

# Yemima Hadad, 'Buber and Gandhi on land and resistance: Reading the Buber-Gandhi correspondence after October 7'

[2024-10-15-iss-yemima\\_hadad.mp3](#)

This transcript was auto-generated and has not been corrected, we apologise for any errors.

## Transcript

### [Professor Yaacov Yadgar](#)

Our speaker today is Professor Emma Haddad. Who teaches? Jewish studies at the Theological Faculty of the University of Leipzig in Germany. Yuma studied modern Jewish thought, German Jewish philosophy, continental philosophy, political theology, and Jewish feminism, which are the topics around which are work revolved. She's also still a research at the Bucerius that's the name of yes.

### [Dr Yemima Hadad](#)

Bucerius yeah.

### [Professor Yaacov Yadgar](#)

The research for Germany in contemporary history and society, the University of Haifa and Israel. Her research has appeared in or is forthcoming in journals such as the Hebrew Union, College annual, the Jewish Quarterly Review, Jewish Studies quarterly religions, and and others. And she's currently working on a monograph titled Thinking with Care Feminine interventions into the Ethics of Dialog. This work traces the meaning of feminine thought in the 20th century and discusses its relevance for contemporary gender discourses, but the topic for today, which is the topic of previous work and the title of the talk today, is blubber and Gandhi. So the details will be expanded. But. Gibran Gandhi on land and resistance reading the correspondence after October 7. Thank you so much for coming.

### [Dr Yemima Hadad](#)

Thank you so much for having me. I'm very excited to be here today. Thank you for and taking the time. And this is indeed the paper that is. It's a it's a small. Additional part of my work and not the main work that I'm doing right now and. I'll start perhaps. We we can extend on that later and this essay began as a presentation. For a lecture series on religion

and violence at the University of Leipzig, the well known exchange between Wlodek Goldmann and Gandhi that took place between 1938 and 1939. Seemed like a perfect example to explore the theme of religion and violence, and to reflect upon. The theme of peaceful resistance in dire times. What I did not know at the time. Was how painfully. Relevant this topic would become after October 7 massacre. Almost immediately. Heated discussions emerged on resistance, national, Liberty, Zionism, occupation, colonialism and violence. Some students and scholars went so far as to immediately justify and celebrate the massacre as an act of armed resistance. Then a tragic war broke out. That left Gaza. Devastated. And that has since expanded into the religion into the region. With no realistic end insight. Under these circumstances, I began to view the famous. Disagreement between Buber and Gandhi as a debate. Anticipating some of the issues. At stake today? To be sure, historical compromise comparisons are always problematic, and I'm not suggesting that our times, however difficult. They may be. Resemble the fateful years of 1938 and 1939. Nor do I want to suggest that Buber's reply to Gandhi can offer us any concrete answers to the painful political reality in the Middle East. Buber, who died in 1965, believed all his life that the only future for the region would be a big National Cup cooperative between Arabs and Jews. It is difficult to imagine how Buber would respond to the profound conflict that has. Separated 2 peoples. He envisioned to be united. But the exchange, or to be precise, the intellectual Miss meeting, their diagnosing a term coined by Buber between Gandhi and Buber, can still offer us important perspectives about our historical moment. Most importantly, it obliges us. You think again? About the virtue and meaning of spiritual resistance, so this is a work in progress and I'm still. Not even sure that I. I I I I think about all these things. Now in the same way. And that I felt about them in the moment I was writing them, and I am. I'm really grateful and and thankful for the exchange here. And I look forward to our discussion in 1938, shortly after the November pogroms, leading representatives of the Zionist movement approached Gandhi with a request to endorse the Zionist. Enterprise in Elite Israel, Palestine. The moment was urgent. Violence against Jews in Germany and annexed Austria. And reached and you had reached a new peak, forcing those who had the means to secure visas into immigration. Meanwhile, countries around. Thank you. Meanwhile, countries around the world, including the United States, Australia and Great Britain, and and Great Britain, had issued severe immigration contacts. Soon. The British Mandate authorities began to drastically restrict. Restrict Jewish immigration to Palestine. Award. From Gandhi. So the Zionist leaders believed, would appeal to the conscience. Of the world. In his published reply, however, Gandhi spoke out against Zionism with unexpected firmness and suggested that German Jews should remain in Germany and practice Satyagraha. Even if this would lead to massive martyrdom. Jewish intellectuals, many of whom had long desired admired Gandhi, were greatly disappointed in his response to Gandhi's open letter. Martin Buber, along with other progressives and his thinkers. Such as

