

Matan – Judaism and the ISMS

Judaism and Pacifism

Buber and Gandhi

Jews are being persecuted, robbed, maltreated, tortured, murdered. And you, Mahatma Gandhi, say that their position in the country where they suffer all this is an exact parallel to the position of Indians in South Africa at the time you inaugurated your famous “Force of Truth” or “Strength of the Soul” (Satyagraha) campaign. There the Indians occupied precisely the same place, and the persecution there also had a religious tinge. There also the constitution denied equality of rights to the white and the black race including the Asiatics; there also the Indians were assigned to ghettos, and the other disqualifications were, at all events, almost of the same type as those of the Jews in Germany. I read and re-read these sentences in your article without being able to understand.....If I oppose to this the thousands on thousands of Jewish shops destroyed and burned out, you will perhaps answer that the difference is only one of quantity and that the proceedings were of almost the same type. But, Mahatma, are you not aware of the burning of synagogues and scrolls of the Law? Do you know nothing of all the sacred property of the community - some of it of great antiquity - that has been destroyed in the flames? I am not aware that Boers and Englishmen in South Africa ever injured anything sacred to the Indians. I find only one other concrete complaint quoted in that speech, namely, that three Indian schoolteachers, who were found walking in the streets after 9.00 p.m. contrary to orders, were arrested and only acquitted later on. That is the only incident of the kind you bring forward. **Now do you know or do you not know, Mahatma, what a concentration camp is like and what goes on there? Do you know of the torments in the concentration camp, of its methods of slow and quick slaughter? I cannot assume that you know of this; for then this tragi-comic utterance “of almost the same type” could scarcely have crossed your lips. Indians were despised and despicably treated in South Africa. But they were not deprived of rights, they were not outlawed, they were not hostages to a hoped-for change in the behaviour of foreign Powers. And do you think perhaps that a Jew in Germany could pronounce in public one single sentence of a speech such as yours without being knocked down? Of what significance is it to point to a certain something in common when such differences are overlooked?**

It does not seem to me convincing when you base your advice to us to observe satyagraha in Germany on these similarities of circumstance. In the five years I myself spent under the present regime, I observed many instances of genuine satyagraha among the Jews, instances showing a strength of spirit in which there was no question of bartering their rights or of being bowed down, and where neither force nor cunning was used to escape the consequences of their behaviour. Such actions, however, exerted apparently not the slightest influence on their opponents. All honour indeed to those who displayed such strength of soul! But I cannot recognise herein a watchword for the general behaviour of German Jews that might seem suited to exert an influence on the oppressed or on the world. An effective stand in the form of non-violence may be taken against unfeeling human beings in the hope of gradually bringing them to their senses; but a diabolic universal steamroller cannot thus be withstood. There is a certain situation in which no “satyagraha” of the power of the truth can result from the “satyagraha” of the strength of the spirit. The word satyagraha signifies testimony. Testimony without acknowledgment, ineffective, unobserved martyrdom, a martyrdom cast to the winds - that is the fate of innumerable Jews in Germany. God alone accepts their testimony God “seals” it, as is said in our prayers. But no maximum for suitable behaviour can be deduced from that. Such martyrdom is a deed - but who would venture to demand it?

Pro-Pacifism

The evil that is intellectual, the evil that is lying, the evil that is political—that is to say, evil that brings alongside itself an excuse, is the greatest source of destruction in the world. It is the source of all of the disasters and destruction since the time when humanity began, in a small way, to perfect its intellectual capabilities, such as they are. For from that time, private murder, the natural murder of an individual falling upon another, has decreased. But, in place of that decrease, the lying form of murder has increased. And what is that lie? The formation of nations, which are “clubs” organized together for the sake of pursuing and afflicting other nations weaker than they are.⁸

We can now explain the *beraita* that discusses the verse, “and you shall not leave, not any one, from the door of his home until the morning.” Rav Yosef taught, “once permission was given to the destroyer, he will not differentiate between wicked and righteous.” At first glance, this *beraita* is a deep contradiction to the statement in the Haggadah of “I and not an emissary.” How can the *beraita* say, “once permission was given to the destroyer!” But according to our ways the two statements match. For the *beraita* is coming to explain why the Holy Blessed One sought to exact vengeance Himself and did not allow the Israelites even to look. The answer is that God acted in this way so as not to arouse the destroyer that is within the Israelites themselves. For once permission is given, he will not distinguish between wicked and righteous and the defender will in the end become a pursuer.¹⁸

