

Dr. Cedric Cohen Skalli and the  
Dept. of Jewish History invite you  
to an international Week Seminar:



## 1968 between East and West, North and South - A Comparative Approach

The intention of this class is to offer advanced students a new form of seminar course condensed into one week. This special seminar adopts a multifaceted approach to the subject by bringing together different scholars to teach and guide the reading of texts and documents. This week-long seminar purposes to study 1968 in different contexts:

1. The Polish crisis and the Prague Spring in early 1968.
2. Intellectuals in 1968: Prague and Paris
3. North and South America: Towards a new era?
4. The aftermath of the 1967 shock: Israel and the Arab world in 1968

### Speakers:

Dr. Marcos Silber (University of Haifa)  
Dr. Katerina Capcova (New York University, Prague Campus)  
Dr. Jakub Čapek (Charles University, Prague)  
Dr. Cedric Cohen Skalli (University of Haifa)  
Dr. Eli Cook (University of Haifa)  
Silvana Kandel Lamdan (University of Haifa)  
Prof. Michael Eppel (University of Haifa)  
Prof. Hanoah Ben-Pazi (Bar-Ilan University)  
Prof. Zeev Gries (Ben Gurion University)



December 31st, 2018 - January 4th, 2019 | #116.4237  
09:00-16:00 (Except Jan. 4, 09:00-12:00)

Please register with the coordinator of the department:  
Ms. Moran Shwartz [mshwart1@univ.haifa.ac.il](mailto:mshwart1@univ.haifa.ac.il)

*Josef Koudelka, Invasion 68: Prague.*

Dec. 31<sup>st</sup>, 2018      Day I:  
The Polish Crisis and The Prague Spring



**Dr. Marcos Silber (University of Haifa) and Dr. Cedric Cohen Skalli (University of Haifa)**

***“Leszek Kolakowski and the cultural and political crisis in early 1968”***

“Priests and jesters cannot be reconciled unless one of them is transformed into the other, as sometimes happens.” This cryptic line toward the end of Kolakowski’s essay “The Priest and the Jester” published in English translation in 1968, could be read as a description of Leszek Kolakowski’s own trajectory in Communist post-war Poland. Indeed, he began his career of philosopher as a “priest” of orthodox Marxism in the early 1950s, but already toward the end of 1950s, he became the leading intellectual voice in Poland of “revisionism.” In an article entitled “What is socialism?” he answered the question with irony: “Socialism is not a state in which a person who has committed no crime sits at home waiting for the police, in which there are more spies than nurses and more people in prisons than in hospitals... in which a person lives better because he does not think at all, and which wants all its citizens to have the same opinions in philosophy, foreign policy, economics, literature, and ethics, in which the philosophers and writers always say the same thing as the generals and ministers, but always after them, in which one must each day refute what one affirmed the day before and always believe it is the same.” In the decade 1956-1966, the revisionism defended by Kolakowski became more and more the object of attack and rejection. In October 1966, for the tenth anniversary of the Polish “October”, Kolakowski held an important speech at a student meeting organized in the faculty of Warsaw University, in which he described the growing repression of the regime, the growing censorship and the growing political interference in humanities, social sciences and arts. On the following day, Kolakowski was expelled from the Polish United Workers’ Party. The Central Committee wanted also to deprive Kolakowski of his chair of philosophy at the university but did not succeed.

In the beginning of 1968, the cultural and political conflict between new trends in Polish society and the pseudo-destalinization of the regime conflated around the ban of the play *Dziady* (the Forefathers) by the Polish national Poet, Adam Mickiewicz. The Warsaw branch of the Polish Writers’ Union held a meeting of protest on February 29. Kolakowski held there another important speech, in which he said:

When the first, timid repressive acts are not resisted, they encourage their initiators to an even greater scale of repression, which in practice begins to have no limit. Now in our country the scope of repression has spread so far that in fact all opposition has ceased... We observe the constant destruction of scholarship and the hampering of its rate of development, the limitation of the free investigation spirit. What we have now in our country is not socialism, it has nothing in common with Marxism.