Kim Greenberg and you, the magnets question the wisdom. Of satyagraha. Advocating an otherwise rarely articulated non pacifist. But this did not mean that boober rejected spiritual resistance altogether. Here. We must remember that both the model of Mahatma Gandhi and the philosophy of Martin Buber would later inspire movements of nonviolent resistance. Martin Luther King, for instance, referred directly to Boover and Gandhi. Martin Buber's concept of dialogue and Mahatma Gandhi's concept of Satyagraha emerged in response to violent conflicts. Bubba's book, I endow. Conceived in 1916, written in 19/22/22 and published in 1923, was a direct response to the horrors of World War One. Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy of Satyagraha responded to brutal British colonial rule. Both Bloomer and Gandhi advocated nonviolence. As a new way of conflict resolution and peacemaking, however, both also differed in their approaches to pacifism and martyrdom. This difference as well as we shall see, must be seen in the specific context of the violent reichstag's program of November 1938. What the Nazis named the Crystal Kristallnacht. For buber. And most German Jews at the time this event marked a distinct turning point. After the rise of Hitler in 1933 and the legally. Implemented racial discrimination against Jews in 1935, the November pogroms of 1938 made clear that National Socialism was not just a political regime but a brutal regime of ordinary people and approving bystanders. It left no doubt that the Jews were not only. Singled out. For destruction, but profoundly alone. We were believed that these events were fundamentally different from the history of colonial violence and discrimination. And they differed also differed also from his understanding of Zionism, which he referred to see as a necessarily. Colonial enterprise envisioning instead. A genuine Arab cooperative. Boober. I'm sorry. But there was another difference between Boobers and Gandhi's approaches to nonviolence. Whereas Gandhi understood Satyagraha as a nonviolent resistance. Demanding. Ultimately, self sacrifice. Blubber insisted in the ethical imperative of subjectivity. Already in his early dialogical philosophy, he argued for the necessary. For the necessity that both I and thou had to be. Preserved as ethical subjects in their otherness, for dialogue to be possible, both I and thou must survive as distinct subjects. Self sacrifice for Buber was not a dialogical act. With these differences in mind. We can look at the background of the Buber Gandhi correspondence. Gandhi developed the term Satyagraha around 1906, when he was still working in South Africa. The term emphasizes the power of truth as such and adherence to it. Truth, Satya, fairness, agaha. According to Gandhi, Satyagraha was not a passive resistance, for this would be the weapon of the weak, but an active one which he described as the weapon of the strong. As such, this weapon was also nonviolent, but meant a spiritual strength. One of the most famous examples of Gandhi's nonviolent resistance was the salt March. In 1930, none as the Salt Satyagraha, which covered nearly 400 kilometers and was directed against the tax laws of the British colonialists. Gandhi saw Satyagraha as a form of civil disobedience to oppression and power. That would change

