CHANGES IN THE TRANSNATIONAL RELATIONSHIP OF THE WORLD ZIONIST ORGANIZATION AND LATIN AMERICAN JEWRY: INFORMAL EDUCATION, 1968–2006

Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll

Resumen

Los cambios ocurridos se refieren al transnacionalismo ideológico del Movimiento Sionista aplicado a las relaciones de su órgano ejecutivo, el Departamento de Juventud de la Organización Sionista Mundial (OSM) y sus variantes organizacionales durante el período determinado, con la juventud judía en América Latina, respecto a los movimientos juveniles sionistas pioneros, grupos y asociaciones no sionistas. A ello se anticipa la descripción del tipo de relaciones que precedieron a la Guerra de los Seis Días. Se trata de una evolución desde la consideración de la inmigración a Israel (*aliá*) como el objetivo principal y casi exclusivo de la educación no formal, hasta la visión de la educación judía como una meta en sí misma, de la cual forman parte integral el sionismo y el Estado de Israel.

Este complejo se presenta en el marco de la historia de Israel y los acontecimientos en Latinoamérica y su repercusión en la juventud judía. Las principales fuentes primarias son los protocolos y las resoluciones de los Congresos Sionistas, el Comité de Acción y el Ejecutivo de la OSM.

The character of Jewish transnationalism

Despite the wide range of attributes of transnationalism, it focuses primarily on issues resulting from the migration of members of one nation

or a certain ethnic group from one country to another. Among these are: how the cultural heritage, and at times also the professional background, they bring with them from their home country influences the manner in which they successfully—or unsuccessfully—take root in their new home; how local groups and bodies influence this process; and the ties to their former homeland, whether they be blood relations, economic aid, or any other real or virtual connection.[1]

In the case under study, we are dealing with an ideological transnationalism that has practical implications. Migration by Jews falls into the category of ethnic migration that is not primarily connected to a specific territory, though the milieu of the country of origin can exert some influence; the overriding factor is that which is shared by all Jews, such as a common fate and a common historical, religio-cultural heritage. Therefore, when we speak of ideological-political trends of thought that are unique to the Jewish people, there is not necessarily any correlation between country of origin, ideological affiliation and new country of residence. For example, Communism, as a transnational movement, was centrally rooted in the Soviet Union, where it was implemented in practice and which was the country of origin of most of its Jewish adherents, at least during the first period of its existence. The Bund strove for Jewish socialist nationalism in territories with a high density of Jewish population, such as Poland and Lithuania. Transnationalism was not a principle of the Bund's ideology because it professed absolute cultural autonomy for Jews in all countries in which it was active. In contrast, the Zionist movement and Agudat Israel, each in its own manner, considered the focus of its ideology to be a place which, statistically, was not a central locus of Jewish immigration in the modern period, when Jews were dispersed in many lands, but rather the spiritual and religious center of the Jewish People—Eretz Israel prior to the establishment of the State of Israel.[2]

1 There is an extensive literature on this subject. Noteworthy are Everett H. Akam, *Transnational America: Cultural Pluralist Thought in the Twentieth Century*, Lanham MD 2002; Yossi Shain, *Kinship and Diasporas in International Affairs*, Ann Arbor 2007. Shain analyzes transnational economic and religious relationships in the Middle East conflict and in international relations, in which the partners are Israel and American Jewry. He compares this with other cases of transnationalism, especially of the Armenians.

2 Yosef Gorny, *The Bund, the Jewish Labor Movement, and "Klal Yisrael" 1897–*

The transnationalism of the Zionist movement is characterized by the centrality of Eretz Israel and the State of Israel as continuators of the Jewish heritage and as a political solution for Jewish nationalism. Thus, Jews carried the Zionist idea in its diverse manifestations when they emigrated from various countries to a new continent, to countries that welcomed immigrants—in our case, Latin American states. As demonstrated in earlier studies, these communities were considered important to the Zionist endeavor only inasmuch as they contributed financially to its achievement. This meant that as long as European Jewry existed, the Zionist movement did not invest efforts in the Jewish communities of Latin America over and above fundraising, despite requests by local Zionists for the world movement's involvement in informational and educational activity.[3]

After the destruction of European Jewry and the establishment of Israel, the transnationalism of the Zionist movement vis-à-vis the surviving world of Jewry in general, and that of Latin America in particular, was expressed by sending emissaries, in addition to those involved in fundraising. They were active in formal and informal Jewish education as well as dissemination of the wide range of ideologies represented in the world movement. The objective of the Zionist movement, through its operational bodies—the World Zionist Organization (WZO), the Zionist half of the Jewish Agency, and the national funds (the Jewish National Fund and the Foundation Fund (Keren Hayesod)—was to ensure the centrality

1985 (Hebrew), Jerusalem 2005); idem, "Is the Jewish Transnational Diaspora Still Unique?" in Eliezer Ben-Rafael and Yitzhak Sternberg (eds.), with Judith Bokser Liwerant and Yosef Gorny, *Transnationalism: Diasporas and the Advent of a New (Dis)order*, Boston 2009, pp. 237–50; Gabriel Sheffer, "A Reexamination of the Main Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Diasporas and Their Applicability to the Jewish Diaspora", in ibid., pp. 375–96; Jeremy Cohen, "Introduction", in Jeremy Cohen and Moshe Rosman (eds.), *Rethinking European Jewish History*, Oxford 2009, pp. 1–12; Moshe Rosman, "Jewish History across Borders", in ibid., pp. 15–29; Jeremy Stolow, "Transnationalism and the New Religio-politics: Reflections of a Jewish Orthodox Case", *Theory, Culture and Society* 21, 2 (2004): 109–37.

