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BY HARRY SCHNEIDERMAN

I

THE UNITED STATES

Economic conditions in the United States during the past year were such as to compel the Jewish community to apply by far the greater part of its energies to the solution of its own domestic problems, including those of continuing the activities and, in some extreme cases, preventing the dissolution, of institutions and agencies which had been created by the community in previous years. American Jewry was prevented, therefore, from taking as active an interest in its sister communities overseas as in former years, especially insofar as material aid was concerned. And yet, harassed as they were by their own difficulties, the Jews of America maintained to a measurable extent their sense of solidarity with their brethren in other countries, to whom they extended their sympathy and such material aid as their drastically reduced means made possible. They watched with interest events affecting their brethren in many countries, especially Palestine, Poland, and Roumania and, perhaps for the first time in generations, they followed, with considerable anxiety, events in Germany which appeared to portend misfortune for the Jews of that country.

A large section of the American community followed with lively interest the proceedings of the Seventeenth Congress of the World Zionist Organization which was held at Basle, Switzerland, during the first two weeks of July 1931. American delegates to the Congress took an active part in its discussions, which were made notable by bitter criticism of the policies of the government of Great Britain and of the

*The period covered by this review is from July 1, 1931 to June 30, 1932. It is based chiefly on the dispatches of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency; the Jewish and general press and reports of many organizations have also been used as source material.
attitude, vis-a-vis these policies, of the leadership of the Zionist movement. While the American delegates did not act as a unit, the majority of them took an active part in bringing about a bloc of the general or moderate factions of the Zionist Organization which was instrumental in effecting the retirement of Dr. Chaim Weizmann and the election of Dr. Nahum Sokolow, as president of the World Zionist Organization, and the creation of a coalition Executive Committee of five members, including one American, Emanuel Neumann, of New York City. The American delegates also led the movement for securing the adoption by the Congress of a resolution recommending the establishment in all countries of private corporations to stimulate the flow of capital into all economic fields in Palestine, and the union of such organizations into a single association. An important section of American Zionists, known as the Brandeis-Mack group, had been agitating for such a plan for many years.*

The lack of unanimity of the American delegates to the Zionist Congress reflected a cleavage which existed within the Zionist Organization of America, which, since the convention of the Organization at Cleveland in July 1930, had been under the control of the so-called Brandeis-Mack group (see American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 32, page 72). A faction led by Louis Lipsky, former president of the Organization, which had virtually surrendered control to the Brandeis-Mack group, had, since that convention, become dissatisfied with the new administration, and disapproved of the stand taken by leaders of that group at the Zionist Congress. Dr. Stephen S. Wise and others came to the defense of the administration, and it appeared as if the breach in the Organization, which the public believed had been healed at the Cleveland convention, would be reopened. To prevent this, the Executive Committee appointed a committee of six with "full power to make recommendations for the selection of a national administration, that shall disregard partisan differences and aim at securing cooperation of all Zionist forces without regard to majorities or factions."

* For an account of the Congress and of meetings of the Jewish Agency, see pp. 86–92 post.
At the 34th Annual Convention of the Organization held on November 8–10, 1931, this committee presented a coalition slate, and a program for work for the ensuing year, combining the views of the principal groups of the Organization, both of which were accepted. The program urged the development of activities in six principal directions, namely, 1) the extension of Zionist propaganda among Jews and non-Jews; 2) work for the Jewish National Fund upon the largest and widest scale; 3) strengthening of the Keren Hayesod, or Foundation Fund; 4) the acceleration of the economic absorptive capacity of Palestine, by the stimulation of the investment of private capital and the immigration of small capitalists; 5) the formation of Zionist youth groups and the development of a national Jewish youth movement in America; and, 6) the encouragement of all manifestations of the Hebraic spirit in America. With the acceptance of changes in the personnel of the leadership and the foregoing program harmony was restored within the Organization, making possible a united effort to gather the funds required for its work as well as for the even more important development of the Jewish settlement in Palestine.

It will be recalled that, in January 1931, the American Palestine Campaign of the Jewish Agency for Palestine had been launched with $2,500,000 as the objective for the year. At the Convention of the Zionist Organization in November, announcement was made that a little over $1,000,000 had actually been raised. This, however, does not represent the total contributed by American Jewry for Palestine work, as separate appeals had been made on behalf of the Keren Hayesod, the Jewish National Fund, and Hadassah. On January 17, 1932, a new drive for $2,500,000 was opened at a meeting in New York City, of leading Zionists and non-Zionists, and in March another meeting inaugurated the local campaign for $1,000,000, New York's quota. Other communities throughout the country did likewise. Much impetus was given to these campaigns by the presence in the United States of Dr. Nahum Sokolow, the newly-elected President of the World Zionist Organization, who toured the country and addressed numerous meetings.

Late in June 1932, at a dinner marking the close of the
New York Campaign, announcement was made that a total of $609,293 had been raised throughout the country by the American Palestine Campaign and affiliated bodies; over $196,000 of this had been secured by Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization. A comparison of the amount raised in the first half of 1932 with that gathered during the same period in 1931 which was close to $1,000,000 parallels the downward trend in business conditions in the United States.

In spite of the great difficulty in raising funds, however, the various societies interested in promoting one or another phase of Zionist work or Palestine development did not succumb to apathy and inaction but continued their chosen tasks as well as they could with the reduced means at their disposal. Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization, was very active during the year. Undaunted by the unfavorable conditions, its chapters in many cities strove energetically to raise the budget of $350,000 set by the annual convention in November, 1931. Toward the end of April 1932, Dr. Haim Yassky, the director of the Hadassah medical service in Palestine, visited the United States to make a six months study of public health and hospital administration here. What was probably an unusually favorable result was achieved by the Jewish National Fund. A report of that agency for the six months from October 1, 1931 to April 1, 1932, showed a total collected of $162,525, compared with almost $200,000 for the same period a year before. In January, 1932, at a dinner in New York City in celebration of the thirtieth anniversary of the Jewish National Fund, it was reported that during the three decades American Jews had contributed five of the sixteen million dollars paid into the Fund, which had been used to purchase 320,000 dunams (about 74,000 acres) of land in Palestine for the Jewish people.

In February 1932, a new project was initiated at a meeting held in New York City, in connection with the celebration of the bicentenary of the birth of George Washington, when it was decided to set up a national committee of Jews and non-Jews to sponsor the collection of special contributions for the purpose of establishing a Washington Forest in Palestine on land of the Jewish National Fund.

Non-Jews continued to show a lively interest in Palestine
matters. During the Seventeenth Zionist Congress in July 1931, the Pro-Palestine Federation of Chicago, which had come into existence in the preceding January, sent a cablegram of greeting to the Congress "in the name of the multitude of non-Jewish American sympathizers and sponsors of Jewish Palestine". Shortly thereafter the Federation announced that it comprised eight groups in as many cities, with more than 700 individual members, and that it was about to initiate a campaign for additional members.

The most important step thus far in organizing non-Jewish sympathizers with Jewish aspirations as regards Palestine was the dinner held in Washington, D. C., on January 18, 1932, attended by eighty guests, including Vice-President Curtis, members of the Cabinet, Senators and Representatives. Following a presentation by Dr. Felix Frankfurter, Professor at the Law School of Harvard University, of the Palestine situation with special reference to its international political aspects, and addresses by Emanuel Neumann, American member of the World Zionist Executive, and Dr. Elwood Mead, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, the guests decided to organize an "American Palestine Committee for the furtherance of the restoration of Palestine as the Jewish National Homeland, and the dissemination of accurate information as to the progress of the upbuilding work in the Holy Land."

Though Palestine occupied the chief place in the interest of American Jewry in overseas communities, the situation of Jews in other countries was not ignored. Thus, for a few weeks in November and December 1931, our community was stirred by a series of anti-Jewish outbreaks in Poland, which, starting at the University of Cracow, spread to other universities, and even beyond the bounds of these institutions. The news reports led many to form the opinion that these disorders would not have spread as far and as rapidly as they did if the Polish authorities had made more rigorous efforts to localize them in the beginning, and charges of weakness and vacillation against the Polish government were made by sections of the Jewish press and by a number of organizations. The Federation of Polish Jews in America convened a massmeeting in New York
City which adopted resolutions of protest. This was followed by a larger meeting called by the American Jewish Congress. By this time, information had been received which indicated that the Polish authorities had not been as remiss as had at first been believed. Although one non-Jewish speaker suggested that the United States Government make representations to the Government of Poland, the Jewish speakers at the Congress massmeeting disclaimed holding the Polish Government responsible for the outrages, and laid the blame at the door of chauvinistic elements.

The Union of Orthodox Rabbis which was then holding a convention in Cincinnati sent an appeal to President Hoover to help the Jews of Poland, and a protest to the Ambassador of Poland in Washington. The B'nai B'rith also communicated with the Ambassador, as did the American Jewish Committee, and a letter of protest was sent to him also by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

In the meantime, Dr. Joseph Tenenbaum, chairman of the Committee on Good-Will between Poles and Jews in America, resigned from that Committee, which was subsequently completely dissolved by the withdrawal of all the other Jewish members, on the ground that the Polish Government, despite pledges to do so, had done nothing to improve the condition of the Jews of Poland.