the heart. Of the aggressor. In developing this concept, Gandhi was inspired by Henry Thoreau. Henry David Thoreau. An American writer. Philosopher known for his 1849 essay on the duty of civil disobedience. In his essay, Thoreau called for people to resist immoral government action by simply refusing to cooperate and pay their taxes. Not only Gandhi, but also Martin Buber, was influenced by Henry Thoreau. On the center center. Sorry on the same. Centenary of Henry Thoreau's death in 1962, Buber reflected on the importance of civil disobedience. The Rose treatise he wrote was formative for him in his younger years because it focused on the concrete. Situation the here and now and called for the struggle. For the duty of men as men. Thorough, distinguished between public servants. Who only serve in dull. Obedience and those who actually serve the state in their own critical responsibility. I quote a few as Heroes, patriots martyrs, reforms in the great sense, and men serve the state even with their conscience. And therefore necessarily oppose it for the most part writes to Rome. And, he adds. What we already know about the Biblical prophet. And they are generally treated by. Bite as enemies. Buber sought to row as a model for prophetic society in which disobedience was actually a form of obedience. Obedience to a higher I quote obedience to a higher institution than the one to which one is disobedient here and now, obedience to the highest institution. Civil disobedience can therefore only be justified by obedience to a sovereign who is higher than Caesar and higher than the state. In short, Buber demanded a religious obedience that surpassed the power. Of the state. Buber applied applied to Rose Idea. Ideas to his spiritual resistance to the Nazi regime? His students and Simone later described the spiritual resistance as a way of learning in order to retain 1's own human dignity despite persecution. Buber, who had taken over the leadership of the Frankfurt Jewish rehouse in 1935. Promoted Jewish learning, the study of the Torah, Talmud, philosophy and history. As an act. Of defiance and dignity. For five years Buber led the little house. He postponed his plans. To to immigrate to Palestine and Israel until after the November programs of 1938, when members of the Gestapo also broke into his family home in Heppenheim. We must understand these circumstances to appreciate Buber's reply to Gandhi in 1939, shortly after he had arrived in Jerusalem with his family. We must also understand Bueller's disappointment in Gandhi's moral position. As I mentioned. Many German Jewish intellectuals strongly admired the Gandhi's ethics. Margarete Zusman, for example, delivered a lecture in mines dedicated to Mahatma Gandhi's Gandhi in 1929. Gandhi argued this man was a leader espousing, espousing a feminine kind of non violence maternal politics. Quote. This innermost painful identity of the Mahatma with his country. Whose reality he carried and embraced in his soul like the mother. The unborn child this immediate. Self responsibility for his people. It is one with Gandhi's great religious nationalism. End of quote contrasting Gandhi's motherly nationalism of birth with the paternalistic European nationalism of destruction. Zusman returned to an earlier essay

from 1923 Europe and Gandhi. Where she described European history as a history of violence, power and conquest, marched on visits. European nationalism stood for Zusman, in stark contrast to Gandhi's.

World.

Buber, who became an unspoken critic of European nationalism after World War 1, shared this sentiment. He also warned already in the 1920s, that Zionism should never deteriorate into a mere nationalism. Of the European model. It is fair to say, then, that blubber read Gandhi's letter as a betrayal of intellectual kinship. Gandhi, as far as we know, never replied to boober. And researchers doubt that he ever received boober's letter. In his letter on Zionism. Gandhi made the following points. One Palestine belongs to the Arabs, 2 the Jews in Nazi Germany are oppressed just like the Indians under British colonial rule. Three, the Jews in Palestine, Eretz Israel, are colonialists themselves, just like the British Empire in India. For the Jewish. The Jews should not settle in Mandate Palestine. 5. The Jews should not flee anywhere but stay in Germany and practice Santiago, huh? 6. The Jews who are already in Palestine should not defend themselves from violent attacks. But practice satyagraha with the Arabs in order to convert the heart of the Arabs. Based on their knowledge. Analogy between a colonial Britain and Nazi Germany, Gandhi concluded that Jews in Germany should in essence. Replicate. His struggle against colonialism. Buber could not accept these premises and turned against Gandhi. On three crucial points, one his relationship, 2, pacifism and martyrdom, and the right to escape or flee. Too. His concept of land and belonging, and three, his understanding of resistance, let us now take a closer look at these points. Gandhi was not an. Sympathetic. To their flight of the Jews. But he qualified his compassion. I quote. My sympathy is with the Jews. But my sympathy does not blind me. To the demand for justice, the call for a national home for the Jews is not very attractive to me. And of course. And he continued. I quote If I were a Jew and were born in Germany. And earned. My living there. I would claim Germany as my home, even if the greatest non Jew in Germany could shoot me or throw me into prison, I would refuse to be expelled or to be treated in a discriminatory way. To do this, I would not wait. For my fellow Jews to join me in civil resistance, but I would trust that the others would follow my example in the end and of. Indeed. As we now know. For instance, from the recent work on. Everyday acts of Jewish resistance by the historian historian Wolf Guna Jews in Germany did resist the decrease in Nazi Germany in various ways. But it was resistance to little. Or no avail. The only successful acts of resistance in Nazi Germany came from German non Jews such as de Rosenstrasse de Rosenstrasse protests in Berlin in February 1943. Gandhi was probably thinking of the symbolic success of the Salt March in 1930, which began with just the small crowd before thousands of people joined in. Boober, however. Was. However, with the hunting images of the November programs in mind when thousands

