

## EMIL GREENZWEIG IN MEMORIAM

Emil Greenzweig was born on December 1, 1947 in the city of Cluj, Romania. He and his family (his late parents, Olga, a survivor of the Auschwitz concentration camp, and Shmuel, along with his brother, Eliezer, known as Lulu) started their nomadic travels in Transylvania, and continued on through Romania, France, and Brazil. While they were still in France, on their way to Israel, Emil's father died. Eventually, Emil, his mother, and brother reached Israel, arriving in the summer of 1963, and settling in the Carmel area of Haifa.

Emil was graduated from the Reali School in Haifa, and, in 1965, he joined a Nachal Unit based in Kibbutz Revivim in the Negev. He fell in love with the desert landscape and the wide vistas that gave him a feeling of home. His regular army service was with the Nachal Paratroopers, and he fought in the Six Day War, the War of Attrition, the Yom Kippur War, and the War in Lebanon in 1982.

Following his demobilization from the IDF, Emil became a member of Kibbutz Revivim, and it was there that his daughter, Niva, was born. After a few years of agricultural work on the kibbutz, mainly in the orchard, he took time off to earn a degree in Mathematics and Philosophy at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. This period in his life was marked by his intense involvement in social action. On completion of his studies, he returned to Revivim where he joined the teaching and educational staff at the "Ma'aleh Besor" regional school as a Mathematics and home room teacher. In addition to his teaching responsibilities, he invested much time in developing social awareness at the school, and he initiated social action programs for the young people. This fortuitous integration of these two interests was successful and apt.

Gabi Mazor, a friend, and colleague of Emil's at "Ma'aleh Besor" says:

"Initially, the "Ma'aleh Besor" school was set up in Kibbutz Magen as an educational facility serving the Ha Shomer Hatzair kibbutzim in the Western Negev. Eventually, in the early 1970s, kibbutzim belonging to the Kibbutz Hame'uchad, such as Revivim, Ze'elim, and Kisufim joined in the school, and

it became the first educational facility to integrate all the political and ideological streams in the kibbutz movement as a whole. The population of the classes themselves was mixed, so for some of the students, "Ma'aleh Habesor" was an educational institution in every sense of the word, while for others it was just the school they attended every day. Since Kibbutz Revivim was the largest of the kibbutzim in the area, the students from Revivim outnumbered the students sent by each of the other kibbutzim. The teaching staff was also integrated, and the largest number of specialty and homeroom teachers were from Revivim. Most of the faculty was young, and most of them were still involved in completing their own academic education. Most of them viewed teaching at "Ma'aleh Habesor" as an educational, academic, and intellectual challenge. Due to its integrated staff and ideology, the school entertained a pluralistic philosophy; and thanks to its originality and uniqueness, it was extremely receptive to and tolerant of revolutionary educational ideas and methodology, to an almost unlimited degree. Each and every idea caught the imagination of most of the people there, serving as a broad base for an inexhaustible number of endeavors. The students, for whom this was also a process of constructing new concepts, took an active part in the general excitement. The feeling was that we were all building together something common for everyone, students and educators alike.

This arrangement suited Emil, who joined the school after the Yom Kippur War. Emil was the personification of the liberal intellectual, with definite and well-established views. In addition, he possessed unlimited intellectual curiosity and inquisitiveness, receptive to any experiment or trial. Without a doubt, the "Ma'aleh Besor" school gave him a broad base for all these characteristics and more. His entry into this system was so natural and rapid that soon it seemed as if he had always been a part of it. He started as a mathematics and homeroom teacher, and very quickly he became the core of development in the school. The staff room, the lawns, and especially his room at the kibbutz in the evenings, became centers for exchange of ideas, for spontaneous discussion groups at which ideas were raised, considered, and explored, along with other enterprises. As the ideas were developed, they would be presented to the administration for approval and implementation.