A great deal of attention to the Polish-Jewish problem was given in the report of the Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee submitted at the twenty-fifth annual meeting of that body on December 6, 1931. The report disclosed that the secretary of the Committee had had conversations on the subject with Polish representatives in the United States, and, at their request, with Polish statesmen abroad; when in Warsaw, in the summer of 1931, he had submitted a statement of the complaints of the Jewish population, supported by specific data. (For complete statement, see Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee, in this volume).

Interest in Jewish affairs in Roumania was not as keen during the period under review as during the preceding
twelvemonth. The United Roumanian Jews of America was greatly aroused by the report of the brutal shooting by Roumanian frontier guards, of six Jewish young people who were attempting to cross the Dniester into Russia, at Soroca, and the organization sent an inquiry regarding the matter to the Roumanian Legation. Later, the organization published a statement alleging, on the basis of reports of an investigation conducted at its request, that the shooting was a pre-arranged cold-blooded atrocity and that the Government had failed to make a thorough and impartial investigation. Subsequently a delegation of the organization called upon Mr. C. A. Davila, the Roumanian Minister to the United States, who stated that the Government had promised a new investigation of the affair. At the twenty-third annual convention of the organization on January 10, 1932, a resolution was adopted expressing alarm at the resumption of anti-Jewish agitation by so-called patriotic organizations in Roumania.

The interest of American Jews in Germany, which was greatly increased because of the tremendous vote polled by the National Socialists in the Reichstag elections in September 1930, became even more intense because of events during the period under review. Almost in the beginning of this period, what has been described by reliable observers as one of the worst street attacks by National Socialists against Jews, took place. This occurred in Berlin, on September 12, 1931, Rosh Ha-Shanah, just as worshippers were leaving the synagogues. This event filled Jewish circles in America with alarm, and subsequent occurrences were watched with deep concern.

Interest reached a high pitch during the campaign which included the two elections for president of the Reich on March 13 and April 10, 1932. The re-election of Marshal von Hindenburg was greeted with satisfaction not only by American Jews but by Americans generally. The press hailed the outcome as a triumph of sanity and common sense. As one newspaper put it, “the froth and fury of Adolf Hitler and his Fascists have not prevailed against German democracy.” Another editor declared that a Fascist victory “would have been a major catastrophe,”
spelling ruin for Germany and confusion piled on confusion for Europe in general. The press did not, however, believe that Hindenburg’s election had obliterated the menace of the Hitler movement. The large vote he polled and the remarkable response of German youth to his appeal, indicate, according to the view of the press, that Hitlerism is a continuing peril, and a power in German public life which has to be reckoned with. The indecisive outcome of the election of deputies to the Prussian Landtag was a source of satisfaction to the press, although the fact that Hitler obtained 35% of the popular vote was regarded as ominous. That it boded ill for the Jews of Prussia was soon shown by the passage by the Landtag of an infamous measure demanding that the Government introduce a bill providing for the confiscation of all the property of east European Jews who had entered Germany since August 1, 1914, the date of the outbreak of the World War. This measure was an attempt to implement one of the anti-Jewish planks of the National Socialist program. Although it could not be enacted into law without the consent of the Prussian Government, which was still in control of democratic elements, the fact that such an outrageous proposal could be passed by a parliamentary body in a civilized country was a violent shock to American Jewry. The fall of the liberal coalition cabinet of Social Democrats and Centrists, and the accession to power of a reactionary government was also regarded with misgiving in Jewish circles in America.

Much publicity was given, during the past year, to the organization of Hitler groups in this country. In general, the American press regarded the movement with good-humored tolerance, but The New York World-Telegram condemned it an un-American growth. The object of this movement, this newspaper pointed out “is to gather German citizens into a group to help Hitler get hold of the Vaterland and start, as one of his major programs, the persecution, banishment, and even annihilation of the Jews in Germany.” America should not be allowed to become “the battleground of European factions with such vicious objects as the Hitlerites profess to have,” the editorial writer concluded. The New Yorker Staatszeitung also condemned the Hitler movement in America, in commenting upon a meeting of National
Socialists held in New York City in April, at which inciting anti-Jewish speeches were made.

During the year, *Vorposten*, the German-language organ of the Nazis in America, suspended publication, but in June a new organ, *The American Guard*, appeared in Boston. This monthly publication, unlike *Vorposten*, is printed in English and is, therefore, much more dangerous. The stated purpose of the *American Guard* is “To maintain, defend, and advance American ideals, Aryan Concepts and Culture; to further the cause of National Unity and Justice.” The contents of this paper were exclusively anti-Jewish and, in large part, a translation of articles from the German Hitlerite press. The editorial policy clearly aims at creating the impression that Jews have a dual loyalty and cannot whole-heartedly be citizens of the countries in which they live.

Events affecting scattered Jewish communities in Mexico, Cuba, Guatemala, and one or two other Latin-American countries also attracted some of the attention of American Jews. But in spite of a general apathy resulting from the reduced ability of America Jewry to be of help, the wretched situation of the Jewish communities of Poland, Roumania, and other European countries was not altogether lost sight of, and the national as well as the local leaders of the Joint Distribution Committee strove to gather funds to alleviate this situation. Campaigns were held in many cities throughout the country. On March 27, 1932, a meeting of the National Council of the Joint Distribution Committee was held in New York City, attended by three hundred delegates from all over the country. One of the sessions of the convention was made the occasion for memorial exercises in honor of Julius Rosenwald of Chicago who had died in Chicago on January 6, 1932. The national Committee pledged itself to continue the work of rehabilitation begun shortly after the outbreak of the World War. Up to the time these lines are being written, no reports had been made regarding the results of the efforts of the Joint Distribution Committee to raise funds for this work.

The European situation was a subject of discussion at
many meetings called by the American Jewish Congress in
New York City, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Baltimore, and
Washington. At a convention in Philadelphia in October
1931, the convening of a world Jewish congress was proposed
as the only adequate forum for the presentation of Jewish
problems. Previously, at a conference called by the Amer-
ican Jewish Congress and held in Basle in July 1931, the
idea of convening a world Jewish congress had been
discussed, and a committee had been appointed to arrange
an international conference at Geneva in the summer of
1932 to consider the advisability of such a congress. The
only American organization represented at this conference
was the American Jewish Congress, to which was confided
the task of arousing interest in the plan in the United States.
In June 1932, from statements published in the press by the
American Jewish Committee and the American Jewish
Congress, it transpired that the Congress, although com-
mitted to the Geneva conference, had invited the Committee
to discuss the idea and that the representatives of the
Committee had opposed it and had endeavored to persuade
the Congress to abandon its plan. A meeting of the two
groups had taken place on June 2. On the following day,
Dr. Stephen S. Wise, honorary president of the American
Jewish Congress, who had not been present, in an interview
with newspapermen, violently attacked those who opposed
the international conference, and although he did not refer
by name to the American Jewish Committee, it was clear
from his remarks that they were aimed at that organization
and its leaders. This was deemed a breach of faith by
Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of the American Jewish Com-
mittee, who thereupon issued a statement setting forth the
views of the Committee on the subject and stating that
in view of the attack of Dr. Wise, the American Jewish
Committee “will not waste its time upon further attempts
at so-called co-operation with organizations whose principal
concern seems to be their own prestige.” (This referred to
the modus vivendi between the two bodies which had been
arrived at early in 1930.) The reply of the American Jewish
Congress to this statement evoked an unpleasant contro-
versy in the Jewish press and in Jewish organizations, which
gave clear indication of the existence of considerable opposi-
tion to the planned international conference and congress, yet at the convention of the American Jewish Congress held at Washington, D. C., late in June, the subject was not reopened for discussion on the ground that it had already been decided at a previous convention, and delegates were elected to represent the American Jewish Congress in Geneva.

By several organs of the Jewish press, this discussion was regarded as indicative of an undesirable division in Jewish community leadership. Complaints of this tenor had been voiced earlier in the year when, in connection with incidents which appeared to require representations by Jewish organizations, action had been taken independently by a number of organizations, principally the B'nai B'rith, the Committee, and the Congress. From some quarters came the suggestion for the federation of all important national causes into one central Jewish agency; from other quarters came the suggestion that a national council for planning the functions of the organizations to prevent duplication, overlapping, and working at cross purposes, was sorely needed.

At the twentieth annual convention held at Atlantic City, N. J., in May 1932, of the United Synagogue of America, a resolution was adopted requesting the Executive Council to effect a united policy of all Jewish organizations interested in combating anti-Semitism in America and abroad. In June, the Executive Council of the Rabbinical Assembly of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America adopted a resolution stating that as a world Jewish congress, without the cooperation of all important groups, would be ill-advised, and inaction may be fraught with dangerous consequences, the American Jewish Committee, the Congress, the B'nai B'rith, and other national organizations be urged to meet and discuss the advisability of a world conference of community leaders, in order that a united program of action be planned and carried into effect.