Following the ban of the play *Dziady*, students in Poland conducted actions of rebellion and resistance, which were followed on March 25 by the expulsion from the Warsaw University of six professors, among them Leszek Kolakowski. In the second half of 1968, Kolakowski was already visiting professor at the University of McGill in Montreal. In that very year of 1968, in which he was brought to the decision to leave Poland and the Communist bloc, Kolakowski published an English translation of a collection of essays he wrote in the years 1956-1967. The book came out in London under the title "Marxism and Beyond" and in New York under the title "Toward a Marxist Humanism". In this session, we will read sections from this collection of essays with a double scope: first to understand the background of the 1968 crisis in Poland and its intellectual roots, second to reflect upon the effect of these essays in 1968 in the West upon the debates about Marxism, Socialism, old and new left.

#### Sources:

1. Kolakowski, Leszek. *Marxism and Beyond on Historical Understanding and Individual Responsibility*, trans. By J. Zielonko Peel, London 1968.

2. פלוצקר, אנת. "יהודים כגיס חמישי: המסע האנטי-ציוני בפולין 1967-1968." *זמנים: רבעון להיסטוריה* (סתיו) 90-101, 2011.

3. Junes, Tom. "Confronting the 'New Class' in Communist Poland: Leftist Critique, Student Activism and the Origins of the 1968 Student Protest Movement." *Critique*, 36:2 (2008), 257-272.

4. Zaremba, Marcin. "1968 in Poland: The Rebellion on the Other Side of the Looking Glass." *The American Historical Review*, Volume 123, Issue 3, 1 June 2018, 769–772.

#### **Dr. Katerina Capcova (New York University, Prague Campus)**

##### ***"Kafka, Antisemitism, Israel, and the Communist Reform Movements in Czechoslovakia."***

In contrast to Poland, where the topic of antisemitism and anti-Zionism plays a crucial role in historiography on the important peak of Reform Communism in 1967–68, regarding Czechoslovakia few historians ever even mention the discussions and debates about the State of Israel and antisemitism in their interpretations of the Czechoslovak Communist Reform Movement. This is largely understandable, since those topics were not part of the core of the struggle in Prague or the rest of Czechoslovakia. Nevertheless, focusing on debates over the State of Israel, antisemitism and Judaism in the Czechoslovak context – especially in comparison with Poland – reveals perspectives that are indeed important to interpreting the Prague Spring and its uniqueness in Europe.

Three topics related to this issue are of key importance. First, we will analyze discussions in the 1960s over the work of Franz Kafka which were initiated by the famous Liblice conference organized by several Jewish Communists in 1963. It was the first conference of this kind in a country of the Soviet bloc. Leading literary scholars from Czechoslovakia and the GDR met in order to think over the importance of Kafka's work and they initiated broad interest in Kafka among the Czech intellectual circles which deepened in the late 1960s.

Second, when interpreting antisemitism in political discourse in the 1960s, a comparison with Poland helps to bring out its particularities in Czechoslovakia. Whereas amongst Czechs the antisemitism of the 1950s (especially the Slánský trial) was widely criticized as a part of the Soviet Stalinist totalitarian regime, which was meant to give way to Czechoslovak reform Communism, the early 1950s in Poland were criticized as years of Stalinist Communism, when politicians from Jewish families had too much influence (in keeping with the myth of *Żydokomuna*, Judeo-Communism) and the call for a Polish version of Communism included an acceptance of antisemitism in political discourse. Despite the existence of a fairly significant Czechoslovak tradition of antisemitism, anti-Jewish sentiments were widely criticized among the Reform Communists as well as by some key Czech artists. Famous among Czechs is especially the Jan Werich's critique of antisemitism in which he used the essay *Réflexions sur la question juive* as a starting point for his analysis.

Third, during the Six-Day War in 1967 the Czechoslovak government kept in line with the Soviet rhetoric in condemning Israel's alleged aggressions. The same war became, however, also a key topic of the Congress of Czechoslovak Writers that same year, when several leading Czechoslovak writers expressed their sympathies with Israel. The erstwhile Stalinist playwright, and later dissident, Pavel Kohout even compared Israel with Czechoslovakia after the Munich Agreement in autumn 1938. Ladislav Mňačko, a non-Jewish Slovak writer and journalist, who had been a devoted Communist in the early 1950s, also protested the anti-Israel policy of the Czechoslovak Communist Party in 1967. In the interview for *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* he claimed that the breaking off of diplomatic relations with the State of Israel was a continuation of antisemitic Stalinist ideology, which clashed with the humanist ideas of Communism.