3 Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll, *The Zionist Movement and Zionist Parties in Argentina, 1935–1948* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1997, pp. 195–230; Silvia Schenkolewski (Tractinsky), "Cambios en la Organización Sionista Mundial hacia la comunidad judía y el movimiento sionista en la Argentina, hasta 1948", in *Judaica Latinoamericana: Estudios Histórico-sociales*, Jerusalem 1988, pp. 149–66.

of Israel and encourage *aliyah*. All efforts, whether direct or indirect, were aimed at the achievement of these objectives, which found expression in the first Jerusalem Program, adopted by the 23rd Zionist Congress in 1951, and in David Ben-Gurion's repeated declaration that he considered only those who emigrated to Israel to be Zionists.[4]

Thus, Jewish transnationalism as applied to the Zionist movement can be defined as not stemming from the country of origin of the migrants. Until the fulfilment of Zionist objectives with the establishment of Israel, transnationalism vis-à-vis the Jewish communities of Latin America was a two-way street between center and periphery that focused on one subject only: fundraising. After 1948, we can discern three tendencies and directions: continued fundraising (from the periphery to the center), the sending of emissaries (from the center to the periphery), and support of the Zionist movement and encouragement of *aliyah* (from the periphery to the center). A survey of the ups-and-downs or the successes and failures of these tendencies is beyond the scope of the present article.

In time, especially after the Six Day War which led many Jews who did not consider themselves Zionists to identify with Israel and the fate of world Jewry, a fourth direction of transnationalism emerged, this time a more balanced one. Without denying the centrality of Israel, the Zionist movement recognized the legitimacy of Diaspora Jews to "be a Zionist in the Diaspora." As a result, Israel was endowed with an additional transnational significance as the means by which the Jewish nation would be saved from assimilation by enhancing its Jewish identity, without demanding of its members to come on *aliyah*. The foundations of this outlook are in the second Jerusalem Program adopted by the 27th Zionist Congress in 1968.[5]

4 Judith Bokser Liwerant, "Latin American Jews: A Transnational Diaspora", in Eliezer Ben-Rafael and Yitzhak Sternberg (eds.), with Judith Bokser Liwerant and Yosef Gorny, *Transnationalism: Diasporas and the Advent of a New (Dis)order*, Boston 2009, pp. 351–74; Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll, "Tradición y cambio: la relación de la Organización Sionista Mundial con la comunidades de América Latina", in Haim Avni et al. (eds.), *Pertinencia y alteridad: los judíos en América Latina*, Madrid, 2011, pp. 457- 75

5 27 Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* 9-19.6.1968, (Hebrew) p. 503; see Schenkolewski-Kroll (see note 4), n. 14.

A case study of Zionist transnationalism

As a case study of this latter tendency we will examine the processes that led to the change in the transnational relationship between the WZO and Latin American Jewry from the Six Day War in 1967 to the 35th Zionist Congress (2006) in relation to informal education, including the established youth movements, youth clubs, and community centers. This subject has received partial treatment in our previous research that studied the attitude of the WZO towards communities in Latin America during that period of time.[6] Like in the earlier study, we intend to examine aspects of organization and content and their implications under various circumstances; that is, study of traditional procedures and the changes undergone by the WZO in the process. Whereas the previous research was based on the Organization Department of the WZO, the present study will focus on the Youth and Hehalutz Department (hereafter YHD) and the changes it underwent during the years covered by this article. In the present research I am also developing a previous study of the history of Jewish youth movements in Argentina, one of whose aspects was examination of the mutual relationship between those movements and the WZO.[7]

The above-mentioned studies[8] were preceded by other publications touching upon the present subject—some of them academic, and others of a more documentary or almost journalistic nature. Noteworthy are two books by Shlomo Bar-Gil. The first, *At First Was the Dream*, deals primarily with the absorption of members of youth movements in the kibbutzim between 1946 and 1967, but in two chapters the author analyzes the character of the youth movements in Latin America. His second book, *Youth – Vision*

6 Some conclusions from that research are to be found in Schenkolewski-Kroll (see note 4) and in a lecture I delivered at the 15th World Congress of Jewish Studies (2009): "The Attitude of the World Zionist Movement towards Youth Movements in Latin America after the Six Days War" (Hebrew).

7 At the 13th World Congress of Jewish Studies (2001) I proposed such a study; see Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll, "Los movimientos juveniles: una faceta carente en la historiografía sionista de la Argentina", in *Judaica Latinoamericana: Estudios Históricos, Sociales y Literarios,* V, Jerusalem 2005, pp. 209–19.

8 See above, notes 6–7.

and Reality, is devoted entirely to Dror, Gordonia, and Ihud Habonim movemenets in Argentina from 1934 to 1973. Orna Stoliar published a study of Hashomer Hatzair in Chile, *Shomrim in the Land of the Andes: History of the Kidmah–Hashomer Hatzair Movement in Chile*. David Horowitz edited and published memoirs by the founders of Dror-Hehalutz Hatzair in Argentina, with some mention of that movement in Chile and Brazil. Additional references to youth movements are included in PhD dissertations devoted to the Jewish communities in Argentina, Uruguay, and Cuba.[9] Naturally, all these cover only some of the years under study in the present article.