Discussion along these lines had also been stimulated by a suggestion made in February 1932, by Judge Horace Stern of Philadelphia at the semi-annual meeting of the Executive Board of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Judge Stern's suggestion, briefly stated, was that
in each congregation the members be divided into groups each of which is to interest itself in a special aspect of Jewish community life. Judge Stern divided this into eight principal functions, namely, 1) local charity, 2) national charity, 3) national educational institutions, 4) national institutions engaged in religious training, 5) foreign relief work, 6) Palestine endeavor, 7) protection of Jewish rights at home and a broad, and 8) the problems of local education.

The special groups in each congregation "would be required to specialize in their respective subjects. They would have meetings and discussions, invite to address and inform them those most qualified in such subjects: they would also do such clinical work as the nature of the subject made possible. In turn they would instruct the public generally in behalf of the causes in which they would thus be interested; they would labor for such causes by arousing public interest therein."

In the opinion of the author of the plan, its effectuation would restore the synagogue to its former position as the center of all Jewish communal effort, thus making the synagogue a more vital institution. A modification of this plan for bringing about communal unity was brought forward by Dr. H. L. Lurie, Director of the Bureau of Jewish Social Research in New York City, who, while recognizing the value of broadening the base of popular support of Jewish social work which Judge Stern's plan would make possible, expressed the view that such congregational organizations "should supplement, rather than replace, the developing centralized community efforts which are represented today in federations of Jewish charities and Jewish welfare funds." Dr. Lurie pointed out that this form of organization would "enlist the participation not only of the varied congregational groups but of unaffiliated Jewish groups and of other interests which may not naturally function through synagogues."

Added interest in both plans was aroused because they appeared to aim at a more dependable and steady income for national Jewish agencies, and the need for such an income, derived on a broad basis from a larger number of
individuals, was being felt very keenly by many of these agencies.

This need, insofar as religious institutions were concerned, had been voiced by Rabbi Nachman H. Ebin, president of the Rabbinical Association of the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, at the annual convention of the Association in August. "We must come to the conclusion," said Rabbi Ebin, "that the sudden crisis that has come about in our religious life is, in a great measure, due to the fact that we built our institutions on unsound foundations. We relied largely upon the support of individuals while the masses were overlooked." Rabbi Ebin pointed to centralization also as a solution of existing problems, and advocated the merging of small yeshiboth and synagogues.

That economic depression made necessary the limitation of the number of rabbis, owing to the larger classes being graduated by the seminaries and the cessation of the organization of new congregations, was the suggestion which Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal, then president of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, advanced in his address to a convention of that body in July 1931. Such limitation could be brought about, Rabbi Levinthal believed, by increasing the rabbinical course by at least one year, and by requiring graduates to serve for one year as assistants to more mature ministers. The creation of an emergency fund to aid graduates of the Jewish Theological Seminary who are unable to secure pulpits was decided upon by the Rabbinical Assembly at its succeeding Convention in May 1932. The fund is to be created by a tax on the annual incomes of the members of the Assembly.

Despite the depression, however, the various central religious bodies were very active. Resolved to combat the "religious depression," the Union of American Hebrew Congregations conducted conferences in various parts of the country, went on organizing its member congregations into regional unions, and promoted closer association between the Jews in cities having organized congregations and small scattered settlements of Jews in the vicinity of such cities. The United Synagogue of America also held regional meetings and took other steps to maintain and stimulate the interest of its members, and to increase the
influence of the organization. At its annual convention in May 1932, the organization's director, Rabbi Samuel M. Cohen, reported that the income for the preceding year had not only been sufficient for the current expenditures but also had made possible a reduction of the deficit carried forward from previous years. The United Synagogue had also gained the adherence of forty-three additional congregations, and two new regional branches had been organized, one for the Pacific coast and the other for the New England States.

In the struggle for survival, as it were, of Jewish communal agencies, those devoting themselves to Jewish education appeared to be among the most acute sufferers. In a report submitted in October 1931, to the National Conference of Jewish Social Service, Dr. Alexander M. Dushkin, Executive Director of the Joint Board of Education of Chicago, stated that these agencies had been compelled to reduce their budgets drastically, and that those which are not affiliated with a welfare fund or a federation were in a wretched plight—teachers' salaries remained unpaid, schools were being shut down by caretakers whose wages were in arrears, teachers' strikes had broken out, and some schools had to close their doors, many temporarily and some permanently.

In September 1931, it was reported that the Hebrew Theological College of Chicago, was faced with the possibility of being compelled to close its doors to its enrollment of 400 students. In November a special committee was organized to devise ways and means for keeping the institution open. In New York, the Yeshivah College was compelled to publish urgent appeals for aid several times during the year.

The Jewish community was shocked when, on June 6, 1932, at the eighth annual commencement exercises of the Hebrew Union College School for Teachers, in New York City, Dr. Julian Morgenstern, president of the Hebrew Union Colleges, announced that the school was to be discontinued because of lack of funds. The school, which trained young men and women for teaching in religious schools of Reform congregations, had been in operation for nine years, during which time it had graduated 176 students and had had an aggregate enrollment of over 2,000 in its classes.
That the Jews of the United States spend over $6,000,000 annually for Jewish education was one of the statements made by Albert B. Schoolman, president of the National Council for Jewish Education, at a joint meeting of the Council with the National Conference of Jewish Social Service, held in Philadelphia, in May 1932. After calling attention to the progress that had been made during the past twenty years, by a handful of Jewish educators, in organizing a modern system of Jewish education, Mr. Schoolman gave credit to the federations and social workers for helping to provide a great part of the support for this system and pleaded for the continuance of this support. Discussing the relationship of the organized community to Jewish education, at the same meeting, Samuel A. Goldsmith, Executive Director of the Jewish Charities of Chicago pointed out that Jewish educational activities must be limited by the amount of money available, and that during the present crisis, the communities cannot be expected to plan for providing a Jewish education for all Jewish children who may require it.

The pinch of poverty was felt also by the strictly charitable institutions. In the face of increasing demands upon their services, their incomes suffered drastic reductions. They were therefore compelled to restrict their ministrations to those suffering from the greatest want, and to suspend, in most cases, such constructive tasks as they had assumed in years of plenty. According to figures made public in December 1931, by the Bureau of Jewish Social Research, the number of families receiving aid from thirty Jewish agencies in various parts of the country was 42.8% greater during the first nine months of 1931 than during the same period in 1930. In Baltimore, according to a statement published in October 1931, there had been an increase of 77% in the number of families applying for aid to the Associated Jewish Charities. In Minneapolis, the increase was reported to be 100% for the first eight months of 1931 as compared with the same period in 1930. In St. Louis, the Jewish Family Bureau was unable to accept relief applications for a period of ten days, the first time in the history of the organization that such a step was necessary.
Even orphanages were faced with the necessity of making budget reductions which, it was feared, might affect the health of their wards. In May 1932, the Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society announced that during the first four months of the year it had served 15,495 free meals, and had provided 15,463 nights of shelter to needy men, women and children. In January and February alone, the number of meals served equalled the total for the whole of 1930. The unprecedented economic conditions were reflected also in the reports of hospitals which were compelled, in spite of reduced revenues, to give free care to a far greater number of patients than ever before.

That these conditions demand a revaluation of our community activities and a consolidation of community resources was the opinion expressed by Morris D. Waldman, secretary of the American Jewish Committee, in an address before the National Conference of Jewish Social Service in May 1932.

"We shall have to reflect," said Mr. Waldman, "upon our huge investments in synagogues and temples, in hospitals and child-caring institutions, in homes for the aged and in community centers. We shall have to face courageously the appalling maintenance cost of our half-empty houses of worship and boldly determine to consolidate many of them. We shall be impelled to consider whether five or six large rabbinical seminaries and institutions of higher learning need be supported to furnish spiritual leadership for a prospectively diminished number of synagogues among which there prevail only two fundamental differences of theology, and whether, by a consolidation into two institutions both Jewish scholarship and the prophetic spirit may not be enhanced at less than one-half the cost. We shall similarly have to reconsider fearlessly and wisely the general policies and programs of our philanthropic structures. We shall have to submit to curtailment in many of the activities, which during the past decade or two of bursting financial surpluses, have been encrusted with luxurious refinements and embellishments. We shall have to go even further and determine what organizations shall have to be scrapped, what others merged, and still what others shall be turned over to the state, county or municipality."

Mr. Waldman also expressed the views that the care of
dependents is the duty of the State, that with the cessation of immigration there is diminishing logic for specifically Jewish material relief organizations, and that the "only valid basis of Jewish community organization is the preservation and promotion of the essentially Jewish values.”

