations; he does not claim philanthropy. However, Jews getting excessively involved in it seem to confess Jewish guilt, as though Jews had a greater obligation.

Now, I am not speaking against philanthropy, it is one of the elements in the fight, but to do what the New York Federation of Jewish Philanthropies did recently, make a statement that it will be bad for the Jews if we do not concentrate all our philanthropy on the Negroes, is not the answer.

More important is the fact that philanthropy is denigrating even to Jews. The East European Jew was not very happy about the philanthropy of the German Jew in the United States. That

is why we created our own funds and our own structures, hospitals and schools. We, children and grand-children of East European stock, should learn from our own experience how erroneous the philanthropic approach is.

I spoke earlier about the European situation and said that Jews have a habit of intruding in other peoples' revolutions and claiming them as their own. Jewish youth has done exactly that in the Negro Revolution. It is one thing to assist that revolution; it is another to impose oneself on it and claim it as his own. It is one thing to see a community of interest; it is another to deny your own interest and claim that the other's interest is yours.

Robert Penn Warren several years ago published a book of interviews with black militants—Stokely Carmichael and Bob Moses (a founder of Snick and a kind of legendary figure among them, the saint of the movement who resigned from his sainthood and retired to obscurity, a completely devoted man). When you read about Bob Moses, you will see that this is the prototype of the kind of people who founded the kibbutzim and the Hashomer Hatzair movement. And there are great parallels between the two movements. Robert Penn Warren asked them directly how they felt about the white boys and girls—in this case mostly Jewish white boys and girls—who talk like Negroes, who use your slang, who play your music, dance your steps and behave, to use Norman Mailer's phrase, as though they were "white niggers." They hesitated about answering and finally they said, "These people are ridiculous. And we laugh behind their backs." But Warren probed beyond that, and finally it came out, and it comes out repeatedly now in their writing, that they feel that some of these young people came to their movement for adventure, from middle-class and upper-middle-class homes. The militants felt that the young people had denied the Negro his own initiative. They, who could do things better than the Negro, having a better background, better education and more experience, decided to do the Negroes' "thing." And then there was the erotic element which played a role, antagonizing the Negro young men and boys. So this method proved not only to be erroneous but quite fatal to the Jew. This does not mean that I am suggesting any kind of withdrawal.

We are now coming to the second stage (it

may be too late, but perhaps it is not), to the point of an alliance with the Negro. The first thing that is required, and the Jewish organizations have not done it to this day, is a study of the economic structure of the American Jewry in the big cities. The American Jewish Congress engaged in one such study; it took several blocks in Harlem and omitted 125th Street, which is central, and came up with a false, fictitious report that Jews are not represented in ghetto businesses. I say ghetto business today is not the central issue. The Jewish community should remove these businesses, although they mean nothing in the Jewish economy. I would like to see Jewish organizations, instead of studying attitudes, make a prognosis for the next ten years of the various professions the Negro will penetrate or the various professions in which Jews are today present or might penetrate in the future and the various alternatives. And, having reached that analysis and some conclusions, they can sit down with the Negro community and discuss some sort of re-ordering, not of the Jewish economy but of the urban economy in which the various ethnic groups might have the proper representation.

We have nothing of the kind. Instead of that we have the Jew leaving the core city for the suburbs. This spells absolute catastrophe, as much catastrophe as a clash within the urban area which would have serious political consequences. Let us take the ten major cities where Jews hold some edge politically because of their votes. As the clashes and tensions multiply and the division, the schism, widens, the white politician will suddenly see that he must choose between two votes, the Jewish bloc and the Negro bloc. And he then decides, at best, that he will be neutral. And an Israeli issue arises in Congress. And the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from the State of New York are absent on the day of the vote. And future progressive senators from the State of California are absent on the day of the vote. And all the other senators who would be normally trading votes with these from the metropolitan Jewish-populated areas, and consequently voting on that Israeli issue, will decide that since these fellows have absented themselves, it means they are not interested in a trade, so why should we from Montana, from Nebraska, from Iowa, vote at all? Several

such defeats for Israel in Congress mean the diminution of the power of the American Jewish community, a clear demonstration that the American Jewish community cannot marshal power in Congress on an issue of concern to itself. Once that penetrates into politicians' minds, the Jewish community has lost power, which to some extent is real and to some extent is mythical. And I do not know which is the larger proportion, the mythical or the real. But once this has occurred, we lose on domestic issues.

