

RESEARCH

FOR ADVANCEMENT

A Check-List
of Programme
Choices

OF PEACE

Julius Stone

מכון טרומן
הספרייה

Jerusalem, 1968

Harry S Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace
Hebrew University of Jerusalem

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM
THE HARRY S TRUMAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE
LIBRARY AND DOCUMENTATION
1968

© by JULIUS STONE, 1968

Truman Center Publications, No. 2, is the fuller text of a speech delivered at a Dinner held on Mount Scopus on July 25, 1968 to mark the occasion of the first Meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace. It represents Julius Stone's personal statement on the range of choices facing the planning authorities of the Center and does not necessarily reflect policies to be officially adopted.

I. THE MEANING AND OBJECTIVES OF "PEACE RESEARCH"

Many years ago, Samuel Butler wrote a satirical fantasy about a country he called Erewhon, which of course is really "nowhere" approached backwards. Among his entertaining and still often instructive thoughts was one about the responsibility incurred by unborn children for the choice of their future parents. The unborn, he suggested, pester and importune their reluctant parents-to-be in order to escape into life from the world of the unborn. And so once the parents are chosen, and the unborn born, it is they, the children, and no one else, who are responsible for their own innate weaknesses, ailments and sufferings.

All this may have some implications for the Harry S Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace. Take that gleam in the eye of Sam Rothberg, the leader of the New York Friends and Founders to whom the Center owes so much, who is now the esteemed President of the Board of Governors. We have all thought for two years and more that that gleam in Sam Rothberg's eye was the gleam of creative intent of a doughty progenitor of the Center. But perhaps, if Butler were right, what we were really seeing in that gleam was a manifestation of this compelling idea of a Peace Center in Jerusalem, which with great discrimination picked Sam Rothberg to do the fathering. Or perhaps, Harry S Truman himself, when he chose this Center to perpetuate the search for peace with justice which inspired so many of his decisions as President of the United States, was but the parent-elect of an idea which simply insisted on being born. As for the others, retiring President

Elath, President Harman, Rector Rotenstreich, Justice Haim Cohn, the Senate, the Governors, Harry Zinder and the rest, whatever the reality behind the gleam in Sam Rothberg's or former President Truman's eye, they have diligently ministered to the consequences, as do obstetricians, midwives, pediatricians and all their company.

For the mere fact that, according to the Erehwonians, the newborn bears responsibility for his own constitution, capacities, limitations and potentialities, does not mean that other people do not have worries and pride and hopes about them. As to the constitution, two years of anxious and devoted care have revealed the Center as an autonomous body, headed by its own Board of Trustees and Academic Director, within the framework of the Hebrew University, and drawing on the latter's intellectual and physical resources and the high standards it sets. It is to be expected, of course, that the Center will attract new minds of high calibre to Jerusalem. But equally clearly it will draw to itself distinguished minds already working in the Hebrew University whose thought bears closely on problems of peace. The Center should assist the earlier maturation of their work, for instance, by relieving them for necessary periods from otherwise inescapable burdens of administration and undergraduate instruction. But even with all this, and on so sound a constitutional basis, what we can expect from the Center in terms of its capacities, limitations and potentialities in the advancement of peace, will depend finally on the life-design and programme of the Center itself, and those who work within it.

The disciplines which we all hope may contribute to the programme are easy enough to list, and their broad description has indeed been set out in the Constitution approved by the Senate and Board of Governors of the Hebrew University and the Founders as follows:

- Humanities in the Advancement of Peace
- Developing Nations and International Law
- Studies in Conflict Resolution
- Comparative Studies of Modernisation
- Economics of Modernisation and Growth
- Studies in the Uses of Science and Technology
- Environmental Sciences
- International Conferences and Seminars
- Library and Documentation Center.

Within so broad a range, of course, many basic choices will still have

to be made. Many of the answers may have to wait on the actual experience, the trials and errors, of the early years of the Center's work. And, of course, at a Center directed to problems of peace, the vicissitudes and travails of change in international relations in a deeply troubled and exciting age must continually affect the choices to be made. But there is need, at the beginning, to foreshadow somewhat more closely at least the range within which the actual programme choices for the Center will have to be made.