Though money stringency slowed down, it did not altogether stop, the communal machinery. The leaders of the various religious, educational and charitable agencies realized that they must be kept functioning and be prepared to resume their normal services when the crisis is past. The importance of maintaining the Jewish educational institutions was especially appreciated, and in many parts of the country efforts to extend existing educational services were made. Thus, in October 1931, the foundation of an Academy for Jewish Adult Education which will teach the New Testament as well as the Old, according to the methods of the “higher criticism” was announced by the Congregation Beth Elohim of Brooklyn. In Atlanta, a similar agency, called the Institute for Jewish Studies, was established in November by the Congregation Ahavath Achim. In December, representatives of 75 Jewish organizations of Wisconsin met in Madison and agreed upon a state-wide campaign to revive interest in Jewish culture, history and religion among the Jewish youth. And in March 1932 the Board of Jewish Ministers of Northern California and the Pacific Coast Region of the United Synagogue of America determined to supply correspondence courses in Jewish subjects to boys and girls in California's rural districts where there are no synagogues or religious schools. In Washington, D. C., a Society for the Advancement of Jewish Studies was organized to stimulate interest of adult Jews in Jewish history and culture. In New York, representatives of 200 congregations met in December 1931, and decided to establish "a nation-wide organization . . . to help build a stronger and more widely effective system of Jewish education from the elementary Talmud Torah to the culminating extensive work of the Yeshiva and the Yeshiva College.” In June 1932, at another convention of Orthodox congregations, a permanent federation of Orthodox Congregations of the United States and Canada was established.
Another forward move in community organization was made possible by the New York State Board of Regents which granted the Training School for Jewish Social Work a permanent charter, as the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work, investing it with power to grant master and doctoral degrees in social service. It was said that the School was the first institution authorized to offer such degrees.

In connection with Kashruth, it will be recalled that in May 1931 the Mayor of New York City appointed a Committee to draft regulations for the better enforcement of the State Kosher law. In January 1932, this Committee submitted its report, recommending that the enforcement of the law be transferred from the Department of Public Markets to the Department of Health, and that all dealers in, and producers of, kosher food products be licensed, subject to certificates by a general Kashruth Board of rabbis and laymen to be chartered by the State and to be entrusted with jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the supervision of Kashruth. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that in a statement issued in October 1931 by the Mayor’s Committee, the assertion was made that kosher food products consumed in New York City annually have a value of about $200,000,000.

In Newark, N. J., a Judge of the Supreme Court of the State upheld in September 1931, the right of the municipal authorities to prevent misrepresentation of non-kosher food products as kosher. This right was questioned by the Va'ad Ha-Kashruth which argued that such supervision was contrary to the principle of the separation of church and state. Following the passage, in June 1931, of a kosher law by the Legislature of California, representatives of orthodox congregations of San Francisco and Oakland organized a Va'ad Ha-Kashruth to assist in the administration of the new law.

Several interesting events in the field of Jewish culture are noteworthy. In August 1931, the Jewish Braille Institute of America began the publication of the *Jewish Braille Review*, a monthly magazine intended for free distribution among Jewish blind in English speaking countries. In
November, *The Current Jewish Record*, a new monthly magazine, containing articles and other features culled from periodicals of all kinds, came into existence in New York City. This was followed, in December, by a new weekly called *Opinion*. In January, the *American Hebrew* acquired *The Jewish Tribune* which had suspended publication in April, 1931. The *Jewish Herald*, a new monthly publication, made its appearance in Pittsburgh in April 1932. *Unser Folk*, a new Yiddish weekly made its appearance in New York City in September 1931. The fiftieth anniversary of the beginning of mass Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe and of the establishment of the Yiddish press in America was celebrated in April 1932 at a Jewish press jubilee banquet in New York City. A fund to aid unemployed and disabled Jewish writers and for the publication of a history of the fifty year period was set up.

When the Yiddish theatrical season opened in September 1931, performances were offered in twelve theatres in New York City, and ten in other cities.

Among significant Jewish books published during the year were "Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash," a translation by the late Prof. Max L. Margolis, of the standard work of Hermann L. Strack, the famous German Hebraist; this was brought out by the Jewish Publication Society of America, which issued also "Legends of Palestine," a translation with additions and rearrangements, of the Hebrew work, "Agudat Erez Yisrael" by Zev Vilnay, which appeared in London in 1929. In November 1931, Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, announced the publication of the first part of "The Book of Joshua in Greek," by Prof. Max L. Margolis, who had spent twenty years on the work. Finding it impossible to secure an accurate text, Dr. Margolis had written one himself, a facsimile of it appearing in the book. The book was issued under the auspices of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation.

In the spring of 1932, "The Arena" the third volume of the autobiography of Shmarya Levin, Russian revolutionist and Zionist leader, was published; like the first two volumes this was translated from the Yiddish by Maurice Samuel. Another important spring publication by the Hebrew Union
College, was “Text and Studies in Jewish History and Literature,” by Jacob Mann, Professor of Jewish history and literature at the College.

Other significant publications were “As a Jew Sees Jesus” by Rabbi Ernest A. Trattner; “The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth” by Dr. Max Radin, professor of law at the University of California; “Josephus on Jesus,” by Dr. Solomon Zeitlin, professor in charge of the Rabbinical Department of the Dropsie College; “The Jew and His Neighbor,” a Christian study of anti-Semitism, by James Parkes; “The Third Wall of Jerusalem,” a description of archaeological excavations carried on in the vicinity of Jerusalem by the authors, E. L. Sukenik and L. A. Mayer; “A Rabbi Takes Stock,” by Rabbi Solomon Goldman; “The Prophetic Poetry of Isaiah,” by Dr. William Popper, professor of the department of Semitics at the University of California; and “The Memoirs of Glueckel of Hamelin,” a translation by Marvin Lowenthal of the famous German journals of a pious Jewish wife and mother of the second half of the seventeenth century.

In connection with Bible reading and instruction in public schools, a significant event was the dismissal in October 1931 by the Supreme Court of the United States, for want of substantial Federal question involved, of the appeal of a group of citizens of Washington from the decision of the State Supreme Court denying to issue a writ of mandamus to compel the State Board of Education to provide for Bible reading and instruction in the public schools of the State. In September, the Board of Education of Omaha directed the superintendent of schools to “incorporate in the course of study in ethics such passages from the Bible as are deemed appropriate.” Later announcement was made that the Biblical stories to be taught in the schools would be chosen by a Jewish, a Christian Scientist, and Protestant, teacher; but Jews were not represented on the Committee appointed to select the Biblical passages to be taught.

In last year’s review, we recorded the fact that, in New York City, an Interfaith Committee, a group of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, had secured in June 1931, a ruling from the State Board of Regents to the effect that an after-school course in Bible study for High School students may,
under certain conditions, be approved for credit. (See Vol. 33, pp. 50–51). In January 1932, the New York Board of Jewish Ministers voted in disapproval of this action.

There were signs of a revival, during the period under review, of efforts to have the study of Shakespeare's "Merchant of Venice" barred from elementary public schools. In November 1931, the anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith announced that, during the past ten years, twenty-six cities in twenty-one states had taken this action, and that very few school systems in the country retain this play in their curricula. In December, the play was removed from the course of study of the public schools of Buffalo, N. Y., and of Manchester, N. H.; subsequently, the same action was taken in Grand Forks, N. D., Rochester, N. Y., and Terre Haute, Ind. In most cases, removal of the text was ordered by the superintendent of schools upon representations of a rabbi or a lay leader of the local Jewish community. The procedure was different in Syracuse, N. Y., where there is a local Good Will Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. In July 1913, this Committee submitted a petition to the Board of Education that the play be removed from the list of required reading in the High Schools, because of "the unfair and malicious conception of Jews induced by a reading of Shakespeare's description of Shylock." The petition was granted.

The movement for fostering goodwill between Jews and Christians, inaugurated some years ago by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in cooperation with the National Conference of Jews and Christians, was actively promoted during the year by means of seminars, round table discussions, joint religious services, and other methods which experience had shown to be effective. Nationwide attention was attracted to this movement by a Jewish-Christian Conference which took place in Washington, D. C., early in March 1932, under the auspices of the National Conference, the co-chairmen of which are Newton D. Baker, former Cabinet member, Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia University, and Roger W. Straus. Addresses were delivered by the Rev. James Freeman, Bishop of Washington; the Rev. Dr. Francis J. Haas, Director of the
National Catholic School of Social Service, the Rev. Dr. Abram Simon, Rabbi of the Washington Hebrew Congregation; Dr. Cyrus Adler; Rev. Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Alfred M. Cohen, President of B’nai B’rith, the three chairmen, and others. Many of these addresses were broadcast over extensive hook-ups of radio stations.

A message urging the "cultivation of understanding, appreciation, and good-will toward the Jewish people to whom we owe so much," to be read in Protestant churches on Christmas day, was published in December 1931, by the North American Committee on Christian Approach to the Jew. In January, official representatives of the Young Men’s Christian Association, the Newman Club (Catholic), and the Menorah Society, all of New York University, formed an Inter-Faith Council; similar bodies now exist in a number of colleges and universities throughout the country. In June, a Fellowship of Faiths was organized in Detroit, and a massmeeting called by it was attended by a large audience; addresses were delivered not only by Catholics, Jews, and Protestants, but also by Buddhists and Moslems.