joined. In physically violent protests. And actions against Jews in their synagogues did not have that same confidence in. Nor did he believe in Gandhi's religious doctrine that for the God fearing Man's death, has no. Terror and of course. Instead, he pointed out. An important historical difference under the under British colonial rule. Gandhi could practice satyagraha. He could speak and protest despite the British colonial oppression. He had the opportunity to make speeches and gain followers not only in India but in Britain itself and worldwide. The Jews in Germany, by contrast, did not have the privilege of speaking and changing people's hearts. There was no option to effectively practice Satyagraha because there was no place to speak or resist a terror. That came from both the government and the people themselves. A quote. Well, Mahatma. Do you perhaps think that a Jew in Germany could utter even a single sentence of a speech like yours in public without being struck down? It does not seem convincing to me if you base your advice to us on the practice of Santiago High in Germany. Blubber was not a dogmatic pacifist. But even. As committed a pacifist as you, the Magnus. Believed that Gandhi satyagraha was precisely not the right answer in face of a Nazi like regime. On Gandhi's successful resistance, he writes, quote has not this been possible largely because, despite. All the excesses of its imperialism. England is, after all, a democracy, with the Parliament and a considerable measure of free. Which I wonder if even you would find the way to public opinion in in totalitarian Germany, where life is snuffed out like a candle. And no one sees or knows that the light is out and of. Any ants? Many Jews, hundreds, thousands, have been shot. Hundreds. Thousands have been casted into dungeons. What more can satyagraha give them? Kim Greenberg, his letter to Gandhi from 1939, replied to this point in the same manner to that of Buber and Magnus. I quote a Jewish Gandhi in Germany. Should one. Erase. Could function for about 5 minutes until the 1st Gestapo agent would lead him not to a concentration camp, but directly to the gallows. Greenberg reminds Gandhi of the words of the British judge. Who sent him to jail, acknowledging him a quote. Is a great patriot and a great leader. What was striking in Gandhi's 1938 letter was not only his insistence on Satya Santiago. Even in the face of massive death and genocide. But also his uncanny. Free science about. The. Imminent doom of European Jews. Thus he writes. I quote. But if the Jewish mind could be prepared for voluntary suffering, missus Gandhi. Even the massacre I have imagined could be turned into a day of Thanksgiving and joy. For the God fearing death has no terror. It is a joyful sleep to be followed by awakening. That would be all the more refreshing for the long sleep. And of course. Gandhi's insistence on martyrdom generated mixed feelings among his Jewish readers. You, the Magnus, argued that martyrdom was not a Jewish value. Blubber, on the other hand, acknowledged that there was martyrdom in Judaism, Kiddush Hashem. But that this required an element of testimony which was lacking in the case of Satyagraha in Nazi Germany, satyagraha and martyrdom. Martyrdom are not moral actions of sacrificing themselves unless. They have witnesses in Gandhi's case, Satyagraha was