There are, on a calculation made in 1966 under Unesco auspices, about sixty-seven organizations, national and international, wholly or in substantial part engaged in "peace research". (This excludes bodies engaged in mere advocacy of peace programmes or in merely disseminating relevant literature.) Of these sixty-seven more than twenty are *wholly* devoted to peace research.

Those responsible for the Truman Center's programme may well be intrigued and sometimes startled by the many varied notions of the relation of knowledge to peace implied in the work of these centres. And when scholars may get lost in the profusion, laymen are perhaps entitled to some clarification. Even for the laymen, I suppose, we need not spend much time on the more naive approaches, such as those which seek to substitute a World State and Government for the obsolete sovereignties of our day; or which hope to achieve peace by exposing persuasively enough the evils of violence and the blessings of peace and law; or by application of the objective techniques of natural science, infused with a sense of social responsibility. When these and other naivetés have been dismissed, we are still faced with many different views of what are the tasks of peace research.

Despite all the recent bustle of activity on so-called "peace research", none of the scholars or organisations engaged in it have any special authority to define its limits. We can, perhaps, assume that we know what "research" is and that it embraces both the extension of some field of basic knowledge, and the new applications of existing basic knowledge to particular problems. The variable meanings of "peace research" mostly arise thereafter, from uncertainty as to the scope of subject-matter imported by the word "peace". As to this, current thought properly distinguishes between the *negative* and the *positive* aspects of the state of affairs called "peace". The former points to the *absence* (or non-presence) of organised violence between States and similar major groups;

the latter points to the *presence* of such bonds of friendship and integrated and cooperative relations as assure that occasions for resort to such violence do not arise. Both these aspects are entirely within the proper concern of a peace research center.

Moreover, there is no reason to restrict peace research to research designed to enlarge knowledge *concerning peace* (in the above broad sense), as distinct from such research designed to *advance peace* (in the same sense). For the Truman Center, a University Center concerned as such with research, its very title ("for the Advancement of Peace") confirms that new practical applications of knowledge useful for improving the prospects of peace, as well as the extension of relevant basic knowledge itself, are a proper part of its business. This is obviously a very important point for a Center within the State of Israel, a State which has already shown an outstanding capacity for such practical applications both at home and in its programmes of assistance to the newer States of Africa and Asia, and to Latin America.

Bearing these principles in mind we can, I believe, already foreshadow at least five areas which invite the concern of the Truman Center, engaging the "research and activities" directed to the advancement of peace approved in the Constitution of the Center. Let me now describe these five areas, pausing occasionally to deal with possible objections affecting one or two of them. As I do so, I beg you to remember that at this stage I am talking of the areas only as *inviting* the concern of the Center. Whether, and if so when, and to what extent, the Center should *actually* enter a particular area, are questions which I will postpone until the end of this address.

II. AREAS OF CONCERN AVAILABLE FOR WORK OF THE TRUMAN CENTER

A. *Studies of the Nature and Causes of Conflict*

Insofar as it is human conflicts out of which threats and breaches of the peace immediately spring, peace research obviously embraces, as a first area, the extension of knowledge about the nature and causes of human conflict. Viewpoints thus focused on conflict themselves cover

a wide spectrum of concerns. At one extreme, answers have been sought to problems of war and aggression from the study of the behaviour of all living creatures, from the most primitive planarian worm through a fascinating range of fish, birds and other animals—a study named "ethology" by Konrad Lorenz and its other founders. At the other extreme and nearer our present interest, is study of the kinds of conflicts threatening men's *present* peace and survival, and especially conflicts between States. Among these, for example, may be the study of past but recent conflicts, comparing those which matured into war, with those where tensions were held down so that crises passed without war, in a search for indications for handling future conflicts.