A subject which frequently came up for discussion at goodwill seminars was the widespread practice on the part of employers, especially in industrial centers, to refuse employment to Jews, without regard to their fitness or ability. Owing no doubt to the intensified struggle for existence of the past several years, this practice has come to affect a far greater number of Jewish employment seekers, with the result that it has now come to be recognized by communal leaders and organizations as a problem of tremendous seriousness. The subject was discussed at a number of public meetings of Jewish organizations. It was analyzed from the viewpoints of the economist and the professional social worker in an address delivered in May 1932 at the convention of the National Conference of Jewish Social Work by Dr. I. M. Rubinow, secretary of the National Conference on Jewish Employment which was organized in the winter of 1930–31. This organization, it transpired
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during the year, had been unable to embark upon its pro-
gram because of lack of funds. Steps to study the mani-
festations of the evil had been taken in several communities.
In New York City, the American Jewish Congress has had
a special committee at work for several years, and the
Emanu-El Federated Employment Service has also been
dealing with it. In November 1931, as a result of a study
under the auspices of the Council of Jewish Women and the
Jewish Family Welfare Association of Minneapolis, a num-
ber of Jewish organizations in that city determined to expand
the functions of an existing employment bureau for Jews
so as to include an effort to deal with the problem of anti-
Jewish discrimination. In December, an employment bureau
for this specific purpose was set up in Los Angeles by the
B’nai B’rith Lodge and the Jewish Social Service Bureau.
In April 1932, a Committee on Unjust Discrimination
Against Jews Seeking Employment was established in Chi-
cago. The program of this Committee is interesting because
it reflects the most salient elements which underlie efforts
to cope with the employment discrimination evil. The Com-
mittee, of which Sigmund Livingston is chairman, set itself
a five-fold task, namely, (1) to make a survey of cases of
discrimination; (2) to cooperate with existing employment
agencies in discouraging such discrimination; (3) to educate
offending employers as to the unfairness of the practice,
with a view to persuading them to desist; (4) to discourage
individual volunteers who may wish to attempt corrective
measures; and (5) to prevent and discourage all false rumors
of unjust discrimination against any employer.

The vexatious question of the limitation of the enrollment
of Jews in medical schools was also widely discussed during
the year. That there is a fundamental difference of approach
toward this problem among American Jews was evidenced
by the fact that, at a convention of the American Jewish
Congress in October 1931, that organization reached the
conclusion that solution of this problem lies in the establish-
ment of a medical school primarily for Jewish students,
whereas at the Annual Meeting of the American Jewish
Committee, held in December, the Executive Committee
of that body expressed the opinion that in view of the over-
crowded condition of the medical profession the solution
lies rather in better vocational guidance for Jewish young men and women wishing to embark on a professional career. (See Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee in this volume). Both of these attitudes found their adherents in the community. At the convention of the National Conference of Jewish Social Service in May, 1932, there was a discussion of the question which was led by Dr. Israel Strauss of New York City who upheld the establishment of a medical school for Jews, and by James Marshall of New York City, a member of the Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee, who opposed it.

Besides these two continuing manifestations of an anti-Jewish attitude, other sporadic incidents also gave rise to discussion during the year. For the most part, these were the kind of incidents which have long been familiar to the Jewish community, and most of them aroused only local comment. Several unusually significant episodes deserve brief mention. In September, when an applicant for admission to Lasell Seminary for girls in Boston, was rejected, she was told: "The Jewish quota has already been filled." Investigation disclosed the existence in that school of a three per cent quota for Jewish applicants, and an official of the school stated the reason with uncommon frankness. According to a press report, this official said: "We cannot let the bars down for we should then be swamped with Jewish students, and in a short time, we would have to go out of business, for our competitors in their literature make a great deal of the fact that they have virtually no Jewesses. And we are constantly asked by our prospective students and their parents as to whether we have any Jewish students and how many."

The complaint of discrimination as against Jews by Rutgers University in New Jersey which aroused much comment in the fall of 1930 was referred to in our preceding Review (see Vol. 33, p. 55). In March 1932, Judge Joseph Siegler of Newark, chairman of a joint Committee of local and national Jewish organizations which had investigated the matter, announced that assurances had been given by the authorities of Rutgers University to the State Board
of Regents that "there had been no discrimination and there was no intention to discriminate against any class, and that there had been no limitation of and there was no intention to limit any class to any fixed percentage of the student body based upon the percentage that such class might bear to the total population of the State." This assurance was regarded by Judge Siegler's committee as closing the incident.

In February, great excitement was caused in Jewish circles by the publication, in the Army and Navy Register, an unofficial weekly publication, of an anonymous article on the subject of armament limitation, in the course of which the patriotism of Jews was impugned in what the Jewish press regarded as a highly scurrilous manner, and they were charged with unwillingness to do military service because "the pay is poor, there is no profit in it, and worse, they might be called upon to die for the country of their adoption." This part of the article was inspired by another entitled "The Student Looks at Militarism," by Dr. Felix S. Cohen, published in a periodical issued by the League for Industrial Democracy. Following protests against and refutation of, the charges by several Jewish organizations and some individuals, the editors of the Army and Navy Register published an editorial headed "Recantation" disclaiming responsibility for the views expressed by the anonymous writer, and a letter from Dr. Cohen in which he pointed out that the military training in colleges which he condemned had also been opposed by a large number of Christian denominations. The matter was referred by President Hoover to the Secretaries of War and the Navy. The former issued a statement denouncing the attack in the Army and Navy Register.

In March, an advertisement in a Philadelphia newspaper asking for "Gentile" recruits to an engineer company of the Pennsylvania National Guard was repudiated by the highest officers of the regiment when their attention was called to it by the Jewish Exponent of Philadelphia, and by officers of the American Jewish Committee.

We cannot more fittingly close this part of our review than by quoting the following from the March 1932 issue of the Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine:

"Several proposed gifts or bequests were refused by the
trustees and wisely so for the following reasons: A wealthy citizen proposed to leave to the Academy $200,000 or more, the income of which was to be used for the making of grants to individuals engaged in research in medicine. It was to be stipulated, however, in the will that no grants should be made to Jews or any other individual working in an institution which had a Jew as a member of its Board. This proposal was unanimously turned down by the trustees."

Although the influx of aliens into the United States during the past year gave indications of being the lowest in one hundred years, yet the pressure brought to bear on the United States Congress for restrictive legislation was considerable, and came principally from patriotic societies and labor organizations. These were encouraged by the attitude of President Hoover, who, in his annual message to the Congress, in December 1931, recommended that the reduction, by administrative measures, of the number of immigration visas issued, be made permanent by statute. The President also recommended the registration of aliens and the strengthening of the deportation laws. As a result, a large number of restrictionist measures were introduced in the Congress, but owing principally to the preoccupation of that body with more urgent measures, none of these reached the voting stage. In March 1932, Jewish organizations were represented at hearings before the House of Representatives Committee on Immigration in opposition to these measures.

A situation which aroused great interest was that of female American citizens residing in the United States who have alien husbands who could not enter the country because of the reduction in visas; a great many of these couples are Jews. In January, a delegation of women appeared before the House Committee on Immigration and made a plea for a change in the law whereby husbands of American citizens should be able to come in outside the quota, as was the case with alien wives of American citizens. The Hon. Samuel Dickstein of New York, who had become chairman of the House Committee, introduced a bill along these lines, and, largely because of his earnest and energetic work, it was passed.
None of the alien registration bills introduced was brought up for a vote. In December 1931, the alien registration law enacted in the State of Michigan (see Vol. 33, p. 57) was declared unconstitutional by the United States District Court.

II
OTHER COUNTRIES*

A. WESTERN COUNTRIES

CANADA

Jewish life in Canada, during the period under review, substantially followed along the same paths as described in last year’s article. The French press of Montreal, aided and abetted by members of the Catholic clergy, continued the campaign of vilification which was inaugurated last year in connection with the discussion of the separate Jewish schools question. The agitation caused great annoyance to the Jews of Montreal, and Peter Bercovitch, a deputy in the Quebec Legislature, introduced a bill outlawing such propaganda. In February, this bill was replaced by another measure providing for the appointment of a non-partisan committee to study the situation. At the same time the Legislature adopted a resolution declaring that it “wishes to express its opinion that this campaign, which is destined to create racial and religious dissensions, be condemned as deplorable, and is not meeting with the approval of the Legislature.”

