

sujet et le cheminement différent des divers segments du milieu juif montréalais. Notons que ce faisant, l'auteure nous donne aussi un portrait des alliances conclues et rompues, à travers le temps, au sein du milieu juif mais également avec les instances catholiques et protestantes, de même qu'avec le gouvernement québécois. Il s'agit en outre d'une lecture qui apporte un éclairage très intéressant sur le débat ayant cours actuellement à propos de la place de la religion à l'école. On y voit des Juifs débattre de questions semblables à celles posées à l'égard de tout le système scolaire actuellement. Le chapitre sur les mouvements hassidiques et ses différents segments évoque entre autres la croissance des effectifs scolaires au cours des années 1990, ce qui continuera de s'accroître.

Pour conclure, il s'agit d'un ouvrage intéressant pour lecteurs non familiers avec les Juifs de Montréal, traçant un portrait synthétique, à travers la question des écoles, de la diversité complexe de ce milieu. En outre le traitement de la question scolaire permet d'éclairer de façon stimulante le débat actuel sur la place de la religion à l'école. Pour les lecteurs plus familiers avec ce sujet, il apporte une approche historique globale nécessaire pour en comprendre la situation actuelle.

Jean-Luc Bédard  
Université Laval

Cotler, Irwin, ed. *Nuremberg Forty Years Later: The Struggle against Injustice in Our Time* McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995

In November, 1987, an International Human Rights Conference was held at the Faculty of Law at McGill University. It brought together some of the world's leading scholars and spokespersons in the field to discuss the state of human rights and justice in the world, but especially Canada, forty years after Nuremberg. The participants included Canadians such as Irwin Cotler, who was the prime organizer of the conference, Ramon

Hnatyshyn the Minister of Justice, Jules Deschenes, Chair of the Commission of Inquiry on War Criminals, Svend Robinson, Justice Critic for the New Democratic Party, Judge Maxwell Cohen, who chaired the Special Committee on Hate Propaganda in the 1960s, and Judge Rosalie Abella of the Provincial Court of Ontario. Non-Canadians included Elie Wiesel, Alan Dershowitz, Greville Janner, a prominent Member of Parliament from the United Kingdom, Nazi hunter Serge Klarsfeld, and Benjamin Ferencz, Chief Prosecutor at the *Einsatzgruppen* Trial. The papers and addresses at this conference form the first part of this work.

The conference had two aims. The first was to assess the legacy of Nuremberg. As Cotler stated in opening the conference, Nuremberg was a “double entendre”, being both an exhortation against injustice and the personification of racism. He was referring in the first instance to the trials of 1945-6, and in the second to the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 that framed the racist state of the Third Reich. For Wiesel, Nuremberg represented the triumph of memory. He remarked that Nuremberg’s legacy was to discern evil, resist evil, and eschew neutrality. The second aim of the conference was to assess Canada’s policy of bringing war criminals to justice, and to place this policy into the context of similar policies in other countries. This discussion was somewhat premature as the Deschenes Commission had released its findings less than two years earlier, and Canada’s policy was still in its early stage of implementation. Nevertheless, the failure of previous governments to enact legislation and the nascent policy were attacked by Robinson, Cotler, American activists Elizabeth Holtzman and Alan Ryan, and David Matas, a Canadian crusader. For the Americans, the problem lay in the process — criminalization instead of deportation. For the Canadians, it was the forty year hiatus during which war criminals lived in quietude.

The most exciting part of the conference occurred in an exchange between Dershowitz and Ron Sklar of McGill’s law school over free speech in the aftermath of the first Zundel trial.

Dershowitz upheld Zundel's right to propagate his hateful views regarding Jews and the Holocaust. Sklar countered by questioning the efficacy of exporting American principles of free speech, especially to more volatile societies.

The second part of the book is titled *The Nuremberg Legacy — Five Years Later*. In 1992, the original participants were invited back to provide updates on Human Rights developments. Two speakers, Per Ahlmark of Sweden, who spoke about the legacy of Raoul Wallenberg, and Albie Sachs of South Africa, who analyzed the post-Apartheid society, were added. Matas again assailed the government's attempt at bringing Nazi war criminals to justice. He argued that the changes to the Criminal Code, the Immigration Act, and the Citizenship Act that were invoked in the aftermath of the Deschenes Commission, were superficial. Only two people had been deported, and one of them had never lived in Canada.

This second conference took place almost a decade ago. The immediate question one asks is how valuable is this volume today? I would argue that these proceedings remain significant. They provide a window on the attention accorded to Human Rights in this period. We now lose sight of the fact that the clamour for Human Rights, despite the United Nations Declaration, was relatively low-key for four decades. In the years encompassing these proceedings, we witnessed the end of apartheid, the acceleration of war crimes investigations in Canada and the United States, and most significantly, the end of the Cold War. We also sat idly by while Yugoslavia dissolved into civil chaos and central Africa deteriorated into ethnic strife. Since then we have witnessed the Rwandan genocide, Chechnya, ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia, the Sudanese civil war, and scores of other violations of human rights. The "double entendre" of Nuremberg has not faded, and this book is a reminder for us to remain vigilant.

Franklin Bialystok  
Toronto