possible because of freedom of speech and the press coverage of the wrongdoing by the imperial rule. Jewish martyrdom in Nazi Germany, by contrast, was silenced. It aroused no internal debate, self critique, and no public response. In Buber's words, I could. There is a certain situation in which the satyagraha of the power of the spirit cannot give rise to a satyagraha of the power of truth. The word satyagraha means testimony without the testimony of those who flee. What remains of Satyagraha. Is a form of martyrdom. Of course, no maxim for appropriate behavior can. Be derived from it. And. Martyrdom without witness would be a death cast to the wind, a senseless extinction or annihilation. In so far as pacifism leads to self destruction, it cannot be reconciled with Buber's theological ethics, which is understood as an I thou relationship. Just as then nationalistic, militant ethos runs the risk of. Attaching too little value to the existence of a you, pacifism, places disproportionate value on the existence of EU to the point of abolishing the eye. For Buber, any excessive treatment of the eye or the thou removes us from this sphere of ethics and theological. Ontology in which I and thou have the same ontological status guaranteed by the eternal thou God, or the sovereign in buber's theopolis tics. Thus. The ideology of pacifism is a mirror image to the ideology of nationalism. While the latter. Wants to eliminate the thou. The former allows the elimination of the eye. Blubber, as I mentioned, was a pacifist but not a dogmatic 1. Violence, of course, should be at all costs avoided. In June 1939. Buber. Publicly condemned Jewish retaliation against Arabs, as well as against the British mandates. Mandate as a Sodo Samsonite. But he rejected violence, not categorically, but only as far as it exceeds its necessary minimum. It was this, admittedly vogue principle that book that guided boober's political ethics. Boober. As is well known, was opposed to mainstream national Zionism. He even rejected the Biltmore program in 1942, as well as Ben Gurion's plan to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. This notwithstanding, after the atrocities and destruction of European Jewry and the Jewish refugees problem. Buber had to accept post factum, the establishment of the Jewish state. I quote as a new starting point of the struggle for the righty of politics. The reality of state for Buber was a mere beginning, not the last word of peace politics. Some might consider this as spineless. Excessively flexible. Attitude. From Buber's own ethic, however, it was clear that every situation had to be evaluated on its own grounds. There was no rule, no principle, no imperative that could be equally applied to one situation or another, while the luftman. Is concerned with pure distinctions and abstractions. But is essentially hovering above the concrete realities. And the politician is embedded in their real politic at the price of dispensing altogether with a prior ethical. Demarcations. We were trying to find a way to mediate the two approaches and weigh them against each other. Ethical questions. Are not abstract. The right of the Arabs. Had to be considered together with the needs to give home to Holocaust survivors and refugees. This brings us to the second point in Gandhi's letter I quote. Here we talk about land and indigenous people. A quote Gandhi. Palestine

belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English or France. To the French it is wrong and inhumane to impose the Jews. On the Arabs. And of course. Gandhi invoked a claim for what we call today. Indeed indigeneity. Needless to mention, this nativist idea remains a problematic term. Not least as it was used by the Nazis in the 30s to deny Jewish basic rights to live in Germany or to live at all. There is a long history of anti-Semitism claiming that Jews by definition are people. Are people without any indigeneity at all. Gandhi used the logic of indigeneity in order to question the right of German Jews to flee Germany and find refuge in the British colony Palestine, else Israel. By linking indigeneity, belonging and possession. Gandhi also seemed to suggest that indigenous rights are exclusive rights. Uber sharply disagreed with Gandhi on the exclusivity of indigenous rights. In fact. He obliges us to think about other possible catastrophes which may result in waves of mass migration around the globe, whether war, refugees or climate refugees. Can we, on the basis of indigeneity, refuse refuge and let catastrophes wipe out an entire people? Buber writes with almost prophetic foresight, I quote. Possibly the time is not far removed when perhaps after a catastrophe, to the extent of which we cannot yet estimate, the representatives of humanity will have to come to some agreement. On the reestablishment of relations among peoples, nations and countries on the colonization of thinly populated territories as well as on illogical intensification of the. Cultivate on the cultivation of the globe. In order to prevent a new catastrophe. Is then the dogma of possession. Of the inalienable right. Of ownership of the sacred status quo to be held up against the man who dared to save the situation. End of quote. Buber appeared the supreme rights of indigeneity to a land on two different grounds. 1st. He reminds Gandhi that there are different ways of belonging to a land beyond nativism. One can belong by history, culture, and myth as the Jewish people demonstrate in their tradition. Belonging, even if it's not possession. Can be expressed in everyday prayer and liturgy. Think of the Jewish side or the Jewish prayer book, where Jews are observant Jews pray three times a day for hundreds and hundreds of years. The prayer sound, the Great Horn for our freedom. Raise the banner. Together, our exiles and gather us from the four corners of the Earth. Blessed are you, Lord, who gathers the despaired of his people, Israel and quote. Think of middle-aged poetry. Thinking of Yoda, Halevy, and his famous poem My Heart is in the east and I am at the edge of the West. Think of Jewish thought and the Rambam my monitors in. I quote. The Messianic King will arise in the future and restore the Davidic Kingdom to its former States and original sovereignty without mehrin. As well as in mystical literature, messianic yearning for national return to Zion, Zionism always understood itself to be an old new movement. But as we shall see momentarily, even the historical connection of a people to a land does not ensure or justify position. The second point Buber makes against Gandhi reminds him that the history of the land is a history of conquests from antiquity to modern times. There is no one indigenous



people in Eretz Israel Palestine. But different peoples from different settlements and migration periods. There is the character. This is the character of the region and at Israel Palestine. That it was conquered again and again throughout history because of the ancient Israelite, the Syrian, the Persian, the Hellenists of Rome and the Bizans, the Arab khalifat, the Crusades, the Mamluk Ottoman Empire and the British Mandate. Booboo writes to Gandhi, quote. You seem to want to say that the people that has settled on a land has such an absolute claim. To the possession of that land that any one who settled on it without the their permission. Is committing robbery. But in what way did the Arabs acquire the right of ownership of Palestine? Certainly by conquest and conquest by settlement and quote. Furthermore, from a religious and theological point of view, and you see we have two religious thinkers, Gandhi and. Or in other words, from his geopolitical point of view, Boober claims that no one. Whether indigenous or not, can lay a claim. To a piece of land on planet Earth. Wilber opposes any ownership of land by a nation. I quote. It seems to me that God does not give away any part of the earth so that its owner can say, as God does in the Holy Scripture, mine is the land. Even for the Conqueror. Who has settled on it? The conquered land is, in my opinion, only alone. The theological utopia in which God is the king can be understood either as a direct theocracy or a religious anarchy. According to boogers, understanding both men both mean one and the same. Direct theocracy means that ultimately, only God. Possess.

Rules.

And guides the world. While religious anarchy eradicates any kind of human rule and possession. This conceptual unity is referred to as an acronym, theocracy. The Bible does not guarantee any people the rights to own land to own land is a human desire that is doomed to remain an illusion from the Bible point of view. There are no property rights to land. Nor not even birthrights. Because the whole Earth is his. I quote from the autonomy behold to the Lord your God belong heaven and the heaven of heavens, the earth, and all that is in it. Only God, the Boober emphasizes, is the ruler and the right and the rightful owner of earthly spaces. I quote surely the whole Earth is his peoples and nations, including the Israelites, are only temporary residents and immigrants to have no absolute rights to physical spaces. For I quote for you are strangers and sojourns with me. This clearly points to the special character of the possession of the land. Boober presents the Jewish and Arab claims to the land as two just claims. And the solution is coexistence or real. Peace. Therefore, Boober demands of Gandhi that he. Not emphasize property rights for one side in the conflict, but reconciliation I quote. Instead of determining that the land belongs to the arms. Help us reconcile both claims. If lying that you explains further why Gandhi not only declares. The land as our property, but also did not call for Arabs charisma. Only to the Jews. Clearly, for this, for his own political reasons favoring the