In the province of Ontario, the alleged discrimination as against Jews by insurance companies was again in the forefront of Jewish interest. A bill to make this illegal was introduced in the provincial legislature by Deputy E. F. Singer. Another interesting event was the publication in November 1931, in Varsity, the undergraduate organ of the University of Toronto, of an article by a non-Jew suggesting

*The leading events of Jewish interests in other countries than the the United States will be classified, as in previous years, as follows: (A) Western Countries, (B) Eastern Countries, and (C) Palestine. In a separate section (D) such matters of International concern as have not been mentioned elsewhere will be briefly referred to.
the establishment of a Jewish autonomous college as one of the units of the University. The author of the article denied that anti-Jewish discrimination at McGill University inspired his suggestion, which was motivated by the belief that Jewish students would be more respected if they attended a college of their own, which would enable them to gain recognition for Jewish literature, culture, and religion.

Among the outstanding events in communal life were the beginning, in August 1931, of the construction of a new Jewish hospital in Montreal, for which a building fund had been gathered in 1928; the oversubscription, in December, of the $320,000 fund for the annual budget of the Montreal Federation of Jewish Philanthropies; and the success of an effort to raise $40,000 which was required for the 1932 budget of the United Talmud Torahs of Montreal, with an enrollment of 1500 children. Canadian Jewry also protested against the anti-Jewish disorders of November and December 1931, in Poland.

**Latin America**

In Argentina, the Jews complained of the anti-Jewish agitation carried on in connection with a political election. In several places anti-Jewish demonstrations occurred. In December, the Jews of Buenos Aires made preparations for a meeting to protest against anti-Jewish excesses in Poland, but were persuaded to abandon their plan by the Minister for Poland who argued that such meetings were harmful not only to Poland's prestige abroad, but also to the Jews in Poland.

In September 1931, a news dispatch from Buenos Aires reported that a number of Jews of La Paz, Bolivia, had been arrested on the charge that they were communists, and ordered deported on short notice. The Polish Minister in Argentina, it was reported, took steps to intervene on behalf of the Polish citizens among these Jews, and the intervention of the Bolivian Minister to the United States was sought by the Federation of Polish Jews of America. The arrested Jews complained that they were the victims of an "anti-Semitic plot." In September, the chief of police of La Paz and his secretary, who were responsible for the arrests, were
themselves arrested charged with attempting to extort bribes from the Jews affected, who were thereupon released.

In January 1932, the B'nai B'rith headquarters at Cincinnati, received a request from a group of Jews in São Paulo, Brazil, for a charter for a lodge of that order. Their application included a statement to the effect that, with the virtual stoppage of Jewish immigration, and the absence of Jewish institutions of any kind, except one small school, the danger of the assimilation of the Jews was great.

In November 1931, the threatened expulsion from Cuba of about 800 Jews, charged with promoting communistic agitation was reported from Havana. These persons were all members of the Jewish Culture League. The American Jewish Committee made representations to the Cuban authorities. According to information received by the Committee, while some members of the League doubtless entertained radical views, this could be true of only a small part of the membership. Subsequently, the Minister of the Interior announced that an investigation had convinced him that the League is not communistic, and all those arrested were released. In December a new Jewish Center was dedicated, and in April, Zionist headquarters were opened, in Havana.

In Guatemala, also, Jews were threatened with expulsion. In February 1932, the Government placed a ban on peddling and decreed the deportation of all persons so engaged. Immediately thereafter, the deportation of sixty Jewish families in Guatemala City was ordered. Jewish organizations in the United States appealed to the Guatemalan Minister at Washington to secure reconsideration of the matter by his government. Subsequently, the Minister informed these organizations that the order had been rescinded, but that peddlers will be obliged to establish themselves in business as the law requires.

The same symptoms of economic depression appeared also in Mexico, but to a more marked degree. The anti-Jewish
agitation which began on a small scale several years ago and attained alarming proportions last year, was continued during the period under review. The basis of the agitation appears to be entirely economic, aimed not at Jews, as such, but at aliens in general. It is charged that Jews are replacing native Mexicans in certain fields, and are content to work for lower wages. Installment selling by Jewish merchants also evoked displeasure. Throughout the year the agitation continued in a number of newspapers, mainly at the Capital, which demanded various administrative measures aimed at restricting the commercial freedom of aliens. With the approach of May 1932, the anniversary of the anti-alien demonstration of last year, Jews in Mexico City feared a repetition of that demonstration, but the day passed uneventfully.

Great Britain

It will be recalled that, with the publication on October 20, 1930 of the report of the Commission, headed by Sir John Hope Simpson, to investigate the development and immigration possibilities of Palestine, Lord Passfield, Colonial Secretary in the Labor Government of Great Britain, issued a White Paper in which the Government stated that a program of intensive land development in Palestine is required. Owing to the discussions and negotiations between the Government and the Jewish Agency which followed, it was not until July 1931 that the Government made public the land development scheme, elaborated in the meantime, although in November 1930, the Colonial department had announced in Parliament that the plan under consideration would provide for the settlement of approximately 10,000 families, at an expenditure of not more than $12,500,000 for works of a productive nature, such as irrigation and drainage. According to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, the scheme provides in brief, for the preparation of a register of such Arabs as can be shown to have been displaced from the lands which they occupied in consequence of the land passing into the hands of the Jews, and who have not obtained other holdings on which they can establish themselves, or other equally satisfactory occupations. On the basis of this register, the director of development is to draw up a scheme
for the resettlement of the registered, displaced Arab families, together with an estimate of the cost of such resettlement, which is to be carried out as quickly as possible after the high Commissioner of Palestine has approved the scheme.

The director of development is also empowered to investigate the methods to be adopted to give effect, within the limits of the funds available, to the British government's intention (as promised in Premier MacDonald's letter to Dr. Chaim Weizmann on February 13), as soon as possible to ascertain, inter alia, what state and other lands are, or properly can be made, available for close settlement by Jews under reference to the obligation imposed upon the Mandatory by Article VI of the Mandate.

In submitting this scheme to the House of Commons, Dr. Drummond Shiels, under-secretary of state for the colonies, explained that the proposed investigation is to cover the following items:

1. The feasibility and advisability of providing credits for Arab cultivators and Jewish settlers, and if so, the best methods to achieve this purpose; 2. Proposals for draining, irrigating and otherwise reclaiming land at present uncultivated or cultivated only to a limited extent; 3. The British government intends to authorize the High Commissioner to incur an expenditure not exceeding $250,000 in the foregoing investigations, including all necessary surveys and experiments, such expenditure being met from Palestine funds; 4. The High Commissioner will take the report into consideration, and, before submitting recommendations to the government, will invite the observations of the Jewish Agency and the Arab Executive upon the practical proposals of the scheme and will afford them an opportunity to make representations regarding such proposals as have not yet received a concurrence of the Jewish and Arab advisors; 5. The development director is to submit estimates of the cost of works proposed and intimate their order of preference, and he must submit his report not later than December 1931.

At the same time, announcement was made that Lewis French, a retired official of the Indian Civil Service, had been appointed as the director of the development scheme. Although "forecasts" of the report were published in Janu-
ary, 1932, it was not until February that the Government announced that a preliminary draft had been received. In June, the Colonial office handed a copy of the report to the Jewish Agency Executive in London, with a request for comment and criticism; copies had been given also the Executive of the Agency and the Arab Executive in Palestine. The Jewish Agency appointed a commission of experts to study and draft observations on the report, the contents of which have not been made public.

In the meantime, British Zionists became impatient with the Government's inactivity in respect of Palestine, and, in January 1932, at the Conference of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, the keynote of the addresses delivered was that Great Britain's pledges have a way of evaporating on their way from London to Jerusalem. At the same time, the speakers stated that Zionists have no alternative but to co-operate with the government and must approach it with definite proposals. In the resolutions adopted by the conference objection was expressed to the limitation of immigration to Palestine, and notice was given that when the land development scheme is implemented, Zionists expect that "the claims of the Jews for settlement upon the land shall be promoted on the principle of equality between them and the Arabs, and that due regard be had to the close settlement of Jews on State lands in accordance with the provisions of Article Six of the Mandate."

Other overseas interests of the British community were with the situation of Jews in Roumania and in Germany. In February 1932, at a session of the House of Commons, Colonel Josiah Wedgewood requested that the Foreign Office make inquiries regarding the Soroca shooting affair in Roumania. In March, the Joint Foreign Committee asked the Roumanian Ambassador to transmit to his government their request that a Parliamentary commission to inquire into the affair be appointed. In April, Colonel Wedgewood spoke in the House of Commons on the anti-Jewish excesses in Jassy, and in June, he brought up the report of the alleged torture of Samson Bronstein, a Roumanian Zionist, and was informed by a representative of the Foreign Office that the British Ambassador had been requested to report on the incident.
Although British Jews watched events in Germany with profound concern, no action was taken by their representative organizations. In October 1931, the Board of Deputies voted down a motion to send a message of encouragement to President von Hindenburg.