The attendees of this workshop will have the unique opportunity to read some of the key primary sources in an English translation prepared for this workshop only.

#### Sources:

##### *Primary Sources:*

1. An interview with Ladislav Mňačko, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 11 August 1967 (English translation of this German text will be prepared for the workshop)
2. Speeches of Pavel Kohout, Arnošt Lustig, Ivan Klíma and Jan Procházka at the Czechoslovak Writer's Union in June 1967 in which they react to the Six-Day-War. In Czech published in: 4. sjezd Svazu československých spisovatelů, Praha 27. – 29. června 1967. Prague 1968. (English translation from Czech will be prepared for the workshop)
3. Jan Werich, His speech analyzing the phenomenon of antisemitism, from April 1967, when opening the exhibition on Millenium of Jewish settlement in the Bohemian Lands. The text of Werich's speech is available at online: <http://www.moderni-dejiny.cz/clanek/jan-werich-o-antisemitismu-na-vystave-millenium-judaicum-bohemicum/>. (English translation from Czech will be prepared for the workshop)
4. Selection of 3-4 articles from *Rudé právo*, the leading Czechoslovak Communist Party's newspaper, on reflection of Slánský trial during the rehabilitation process in spring 1968 and an

article of Eduard Goldstücker in which he published an anonymous antisemitic letter which her received with his comment (English translation from Czech will be prepared for the workshop)

*Secondary Literature:*

5. Galia Golan, *The Czechoslovak Reform Movement. Communism in Crisis 1962-1968*. Cambridge University Press, 1971, 223-329.

6. Veronika Tuckerová, *Reading Kafka in Prague: The Reception of Franz Kafka between the East and the West during the Cold War*“, PhD Theses, Columbia University 2012, 137-220.

Available at:

[https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/.../Tuckerova\\_columbia\\_0054D\\_10561.pdf](https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/.../Tuckerova_columbia_0054D_10561.pdf)

Jan. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019      Day II:

Intellectuals in Prague and Paris



**Dr. Jakub Čapek (Charles University Prague)**

***“On the role of intellectuals in 1968: Reading ‘Intellectuals and Opposition’ (by Jan Patočka) in context.”***

The year 1968 has been associated with unprecedented public upheavals in different parts of the world. These movements were sustained in most countries by the young generation and they were mostly critical towards the official power structures. Regardless of this external similarity, the key question remains whether they do have anything in common. To take but one striking disparity: while the student revolts during the famous May in Paris 1968 were of a radical left-wing (sometimes Maoist, often communist) orientation, the Prague Spring voiced demands for the most fundamental human rights (the freedom of press and opinion) and reclaimed the liberation of the state-organized, socialist economy.

In the very year 1968, the Czech Philosopher Jan Patočka attempted to answer the above question by claiming that in spite of obvious differences, the public events in late 60s do have something in common: the mass movement is mainly composed of students or intellectuals. The “mass nature of modern society” has, according to Patočka, “encompassed the intellectual sphere”. Patočka develops a historical reflection on the concept of the intellectual (from Greek philosophy to Hegel and Marx) and on the capacity of intellectuals to oppose the existing state of society.

Patočka’s text “Intellectuals and Opposition” exists in two different versions (a public lecture presented in West Germany in June 1968, and an article in Czech submitted for publication after the Warsaw Pact invasion in August 1968). This offers interesting insights into the way Patočka’s ideas and expectations evolved in reaction to important historical events. Patočka is well known from his texts that accompanied and explained the intentions of the Charter 77. His reflections from 1968 show a different, yet interconnected face of his analysis of the role of the intellectual in the 20th century.

After a presentation of Patočka’s text, I will locate it within a broader context of his own thought, but also, I will situate it in relation to the debate on the “Czech destiny” that took place in 1968 and 1969 between Milan Kundera and Václav Havel. Both Kundera, and Havel attempt to understand the Prague Spring within a larger, European context. While Kundera describes the Prague Spring as a moment of greatness of a small nation (which has shown to the world how to combine socialism and freedom), Havel refuses such messianic self-delusions, as well as vain hopes that the socialism might have a “human face”.