Now at this point I would say what is most essential is a) an alliance, and b) that Jewish community try to stay in the core cities; in the suburbs we lose voting power, we lose all strength, we are dissipated.

And there is a great promise which the Negro Revolution holds forth for the Jew which can be the basis of an alliance: in raising the issue of Negro studies, they have raised an issue that has long been latent in American society, namely, that a minority in American society—the Wasp minority—has been ruling American history, studies, universities and distorting the study of American history.

* * *

Distortion of History

This is a fact: they have as much distorted the study of American history for Jews as they have for the Negroes, the Italians and the Irish. It is absolutely untrue that American society, as constituted today and as constituted since the Civil War, is the product of Wasp culture or is the product of Wasp pioneers. Their era ended with the colonial period or with the Civil War. Industrialization started, and that is when we came in, and that is when other groups came in, and American society as it exists today, all American history that has been created since the Civil War, is Jewish history, Irish history, Swedish history and Negro history. It is not White Protestant Anglo-Saxon history. But you find nothing of this in the history books.

Now there is a great chance of converting the metropolitan centers of this country, certainly on the East Coast and in the Mid-West, into what they should be: great pluralistic societies. This is a program on which I think we can unite with the Negro intellectual and forget the antisemitism for the moment. There are issues which over-ride prejudices and these

are the natural issues which Borochoy called the "stychic process," the natural processes of history.

But let us bear in mind yet another thing: that there will be a superfluity of Jewish manpower in the United States regardless of re-ordering. Automation will bring it about and the over-concentration of Jews in certain areas. I believe that this superfluity of manpower can be directed towards Israel, but only under certain circumstances. Not by coming to the American Jewish community, as I have seen it done in the Israel press, and saying, things are happening in the United States, Germany is upon you, the Nazi catastrophe, why don't the teachers come to Israel? It does not happen that way. There is ideology. There is an understanding of historical processes. When that understanding and that comprehension takes place, this evolution and this pressure becomes comprehensible to the individual and becomes comprehensible to the mass.

* * *

Israel as Social Experiment

Furthermore, American Jewry has not realized the importance of Israel in quite another sense—as the social experiment. Our great weapon even here—the great basis of our understanding with Negroes in the United States—cannot be, as happened in Great Neck, contribution to Negro philanthropy but refusal to admit Negro children into a school in the area. It *can* be on the basis of social experimentation which is part of the contemporary Jewish tradition. I refer to Israel, and I refer to the kibbutz—our presentation of the total of Jewish history, of the global content of what is happening to the Jew.

Second, we are today involved in the world scene and whatever support we get on the world scene even from American Jewry is very important in various crises, such as the Russian crisis. On the world scene, we American Jews are cast as part of the white Christian society and establishment. There could be no greater irony that a people that up to 1791 had no emancipation and was incarcerated in the ghettos, and since 1791 had difficult times and was again enclosed in ghettos, should suddenly become in the public eye of the unaffiliated world part of Christian civilization and Christian society. The situation for the Jews in France is changing; there is a large Algerian

population in France and more and more North African people will probably be coming. In Britain today, although the percentage is small, Pakistanis are quite visible and they will become increasingly so, and so are West Indians, and eventually they will obtain their place. So in these very important centers of the West, the non-white world will become very important and will determine the policy of those countries in a manner which may affect American Jews, not only Israel. And Israel, despite all the Arab propaganda, still remains as the spring-board, that door of the Jewish people that opens on Asia and Africa. American Jewry certainly is not.

In conclusion, it can be said that we face a situation which proves that American Jewry is not an exception to Jewish history and that America is a *gola* (exile); this *gola*, for domestic reasons, must relate itself to Israel, and must relate itself here to other minorities, on the basis of certain progressive programs. If we continue our public relations, if we continue the legend of exceptionalism, then I am afraid that within five or six years from now, Jewish political power will have declined, it will dissipate through the core cities, through the clash with the Negro population, and through alliances that other white minority groups will create with the Negro against us, and we will be no more than five million Jews in an exploding American population which may be then 250 million.



Q: V
A: S
nationa
from be
bers of
and am
from th
Ruman
choslov

Q: V

A: T
It is tr
will the
which i
mobiliz
passed
Vietnar
to brin
the Vie
with e
Vietcor
people
the ar
out of

Alth
is clear
turn o
country
to orga
reconst
Amo
gress w
of the
resoluti
to the
Paris.

Q: V
the Co

A: T
acteriz