A short time after his arrival, Emil accepted responsibility for coordinating social activities of the school, as well as for initiating social action. Without a doubt, his most outstanding achievement was the initiation of simulation games: in the middle of the 1970s, the subject of peace between Israel and the Arab nations, and especially the Palestinians, was as far from the achievement of peace agreements with Egypt and Jordan and the Oslo Accords, as the distance from East to West. The Peace Movement in Israel was an esoteric minority, having no real impact. Thus, raising the subject for a deep and pervasive all-school discussion was an outstandingly revolutionary idea.

The education forum, with Emil as the prime mover, most enthusiastically dived into the deep water, and after many long days and nights, the subject was underway. Students in the higher grades learned the topic thoroughly for two weeks in their classes and at lectures given by experts to all the classes. They studied texts, documents, platforms, and positions offered by the various Arab states and the spectrum of the different political parties in Israel. Afterwards, the students were divided into delegations representing the Arab states and the Palestinians, on one hand, and the Israeli political parties, on the other. The purpose of this simulation game was to set up a number of "negotiation committees" between Israel and the different Arab states and the Palestinians; each committee consisted of an Arab delegation negotiating with an Israeli delegation represented by a different political party; the committees all negotiated simultaneously. "Key journalists" served as observers to make sure that the delegations were indeed conducting the negotiations according to the true ideological positions of the parties they represented. Without a doubt, this was a week of intense, interactive, personal learning; the whole school participated in this activity without exception, students from all the grades and educational staff alike.

The simulation game was an unmitigated success and it was clear to everyone that the games should take place every year. And indeed, during the next years there were new topics: "the Labor Union, Salaried Workers and Employers" tackled the subject of "port strikes"; "Religion and Government" took on relationships between religious people and secular people; and other topics in the same vein. The tradition inaugurated during Emil's term continued and remained even after Emil left the school and Kibbutz Revivim.

Another project initiated by Emil and the teachers who surrounded him was the month that the twelfth grade students spent working in the city. During this time, students had to find work and support themselves from their salaries for a whole month, each person by him/herself while taking into account joint responsibility within the group. This was the first time that the kibbutz youth were testing themselves in the city without any protection, and a very real expression of personal and group responsibility. The educational staff observed the experiment from afar, and did not interfere. Here, too, there was the beginning of a pedagogical, social, cultural, and personal test that was developed further with time.

These were two of the outstanding initiatives in the educational field in which Emil played a central role. However, there were many other initiatives, perhaps of smaller dimensions, but whose influence was no less significant.

The job of coordinator of social activities at a pluralistic school such as "Ma'aleh Habesor" was not an easy one, for at its very basis one can find all the components for obvious conflicts between the all-encompassing educational institution of the Ha Shomer Hatzair (with its own educational ideology), and a regular daytime school with students who return to their own homes every day. From the very outset, joint classes, joint social activities,

and the struggles between the two currents indicated that there would be many conflicts. Emil, with his enthusiasm, his will, and above all his commitment to bridging the gaps and solving the conflicts succeeded. Emil's main accomplishment was the engendering of the feeling of creative partnership between students and faculty who felt that together they were creating something special belonging to everyone. Both sides felt that this was a tremendous pedagogical and social experiment, and both sides took this feeling with them when they left the school and went their separate ways. Meetings with students and teachers years afterwards emphasize that this experiment had great influence in later life.

When Emil left the kibbutz, as well as "Ma'aleh Habesor", he found his way to the Van Leer Institute. Emil took with him at least some of those seeds for pedagogical and social thought when he left and he planted many of them there, as well, blessed with the same freedom of thought, intellectual depth, and unlimited inquisitiveness.