### Sources:

1. Jan Patočka, “Intellectuals and Opposition”, tr. by F. Tava and D. Laufer, in: *Thinking After Europe. Jan Patočka and Politics*, ed. Francesco Tava and Darian Meacham, London, New York (Rowman & Littlefield) 2016, p. 7–21 (also “Intellectuals and Opposition. Alternative End”, p. 23–26, and the “Translators’ Preface”, p. 3-6).
2. Jan Patočka, “The Spiritual Person and the Intellectual”, tr. by E. Manton. In: *Living in Problematicity*, Prague 2007, p. 51–69.
3. Eric Manton, “The Political Philosophy of a Non-Political Philosopher”. In: *Living in Problematicity*, Prague 2007, p. 70-79.
4. Milan Kundera, Václav Havel, “The Czech Fate”. Debate between Václav Havel and Milan Kundera in 1968/1969. In: Josette Baer (ed.), *Preparing Liberty in Central Europe*, ibidem-Verlag, Stuttgart 2006, p. 140-164.

### Historical Context:

5. Tony Judt, *Postwar. A History of Europe since 1945*, The Penguin Press, New York 2005, chapters XII and XIII (esp. pages 436-449).
6. International School History. “Prague Spring.”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GSGaFhcQfoM>

### **Dr. Cedric Cohen Skalli (University of Haifa)**

#### ***“Three Jewish intellectuals in 1968: Daniel Cohn-Bendit, Jacques Derrida and Emmanuel Levinas.”***

These three Jewish intellectuals were born in different historical contexts. Levinas was born in Imperial Russia in 1906 before WWI and before the October Revolution of 1917. Derrida was born in French colonial Algeria in 1930 between the two World Wars, scion of Jewish Sephardic and Algerian family involved in complex process of French acculturation. Cohen-Bendit was born in hideout in France at the end of the war in 1945. He was the second son of two Jewish German refugees, who after WWII hesitated between many living options (emigration to the USA, naturalization in France or the return to the new German Federal Republic). Despite their different historical and geographical background, all three shared the difficult experience of emigration and the complex search in Paris for new intellectual, cultural, religious and political directions.

This difference in background is reflected in their different role and views in 1968. Cohen-Bendit incarnates a political and generational disruption in left organizations in France and Western Europe. Jacques Derrida delivered a famous lecture in New York in October 1968 *Les fins de l’homme* in which he presents a critical descriptions of the major trends of French Philosophy (which informed the 68 discourse) and proposes new attitudes for his deconstruction. In his famous Talmudic lecture “Judaïsme et Revolution” given in March 1969, in the immediate

aftermath of May-July 1968, Levinas questions and dismantles the modern articulation of Judaism and political revolution, and defends a new ethical-religious separation of the realms. I intend to explore these different views by focusing on:

Sources:

1. Gabriel and Daniel Cohn-Bendit *Obsolete Communism a Left-Wing Alternative*, published originally in German in August 1968.

2. Jacques Derrida, *Marges de la philosophie*, *La dissémination* and *Position*, all published in 1972, but collecting many texts from or around the year 1968.

3. Emmanuel Levinas, *Quatres Lectures Talmudiques*, published in 1968 ; *Du Sacré au Saint*, published in 1977 which contains a lecture written and delivered just after 1968; and *L'humanisme de l'Autre Homme*, published in 1973 and containing an important essay from the years 1968.



Jan 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2019      Day III:  
North and South America: A New Era?



**Dr. Eli Cook (University of Haifa)**

***“1968: Year Zero of American Neoliberalism?”***

Many scholars believe that the history of the USA in the 20<sup>th</sup> century can be divided into 2: before and after 1968. Is this true? Is 1968 the Year Zero of the American Neoliberal age in which we still live today?

To answer these questions, we shall read source materials that address the many events which took place that year: the murders of Martin Luther King and of Bobbie Kennedy, Richard Nixon’s electoral win, the crash of the Democratic Party, student protests in the universities, the entanglement of the US army in Vietnam, the uprising of black Americans in northern cities, etc.