There are, of course, many intermediate positions on the spectrum as to what conflicts should be studied, and how they should be studied. There have been, for example, massive open-ended computer-aided studies of all recorded human behaviour during the build-up of tensions which finally exploded into World War I, in the hope of discovering correlations decisive for peace. And there are, of course, endless studies proceeding on rather closed theses as to the causes of war, like those of geo-politics, or Marxism-Leninism. Re-examination of such theses may well yield new light today. It may well be productive of new knowledge to re-examine the Marxist-Leninist thesis, for example, that wars are essentially "imperialistic", arising from the struggle for profits between groups of capitalists and governments which subserve the interests of such groups. For it appears today that among the wars now most feared are those in which the Soviet Union is at least as likely to be opposed to the Chinese People's Republic, as it is to the United States.

B. *Studies Focused on Peaceful Fulfilment of the Needs and Aspirations of Developing States*

A second main area of concern inviting peace research surrounds the understanding and fulfilment of the needs and aspirations of developing countries. In this second area, the assumptions are that the social, political and (especially) the economic environments of human life are important determinants of behaviour, including the behaviour that tends to conflict or cooperation. Possibly decisive factors in build-up of tensions towards violence are seen in the sufferings, resentments and frustrations arising from backwardness, deprivation, misery and misfor-

tune. These conditions may, of course, as the Kerner Commission report on the causes of disorders in American cities suggests, exist even within comparatively well-endowed and organised societies. But internationally such conditions affect most of the struggling new States of Asia and Africa, including something more than half of mankind. Part of this central problem, assumedly aggravating the resultant tensions, is the ever more obvious gap between the endowments of richer and poorer States in natural resources, know-how, basic education and available capital. So that, in this second area of concern, the effort would be to reduce tensions which otherwise lead to conflict and war by seeking means of narrowing this gap, and generally, by using existing knowledge to increase the capacities of poorer States to feed, shelter, educate and assure the health and welfare of their peoples.

At this point, I must spend a few moments on certain objections which some may feel to acceptance of this development-centred area of peace research. For, if we concentrate on the violent dramas of international conflict, and see wilfulness of power and especially of Great Powers or "Imperialist" Powers as the *primum mobile* of war, we may react sharply to approaches to peace research which focus on promoting the welfare and development of the newer and weaker States. Such approaches, we may feel, insofar as they imply that causes of war are to be found in problems of smaller States, are a gross distortion of history in three respects.

First, it may be objected, the historical fact of the matter is, at any rate since the Napoleonic Wars, that the chief actors in armed conflicts have been the stronger and more advanced nations, usually the Great Powers. And even when smaller States seemed the principals, the meddling right arms of Great Powers were usually well in the picture. Second, it may be objected that these development-centered approaches, for this very reason, obviously cannot redeem the world from the threats of war which stare us in the face. And third, and consequentially, it may be thought a gross injustice to small States to imply, as the development-centered approaches may seem to do, that smaller and weaker States are responsible today for the chief dangers of war.

These are serious objections. Indeed, frontally, and as a matter of history, they are mostly unanswerable. In relation, however, to the choice of meaningful and feasible tasks for the Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, the matter may still lie rather differently. In

this context, even if the first objection is correct that the chief actors and instigators of war are Great Powers, the view may still be taken that no peace research projects can change very much the conduct of the Great Powers; or at least that any promising projects to this end have already been undertaken, whether diplomatically—for instance, in the tangle of United Nations armaments discussions—or in scholarly centers of strategic studies and the like. So that the programmers of a new Peace Research Center in 1968 might still conclude that *its* resources would be better used on other tasks than the attempt to modify war-producing behaviour of Great Powers.

They would still, of course, have to meet the second objection, namely, that development-centred peace research cannot remove the rather obvious and immediate dangers of war. There would be no answer to this *if* peace research were limited to what I have above called the negative aspect of preventing organised violence. No one, however, is entitled to lay down, or is bound to accept, such a limitation. Indeed, as I have already suggested, it is a widely accepted view (which I share) that designs for the advancement of peace must include, besides the negative tasks of averting threats of war, the positive ones of building among States patterns of mutual consideration and cooperation and integration in shared tasks of peaceful development.