When Niva was a year old, Emil decided to return to academia. While studying for his Master's degree in Philosophy of Science at the Hebrew university in Jerusalem, he worked at the Van Leer Institute where he prepared educational projects for developing commitment. He organized summer camps for Jewish and Arab youth who grappled with, among other things, the question of **how one creates commitment on a basis of free choice between youth**. Emil felt that "a necessary condition – but not sufficient – for turning involvement to active commitment is the willingness to pay the price for the stand taken. This readiness to pay the price is the test between what one keeps inside oneself and the stand one takes for which one is prepared to do something."

In the summer of 1982, in the wake of summer camps run by the Van Leer Institute, Emil wrote the **"Report on the Summer Camps for Jewish and Arab Youth"**:

## **Cognitive Content and Didactic Aspects.**

### **Aims**

The purpose of the camp is to make it possible for the youth of both sexes with exceptional willingness and ability for social action, or those who are interested in social problems and the relationship between social science and the problems of the individual in society, to implement this willingness and ability. Therefore, the staff has decided, as in the previous year, to choose during the selection process, those young people to whom we tend to ascribe:

1. The ability to think methodically.
2. Concern and sensitivity to social problems and processes.

We tried to discern these characteristics on the basis of the spectrum of social activities of the candidates and the level of their concern for their immediate social surroundings and the societal structure. This concern was expressed primarily in their level of consciousness and in their critical approach.

On the basis of these characteristics and data, we tried to develop in each participant:

- A. The ability to connect what is happening to him/her with what is happening in his/her social surroundings.
- B. The level of his/her desire to control what is happening to him/her.
- C. The level of his/her concern about what is happening in his/her social surroundings.
- D. His/her belief in his/her power to take a stand, while recognizing the difficulties and price involved in this action.
- E. The awareness that there are prices to pay and benefits to be gained by taking a stand, if one truly wants to see it implemented or advanced.
- F. The ability to make use of knowledge and methods from the social sciences, while nurturing the ability to recognize the complexity of the phenomena and the social variables, and the consolidation of this recognition in the absence of absolute answers in the social sphere.
- G. The belief in the ability to intervene in the course of social processes, despite the knowledge of the complexity and the limitations of the possible change, and despite the awareness of the possibility of failure.
- H. The struggle with the problem of bridging between theoretical analyses of the phenomenon and understanding it and practical intervention in order to effect a change.

\*\*\*

Along with endless hours of work with young people, Emil never ceased to search for answers to questions about worlds of knowledge and cultural traditions, the human being as an organism and as a social creature, possibilities of having a rational discussion about science and its implications in a debate on democracy within the public domain. He would research every subject that caught his interest deeply, thoroughly, and originally, as testifies his close colleague, Gabi Maor: "Emil was a perfectionist in every thing he did. He wanted to arrive at the basis in everything."

Emil was a voracious reader, but he was also known as a man who valued his friends, enjoyed parties, the theater, and music. In between all these activities, overcome with longing for his daughter, he would travel to the kibbutz to visit her.

Along with his intellectual and social pursuits, Emil was also politically active. The war in Lebanon and his fear for the fate of democracy made him uneasy. Between one military reserve duty and the next, he would weigh the subject with his friends on many occasions, as well as with his students, and he expressed his great worries in light of the situation.

On February 10, 1983 Emil and his friends in the "Peace Now" movement participated in a march, which went from Zion Square in Jerusalem to the open space in front of the Prime Minister's office, in order to protest against the Likud government's failure to implement the recommendations of the committee headed by Judge Cahan concerning the massacre in Sabra and Shatila. Passersby were hostile to the marchers, pushing them while shouting "Alayhum, alayhum" (*On them! On them!*), and even beating some of them severely. Catcalls such as "PLO-lovers", "Destroyers of Israel" and "Traitors" could be heard from all sides.

At 20:50 Yona Avroshmi, a young Jewish man, threw a grenade at the demonstrators. Injuries sustained from the exploding grenade ended Emil's life. He was 36 at the time. Another nine demonstrators were injured, some of them seriously.