Source Texts:

1. Joseph, Peniel E. “Rethinking the Black Power Era.” *The Journal of Southern History*, Vol. 75, No. 3 (AUGUST 2009), pp. 707-716.
2. Wilk, J., Curator. *1968: Columbia in Crisis*.  
<https://exhibitions.library.columbia.edu/exhibits/show/1968>
3. Chicago History Museum. *1968 Chicago: Law and Disorder*.  
<https://artsandculture.google.com/exhibit/wRHmq8J>

**Silvana Kandel Lamdan (University of Haifa)**

***“Faith and Resistance: Christianity and Revolution in Latin America’s 1968.”***

From the 1950s through to the 1980s most Latin American countries were undergoing political instability and deep economic crisis. A succession of coups d’état repeatedly interrupted constitutional government. The year 1968 saw several military rulers in the continent, including the Argentinian de facto president Onganía, the Peruvian Alvarado, the Brazilian da Costa e Silva, the Nicaraguan Somoza, among others. These military dictatorships imposed violent political repression and implemented economic policies that deepened social inequality.

Some of the loudest voices against these regimes were raised by Catholic priests throughout the continent, who chose diverse channels of resistance. They initiated new trends within political theology and Christian militancy, planting the seeds of the various shoots that would come to be known collectively as ‘Latin American Liberation Theology’. Their theological innovations were intellectually motivated by: (1) The conclusions of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) –

which had a great impact on Latin American Christianity – on the need to bring the Church closer to the people; and (2) The Theory of Dependence, the work then in progress by the (Jewish) economist Andre Gunder Frank and other scholars of society, which attempted to provide a Latin American response to the accepted European-centred economic and social analyses. All variations of this emerging theology emphasized as their first pillar ‘The Option for the Poor.’

Several distinct trends of Christian militancy in Latin America can be identified in 1968. In our workshop we will focus on three cases:

1. Direct political activism carried out on the front lines of a specific national party, in some cases even supporting local guerrillas. We will introduce the Argentinian “Movimiento de Sacerdotes para el Tercer Mundo” (Movement of Priests for the Third World), founded at the beginning of that year, which served both as a powerful channel for Peronist (the populist party of General Juan Domingo Perón) political activism and as one of the inspirations for nascent social theologies.

2. The contribution to the theological discourse and the revolutionary scene of experienced academics, theologians and biblical scholars. In a meeting of priests and laity in Peru in July ’68, the Peruvian theologian and Dominican priest Gustavo Gutierrez presented a conference titled “Towards a Theology of Liberation.” This conference established the foundations of his famous book, published three years later. Gutierrez’s Marxist-oriented Liberation Theology will be the focus of the second part of our workshop.

3. Raising up the *common people*’s voices. Finally, we will meet another kind of Christian resistance taking place in this seminal year: a book titled “El Evangelio en Solentiname,” a compilation of commentaries on the Gospels by a community of peasants from an isolated Nicaraguan archipelago – our chosen example of the phenomena of revolutionary biblical exegesis that emerged from one of thousands of ‘Basic Ecclesial Communities’ scattered all around Latin America.

#### Sources:

1. Galeano, Eduardo. “The Contemporary Structure of Plunder” in *Open Veins of Latin America*. Translated by Cedric Belfrage. Monthly Review Press, 1997.

2. Gutiérrez, Gustavo. *A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics, and Salvation*. Translated by Sister Caridad Inda and John Eaglson. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988, pp.47-77.

Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2019      Day IV:  
1967 Aftermath: Israel and the Arab World



**Prof. Michael Eppel (University of Haifa)**

*“The aftermath of the 1967 shock: the new phase in the Arab-Israeli conflict, the sunset of the radical Pan Arab nationalism and the return of Palestinians as a force in the Israeli-Arab arena.”*

From the standpoint of the Arab world, 1968 was a post-traumatic year, which followed the shock of the defeat of the Arab armies in the 1967 war. That year was marked by political changes, which were accelerated by the 1967 war. The regimes, elite segments of society and the discourse in the Arab states were in the process of digesting and internalizing the shock. The shock of 1967 undermined the radical nationalist and socialist-authoritarian regimes and struck a mortal blow to their image as revolutionary modernizers and as a force that had eliminated the conditions that led to the previous trauma, the Nakba of 1948.

The most prominent changes were those that affected the conditions of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the conditions in the regional Arab arena, the challenges that now faced the great powers – the United States and the Soviet Union, the strengthening of the conditions that led major political changes in Iraq, in Syria and in the conditions of the Palestinians and their national movement (the rise of the Ba‘th party to power in Iraq in the summer of 1968, the takeover of the PLO by the Fath and the return of the Palestinians to center stage in the inter-Arab arena in 1968, and the rise to power of Hafez al-Assad and the Ba‘th regime in Syria in 1970). The strength of the shock and the difficulty in adjusting to the new situation focused the attention of the Arab world on its internal affairs and on the conflict with Israel. The profound dependence on the USSR and the simultaneous suspicion with which it was regarded had a considerable effect on Europe’s restrained response to the events.