As is evident from the title, this study deals with informal education, which was brought to the Jewish communities in Latin America from Europe, under the transnational attributes surveyed above. This was a rather sporadic development in the 1920s that gained momentum in the next decade. Informal education was brought by immigrants who had belonged to youth movements in their home countries: Poland, Lithuania, and Germany. In Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, and Cuba they established branches of the movements that were active in their former homes. These included Hashomer Hatzair, Beitar, Dror, Hanoar Hatzioni, Lamerhav, and Bnei Akiva, among others. Not all of these took root in

9 The following does not purport to list all that has been published on this subject. Shlomo Bar-Gil, *At First Was the Dream: Graduates of Pioneering Youth Movements in Latin America in the Kibbutz Movement, 1946–1967* (Hebrew), Sede Boqer 2005; idem, *Youth – Vision and Reality: From Dror and Gordonia to Ihud Habonim in Argentina, 1934–1973* (Hebrew), Ramat Efal 2007); Orna Stoliar, *'Shomrim' in the Land of the Andes: History of the Kidmah–Hashomer Hatzair Movement in Chile* (Hebrew), Yad Havivah 2004; *Bama'aleh: Members Tell about the Dror Hehalutz Hatzair Movement in Argentina* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 2000; Yossi Goldstein, "The Influence of the State of Israel and the Jewish Agency on Jewish Life in Argentina and Uruguay, 1948–1958" (Hebrew), PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1993, pp. 131–32, 143–44, 152–55, 239–40; idem, "The State of Israel, the Zionist Movement, and Jewish Education in Brazil, 1948–1955" (Hebrew), *Yahadut Zemanenu* 8 (1993): 39–66; Margalit Bejarano, "The Jewish Community of Cuba 1898–1939: Communal Development and Taking Root under the Pressure of Changes in World Jewry and Cuban Society" (Hebrew), PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1992, p. 218 and notes on p. 228; Rosa P. Raicher, "Uruguayan Jewry: Jewish National Identity and Assimilationist Tendencies in Its Historical Development" (Hebrew), PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1998, pp. 177, 239–41, 242–44.

every community, but naturally there was a wider spectrum of movements in the relatively large communities. For example, in 1942 there were five different movements in Argentina, as compared to only one in Cuba.[10]

The establishment and development of the youth movements in the 1930s and the early 1940s was unconnected to the formal bodies of the WZO. All efforts by local Zionist leaderships in countries such as Argentina to request that an emissary be sent to engage in youth education came to naught. Only after the outbreak of WWII, when Europe was closed off, did emissaries arrive for purposes other than fundraising. Nathan Bistritzky came to Argentina in 1941 and remained in Latin America until 1945, also including visits to Uruguay, Chile, Brazil, Mexico, and Cuba. He was the first to warn of the Zionist establishment's neglect of the Jewish communities in these countries, and especially of the Jewish youth. In October of that year ten certificates permitting entrance to Palestine were issued to nine members of youth movements and one student. In 1946 Yaakov Perla arrived in Argentina as an emissary of Hashomer Hatzair and in the following year Shlomo Gerner came as an emissary to the youth on behalf of the Jewish Agency in its Latin American office opened in Buenos Aires in 1947.[11] Since then and until after the Six Day War (1967) all ties between the youth movements and the Zionist bodies were conducted through the YHD, including its Religious Section. After the establishment of Israel, this department sent emissaries to all the Latin American states mentioned above.

The policy of the Youth and Hehalutz Department until the Six Day War

In order to ascertain whether the Six Day War was a turning point or the cause of change in the transnational relations of the WZO—and especially its relevant operational wing, the YHD—with youth movements in Latin America, we must examine its policy in the nineteen-year period prior to

10 Haim Avni, *Argentine Jewry: Social Status and Organizational Structure* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1972, 95; Bejarano (see note 9), pp. 215–18.

11 Schenkolewski-Kroll (see note 3), pp. 198–99, 202–3, 347; Schenkolewski (Tractinsky) (see note 3), p. 152.

that war. The reports, minutes, and resolutions of four Zionist Congresses (23rd–26th) and sessions of the WZO Executive Committee in those years indicate that a change did take place, one that corresponded with changing reality and opinions in Israel and the Zionist movement, as well as in the communities in which there was a potential for action, defined in a general manner as those in developed countries. If we take *halutziut* (pioneering spirit, expressed in settlement on the land) as the major indicator for our examination, since that was the focal principle of the youth movements with which the YHD was in contact, we see that at the 23rd Congress (1951) it was almost the sole issue. The intention was to maintain the momentum of development of the homeland through settlement, especially in kibbutzim, that had been the rule of the day in the pre-state period, and informal education in the Diaspora must be attuned to fulfil this mission. This was to be achieved by means of the youth movements in Diaspora countries, the emissaries, the Institute for Jewish Youth Leaders from Abroad (established in 1946), and *hakhsharot* (training farms) in the various countries.[12] The outstanding achievements of youth movements in Latin America, as well as *aliyah* from those countries to Israel and the establishment of kibbutzim such as Mefalsim and Ga'ash, led Eliahu Dobkin to remark: "…and who would have expected that something of a substitute for the pioneering reserve that was lost to u so tragically in Europe be revealed in this remote corner of the world?"[13]