Emil was buried in Haifa. His funeral cortege was accompanied by many protest vigils made up of people from kibbutzim and other locations from all over the country, demonstrating solidarity and expressing shock at the murder. Mourning vigils were set up in Jerusalem, continuing on through the seven day mourning period.

Professor Yehuda Elkana, head of the Van Leer Institute at that time, offered this eulogy of Emil:

"Only yesterday we embraced each other, Emil, and here today I am offering a eulogy for you. You always radiated love; you were a humanist and a great intellectual, a good colleague, and an outstanding educator of young people. You loved the people around you, and you were a symbol of humaneness.

From this day forth Emil will become a symbol, and this symbol will be widely known. We have not completed our ideological debate, one of the most serious known in Jewish history, and this debate will continue for years. Woe to us if this hate between brothers carries on, for if it endures – it may lead to the destruction of the third commonwealth.”

Shlomit Canaan, with whom Emil shared an office in the Van Leer Institute, stated that Israeli Democracy had been the subject that had most occupied Emil for the last two years of his life, almost to an obsession. She said that Emil’s great passion was education and the desire to have an influence towards building a society with improved values.

Janet Aviad, a “Peace Now” activist who had known Emil since his early days in the movement even before he had left Revivim, stated that during the final period of his life, Emil had expressed his feeling that it was difficult to carry on and influence the course of events through demonstrations, and that the solution to the country’s problems, as he saw it, would come about “only if there were to be a disaster or a tragedy”. Nevertheless, Emil continued to participate in demonstrations.

Zila Ushpiz wrote in his memory:

“A young man who would never grow old’, that is how we saw him, as an incorrigible idealist; an enthusiastic romanticist, insistent on implementing ethical principles; [who believed] that right would show itself sooner or later; that evil would be diminished as much as possible; that enlightened understanding would overcome the nationalistic darkness and defeat the lust for occupation; for this he struggled in thought and by protest, but with a drive which diminished in light of the reality that was so very evident. Since the bloody events on the West Bank, and even more so since the outbreak of the war in Lebanon, he became skeptical and cynical. He no longer believed in the power of a demonstration and yet he applied himself to protesting the contempt shown for democratic law and order. He became the target of people spitting at him, but he marched at the head of the protesters, still believing that the longed-for change was just around the corner and humane democracy would return to the State of Israel. But he did not foresee the price of his gamble”. (*Al Hamishmar* newspaper, February 13, 1983).

Emil’s murder shocked the country and distressed the leaders who denounced the murder and expressed their disgust at the deterioration of democracy and freedom of expression. The public debate and schism surrounding the conclusions of the Cahan Committee grew even more acute, and opened a deep wound, which has yet to heal.

At the conclusion of the *Shiva* (seven-day mourning period), the Israel Journalist Association held a protest conference about the violence, which they felt had become more widespread within Israeli society, and especially

against incitement and instigation, which lead to physical violence and destruction of the ethical limits in a democratic society. The conference was held at Beit Sokolov in Tel Aviv. A book of condolences in memory of Emil was posted in the entrance. Additional mourning assemblies were held in different places around the country, and speeches were made.

The inter-kibbutz staff initiated more activities to protest the threat to democracy in Israel. Members of the Knesset from a broad spectrum of parties sought to gather up the leaders of various political camps in the country for a joint activity to eradicate all expressions of violence from public life in the State.

At the conclusion of the *Shloshim* (thirty day mourning period after the death), the Jerusalem Municipality dedicated the "Rose Garden" in Emil's name, at the site where he was murdered. Teddy Kolleck, who was then the Mayor of Jerusalem, said in his speech:

"We have gathered in the garden, which is intended to perpetuate Emil's memory and to symbolize the need to develop tolerance, respect for those around us, and condemnation of any expression of violence. More than anything else, our standing here in silence expresses our determination to act in this spirit for the good of the nation and the State."