The strengthening of Egypt’s and Syria’s relations with the USSR reached a new height in 1967-1968. Nonetheless, in the years that followed, the Soviet Union became more deeply entrenched in the impasse that led to the collapse of its status in the Middle East, starting with the expulsion of the Soviet advisors from Egypt in 1972. As a result of the 1967 war and the failure to achieve arrangements in accordance with UN Resolution 242, Egypt had been caught in a trap that dramatically weakened it, caused its economic and social situation to deteriorate, and renewed its dependence on a European power – this time, the USSR. The failures of Egypt to lead an unified Arab front against Israel, the hopeless situation of the Egyptian economy and the growing dependence on the Soviet Union that characterized the last years of Gamal ‘Abd al-Nasr’s rule

led Anwar Sadat to the conclusion, soon after he rose to power, that Egypt would have to break the vicious circle by taking back the conflict from the hands of the great powers. The initial diplomatic measures taken toward this end in 1971-1972 failed; nonetheless, the subsequent war in 1973 and the peace initiative of 1977 succeeded.

During the year 1968, the force and violence of the conflict between Israel and the Palestinian organizations began to increase. A decade later, after 1977, that conflict would become a central issue.

But in addition to the transformations in political conditions, the trauma of 1967, in combination with other social and political processes, also affected long-term historical processes. The outcome of the 1967 war dealt a heavy blow to the pan-Arab vision. The prestige of Egypt's President, 'Abd al-Nasr, who was identified as the great leader of the Arab nation, was severely harmed. Nasserism as the dominant ideological trend in the Arab world was struck down and did not succeed in recovering from the blow. Egypt became dependent on the economic aid of Saudi Arabia, the conservative pro-western, and Islamist, the ideological and political rival of the Nassirist regime whose legitimation has been the Arab unity, Arab socialism and modernization.

The radical revolutionary regimes experienced a rapidly increasing tension between the individual national interests of each state and the declared and compelling commitment to the Arab unity and the pan Arab ideological vision. The blow to the Nassirist prestige and the weakness of Egypt as the leading Arab force created an ideological vacuum that helped to strengthen the Assad's Ba'ath party in Syria, as well as that of Saddam Hussein in Iraq; at the same time, it contributed, in interaction with sociological transformations, to the strengthening of the trends toward economic liberalization and the departure from socialist and etatist models. Over time and in combination with social, socio-political and global transformations, it also led to the rise of political Islam and radical Islamism.

1968 was a post-traumatic year – a year marked by the accumulation of tensions and the acceleration of processes of ideological and political change, which would give rise to profound social transformations in many states throughout the region during the 1980s and 1990s, eventually leading to the “Arab Spring” of 2011.

#### Sources:

1. Avraham Sela, *The Decline of the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (New York, State University of New York Press, 1998), Chap. 6: pp. 97-109.
2. Sadik Jalal Azm, *Self-Criticism after Defeat 1967* (London, Saqi Books, 2011), pp. 29-141.
3. Malcolm Kerr, *The Arab Cold War 1958-1970* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980).

4. פואד עג'מי, מלכוד, ערביות וערבים מאז 1967 (תל אביב, ידיעות אחרונות, ספרי חמד, 2001), פרק 1: "עולמו של יהיד כהווייתו", ע"ע 15-69.

5. Mark Tessler, *A History of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1994), Chap. 7: "Postwar Diplomacy and the Rise of Palestine Resistance Movement", pp. 407-456.

6. מחמד חסנין הייכל, הספינקס והקומיסר (תל אביב, עם עובד, 1981), פרק אחד עשר: "בקיע במעגל" ע"ע 190-202.

7. חגי ארליך, מצרים האחות הבכירה (תל אביב, האוניברסיטה הפתוחה, 2003), פרק 1.3.5: "מפלת יוני וקריסת הנאצריזם", ע"ע 202-219.