To carry out this policy of encouraging *halutziut*, greater numbers of emissaries were sent to Latin America, including special instructors for the *hakhsharot*, and premises were acquired in which the youth movements operated. However, the beginning of a change was already noticeable between 1951 and 1956, when the 24th Congress convened. The YHD began supporting youth movements that were not identified with *halutziut*. As the realization sank in that it was impossible to transform all Jewish youth—even all those who were members of Zionist youth movements—into pioneers, the tendency, as reflected in the resolutions of the 24th

12 *Reports of the Executive of the Zionist Organization and the Executive of the Jewish Agency, 1947–1951, Submitted to the 23rd Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem 1951, pp. 128, 130–1, 132–34, 138–39; *Fundamental Issues of Zionism at the 23rd Zionist Congress,* Jerusalem, 1952: address by Eliahu Dobkin, pp. 21–28; resolutions, pp.136-137

13 *Fundamental Issues of Zionism at the 23rd Zionist Congress* (see note 12), p. 21.

Congress, was to increase involvement in Zionist sport associations. The Congress decided to devote resources, also in Latin America, to smaller communities and to efforts among "youth that is not identified [with Zionism] and is unorganized," so as to rescue them from the dangers of assimilation.[14] This is apparently the first instance in which mention is made of the need to combat assimilation, despite that the primary objective of the WZO remained *hagshamah* (Zionist fulfilment) and not the wider objective of maintaining a Jewish affiliation *per se*. The latter objective would be placed on the Zionist agenda in full force after the Six Day War.

Just like after the Six Day War, Israel's security situation in 1956 and the Sinai Campaign brought young Jewish volunteers to Israel from circles far removed from Zionism. This is probably what influenced the change in the policy of the YHD when it organized the First World Convention of Jewish Youth in July 1958, on the tenth anniversary of the establishment of Israel. There were 333 representatives of 150 organizations in 36 countries, 60 of them from Latin America. Most of the discussions focused on the problems facing youth who were not imbued with Jewish and Zionist values and how to enhance the Jewish content in work with these circles, including teaching Hebrew and encouraging a sense of affinity with Israel. Even though there was no lack of such youth in Latin America, until the 25th Zionist Congress (1961) that continent was considered the source for the majority of organized pioneering *aliyah*.[15]

At that time non-Zionist youth began to participate in the courses conducted by the Institute for Jewish Youth Leaders from Abroad. Thus, the first resolution passed by the 25th Congress in relation to the YHD stated that "Jewish and Zionist education of the youth in the Diaspora is one of the central tasks of the Zionist movement at this time."[16] This tendency

14 *Reports of the Executive of the Zionist Organization and the Executive of the Jewish Agency, 1951–1956, Submitted to the 24th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem 1956, pp. 275–77, 280–82, 251, 284–88; 24th Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1956: resolutions, pp. 568–70.

15 *Reports of the Executive of the Zionist Organization and the Executive of the Jewish Agency, 1956–1960, Submitted to the 25th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem 1960, pp. 280–81, 282–84, 285–86, 293–96; 25th Zionist Congress, *Proceedings*, Jerusalem 1961(Hebrew): address by Eliahu Dobkin, pp.412, 414-17; resolutions, pp. 720–22.

16 25th Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* (see note 15), p. 720.

continued in the years preceding the 26th Zionist Congress (1965), the last before the Six Day War. The Second World Convention of Jewish Youth was convened in August 1963 with the intention of drawing youth—if not to Zionism—at least to identify with Israel. This might be considered a sign heralding later developments. It was attended by 400 participants representing more than 600,000 Jewish youth in 204 organizations in 39 countries, among them 88 participants from twelve Latin American states. Regional conferences were convened in 1961 and 1963 in Uruguay and Brazil, implementing decisions taken at the world conferences. Umbrella organizations, in the form of Jewish youth councils, were established in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay.[17] There was also more activity among Jewish students, but the main thrust in Latin America remained among the pioneering youth movements, and to this end the number of emissaries sent to these countries was doubled. However, in those years there was also a change in Israel, reflected in a decrease in the number of members of youth movements prepared to undertake *hagshamah* in the form of settlement. In addition, factual information about life on the kibbutz reached Jewish youth in the Diaspora, and there were also political changes in Latin American states. As a result of the information from Israel and new opportunities in Latin America, the increase in resources invested by the WZO—the greater number of emissaries—did not lead to an increase in the number of youth going on *aliyah*.[18]

If we sum up the period preceding the Six Day War, it can be said that it was marked by a process leading from classic *halutziut* to recognition that there are also other possible ways to mobilize Jewish youth for the Zionist cause. This ranged from creating frameworks for youth who belonged to communal organizations to attempts to combat assimilation, not because assimilation was the major concern but in order to bring about identification with Israel. As shall be shown, these tendencies were highlighted after the 1967 war and took on an additional aspect: elevating the status of

17 *Reports of the Executive of the Zionist Organization and the Executive of the Jewish Agency, 1960–1964, Submitted to the 26th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem 1964, pp. 203–4, 206–7; 26th Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1965: address by Eliahu Dobkin, pp. 383–88, 390–91, 395.

18 26th Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* (see note 17), pp. 386–87; resolutions, p. 661. This issue is deserving of a separate study.

the Diaspora in relation to Israel and a mutual relationship between the Diaspora and Israel.