We can see a little bit of difference between the methods of “taking one’s freedom” of the European political parties, and our way of achieving freedom. They took freedom, for example, during the French Revolution, by “barricades” or by throwing bombs upon some despot or another. And we try to achieve freedom by making a seder, eating *matzah*, singing *hallel*...that is to say, by means of repeating well on our lips the memory of the freedom of the Exodus, the Godly flame will be fanned within our souls and we will remember His kindness and His A whole nation, just as an individual, must arrange its way of life on the foundation of the aphorism mentioned by Tosafot (*Bava Kama* 23), “one must be more concerned about harming others than in being harmed by others.” Indeed, for when a person strives to guard his own fists from causing harm to others he causes, through this, the reign of the God of truth and justice over the world, and he gives strength to the kingdom of righteousness. This strengthening of righteousness will in turn guard him against being harmed by others. This is not the case if he prioritizes his own self-defense and keeps his fists ready to defend against the attacks of others. Behold, by this very way of thinking he weakens the power of justice and arouses the characteristics of wickedness.

As the text of the Passover Haggadah states, “And I shall pass [through Egypt] on this night—I and not an emissary.” The Holy Blessed One could have given Israel the ability to exact revenge on the Egyptians themselves. However the Holy Blessed One did not want to show them how to use their own fists. Even though at that moment it would be to protect themselves from the wicked, it would end up causing the spread of the use of the fist throughout the world, and the defenders would eventually become pursuers [1]

R. Tamares wrote of a universal mission of the Jewish people. The basic idea is this: Jews exist as a people to spread the moral precepts of the Torah, including a pacifist aversion to bloodshed, to the rest of humanity. Since an aversion to bloodshed is part and parcel of the moral message of the Torah, the Jewish mission to humanity must be accomplished without the use of force. The suffering of the Jews in exile and attempts to alleviate that suffering, must therefore be evaluated in light of the Jews' purpose for existing as a people.

Exile, and accompanying antisemitism, are not, God forbid, some sort of incitement or pogrom from the Holy Blessed One when we fall behind in offering up to him "taxes" in the form of *mitzvot*. Rather, exile is a necessary result of our destiny and our role.³²

משך חכמה שמות פרק יב

הנה בפסח מצרים, לא היה חימוצו נוהג אלא יום אחד, כן כתבו דיוס טוב לא נהוג ולדעתי הא דאמר להם עתה דבר של דורות, הוא להורות שלמות מצוותיו יתברך, כי כל העמים בדתותיהן הנימוסיות יעשו יום הנצחון יום מפלת אויבים לחוג חג הנצחון. לא כן בישראל, המה לא ישמחו על מפלת אויביהם, ולא יחוגו בשמחה על זה, וכמו שאמר (משלי כב, יז) "בנפול אויבך אל תשמח (ובהכשלו אל יגל לבך) פן יראה ה' ורע בעיניו, והשיב מעליו אפו". הרי דאדם המעלה אינו שמח בנפול אויבו, משום שהשמחה רע בעיני ה' - הלא הרע בעיני ה' צריך לשנאתו! ולכן לא נזכר בפסח 'חג המצות, כי בו עשה במצרים שפטים', רק "כי הוציא ה' את בני ישראל ממצרים". אבל על מפלת האויבים אין חג ויום טוב לישראל.

ולכך על נס חנוכה, אין היום מורה רק על הדלקת שמן זית, וחינוך בית ה' וטהרתו, והשגחת אלקים על עמו בית ישראל בזמן שלא היה נביא וחזון בישראל. ולכן נעשה ההדלקה על ענין בלתי מפורסם, ההדלקה שמונה ימים בהיכל, משום שהמנהיגים והשרי צבאות היו הכהנים הגדולים החשמונאים, והיתה חוששת ההשגחה שמא יאמרו 'כוחם ועוצם ידם', ובתחבולות מלחמה נצחו, הראתה להם ההשגחה אות ומופת בהיכל, אשר אינו ידוע רק לכוהנים, למען ידעו כי יד אלקים עשה זאת והם מושגחים דרך נס למעלה מן הטבע.