From this standpoint, the fact that efforts may falter for disarmament or arms control, for example, increases rather than otherwise the importance for peace of such programmes as "atoms for peace", technical assistance and development programmes generally, including the many efforts of the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations, and regional efforts like the Australian-sponsored Colombo Plan or more highly structured welfare functions of the European Communities. Such activities for peace temper the daily obsession with military stalemates. They may also remind nations and their leaders that there are worthwhile tasks for peace which learning, infused with love and care for mankind, can here and now help to advance, and that mankind is still capable of love and care. The point is no less valid for peace research centers.

This answer to the second objection also disposes of the third, which was (be it recalled) that if we take development problems of smaller States as a focus of peace research, this impliedly charges them with becoming warlike, in the classical pattern of the Great Powers. The

answer is that the implication is not really there. The point of this focus of concern is merely that work for the advancement of peace includes tasks wider, more long-term, and more positive, than the immediately urgent negative tasks of preventing resort to violence. This focus rests, in particular, on reducing the objective barriers to mutual consideration, cooperation and integration, arising from the chasm which divides the affluent from the poorer States.

Insofar, then as we accept this second kind of approach to peace research, focused on problems of development, its aim would be to extend knowledge enabling the newer and weaker States, especially of Africa and Asia, to meet more fully the needs and aspirations of their peoples. And implicit in this is also the aim of minimising the destruction of values which accompanies radical change, even at its most beneficent, whether by inefficiency and conflict within States, or tension and conflicts between them. The concerns thus indicated would gravitate around rather practical tasks of scholarship and science generally, posed by the concrete situations of concrete people. They would be directed to problems of agriculture, industrialisation, urbanisation, modernisation, health and education, including those of psychological and economic adjustment and management, in developing countries. And of course this would engage experts from a wide range of disciplines in the social, the physical, biological, medical and environmental sciences, not to speak of Asian and African studies, and international law and organisation, in their obvious bearings on such matters. Much of it would entail, inevitably, close interdisciplinary cooperation between research workers.

C. *Enquiries Concerning Normative Standards Critical For Peaceful Change*

Problems of development for advancement of peace have, most of them, a concrete geographical location. The position of each developing nation is unique in its concreteness, and its problems are thus not to be solved merely by inquiries at large, based on the experience of human societies generally. Yet, of course, many problems deeply relevant to both conflict-orientated and development-orientated research on peace demand more general kinds of inquiries.

Some of these relate to the meaning for the present relations of

States of certain basic norms or standards, such as justice. The clarification of such norms or standards may be regarded as a *third* important area of peace research. Even if, for example, we make great progress in reducing the material gap between the developing and more developed nations (indeed in proportion as we do so) conflicts as to the meaning of international justice are likely to increase. We shall all of us, whether our States are big or small, rich or poor, have to seek clearer understanding and more consensus about what can sensibly be meant by justice among *all mankind* in a world of *sovereign states*. Incidentally to this, all States and their peoples will need to be confronted far more sharply than they yet have been, with the implications for peace of endemic resort to "double standards", not only in the context of bloc alignments with other States, but as between the respect for human rights which they demand from other peoples, and what they accord to their own peoples.

To apply one standard to oneself and one's friends, and another to States less friendly, is natural enough. It may even be an essential transitional weapon, history being what it is, for promoting peaceful change against the vested interests of the stronger and richer. Yet, clearly, it can also be a source of exacerbation of differences, and of hardening of intransigences, which might perhaps otherwise be overcome. And now that anticolonialism has swept the world free of most of the shackles of empire, we need much more study, free of both ideological bias and excessive legal formalism, of the standing and the function in a future peaceful world, of the principle of self-determination. As the Biafran struggle against the Federal Government of Nigeria shows, the relevance of that principle transcends the anti-colonialist struggle, and its dictates are by no means always self-evident.

It may be that the Chancelleries will not listen to the learned on such basic matters. But if the learned do not speak, they certainly cannot be heard; and unless they speak on the basis of close study of actual world problems, they do not deserve to be heard.