At the end of the *Shloshim*, Hebrew University of Jerusalem held a memorial evening. The central discussion was "Truth, Free Debate, and Democracy", - the subject Emil studied for his Master's degree in the "History, Philosophy, and Sociology of the Sciences" program.

Sections of the course work Emil submitted for that seminar were printed in the booklet that was later published, along with pages from other papers he had written, revealing his involvement with these questions.

## The Idea of Commitment / Emil Greenzweig

It seems to me that when we make use of the most common application of the term "commitment", we mean simply the readiness of the individual to do something not for him/herself alone, and this readiness:

- A. Is not one-sided, but is one of the characteristics of the person.
- B. Is not limited to one's obligations as defined by law.

The complexity of this discussion, as I see it, stems from several factors:

1. I am not content with this readiness to do something, or the actual doing, but what is important to me is the nature of the motivation involved in this

readiness.

2. It is not clear to me when we should relate to specific behavior as doing something, and when we should decide that it is not doing something.
3. When should we relate to specific action as action for the general population, and when should we relate to it as action merely for the individual. Since it is not clear to me if this can be determined, outside of those circumstances that are most trivial, it is possible that this effort to establish boundaries is not fruitful.
4. If action of **any kind** not for the individual itself is the main criterion for commitment, I do not agree to regard commitment in a positive light, just because it is commitment, and it is not dependent on the dictates of action.

Therefore I suggest that there be a distinction between the terms of commitment, where the distinction between them is determined only by the different kinds of motivation to action.

First, as regards the term "involvement". That is what I call "caring" – taking a stand and/or a desire to take a stand, when it is accompanied by the feeling that, on principle, I have the possibility of and the ability to do this. In other words, **involvement is caring, with trust in one's ability to take a stand and the desire to do so.** When involvement according to this definition is joined with an additional element, at this stage we'll call it "X", we see a certain kind of commitment.

It is clear to me, as I said above, that frequently we relate to different types of action as if it were commitment, even if they do not have the element of taking a stand or even a demand to take a stand, nor is there any apparent connection between the action itself and between taking a stand (or the process of taking a stand).

Therefore I suggest that we distinguish between active commitment and

passive commitment, not on the basis of action, as Aziz did, but in the following way: active commitment will be commitment that includes the taking of a stand (as far as the action goes), and passive commitment will be a commitment that does not link the action with taking a stand. For example, someone who goes to give blood because the group of friends with which he/she currently finds him/herself is going to do this, or as a result of a notice on the bulletin board in the kibbutz, without taking a stand of any sort, and without asking oneself any question about the action itself, is doing what he/she is doing out of passive commitment. As opposed to this person, someone who gives blood because he/she sees the importance in doing so and/or because he/she convinced him/herself that this is something that he/she must do, operates from active commitment.

[...]

What is the addition to commitment that changes it from passive commitment? In order to characterize this addition, one cannot avoid entering into a discussion of the term "action", and this discussion does not seem to me to be any easier than the discussion on the term "commitment". As I see it, the necessary condition – but not sufficient – to changing commitment, as it is characterized here, to active commitment, is the readiness to pay the required price for the stand taken. This readiness to pay the price is the test between the stand one keeps inside oneself and the stand that one takes for which one is prepared to do what has to be done. The readiness to pay the price to advance or implement a position is linked to many factors, and it is certainly dependent on the context. For example, it is dependent on consideration of advisability and tenability, which a person evaluates in a subjective manner. That is to say, assessment of the relationship between the magnitude of the price and the chances that there will be any sort of result, or any sort of weight to the results, under the given circumstances."