וכן בנס פורים לא עשו יום טוב ביום שנתלה המן או ביום שהרגו בשונאיהם, כי זה אין שמחה לפני עמו ישראל. רק היום טוב הוא "בימים אשר נחו מאויביהם" (ע"פ אסתר ט כב), וכמו שהיו צריכים למנוחה, והיו נחשים על דרכם ונהרגו הנחשים, היתכן לשמוח יום שנצחו הנחשים?! כי רק השמחה על המנוחה! לכן "ויכתוב מרדכי את הדברים האלה וישלח ספרים וכו' לקיים עליהם להיות עושים וכו' בימים אשר נחו בהם" (שם שם כ), שלכן לא היה חושש ל'קנאה את מעוררת עלינו בין האומות' [שאנו שמחים במפלתם - רש"י]. שאין השמחה רק על המנוחה, לא על יום ההרג בשונאיהם....

והנה במצרים נטבעו בים סוף ביום שביעי של פסח (רש"י שמות יד, ה), ואם היה אומר השם יתברך שיעשו בשביעי מקרא קודש, היה מדמה אדם שהשם צוה לעשות חג לשמוח במפלתם של רשעים. ובאמת הלא מצינו שלא אמרו לפניו שירה, שנאמר "ולא קרב זה אל זה", שאין הקדוש ברוך הוא שמח במפלתם של רשעים. ולכן אמר בארץ מצרים שיעשו חג בשביעי ולהורות שאין החג מסיבת מפלת מצרים בים, שצוה להם טרם שנטבעו בים ודו"ק. וכן מפרש בילקוט רמז תרנ"ד, שלכן לא כתב שמחה בפסח, ואין אומרים הלל כל שבעה משום "בנפול אויבך אל תשמח".

<p>Here is the version quoted by R. Lichtenstein:</p> <p>http://www.gush.net/compromise and concession.htm</p> <p>Mori Verabbi, Rav Yosef Dov Soloveitchik z"l often retold a story about his grandfather, Rav Chaim, who was once travelling on a train and heard some Jews sighing and groaning about the national situation. Suddenly he heard one of them say, "Oy, if only, as a result of all these tribulations, the Moshiah would come." Rav Chaim went over to him and said, "The <i>Mishnah in Sotah</i> list a number of signs of the <i>Moshiah's</i> coming. Spilled Jewish blood is not one of them."</p>	<p>The following fascinating anecdote about Rav Chaim is found at the end of the Hacham Ovadia's piece on land for peace in Techumin.</p> <p>והנני להזכיר כאן מה שכתב הרה"ג דב כ"ץ בספר הגות ודעות בשם הגאון האדיר רבי חיים סולובייצ'יק מבריסק זצ"ל, שבימי מלחמת עולם העולמית, אשר רבים חללים הפילה ועצומים כל הרוגיה, ונהרגו גם כן הרבה מאחינו בית ישראל, אמרו לו להגר"ח בתוך כדי שיחה, שאילו לפחות המלחמה הזאת היתה מביאה את הגאולה אולי כדאי היה הדבר. גער בהם הגר"ח ואמר: מוטב שידחו כמה גאולות מישראל, ואל תאבד נפש אחת מישראל. ואילו היתה באה שאלה לפנינו, שאם על ידי קרבן של אדם אחד מישראל יבוא המשיח, בודאי שהיינו פוסקים, שמוטב שלא יבוא המשיח, ולא ימות אדם אחד מישראל. כי הלא פיקוח נפש דוחה כל מצות שבתורה ובכלל זה אף משיח והגאולה.</p>
---	---

Anti-Pacifism

1. הבא להורגך השכם להורגו.
2. רודף - ואלו הן שמצילין אותן בנפשן^ט, הרודף אחר חבירו להרגו
3. מלחמת מצוה
4. לא תעמוד על דם רעך