### **Prof. Hanoch Ben-Pazi (Bar-Ilan University)**

#### ***"Psalm 19' and the Inner Logic of the Messianic Turn in Religious Zionism"***

This talk will introduce the participants to the with the story of the turn toward messianism among Rabbi Kook's circles – i.e. Rabbi Zvi Yehuda Kook – following the tense waiting period and the Six-Day War, and in its aftermath.

The foundations of this spiritual revolution are on a mystical messianic basis found in the writings of the elder Rabbi Kook. During the quarter century since his death, though, his teaching remained without students, without anyone to carry it forward. In a more profound sense, the year 1967 marked a "turning point" in the history of religious Zionism movement, following the Six-Day War and the return to the Western Wall. From a movement with a dual identity – both religious and Zionist - it began developing a new identity, one of national salvation for the Jewish people.

By exploring the inner logic of the messianic perception within Rabbi Kook's circles, we can offer a critical view of the effect this perception had beyond these circles: towards the idea of Israeli nationalism, towards the meaning of the Zionist standpoint, and towards the development of the Jewish identity in Israel.

#### Sources:

1. Ben-Pazi, Hanoch. "R. Abraham Isaac Kook and the Opening Passage of 'The War'." *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* (25), 2017, pp. 256-278.

2. Yehuda HaKohen Kook, "Mizmor 19: Vision and Reality - the State of Israel Nineteen years," May 1967.

3. Yeshayahu Leibowitz, *Judaism, human values, and the Jewish state*, edited by Eliezer Goldman, translated by Eliezer Goldman, Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press 1992.

Jan. 4<sup>th</sup>, 2019 Day V:

Following the re-release of "*The Seventh Day: Soldiers' Talk About the Six-Day War*"



### **Prof. Zeev Gries (Ben Gurion University)**

This lecture will focus on the testimonies collected in the book "*The Seventh Day: Soldiers' Talk About the Six-Day War*", (שיח לוחמים – פרקי הקשבה והתבוננות, 1967) collected and edited by Abraham Shapira. This book was first published in October 1967 as an internal publication of the Kibbuzim movement. Until the 1973 War, 4 other editions were published, altogether 120,000 copies. The reception of the book by the critics turned from admiration to contempt. The talk will attempt to portray a historical perspective after 50 years.

The talk will be accompanied by a screening of the documentary film of Mor Loushy "*Censored Voices*" (2015) which follows the testimonies brought forward in the book.

In 2017, Prof. Zeev Gries joined Yair Alberton, Yuval Schahar and Abraham Shapira in releasing a new expanded edition of "*The Seventh Day*", published in Jerusalem by Karmel Press, April 2018.

### Sources

1. *The Seventh Day: Soldiers' Talk About the Six-Day War*, New York Charles Scribner's Sons, 1970.

- Reading: Part 4: Generation to Generation, pp. 159-194.

2. אלון גן, השיח שגווע?: "תרבות השיחים" כניסיון לגיבוש זהות מיוחדת לדור השני בקיבוצים, עבודת דוקטור, תל אביב, אוניברסיטת תל אביב, חשוון תשס"ג, אוקטובר 2002, במיוחד: פרקים שני-חמישי, עמ' 53-149.

3. אלון גן, "שינויים חברתיים בתנועה הקיבוצית בשנות השישים", עיונים בתקומת ישראל 16 (תשס"ו) עמ' 372-343.

4. אלון גן, "חשופים בצריח" ו"שיח לוחמים" כצירי זהות מתפצלים", ישראל 13 (תשס"ח) עמ' 296-267.

5. אלון גן, "מ'שיח לוחמים' ל'תנועה של משוחחים': 'תרבות השיחים' ככלי ליצירת תעודת זהות רוחנית לדור הבנים בקיבוצים", הקיבוץ: מאה השנים הראשונות, ערכו אביבה חלמיש וצבי צמרת, ירושלים תש"ע, עמ' 195-208.

6. עודד נעמן, "עלייתם ונפילתם של יפי הנפש: קריאה בשיח לוחמים ובעדויות שוברים שתיקה", תאוריה ובקורת 33 (2008) עמ' 235-231.

7. Tamar Katriel, *Dialogic Moments: from Soul Talk, to Talk Radio in Israeli Culture*, Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 2004. Especially Chapter 1: "Contemporary Dialogue: Soul Talks in Israel Pioneering Ethos, pp. 29-138. See there on "The Seventh Day: Soldiers' Talk About the Six-Day War", pp. 71-87.