D. *Enquiries Concerning Techniques for Abatement of Tension and Conflicts*

There also cannot be too many studies, provided that they are informed by history and by recognition of the condition of our world here

and now, of available judicial, quasi-judicial, diplomatic and organisational processes for the reduction and abatement of international tensions. There is need, still, for more detailed and more objective analyses of the performance of United Nations peace-keeping instruments and techniques in various theatres of conflict, and more expert and imaginative analysis of the tangle of legal-military problems of United Nations headquarters command and operations in the field. And, generally, we may here identify as still a *fourth* cluster of concerns for peace research, the continuing review of techniques, tribunals and processes of conflict abatement and settlement, and collective means of controlling State violence. Such review, to be fruitful, must obviously proceed on the basis of the findings of history and political and social science about the actual condition of our world, as well as the more new-fangled strategic and policy studies. They, too, are likely to develop predominantly along interdisciplinary lines.

E. *The Relevance to Peace of Mankind's Ethical and Religious Experience*

It is probable, if appropriate criteria are respected, that a substantial part of the Truman Center's programme should be focused on material needs and aspirations of developing States, in supplementation of the well-known United Nations Point Four and Technical Assistance and similar programmes. This makes it the more important to add that the Center should (in my view) also find room (if it can only find the men) for a *fifth* kind of concern, centred on mankind's non-material needs and aspirations. It should assuredly try to illuminate the bearing upon international peace of men's engagements, past and present, with ethical and religious experience. Mere inspirational advocacy cannot, of course, be a function of a University Center. But a University Center where generations of students have sat at the feet of men like Martin Buber, where the testimonies of the prophets of three great religions still echo through the land, will certainly wish to see whether and how far those testimonies can be interpreted into meaningfulness for the cause of peace in the contemporary world. And by the same token, once such enquiries are entered upon, scholars of integrity will follow them without preconceptions, wherever they may lead.

For such work touching men's ethical and religious experience, the

Center would be particularly dependent on what dedication and interests it can mobilise among scholars. For this kind of research has not, in recent decades, been among the more favoured stamping grounds of younger scholars. Enquiries in these areas which really illuminate the collective paths of a generation so changeful as ours are bound in any case to be far rarer than the discoveries of science, rarer even than Nobel Prizes for science or letters or even peace. Yet, rare as they may be, and whatever their findings, the Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace should find room for them.

III. CRITERIA FOR THE PROGRAMMING OF THE TRUMAN CENTER

I have thus outlined rather broadly five proper clusters of concerns for the energies of the Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace. They are focused on (1) the nature and causes of conflicts; (2) development of human and natural resources; (3) normative standards critical for peaceful change; (4) techniques of abatement of tension and conflicts; and (5) the meaning for international peace of men's encounters with religious and ethical experience. Upon how many and which of these concerns, and at what pace, the Truman Center can engage, will depend partly on the talents and interests of its faculty as they gather on Mount Scopus, complemented by those of scholars outside the Center whose related work the Center will try to foster. But, there is also, of course, a converse dependence. For obviously, to some extent, the main outlines and directions of the Center's programme will also help to determine which scholars will be attracted to work within its framework.

The above five areas of concern, in the personal vision which I am here presenting, all merit a place in a Center for the Advancement of Peace. The critical questions which will then arise for the competent programming bodies of the Center are as to how limited financial and scholarly resources should be disposed among them; and (even more) how such resources as are available for a particular cluster of concerns will be disposed among the specific research projects offering within it. And these two questions may be interdependent. If, for example, according to proper criteria dramatically better results seem likely from concentrat-

ing from time to time upon projects in some rather than other of the five concerns, it would be sensible to concentrate efforts upon these.