The policy of the Youth and Hehalutz Department after the Six Day War

As is well known, the Six Day War brought in its wake recognition of the centrality of the State of Israel for world Jewry as well as expectations for massive *aliyah* from developed countries, on the one hand, and a new interpretation of the role of the Zionist movement, both in the ideological and practical spheres, on the other. The responses that the war aroused in world Jewry, especially a sense of solidarity and identification with Israel among those who previously did not identify with the center in Israel or the Zionist periphery in their own communities, led to two changes: on the one hand, ideological acceptance of the right "to be a Zionist in the Diaspora" and, on the other, assumption of responsibility by the Zionist movement for the continued existence of Diaspora Jewry.[19] This was explicitly stated in the second "Jerusalem Program" which redefined Zionist objectives as "the preservation of the identity of the Jewish people through the fostering of Jewish and Hebrew educations and of Jewish spiritual and cultural values [and] the protection of Jewish rights everywhere."[20] This is a declaration of the responsibility of the Zionist movement vis-à-vis Jewish youth in the Diaspora, without the precondition of *aliyah*.

The 27th Zionist Congress was the first in which there was an organized youth delegation, and was also the venue in which both outlooks concerning youth were expressed. Muki Tzur, a member of the youth delegation, called for "*aliyah* to Israel and support of Jewish life in Israel and abroad."[21] The policy relating to Latin America, especially Argentina, remained conservative. The objective was to organize the Hehalutz movement

19 Schenkolewski-Kroll, (see note 4), n. 14.

20 Organization and Information Department of the Zionist Executive, *Resolutions of the 27th Zionist Congress,June 9–19, 1968*, Jerusalem 1968, p. 17.

21 27th Zionist Congress, *Proceedings, June 9-19.1968*, (Hebrew), p. 360.

through the cooperation of all the pioneering Zionist youth movements so as to "conquer" the youth who were not organized in any framework. In the Zionist youth movements, pioneering values should be intensified, while steps should be taken to direct the unorganized youth toward *aliyah* or to come as volunteers. Whereas the objective of both outlooks was *aliyah*, an apparent differentiation was made between the youth movements and youth in other frameworks, such as community centers. Despite the emphasis on *aliyah* this approach corresponded with the decisions adopted by the Congress: *aliyah* as the prime objective; training for a pioneering life to be carried out in both Israel and the Diaspora; greater cooperation between the pioneering youth movements; activity among youth in community centers; and creation of a worldwide movement of volunteers.[22]

The truth of the matter is that the declarations and decisions of the Congress had to take into account events outside the Jewish and Zionist framework. In 1968 student uprisings erupted in Europe and soon spread throughout the West; these were the years following the assassination of Che Guevara in 1967 and in which the New Left emerged; and as for Argentina, it had undergone a military coup in 1966.[23] All these detracted Jewish youngsters in general, and the Jewish youth of Latin America in particular, from participating in the frameworks which the YHD created for them. This was reflected in meetings of the Zionist Executive in July 1969. On the one hand, Mordechai Bar-On, then head of the YHD, reported increased membership in the youth movements and their wise decision not to pressure

22 Ibid., resolutions, pp. 522–25.

23 *Reports of the Executive of the Zionist Organization, 1968–1971, Submitted to the 28th Zionist Congress* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1971, pp. 114–16. Among the many publications on these events, see Hugo Cancino, "The Ideological Thought of Ernesto 'Che' Guevara", in Avital H. Bloch, Rogelio de la Mora, and Hugo Cancino (eds.), *Public Intellectuals in Contemporary Latin America*, Colima 2007, pp. 65–78; Diana Sorensen, *A Turbulent Decade Remembered: Scenes from the Latin American Sixties*, Stanford 2007, pp. 15–53; Barry Carr and Steve Ellner (eds.), *The Latin American Left from the Fall of Allende to Perestroika*, Boulder 1993; John C. Chasteen and Joseph S. Tulchin (eds.), *Problems in Modern Latin American History*, Welmington 1994, pp. 245–83; Liliana de Riz, *La política en suspenso 1966–1976*, Buenos Aires 2000; P.G. Atbach, "Student Movement", *Journal of Contemporary History* 5, 1 (1970): 156–74; Ricardo Pozas Horcasitas, "El quiebre de los años sesenta", *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* 63, 2 (2001): 169–91.

members to come on *aliyah* at the age of eighteen but to wait until after they complete their university studies, leading to the creation of different groups within the movements. Bar-On was prepared to adjust the rules to meet reality; *aliyah* would not be a priority, but rather what he defined as a *mitzvah*, an obligation to spend one year in Israel. The discussion focused on ways to find a synthesis between the winds of change in the world and the Zionist movement, between a struggle to achieve universal values and revolutionary ideals and Jewish national values, between *Siah Lohamim* and Che Guevara.[24]

This being the case, youth, too, were made part of the Membership Drive of the Zionist Movement. Moreover, the YHD now placed more emphasis on organizations of non-Zionist youth, in line with the policy of the Membership Drive. For good reason, in 1971 the General Council "urges the [Youth and Hehalutz] Department to create media for its work, in accordance with changing circumstances."[25] Was this carried out?