**From: "What is Commitment", The Meaning of Commitment: A Reader for the Seminar Participant (editor: Rami Hochman), Jerusalem, Van Leer, October 1983, pgs. 93-96.**

\* \* \*

In March 1983, about one month after the murder, an educational fund was established in Emil's memory. The fund initiated contacts with Israeli artists asking them to react to the murder through their art. Most of the artists responded to the request. The resulting works were on display in a series of exhibitions that were held in the three largest cities – Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and Haifa, on the first anniversary of Emil's murder. The artworks were transcribed to prints at the Burston Graphics Center in Jerusalem, and the money received from the sales was set aside to finance educational activities for advancing the values of democracy and freedom of speech. One such event was held in August 1987 at the "Meimad" Gallery in Tel Aviv, where an exhibition was held, followed by a public auction of all of the prints. In preparation for this event, a request was made of 10 additional artists who willingly contributed prints and original works.

What follows is an alphabetical list of the artists who dedicated and contributed of their works:

***Toviya Avraham, Yossi Asher, Arye Uzan, Shaul Bauman, Aliza Ben-Baruch, Dedi Ben-Shaul, Aryeh Berkovitz, Tova Berlinski, Pinchas Cohen-Gan, Geula Dagan, Yaacov Dorchin, Alima, Alfán, Pinchas Eshet, Yair Gruboz, Eliyahu Gat, Moshe Gershoni, David Gerstein, Shuki Grifit, Yisrael Hadani, Shlomo Harpaz, Menashe Kadishman, Dani Karavan, Toviya Katz, Rafi Kenan, Lilian Klapisch, Moshe Kopferman, Ofer Laloush, Rafi Lavi, Uri Lifschitz, Yaakov Mishori, Leah Nickel, Yigal Ozeri, Rafi Peled, Meir Pitzhazda, Mira Recanati, Roni Reuveni, Harold Rubin, Ruth Schloss, Yehuda Schwartz, Ivan Schwebel, Yehiel Shemi, Naomi Smilansky, Yehezkel Streichman, Avigdor Stimatzky, David Tartakover, Nachum Tevet, Yigal Tumarkin, Micha Ullman, Tsur Tsakinski.***

The prints are presently located at the offices of the Adam Institute. It is still possible to buy them. The Institute periodically holds exhibitions in Emil's memory.

**STUDY EVENINGS IN MEMORY OF**

# EMIL GREENZWEIG

The Adam Institute, founded in 1986, approximately three years after Emil's murder, sponsors a study evening every year, in Emil's memory. The evening includes a panel discussion with the participation of a broad spectrum of speakers.

## ***"People to People – Are People"***

On February 15, 1988, five years after the murder, a study day was held in Jerusalem. Among the participants were six classes from different sectors of the city and its environs. That same evening a memorial evening took place, where it was decided to change the name of the Institute, which until then had been called "Adam - The Institute for Education for Democracy and Co-Existence in Memory of Emil Greenzweig" to **"Adam – The Institute for Democracy and Peace in Memory of Emil Greenzweig"**.

## ***Exhibition of Prints***

On February 14, 1989, six years after the murder, there was an evening exhibition of the art prints created in reaction to Emil's death and contributed to the Institute. The exhibition was held in Jerusalem.

## ***"The Index of Democracy in Israel"***

Seven years after the murder, on February 28, 1990, Prof. Yonatan Peres gave a lecture dealing with the results of research on the measure of democracy in Israel.

## ***"Political Violence" – A Lecture and Exhibition of Prints***

In February 1991, during the Gulf War, eight years after the murder, another exhibition displaying the prints executed in Emil's memory was opened at the Artists' House in Jerusalem. On March 9, 1991 Professor Michael Harsgor gave a lecture at the Artists' House, closing the exhibition.

## ***"The Participation of Children and Youth in Demonstrations – a Right, an Obligation, or a Crime?"***

On February 11, 1993, 10 years after the murder, a study evening was held in Jerusalem with the purpose of trying to understand the question of participation of children and youth in demonstrations from a legal, ideological, educational, and political point of view. The participants were: Adv. Tamar Morag; Dr. Galit Hasan-Rokem; Naama Rokem; Rabbi Benny Alon; Masbach Tatur; Carmit Gai; and Dr. Meir Pa'il; Yaron London was the moderator.