In July 1931, the High Court of Justice, Chancery Division, approved of a plan drawn up by the attorney general for the administration of a bequest of about £200,000 left in 1913 by Adolphe Haendler, a French Jew, to “the Israelite community of England in order to be applied to a work bearing the names of Nathan and Adolphe Haendler, and of which the income shall serve to assist poor Jews who, in consequence of religious persecution or other misfortune, shall come to take refuge in England.” The Attorney General’s plan called for the carrying out of the testator’s wishes by means of subscriptions or donations, from the income of the fund, to some twenty Jewish charities named, to clubs for Jewish boys or girls, to Jewish schools, and other charities, and of direct assistance of poor Jewish refugees.

There were a number of interesting communal events. Late in July, the cornerstone was laid of a Jewish community center in London to house many of the religious, educational, and philanthropic Jewish institutions, including Jews’ College, the Board of Deputies, the Anglo-Jewish Association, the Joint Foreign Committee, and others. The building was dedicated on March 30, 1932. An interesting sidelight on the condition of *shohetim* in Great Britain was cast by the adoption, in July 1931, by the trustees of Etz Chaim Yeshiva, of a decision to discontinue training *shohetim*, on the ground that the calling is overcrowded. In August 1931, the *Jewish Guardian*, founded by Sir Philip Magnus, Dr. Claude G. Montefiore, Lord Swaythling, and others, as the organ of British Liberal Judaism, suspended publication, after a notable activity of twelve years.

**Union of South Africa**

South African Jewry was aroused, in November 1931, by a public statement of Dr. Daniel F. Malan, Minister of the Interior, who, it will be recalled was chiefly responsible for pressing to passage the immigration quota law of 1930 (see vol. 32, pp. 89–90). Dr. Malan’s ire having been aroused
by the fact that some Jews, still smarting under the shame of that law, continued to express opposition to it, he said: "I don't know how many Jews agree with the agitation against the quota act and against the Nationalist Party which introduced the act, but I wish to warn those who fan it, that it will be very easy to awaken feelings of hatred against Jews in the country." This declaration created profound resentment in Jewish circles, and the Jewish Board of Deputies sent a deputation to wait upon Dr. Malan in order to convey to him an expression of their concern.

In June 1932, the Jewish community was again disturbed by the introduction in the House of Assembly, Capetown, of a bill providing that the name of the Potchefstroom University College have added to it the words "for High Christian Education." This move was regarded by Jews as the thin edge of the wedge for bringing about a religious cleavage in educational institutions. A disquieting feature of this incident was that the remarks of some of the advocates of the measure clearly indicated the existence of anti-Jewish feeling.

The outstanding communal event in South Africa was the visit of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, former president of the World Zionist Organization, who toured all the communities in the interests of the Keren Hayesod, or Palestine Foundation Fund. He spent a number of months in the country, was received everywhere with great acclaim, and succeeded in raising upward of $300,000 from the comparatively small community of 80,000 Jews.

FRANCE

In November 1931, the Jewish community of France showed deep concern over the growing unemployment among immigrant Jews, and the agitation in some French newspapers for the exclusion of all foreign labor. In December, a Committee of Jewish Immigrants in Paris issued a statement warning Jewish immigrants from coming to France, unless they are ready to work in agricultural districts. In the same month an organization for assisting Jewish sufferers from the economic crisis was set up in Paris, and began carrying out a program of relief which
included such measures as the subsidizing of food kitchens and assistance to unemployed immigrants who desire to return to the countries of their origin.

In July 1931, announcement was made that, in the future, Roumanian students at French medical schools would not, as in the past, receive doctorate diplomas entitling them to practice medicine in France, but only certificates of their having completed their studies. At first, this was regarded as a measure aimed against Jews only, as most of the Roumanian students are Jews. Later, however, it was explained that in view of the over-crowding of the medical profession, Roumanian students, who had heretofore been excepted from this requirement, were to be required, after their graduation, to take the special examination for a license to practice which has to be taken by all foreign students.

In connection with Jewish protest demonstrations against the anti-Jewish outbreaks in Poland in November-December 1931, there was a clash between Polish and Jewish students in Paris, necessitating police intervention resulting in several arrests.

The newspaper attacks of François Coty, perfume manufacturer, against Jewish banking houses, whom he charged with financing revolutionary movements and having sinister designs against France, was disturbing to the Jewish population. In April, 1932, the Jewish Union of War Veterans filed a libel suit against Coty, on the basis of an allegation by him that Jewish labor groups were being formed in France, armed and supplied with munitions, in preparation for a revolution. The French press paid little attention to Coty’s attacks.

Interesting communal events included the election of four non-citizen Jews to the Central Committee of the Jewish Consistory of twenty-four members,—the first time non-citizens were elected to this body which supervises Jewish religious activities in France. There were also celebrations of two important anniversaries. In October, at a meeting held in connection with the Colonial Exposition in Paris, the Alliance Israélite Universelle, celebrated the completion of seventy years of educational work among the Jewish populations of the Levant and in the Balkans. In December, a large mass meeting was held in Paris, under the auspices of
the Federation of Jewish Societies, to commemorate the centenary of the birth of Baron Maurice de Hirsch.

**GERMANY**

The successes of the National Socialist party in many provincial elections in Germany, prior to the balloting for President in March and April 1932, caused a great deal of anxiety to the Jews of Germany not only because these successes seemed to forebode the ultimate triumph of the Nazis, but also because they encouraged the latter to intensify their propaganda, of which anti-Semitism is one of the most appealing factors. At the same time, the Social Democratic-Centrist coalition government of Brüning failed to show any wholehearted opposition to the anti-Jewish agitations of the Nazis or to take any steps to curb their arrogant tactics insofar as Jews were concerned. The past year, therefore, saw a great number of minor clashes between Jews and Nazis, which were sometimes followed by arrests and trials; few of the latter led to an outcome which acted as a deterrent against reoccurrences of disorders. There were also additional desecrations of cemeteries, and assaults upon synagogues; and now and then the accusation of ritual murder was heard.

The most sensational street attack against Jews took place in Berlin on Rosh Ha-Shanah, September 1931, just as worshippers were leaving the synagogues. Many persons, some of them non-Jews, were set upon and beaten, seven being badly hurt, although a number who were also injured did not report. Upon their somewhat belated arrival, the police had some difficulty in quelling the rioters. A total of 67 were arrested and tried in a special riot court; a number were given severe sentences. The Jewish organizations were profoundly disturbed by this occurrence, and the Prussian authorities took special precautions to prevent a repetition on Yom Kippur.

When, in February 1932, announcement was made that Hitler himself would be the Nazi candidate for President, in opposition to Marshal von Hindenburg, the Jews and the liberal elements carried on a vigorous campaign for the latter, who was elected on the run-off balloting on April 13, 1932. It was realized, however, that von Hindenberg's
triumph was largely a personal one, and that, with allowance made for this fact, the results of the elections showed the National Socialist Party had made tremendous growth, chiefly at the expense of the moderate and liberal parties, since the Reichstag elections of September 1930. This was demonstrated again in the elections for the Prussian Diet on April 24, when the National Socialists polled over thirty-five per cent of the total vote. This show of strength of the Nazis eventually led to the retirement of Dr. Bruening's cabinet, and the appointment of a Government under Col. Franz van Papen of a strongly conservative color with a marked monarchistic tint.

This event was received with some misgiving in Jewish circles, which was apparently sensed by the new government which gave assurances through the Jewish Telegraphic Agency that the government would, in strict adherence to the constitution, guard the equality of all citizens, irrespective of race or creed. In the face of this assurance, the statement, a few days later, by the new Minister of Interior, Baron Wilhelm von Gayl, before the Reichrat, was, to say the least, puzzling to the Jewish population. Von Gayl said: "It seems to me important and necessary that in the field of the composite cultural life of our people, especially in moving pictures and radio, there should be emphasis upon, and cultivation of, the German spirit, and the eradication of all alien, un-German influences, which, at times, have astounded large sections of the German people."

The success of the Hitlerites in provincial elections made itself felt almost immediately through the retirement of Jewish officials and the dismissal of Jewish actors and singers from government-supported theatres and opera houses. Another weapon which the Nazis used for harassing the Jews was the prohibition of Shehitah, the Jewish ritual method of slaughtering animals. The Nazis succeeded in bringing about such prohibition in several cities, but failed in others. In April, the Prussian Minister of the Interior instructed Government officials to annul all such prohibitions in Prussian cities on the ground that they were unconstitutional.

An alliance of National Socialists and their mortal enemies the Communists, made possible the passage in the new
Prussian Diet, in June 1932, of a law instructing the Government to submit the draft of a law providing for the confiscation of the property of East European Jews who entered the country after August 1, 1914. The reason given for this measure was that the property of these Jews, "constitutes a dishonest accumulation by a race which is itself working unproductively but has accumulated wealth by enslaving the German nation." Inasmuch as the Social-Democratic cabinet was then still in power the law remained a dead letter; it was explained also that, in any case, such a law would require the approval of the Government of the Reich before going into effect. At the same time, that such a law could be adopted by a twentieth century parliament in a country boasting of a high degree of culture is a fact that bodes no good for the future welfare of the Jews of Germany.