Resolutions adopted by the 28th Zionist Congress (1972) instructed the YHD to increase its efforts among youth movements in the Diaspora "by methods that meet the needs of youth in the 1970s"[26] and to bring them to achieve *aliyah* and settlement by every means. As a result of the decision to make the means correspond with reality, the term "Jewish pioneer"[27] was coined in 1974 with the intention of bringing groups of youth on *aliyah*, though not in preordained frameworks such as kibbutzim, as was the case until then, but taking into account the background and special needs of these youths and the prospects of their integration into Israeli society.[28] The

24 *Session of the Zionist General Council in Jerusalem, 30 June–8 July 1969* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1969: address by Mordechai Bar-On, pp. 100–5; addresses by representatives from Argentina and Uruguay, pp. 120–23. *Siah Lohamim* was a dialogue conducted after the Six Day War by soldiers from various ideological sectors who participated in it. An English translation appeared as *The Seventh Day: Soldiers Talk about the Six-Day War*, New York 1970.

25 *Session of the Zionist General Council in Jerusalem, 20 June, 27 June–1 July 1972*, Jerusalem 1972, p. 249. For the Membership Drive in Latin America, see Schenkolewski-Kroll (see note 4).

26 28th Zionist Congress, *Proceedingss* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1972: resolutions, p. 600.

27 *Session of the Zionist General Council in Jerusalem, 18, 23–23 June 1974* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1974: resolutions, p. 148.

28 Ibidem.

political situation in Latin America and its dictatorial regimes, as well as the Yom Kippur War and its consequences (criticism of Israeli society) complicated matters among the youth, intensifying the conflict between involvement in developments in their home countries and *hagshamah*. Following the new policy; the YHD now put the emphasis on work in community centers; in Argentina it organized courses to train educational directors of these centers. From 1975, the leading initiative was the operation of "Tapuz," a program that during twenty-five years brought youth during the summer months in Latin America for seminars, tours, visits to Israeli universities, and more.[29]

The WZO was not content with simply giving the YHD freedom of action. It initiated constitutional and organizational changes that would enable youth to be active within the WZO. The committee that dealt with this issue at the 29th Zionist Congress in 1978 defined itself as the "committee for youth, students, and *dor hahemshekh* (the younger generation)."[30] The committee proposed reducing the minimum age for delegates to the Congress from 24 to 18, thus enabling youth representatives to express their views and participate in the decision-making process.[31]

Four years later, at the 30th Zionist Congress in 1982, the WZO admitted that it faced an economic and ideological crisis that hampered its activity. The issue of Jewish youth remained on the agenda since it was maintained that they were drifting away from Zionism and Judaism. The solutions suggested did not deviate from previous ones, the only innovation being emphasis on the need to connect between formal and informal education. This meant opening the schools to activity by youth movements, and greater cooperation with additional departments of the WZO to exploit the emissaries and the budgets allocated for them.[32] The impression was that the

29 *Report of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, September 1971–December 1977 Submitted to the 29th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem 1978, pp. 296–97, 304–6.

30 For *dor hahemshekh*, see Schenkolewski-Kroll (see note 4). See also Organizaation Department of the Zionist Executive, *Resolutions of the 29 Zionist Congress, Jerusalem February 20–March 1*, 1978, Jerusalem 1978: speech by Danny Rosolio, pp. 63–65; 29th Zionist Congress, *Proceedings , February 20 – March*, *1978*, (Hebrew) speeches by delegates from Latin America, pp. 233–34; resolutions, p. 410.

31 Ibid., p. 411.

32 *Session of the Zionist Executive, 1–4 September 1981* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1981, pp.

WZO Executive was turning to various means in attempting to overcome the fact that the Zionist youth movements were not attracting youngsters and in view of the rampant tendency towards assimilation among Diaspora youth. In 1986 Zionist leaders referred openly to "the distress of Judaism"[33] that should be combated through the two types of education. Taking cognizance of the overall situation in the Diaspora, the 31st Zionist Congress, in 1987, discussed and decided to extend the framework of informal education to also include adults, to increase its resources, and to reorganize the emissary system to correct flaws resulting from political frameworks. This was to be done by implementing the recommendations of the Landau Commission that included, among others, establishment of an independent authority to choose and appoint emissaries and cooperation in this effort with national Zionist federations,[34] in order to choose the emissaries most suitable for local conditions.

The next stage in implementation of this policy was the proposal of the Executive of the WZO in 1988 to establish a joint authority for Jewish education in which all departments dealing with formal and informal education would be represented.[35] The objective was to achieve more rational use of resources and coordination of educational content. Despite these changes, in 1989 the Zionist Executive proposed that part of the financing of youth movements come from the communities themselves or by local fundraising.[36] A check of the implementation of the resolutions

60–62; *Reports on the Activities of the Departments of the World Zionist Organization, January 1978–August 1982 Submitted to the 30th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem 1982, pp. 141–42; 30th Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1983: resolutions, pp. 461–63.

33 *Session of the Zionist Executive, Jerusalem, 2–6 February 1986* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1986: resolutions, p. 249.

34 Ibid., discussions of 5 Feb. 1986; the Landau Commission report: pp. 193–99; *Session of the Zionist Executive, 15–18 June 1987* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1987: resolutions, pp. 339–40; *Report of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, December 1982–August 1987 Submitted to the 31st Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem 1987, pp. 161–62, 167, 172–73; 31st Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1987: resolutions, pp. 292–95.