### ***"Education for Peace"***

On February 15, 1994, 11 years after the murder, there was a study evening at Binyanei Ha'uma in Jerusalem. Professor Haim Adler moderated the session. Professor Amnon Rubinstein, who was then Minister of Education and Culture, gave a lecture that was followed by a panel discussion between Professor Daniel Bartal, General Hareven, Dr. Adel Manna and Uki Maroshek-Klarman.

### ***"The Peace Process and Education for Peace"***

On February 26, 1995, 12 years after the murder, there was a study evening at the Zippori Center in the Jerusalem Forest moderated by Dr. Adel Manna. Professor Shlomo Ben-Ami and Dr. Sa'id Zaidani participated.

### ***"What is the Difference between Freedom of Speech and Incitement?"***

On February 29, 1996, 13 years after the murder, there was a study evening at the Zippori Center in the Jerusalem Forest. The jurist Moshe Negbi lectured on the question of freedom of speech and incitement in the political context.

### ***"On Literature and Peace"***

On February 18, 1997, 14 years after the murder, there was a study evening at the Zippori Center in the Jerusalem Forest, with the participation of the journalist Amira Hess and the writers Asad al Asad and Salman Natur.

### ***"By Right, not by Sufferance"***

On February 29, 1998, 15 years after the murder, there was a study evening at the Kibbutz Teachers Seminary in Tel Aviv. The topic was social rights. The discussion, moderated by Dr. Michael Atlan, focused on the connections between education for democracy, social justice, and social rights. The other participants were Dr. Elisheva Sadan, Amin Fares, and Dr. Sami Shalom Shitrit.

### ***"Equal – Not Equal"***

On March 23, 1999, 16 years after the murder, there was a study evening at the Zippori Center in the Jerusalem Forest. Scenes from Sini Bar-David's movie "The South – Alice Never Lived Here" were shown, followed by a panel discussion on the connection between the educational system to economic and cultural inequality, moderated by Orna Shem-Tov. Yoel Ifergan, Tami Gordon, Clara Yona, Yael Benyamini-Levin, and Abed Almanan Shbeita participated in the discussion.

### ***"The Weaker Sex – About Women and Poverty"***

On February 17, 2000, 17 years after the murder, there was a panel discussion at the Zippori Center in the Jerusalem Forest moderated by Dr. Daphna Hacker. The participants were M.K. Dr. Marina Solodkin, Dr. Henriette Calev-Dahan, Fatma Kasem, and Dr. Sylvia Fogel-Bejauwe.

### ***"Oh, My Land, My Motherland – About the Law of Return and Right of Return"***

On February 18, 2001, 18 years after the murder, there was a panel discussion at the Zippori Center in the Jerusalem Forest moderated by the journalist Danny Rubinstein. The participants were Prof. Ruth Gavison, Dr. Amal Jamal, and Rabbi Menachem Fruman.

### ***"Unemployment, War, and Peace"***

This year, on February 18, 2002, 19 years after the murder, in the Jewish-Arab Center in Jaffa, there was an evening devoted to the topic of the connection between the economic situation and the political and security situation. The participants were Professor Gadi Yatziv, the Dean of the School of Communications at the Netanya Academic College, and Dr. Ahmad Saad, the Editor-in-Chief of the Arab daily paper "Al-Ittihad". The moderator for the evening was Meirav Aharon-Gutman, the producer of the movie "No One's Slave".

Translated from Hebrew by Wendy Bar-Yaakov

---

Adam – The Institute for Democracy and Peace in Memory of Emil  
Greenzweig  
The Jerusalem Forest, P.O.B. 3353, Jerusalem 91033  
Tel. 02-6448290 Fax: 02-6752932  
e-mail: [adam@adaminstitute.org.il](mailto:adam@adaminstitute.org.il)  
[www.adamistitute.org.il](http://www.adamistitute.org.il)