Rav Soloveitchik – Kol Dodi Dofek

The fifth knock of the Beloved is perhaps the most important. For the first time in the annals of our exile, Divine Providence has amazed our enemies with the astounding discovery that Jewish blood is not cheap! If the antisemites describe this phenomenon as being “an eye for an eye,” we will agree with them. **If we want to courageously defend our continued national and historical existence, we must, from time to time, interpret the verse of an “eye for an eye” literally. So many “eyes” were lost in the course of our bitter exile because we did *not* repay hurt for hurt. The time has come for us to fulfill the simple meaning of “an eye for an eye.” (Exodus 21:24) Of course, I am sure everyone recognizes that I am an adherent of the Oral Law, and from my perspective there is no doubt that the verse refers to monetary restitution, as defined by halakhah. However, with respect to the Mufti and Nasser I would demand that we interpret the verse in accordance with its literal meaning — the taking of an actual eye! Pay no attention to the saccharine suggestions of known assimilationists and of some Jewish socialists who stand pat in their rebelliousness and think they are still living in Bialystok, Brest-Litovsk, and Minsk of the year 1905, and openly declare that revenge is forbidden to the Jewish people in any place, at any time, and under all circumstances. “Vanity of vanities!” (Ecclesiastes 1:2) **Revenge is forbidden when it is pointless, but if one is aroused thereby to self-defense, it is the most elementary right of man to take his revenge.****

The Torah has always taught that a man is permitted, indeed, has a sacred obligation, to defend himself. With the verse, “If a burglar is caught in the act of breaking in” (Exodus 22:1), the Torah establishes the halakhah that one may defend not only one’s life but his property as well.⁷ If the thief who comes to take the property of the householder is capable of killing the householder (should the householder not comply with his demands), the householder may rise up against the criminal and kill him. For good reason the Torah relates that two of its great heroes, Abraham and Moses, took sword in hand to defend their brethren: “And when Abraham heard that his kinsman was taken captive, he led forth his retainers” (Genesis 14:14). “And when Moses saw the Egyptian smite a Jew ... he struck down the Egyptian” (Exodus 2:11–12). This behavior does not contradict the principle of loving-kindness and compassion. On the contrary, a passive position, without self-defense, may sometimes lead to the most awesome brutality. “And I will gain honor from Pharaoh, and all his hosts, his chariots, and his horsemen. And the Egyptians will know that I am the Lord” (Exodus 14:17–18). God did not seek honor and recognition. He wanted Pharaoh, Moses’ contemporary, to know that he must pay a high price for his edict that “Every male child born shall be cast into the river” (Exodus 1:22). **His present desire is that the blood of Jewish children who were slain as they recited the eighteen benedictions of the daily [Amidah] prayer shall also be avenged. When God smote the Egyptians, He sought to demonstrate that there will always be accountability for the spilling of Jewish blood. At present, it is necessary not only to convince the dictator of Egypt [Nasser], but the self-righteous Nehru, the Foreign Office in London, and the sanctimonious members of the United Nations, that Jewish blood is not cheap.** Therefore, how laughable it is when they try to persuade us to rely on the declaration of the three Great Powers guaranteeing the status quo. We all know from experience what value can be attached to the pronouncements of the British Foreign Office and the so-called friendship of certain officials in our State Department. In general, how absurd is the request that an entire people be dependent on the kindnesses of others and remain without the ability to defend itself. Public and private honor is dependent upon the possibility of defending one’s life and one’s honor. A people that cannot defend its freedom and tranquillity is neither free nor independent. The third of the phrases of Divine redemption is “And I shall redeem you with an outstretched hand and with great judgments” (Exodus 6:6). Thank God we have lived to see the day when, with the help of God, Jews have it within their power to defend themselves.

Let us not forget that the poison of Hitlerite anti-Semitism (which made Jews fair game to all) still permeates this generation, which looked with equanimity upon the horrible scene of the suffocation of millions in gas chambers as a normal event that need not be challenged. The antidote for this venom that poisoned minds and dulled hearts is the readiness of the State of Israel to defend the lives of its citizens. Listen! My Beloved Knocks!

Rabbi Michael Broyde, JLAW

Difficult as it is in our current society to take a stand against pacifism as a societal or individual moral philosophy, it is clear that the Jewish tradition does not favor pacifism as a value superior to all other values or incorporate it as a basic moral doctrine within Judaism. Judaism clearly has accepted a practical form of pacifism as appropriate in the "right" circumstances. For example, the Talmud recounts that in response to the persecutions of the second century (C.E.), the Jewish people agreed (literally: took an oath) that mandated pacifism in the process of seeking political independence or autonomy for the Jewish state.⁷² This action is explained by noting that frequently pacifism is the best response to total political defeat; only through the complete abjuring of the right to use force can survival be insured. So too, the phenomena of martyrdom, with even the extreme example of killing one's own children rather than allowing them to be converted out of the faith,⁷³ represents a form of pacifism in the face of violence.⁷⁴ However, it is impossible to assert that a pacifistic tradition is based on a deeply rooted Jewish tradition to abstain from violence even in response to violence. It is true that there was a tradition rejecting the violent response to anti-semitism and pogrom; yet it is clear that that tradition was based on the futility of such a response, rather than on the moral impropriety of such a response. Even a casual survey of the Jewish law material on the appropriateness of a violent response to violence leads one to conclude that neither Jewish law nor rabbinic ethics frowned on violence in all circumstances as a response to violence.⁷⁵