The criteria for choice of areas for emphasis, and of particular projects within chosen areas, are not difficult to state, though they are certain to be often difficult to apply. The basic consideration must obviously be to prefer those projects for which, because of one factor or another, a Research Center at Jerusalem offers *particular promise of effective performance*. Among the more important of these factors would be: (1) The accumulation in Israel of scientific and technological skills and experience on particular problems, as for example with rehabilitation of arid zones, or conservation and use of water resources, or adaptation of methods of agriculture, or education, urbanisation and modernisation in relation to under-privileged populations, and populations of varied cultural inheritance; or control of various diseases; (2) The directions of experience and scholarly concern among personnel available for the tasks of the Center; (3) The existence in Israel of particularly rich documentation on certain matters (as, for instance, the historico-political problems of the Middle East, or the extreme pathologies of racial conflict and genocide, and their ethico-political implications); or of other data for the particular research project; (4) Negatively (that is, as a reason for *not* pursuing them) the extent to which particular projects are already the subject of serious scientific work of adequate range and promise in Israel or other countries or in international organisations. This, of course, would not exclude cooperation with other Centers, financial or otherwise, in particular going projects.

Even at this early stage these criteria would confirm the probability already mentioned that substantial activity at the Truman Center should be focused on urgent problems of the developing nations of Africa and Asia. The long operational experience of Israel specialists in technical assistance of all kinds among the developing States provides an excellent basis, under the first two criteria above, for new research projects. The Center has, indeed, already taken preliminary stock of a number of such projects bearing directly on the problems of development in Africa and Asia, and for which the necessary expertise is already available and eager to proceed, here in Israel, and indeed largely in Jerusalem. Some of them can be initiated even now, at the very outset of the Center's operations. The Center has, indeed, already cooperated in the first stage of a pilot project on regional development in the Middle East, in which

problems of agriculture, of land and water resources, and rehabilitation of refugees, have been canvassed together in a well attended three day seminar in Jerusalem. The main addresses of this Seminar, of March 17-19, 1968, are being rendered into English and in part into Arabic, for early publication. They may well offer some new starting-points for constructive thought in Israel, in the Arab States and elsewhere. All this is but a beginning, but it is perhaps an auspicious one, made as it is before the Center had either a building, a budget or a full-time faculty.

Perhaps it should also be added that there is no sharp line between the tasks of peaceful development in Africa and Asia, and those in the Middle East. A Center dedicated to the advancement of peace, in my opinion, must pursue its work in the firm hope that the present unhappy phase in Arab-Israel relations is a temporary one. It should certainly make efforts (in face of much scepticism if necessary) to attract to its work distinguished Arab minds willing to devote themselves, with their Israel and other colleagues, to the longer-term problems of regional development, conciliation and cooperation. This is a matter on which we ought, even against serious obstacles, to persevere in goodwill and patience, working towards the auspicious turn of events. For promotion of development for human welfare in the Middle East region is as much a foundation of peace, as it is in Africa or other parts of Asia. Such tasks are no more parochial for a Peace Center in Jerusalem, than for a Peace Center anywhere else in the world.

The application of the same criteria to projects offering in the other four areas of concern should permit early initiation of work also in some of those.

I hope that the mission of the Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, in the personal vision of it which I have presented, has avoided excess of ambition as well as excess of doubt. It is a vision of research for peace within which (I am confident) scholars of distinction and dedication may find a place to pursue their deeper interests. No single scholar nor company of scholars, however distinguished, and however penetrating and constructive their contribution, can be expected to transform quickly the anger and hate and suffering which ravages so many parts of our world. We are entitled to hope, however, that the devoted and sustained energies of such a company will make important differences, moving men at least a little nearer to the knowledge and understanding which will help them to live at peace with each other.

Let the Center then, and its broad-visioned Founders, take their guiding thought from one of the wisest of our sages. Rabbi Tarfon, it was (as we have it in the Ethics of the Fathers, II, v. 2-21), who declared to all of us in all our generations: "It is not thy duty to finish the task, but neither art thou free to desist from it". And lest any of us should take this as a licence to do less than he might, Rabbi Tarfon took care also to observe (in the verse immediately preceding): "The day is short, and the work is great and the labourers are sluggish and the reward is much, and the Master is urgent."