35 *Session of the Zionist Executive, 19–22 July 1988* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1988: address of Simcha Dinitz, pp. 49–54; address of Avraham Avihai, pp. 60–62; resolutions, pp. 238–39, 241–42.

36 *Session of the Zionist General Council, 18–21 June 1989* (Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1989:

adopted by the 31st Congress carried out in preparation for the 32nd Congress in 1992 indicated that the budget had been cut and the number of emissaries had not increased; as a result most of the resolutions remained a dead letter. In relation to Latin America, the number of emissaries had decreased from 60 in 1971 to 36. The extent of one enterprise was not reduced, though it also was not expanded: Tapuz, which in 1992 marked eighteen years of operation.

What especially stands out in the minutes of the 32nd Congress is the change in terminology: the title of the chapter dealing with education is "Jewish Education."[37] There is no mention of *halutziut*, while it is stressed that every program of the WZO must include an obligation to support informal education. In addition, the resolutions adopted include once again topics that had not been implemented.[38] As with the WZO in general, in relation to youth the scales now tipped towards concern for the Jewish people—efforts to combat assimilation and antisemitism—instead of concern for the State of Israel.

In preparation for the 33rd Zionist Congress held in 1997, apparently due to organizational changes that reflected changes in the budget, the joint Authority for Jewish-Zionist Education, comprised of the YHD, the Department for Education and Culture in the Diaspora, and the Department for Religious Culture, submitted a report that did not appreciably deviate from the previous ones in extent and content. However, it did contain a chapter on "Contributions to informal Jewish-Zionist education in Latin America"[39] that reported about representatives of the Authority for Jewish-

address of Simcha Dinitz, pp. 58–61; address by Avraham Avihai, pp. 62–63; address of Marc Levy, pp. 92–94; resolutions, pp. 196, 198. An open question deserving of additional study is to what extent the expansion of efforts in the former Soviet Union or elsewhere was responsible for the lack of funds.

37 *Implementation of the Decisions of the 31st Zionist Congress, December 1987* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1992, pp. 16–20; *Report of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, December 1987–May 1992 Submitted to the 32nd Zionist Congress* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1992, pp. 173–75, 181–83, 184–85; 32nd Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1992: resolutions, pp. 281, 282, 284–85.

38 32nd Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1992: resolutions, pp. 281, 282, 284–85. See also *Session of the Zionist Executive,* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1992, pp. 23–24.

39 *Report of the World Zionist Organization, May 1992–December 1997 Submitted to the 33rd Zionist Congress* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1997, p. 176.

Zionist Education engaged in directing a network of informal education, and about projects conducted in cooperation with the national funds, i.e., plans to train instructors for community centers.[40] Obviously, emphasis was now on youth in community centers and not on the traditional youth movements.

The impression gained from discussions at the 33rd Zionist Congress is that an effort was made to break away from the stagnation that characterized the WZO in its handling of affairs relating to youth and students. Unlike at previous congresses, this time discussants presented the youth as grown-ups and a plenary session was even devoted to the subject with the most active participation of delegates representing youth and students from the entire political spectrum. What marked this session was a consensus of opinion concerning the role of youth and students in the Zionist movement. The demand was raised to grant them the right to vote in and be elected to the movement's various bodies. While *aliyah* and integration into Israeli society were raised in the discussion, no priority was given to any one manner of achieving this, such as *halutziut*, as was done in the past.[41]

The organizational solution adopted by the 33rd Congress was to establish two new bodies: the Authority for Zionist Activity and the Authority for Hagshamah of the Younger Generation. A Department of Hagshamah was established within the framework of the latter, since *aliyah* was the primary objective of Zionism. Its first objective was to increase *aliyah* from Western countries and to be involved in all existing frameworks of youth and students in the Diaspora. Half the budget of the WZO was to be devoted to this project.

Fulfillment of the ideal of *aliyah* would be a result of Jewish-Zionist education which must range from the very young to adults. A by-product of Jewish-Zionist education would be to provide Diaspora Jews with a means by which they could preserve their Jewish identity, develop a young leadership cadre in their own communities, and maintain strong ties with Israel. This concern, together with the claim that the Jewish people

40 Ibidem, pp. 162, 175–77.

41 The 33rd Zionist Congress, *Report*, Jerusalem 1997: plenary session no. 2, pp. 39–75; resolutions, pp. 280–87.

is decreasing in numbers due to assimilation, made priority for informal education at all levels and in all contexts all the more urgent.[42]

Latin America was pointed out as having a high potential for *aliyah*. In 1998, during a period of an especially severe economic crisis in Argentina, immigration from that country apparently stemmed more from economic considerations than Zionist inclinations, as the Zionist leadership wished to see *aliyah*. In 2002, too, Argentina was singled out by the Authority for Jewish-Zionist Education due to the great crisis that its Jewish community was undergoing and the collapse of its magnificent educational system.[43] Special mention was made of the establishment of the Jewish Educator's House that provided pedagogical services for both formal and informal education, and of the project "Lomdim", financed with the help of communities in North America, whose object was to have children who dropped out of Jewish schools continue their Jewish education in the framework of youth movements.[44]