Professor Yehuda Mirsky, Political Morality of Pacifism and Nonviolence

First, Judaism's conception of humanity's place in the world is fundamentally activist, committed to the establishment of a just and godly social order here on earth, and through worldly means. The institutions of this world, of *olam ha-zeh*, including war and statecraft, are good or evil depending on the uses to which they are put. Clearly the Old Testament sees the use of force as a legitimate exercise in certain circumstances. Indeed, the Sixth Commandment, *lo tirtsach*, though usually translated as "Thou Shalt Not Kill" is more accurately rendered as "Thou Shalt Not Murder," implying, *ab initio*, a notion of the legitimate use of force that pervades the biblical corpus.⁸ Might does not make right—"Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, says the Lord of Hosts"⁹—but "there is a time for war" as there is "a time for peace."¹⁰

The thrust of the Judaic law of war is to accept war as more or less a given in the life of nations, but to hem it tightly with moral restrictions at every step of the way. As Reuven Kimelman has well put it: "The solution to the moral failings of nations lies not in the abolition of national entities, but rather in the moralization of national power . . . by subjecting nations to legal restraint [the Biblical prophets] seek to civilize them. In this manner the morally preferable can become the politically possible. . . . Jewish political theory, which bases itself on the Bible, sees a system of government which is both politically workable and morally acceptable."¹⁶ Thus *halacha*, the corpus of traditional Jewish law, addresses itself to the gamut of war making, from *casus belli* to the conduct of war and even environmental damage in wartime.

It bears noting that a limited but, in its way, very influential, school of Jewish thought, the Franco-German Pietists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, whose communities were ravaged by the fierce anti-Jewish violence accompanying the Crusades, elevated martyrdom into not only a high ideal but the paradigmatic religious act.³³ In their chief work, the *Sefer Hasidim* [Book of the Pious], one finds extraordinary statements like the following:

If an opportunity comes your way to do God's will in some matter, and you hesitate out of embarrassment, or difficulty, or an evil inclination within you, consider: if you were in a time of persecution, you would suffer all the tortures and die for your Creator . . . all the more so, then, should you overcome your inclinations and do this minor thing.³⁴

Indeed, the Pietists regularly incurred martyrdom even when they were not halachically obligated to do so, and at times engaged in the very questionable practice of mass suicide rather than face the temptation of forced transgression of the law. Over the centuries this sparked discussion among halachic authorities, who concluded that this was a matter of personal discretion, laudable under some—but by no means all or many—circumstances, and not a matter of public policy.

tive views.¹⁵ The pacifistic ideal stands in judgment over us all, who are condemned to live in historical time, but it is not a useful reference point for Jewish political thought today. It fails to pass muster by the two criteria of Jewish political authenticity offered earlier: It simply cannot sustain the physical survival of the Jewish people, nor does it reflect and enact Jewish values—not only survival, but the imperative to combat evil and injustice in this world, in *olam ha-zeh*.

Which brings us to the subject of nonviolence, and particularly nonviolent resistance. One thing must not be forgotten about nonviolence, more precisely, the idea of nonviolence as it has most meaningfully crystallized in contemporary political thought and action—that it is first and foremost a form of struggle.²² It does not shrink from recognizing the reality of evil or injustice nor the imperative to combat it. Where it differs from other forms of struggle with evil, and particularly armed struggle, is in its assertion of a bond between the two sides, and in its focusing attack on the structures of evil rather than on the individuals maintaining those structures. It should not be invoked as a justification or recipe for inaction in the face of pressing evil or injustice.²³

may one come to see. These harrowing responsa exhibit three salient characteristics: the seriousness with which these questions are put; the degree to which Oshry tries to situate his answers within the conventional parameters of Jewish legal discourse (citations to sources and authorities, reasoning by precedent, qualification and analogy, etc.); and the extent to which the primacy of survival colors his halachic decision making. Throughout, Oshry deploys his considerable legal acumen in order to arrive at halachic solutions that the people could, literally, live with.