THE HARRY S TRUMAN CENTER FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF PEACE

The establishment of the Harry S Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace was announced on January 20, 1966 and it became formally constituted at the meeting of the Board of Governors of the Hebrew University in April 1966.

The design is for an interdisciplinary research institute within the framework of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. It is regarded as a lasting tribute to the former President of the United States, Mr. Harry S Truman, who is announcing the establishment of the Center, said:

"Here at the Center for the Advancement of Peace we will give serious consideration to any new practical approach that could help to advance the cause of peace. All will be welcome here who desire to join in our common search for the ways of peace..."

In March 1968 the Statutes of the Center were approved and on July 25, 1968 the inaugural meeting of the Board of Trustees was held in Jerusalem. The first Academic Director of the Center, Professor Julius Stone, Challis Professor of International Law and Jurisprudence at the University of Sydney, was appointed at that meeting.

In the meantime plans were completed and building begun on the Truman Center building to rise on a commanding height on Mount Scopus in Jerusalem. The building will be completed in the winter of 1969.

Members of the Board of Trustees of the Truman Center

Professor E. D. Bergmann	Mr. David Horowitz,
Professor of Organic Chemistry	Governor of the Bank of Israel,
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Jerusalem
Mr. Louis H. Boyar	Mr. Philip Klutznick
Beverly Hills, Cal.	Chicago, Illinois
Mr. Arthur Goldberg	Mr. Max M. Low
Chicago, Illinois	New York, N.Y.
Mr. Nathaniel Goldstein	Mr. Joseph Mazer
President, The American Friends	New York, N.Y.
of the Hebrew University,	Mr. David Noyes,
New York, N.Y.	Personal Adviser to Ex-President
Mr. Avraham Harman,	Harry S Truman, Los Angeles, Cal.
President	Professor Dan Patinkin
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Professor of Economics
	The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Professor N. Rotenstreich,
Rector,
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Mr. Samuel Rothberg
Chairman, The Board of Governors

of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Mr. Abraham F. Wechsler,
New York, N.Y.
Professor Z. Werblowsky
Dean of the Faculty of Humanities
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Founders of the Truman Center

Charlotte Bergman
New York, New York
Abraham Borman
Huntington Woods, Michigan
Louis H. Boyar
Beverly Hills, California
Allan Bronfman
Montreal, Canada
Yekuti'el Federmann
Haifa, Israel
Harold L. Fierman
New York, New York
George Frankel
Greenwich, Connecticut
Harry H. Frankel
New York, New York
George Friedland
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Saul Furman
New York, New York
Philip J. Goldberg
New York, New York
Dr. Philip Gotlieb
Coral Gables, Florida
Anatol M. Josepho
Santa Monica, California
Philip M. Klutznick
Chicago, Illinois
Dr. Mortimer M. Kopp
New York, New York
Stanley S. Langendorf
San Francisco, California
Joseph Levy
New York, New York
Isidore Lipschutz
New York, New York
Max M. Low
New York, New York
Joseph M. Mazer
New York, New York

Samuel M. Melton
Columbus, Ohio
Baron de Hirsch Meyer
Miami Beach, Florida
Jakob Michael
New York, New York
Joel Ostrowicz
Sao Paulo, Brazil
Oscar S. Pattiz
Beverly Hills, California
Julius Jack Rosen
Baltimore, Maryland
James Ross
Youngstown, Ohio
Mrs. Madeleine H. Russel
San Francisco, California
Samuel Rothberg
Peoria, Illinois
Baron Edmond de Rothschild
Paris, France
Emma Schaver
Southfield, Michigan
Mark S. Schulman
Beverly Hills, California
Leonard I. Shankman
New York, New York
Herbert M. Singer
New York, New York
Leon H. Sturman
Rochester, New York
Jerry M. Sudarsky
Bakersfield, California
Benjamin H. Swig
San Francisco, California
Abraham F. Wechsler
New York, New York
Ben Weingart
Los Angeles, California
William Wishnick
New York, New York