The 35th Zionist Congress was held in 2006. The report of the Authority for Jewish-Zionist Education explicitly pointed to the serious condition of Jewish youth in the Diaspora from the point of view of Jewish identity and identification with Israel. The ease of integration into local society, intermarriage, loss of a Jewish collective memory, globalization, and hostility to Israel in the media all had their negative effect. The solution proposed at the Congress was the old one of flooding the Diaspora communities with emissaries from Israel. This included the "Program of the Thousand"—to send a thousand young persons who had served in the Israel Defense Forces or in the non-military National Service to work under the supervision of a professional emissary. Simultaneously, it was proposed to bring youth and

42 Ibidem.

43 *Session of the Zionist Executive, 5–8 November 1998* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1999, pp. 34–35; *Session of the Zionist Executive, 13–16 June 1999* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1999, pp. 30, 32–33; *Report on Department Activities, December 1997–June 2002 Presented to the 34th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem 2002, pp. 86–87; Silvia Schenkolewski-Kroll, "Argentine Jewry: From a Supportive Community to a Supported Community" (Hebrew), *Kivunim Hadashim* 11 (2004), pp. 190–202; idem, 'Tradición y cambio', p. 470

44 Yossi Goldstein, "Comunidad voluntaria y educación privada: tendencias en el seno del judaísmo argentino entre 1990 y 1995", in *Judaica Latinoamericana: Estudios Históricos, Sociales y Literarios,* IV, Jerusalem 2001, pp. 157–81.

students to visit and spend some time in Israel in the framework of "Taglit" and "Masa." According to this report, in 2006 about 28,000 came for short visits and another 8,000 participated in lengthier programs.[45] The objective of the WZO is to reach 100 percent of Jewish youth, and connect those who experienced Israel with those who as yet have not spent some time there. At the time of writing, implementation of the program has not been fully tested.

Conclusions

It is obvious that all the points discussed above deserve a more detailed study, and that there are others which yet await research. These include comparison of the attitude of the YHD to North America and English-speaking youth with that towards Latin America; relations between Jewish youth in Latin America and Israeli young people; and the role of the Jewish Agency in this relationship.

Despite these reservations, our conclusion is that the Six Day War did not directly influence the policy of the WZO towards Jewish youth in Latin America, certainly not for any length of time after the Six Day War. That war was an event that highlighted existing processes, which it influenced and that continued to operate in its aftermath under conditions that it created, or due to other causes. This conclusion coincides with other studies, such as those of DellaPergola, Rebhun, and Raicher on the influence of the Six Day War on *aliyah*, tourism, fundraising, and more, and the research conducted by Avni on its effect on Argentine Jewry.[46]

45 Since the report does not give a geographical breakdown of the figures, it is impossible to ascertain how many of them were from Latin America. *Report of the World Zionist Organization, June 2002–June 2006 Presented to the 35th Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem 2006, pp. 94–97; 35th Zionist Congress, *Proceedings* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 2006: resolutions, pp. 13–15, 18–20.

46 Sergio DellaPergola, Uzi Rebhun, and Rosa P. Raicher, "The Six-Day War and Israel–Diaspora Relations: an Analysis of Quantitative Indicators", in Eli Lederhendler (ed.), *The Six-Day War and World Jewry*, Bethesda 2000, pp. 11–49; Haim Avni, "The Impact of the Six-Day War on a Zionist Community: the Case of Argentina", in ibid., pp. 137–65.

It is maintained that the Six Day War was not a turning point in relation to informal education, including youth movements. As demonstrated, a process of change from a policy calling for absolute *halutziut* to one that took into account other types of informal education had already begun before the 1967 war. There is no doubt that this was influenced by developments in Israel itself, where there were now other possible choices in addition to pioneering settlement, and also in changes that occurred in Latin American countries. As noted, simultaneous with the Six Day War there were dramatic global developments such as student revolutions, or the rise of dictatorial regimes in Latin America and the opposition they aroused. All these placed Jewish youth in a dilemma and to point out that they did not contribute to achievement of the WZO's objectives is an understatement. The mode of operation of the YHD in its various configurations was not radically transformed but was only adjusted to meet changing circumstances. It continued to be based on emissaries sent from Israel or on youth leaders trained in the Institute for Jewish Youth Leaders from Abroad, and these were not limited to the traditional youth movements but included also those active in community centers. As for the Zionist youth movements, what was required of them and their ideology also underwent adjustment: instead of the ethos of *halutziut*, *aliyah* alone became the objective, no matter what form it took. The Zionist establishment believed that organizational change in the WZO would contribute to improving the situation: uniting various departments, on the one hand, and gradually increasing association of youth in its central organs, such as the Zionist congresses, on the other.

There was, however a change in one major aspect in the wake of the Six Day War. The transformation of Zionist transnationalism, which also left its mark on Jewish transnationalism, resulted from a changed conception of Zionism. The Zionist movement reconsidered the mutual relationship between Israel and the Diaspora and the movement assumed responsibility for the Jewish people everywhere. All these also influenced the policy vis-à-vis Jewish youth. The more we move towards the present, the more obvious are the efforts to combat assimilation, in plain terms: to save the Jewish people. To that end the WZO changed its terminology, referring more to "Jewish education" rather than "Zionist education" and created the Authority for Jewish Education, widening its activity until it issued the declaration of 2006 noted above.

The bottom line is that the WZO's policy on youth movements in general, and those in Latin America in particular, underwent transformation from movements whose objective was to further *halutziut* to movements whose raison d'être was to rescue the Jewish people. Circumstances of time and place dictated these changes.