In these responsa one can observe the Jewish principles of martyrdom and self-defense coming together. The Jews of the Kovno ghetto

spiritually resisted the Nazis by clinging to their religion and culture as best they could, including seeking rabbinic sanction for the hard decisions of survival so as to preserve some moral structure in the face of genocide. At the same time, they used every means in order to survive, and Rabbi Oshry invoked the Talmudic doctrine of communal self-defense in sanctioning joining the partisan groups offering armed resistance.³⁷

Yet risk taking as a form of personal piety was also maintained. Thus Rabbi Oshry, who, despite his stature, also ran the ghetto's only laundry, kept the laundry closed on Sabbath and holidays even though by doing so he incurred the wrath of the Germans, and was not commanded to do so by the strict terms of the halacha of martyrdom.³⁸ This self-sacrifice is especially striking in light of the leeway and discretion he generally accorded his questioners in the conduct of their daily struggles.

Robert Aumann, Nobel Prize for Economics Speech

So now, let's get back to war, and how *homo economicus*—rational man—fits into the picture. An example, in the spirit of the previous item, is this. You want to prevent war. To do that, obviously you should disarm, lower the level of armaments. Right? No, wrong. You might want to do the exact opposite. In the long years of the cold war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, what prevented “hot” war was that bombers carrying nuclear weapons were in the air 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Disarming would have led to war.

The bottom line is—again—that we should start studying war, from all viewpoints, for its own sake. Try to understand what makes it happen. Pure, basic science. *That* may lead, eventually, to peace. The piecemeal, case-based approach has not worked too well up to now.

וְהָיָה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים, נִכּוֹן יִהְיֶה הָר בֵּית
 יְיָ בְּרֹאשׁ הָהָרִים, וְנִשָּׂא מִגְבָּעוֹת, וְנִהְרֹו
 אֱלֹיו כָּל הַגּוֹיִם. וְהָלְכוּ עַמִּים רַבִּים וְאָמְרוּ,
 לָכוּ וְנַעֲלֶה אֶל הָר יְיָ, אֶל בֵּית אֱלֹהֵי

We end with a passage from the prophet Isaiah
 יַעֲקֹב, וְיִרְנֹו מִדְּרָכָיו, וְנִלְכָּה בְּאַחֲרֵיתוֹ; כִּי
 מִצִּיּוֹן תֵּצֵא תוֹרָה, וּדְבַר יְיָ מִירוּשָׁלַם.
 וְשָׁפַט בֵּין הַגּוֹיִם, וְהוֹכִיחַ לְעַמִּים רַבִּים;
 וְכִתְּתוּ חֲרִבּוֹתָם לְאֵתִים, וְנִחַנְתּוּ תִּיָּהֶם
 לְמִזְמֹרוֹת; לֹא יִשָּׂא גּוֹי אֶל גּוֹי חֶרֶב, וְלֹא
 יִלְמְדוּ עוֹד מִלְחָמָה.

“And it shall come to pass that ... many people shall go and say, ... let us go up to the mountain of the Lord.... And He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths. ... And He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.”

Isaiah is saying that the nations can beat their swords into ploughshares when there is a central government—a Lord, recognized by all. In the absence of that, one *can* perhaps have peace—no nation lifting up its sword against another. But the swords must continue to be there—they cannot be beaten into ploughshares—and the nations must continue to *learn* war, in order *not* to fight!

Buber

We began to settle again in the Land thirty-five years before the “shadow of the British gun” was cast upon it. We did not seek this shadow; it appeared and remained here to guard British interests and not ours. We do not want force. But after the resolutions of Delhi, at the beginning of March 1922, you yourself, Mahatma Gandhi, wrote: “Have I not repeatedly said that I would have India become free even by violence rather than that she should remain in bondage?” This was a very important pronouncement on your part; you asserted thereby that non-violence is for you a faith and not a political principle - and that the desire for the freedom of India is even stronger in you than your faith. And for this, I love you. We do not want force. **We have not proclaimed, as did Jesus, the son of our people, and as you do, the teaching of non-violence, because we believe that a man must sometimes use force to save himself or even more his children. But from time immemorial we have proclaimed the teaching of justice and peace; we have taught and we have learned that peace is the aim of all the world and that justice is the way to attain it. Thus, we cannot desire to use force. No one who counts himself in the ranks of Israel can desire to use force.**