Hindu Muslim unity. Gandhi did not did everything to preserve the Hindu Muslim unity in India. Is pro our position in the Palestine question was helpful in maintaining this unity. And of growth. As Buber empathetically. Emphasizes in his response viewing the Jewish Arab conflict in Palestine in secular political terms of ownership and sovereignty, justice and injustice would not help to solve the problem, but rather. Exaggerated. In a conflict between two nations claiming equal geopolitical rights. To one and the same land a different way of thinking was required. A visionary and not just historical approach. A religious and not just a secular form of politics, and above all an inclusive and not an exclusive definition of property. A political compromise will be achieved not by statements of belonging, but by statements of sharing the land Burriss Binationalism conveys the acknowledgement. Of the dual belonging of two nations. The last point concerns. The concept of resistance itself, in his letter to Gandhi, we reclaim that Judaism. Advocates peace, not pacifism. Pacifism and peace politics are not the same thing. I quote mover. We do not want violence. We have not, like Jesus, the son of our people. And like you, Gandhi proclaimed the doctrine of non violence because we believe that the person must sometimes use violence to save himself or even more. His children. But from time immemorial, we have preached the doctrine of justice and peace. We have taught and learned that peace is the goal of the whole world and that injustice is the way to and that sorry and that justice is the way. To achieve it. Therefore, we cannot want to use violence. No one who counts himself among the ranks of Israel. Can have the desire to use violence, but if there is no other way to prevail, evil from destroying good, I will probably use force and place myself in God's hands. In other words. Only the case of Nazi Germany can justify. Violent resistance. Peace politics as opposed to militant ideologies are purely pacifist ideologies. Must be committed to both I and thou. Just as the militant nationalist ethos runs the risk of attaching too little importance to the existence of the thou pacifism places, disproportionate importance to the existence of a thou to the point of abolishing the eye. All his life will be objective, objected, selfish nationalism in the ontology, a land of two people. Palm and his floor clearly establishes that from 1918 onwards, Buber remained a consistent foe of chauvinist nationalism. For the rest of his life, frequently criticizing hyper nationalism. In one of his most famous speeches, on the occasion of the 12th Zionist Congress in Carlsberg in September 1921, Buber rejected Jabotinsky lagoons proposal as islamic's posture, attending to what he calls the mere needs. Of the Jewish people, while neglecting the needs of the Arab. Hyper nationalism is a deviation from the healthy principle of nationalism. Blubber thinks of it as a pathology and calls it a disease that has infected. Indeed, the whole era. As in the case of individual martyrdom, boober, however, also objected. The absolute renunciation of national selfhood like the one instructed by Gandhi to the Jews. According to Buber's national martyrdom. Would undermine the logic of ethics as he understands it in so far as pacifism leads to self

destruction, it cannot be reconciled with ethics and peace politics, which is properly understood as the enduring of iron thou relationship. For Buber, it means a quote. We cannot refrain from doing injustice altogether, but we are given the grace of not having to do more in justice than absolutely necessary. What the degree of necessity is in every single case. That, of course, is not easy to recognize for formidable drives. Intervene here and Dodd with great powers of deception. The thirst for possession and the hunger for power.

Something.

The question of. What is exactly what is actually necessary? Has of course no clear answer. But for boober, the point was not to find. Absolute answers, but to ask the questions. Again and again, it was perhaps Gandhi's greatest shortcoming. At the historical hour of 1938, not to ask question. Not to ask the question, but instead to rely on a fixed, unquestioned principle. In a sense. The great pacifist, humanist and religious leader dodged the complexities. Of the moment. I think I will keep my conclusion because I am happy to consider this whole correspondence with you and not to conclude that because I'm not ready to conclude and what I wrote, I I will certainly change it again after our discussion. So thank you very much. Thank you.