Besides, the generation which is now attending the universities, and from whose ranks many of the future rulers of Germany will be recruited is growing up in an atmosphere of Jew-hatred. In January 1932, a report from Berlin stated that two-thirds of the 142,000 students in Germany are National Socialist in their sympathies. All through the year there were more or less serious clashes at a number of universities. Nazi students rioted at the universities of Munich and Kiel, during lectures by Jewish professors. At Weimar, the students declared a strike as a protest against the appointment of a Jew as director of the Engineering Academy, and the municipal authorities, yielding to their pressure, asked the Jew to resign; anti-Jewish rowdyism at the University of Berlin, in January, forced the closing of the institution for a few days; early in February, the disorders recurred and the University was closed again; in June, outbreaks occurred at the University of Frankfurt and again at Berlin, and the latter institution was closed once more.

The anti-Jewish agitation and attacks were not permitted to go on without resistance on the part of the Jewish population. The Central Verein deutscher Staatsbuerger juedischen Glaubens continued, as in former years, to attempt, with such means as it had at its disposal, to stem the swelling tide of Hitlerist propaganda. In January 1932, the Central Verein, the Zionist Organization, the B'nai B'rith, the
Women's Union, and a number of Jewish relief societies held a meeting and decided to set up a joint committee for planning concerted action in combating attempts to deprive the Jews of Germany of their rights, and for negotiating with Government authorities to insure the honor, life and economic existence of the Jewish population.

In a number of cases, persons responsible for vilifying the Jewish people were brought to trial at the request of the Central Verein or other Jewish organizations. In August 1931, the editor of the Nazi newspaper in which the statement had appeared that "Jehovah is not God but a businessman," was sentenced to imprisonment for insulting the Jewish religion. In December, the Breslau court granted an injunction against two newspapers which were carrying on anti-Jewish boycott propaganda in connection with the approaching Christmas holidays. In January 1932, the Supreme Court of Augsburg condemned boycott articles in a local newspaper, pointing out that a boycott is a violation of the equality provision of the German constitution, and that, as Jews are required to perform the same duties as other citizens, they must be accorded equal treatment. In the same month, at the request of the Central Verein, the Berlin court issued an injunction against the use of the Nazi slogan "Perish Judaea," on the ground that it leads to disturbances of the public peace.

Much discussion was aroused in the Jewish community when, in January 1932, the Prussian government made public the text of a new law regulating the status of Jewish communities (Gemeinde). The measure provided that every Jew is a member of the community in the district in which he resides, but it gave voting rights only to citizens. The Prussian Community Council protested against this provision and the text was amended so as to give each community the right to decide whether members who are not citizens may vote at community meetings.

The communal life of the German Jewry was marked by contention and strife during the past year. There were two chief lines of cleavage, liberalism versus orthodoxy in religion, and Zionism versus (for lack of a better term) German nationalism. What was regarded as a symptom of
the latter division was the action of the executive council of the Berlin community in August in deciding to discontinue its annual contribution for the maintenance of a chair in botany at the Hebrew University in Palestine. The ostensible reason for this decision was the lack of funds which had already necessitated the reduction of the staff, including rabbis, and the abandonment of certain activities. The decision, nevertheless, was interpreted by the Zionist members of the Council as a breach of faith, as the Liberals, who were in the majority, had given a pledge to maintain the chair which was occupied by the distinguished botanist, Professor Otto Warburg. In February, when the executive decided to cancel the subsidy for the He-Halutz organization, the Zionist members threatened to withdraw. At a later meeting, in April, the Zionists left the hall. A permanent schism was averted at the next monthly meeting when the Liberals withdrew their objection to the subsidy for the He-Halutz organization. On the same day, however, a convention of delegates from provincial federations of communities, meeting in Frankfurt for the purpose of organizing an association for the whole of Germany, could not agree on a method of representation. Even within Zionist ranks harmony was lacking. In October 1931, the Revisionists voted to break away from the Zionist Federation, while the Federation voted to expel the Revisionists.

The material situation of the Jews of Germany did not improve during the year. There were the same symptoms of acute distress as were enumerated in our Review of a year ago. Added to the natural economic forces which operated upon non-Jews as well as Jews, was the artificial force of the anti-Jewish boycott which has resulted from the propaganda of the Nazis, and which renders the situation of the Jew more difficult than that of the non-Jew. With drastically reduced income, the community was called upon for help by a steadily mounting number of applicants. A study made by the Berlin community indicated that 50,000 of the 580,000 Jews of Germany were unemployed in February. In May, the Mayor of Berlin requested the Polish Government to contribute to the sum of 250,000 marks required for the relief of 987 Polish nationals who were being maintained by the municipality; similar requests
were directed to the governments of Austria, Czecho-
Slovakia and Russia. Within the Jewish community sug-
gestions were made for meeting the unemployment situation
by a bureau for vocational guidance and other means. An
effort to settle Jews on the land had been begun in June
1931, when an estate at Gross Glagow had been purchased
by the Federation for Jewish Land Settlement, with the
aid of a loan from the Berlin Community.

Other Western Countries

The constitution of the new republic of Spain, adopted
in December 1931, was greeted with satisfaction by the
small Jewish community. Although it abolished state
subsidies of all religious institutions, and created some diffi-
culties regarding the maintenance of cemeteries on a
sectarian basis, yet the Constitution did contain the revolu-
tionary provision that "nationality, sex, political ideas, and
religious creeds, are not a ground for legal privileges, which
the state does not recognize." Contrary to the expectations
of some, the Constitution does not refer specifically to
Jews.

Regarding the much discussed subject of the immigration
of the descendants of Jews, expelled from Spain in the
fifteenth century, it is interesting to note that the Alliance
Israélite Universelle, which has worked among Sephardic
Jews in many countries for almost three-quarters of a
century, in the report of its Comité Central, made public in
December 1931, pointed out that such a project is economi-
cally and politically unsound. The country is not in an
economic position to absorb any substantial number of new-
comers, and the Catholic clergy is bitterly opposed to
expediting the return of Jews, when the Constitution makes
necessary the expulsion of Jesuits.

The latter observation of the Alliance report was substan-
tiated by the fact that, following the adoption of the
Constitution, the conservative press in Madrid began
publishing anti-Jewish articles, chiefly of the world-con-
spiration variety. Later, translations of Henry Ford's "Inter-
national Jew" and of the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion"
found wide circulation.
That the situation of the Jews of Belgium who are engaged in peddling has become precarious was indicated by the fact that in March, a conference of Jewish peddlers was held at Antwerp for the purpose of forming an organization to protect themselves against anti-Jewish groups who are harassing them. The fact is that the economic depression which has forced many Jews, formerly engaged in the export trade, into domestic commerce, has made the Jews more conspicuous in business, and has had the natural reaction of causing resentment among competitors. According to a correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Jewish market vendors in Antwerp were attacked in November, their stalls upset, and their wares damaged by young men who suddenly appeared and as suddenly vanished. This correspondent expresses the opinion that the anti-Jewish feeling is a by-product of the Flemish revolt against denationalization, the Flemings resenting the fact that the great majority of the Jews favor the French language and culture, and are thus, unwittingly, promoters of Flemish denationalization.

In Switzerland, the spread of anti-Jewish propaganda in the form of alleged documents such as the notorious forged proclamation of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, evoked a public protest from the Jewish community. In January 1932, anti-Jewish boycott propaganda and other leaflets were distributed from house to house in Geneva, and a group of non-Jews published an appeal to Swiss citizens to pay no heed to this agitation. An effort to introduce the National Socialist brand of Fascism into the country met with little success.

A similar attempt was made in the Netherlands, where in September 1931, the fall of Dutch bonds was in some circles, blamed on the Jews. In February, the Liberal Party held a meeting at The Hague to discuss means of combating this anti-Jewish agitation and the propaganda of the Hitlerites. In April, there was a clash between Nazis and Jews on the streets of Utrecht. In March, a Liberal congregation was established at The Hague; another had previously been organized at Amsterdam.
B. EASTERN COUNTRIES

AUSTRIA

The anti-Jewish agitation of the Heimwehr, the Austrian counterpart of the National Socialist Party in Germany, continued to make life miserable for the Jews of Austria during the period under review. This agitation compelled Professor Joseph Redlich, a converted Jew, to resign from his office as Finance Minister. In December, it was learned that a half million copies of a boycott leaflet had been prepared for distribution, and the Vienna public prosecutor confiscated the leaflets and announced that he would take action against the publisher. Anti-Jewish placards were posted in many parts of Vienna, but the authorities insisted they had no power to suppress them. In April, a Jewish newspaper publisher was beaten in a cafe by Fascists, because his paper had published a special edition in which it had been stated that the father of Adolph Hitler had originally borne the name "Schukelgruber," until he adopted that of "Hitler" in order to obtain an inheritance. In the Diet elections held in April, the Fascists succeeded in gaining a number of additional mandates, and they announced their intention to agitate for the restriction of the rights of Jews. Early in May, representatives of Jewish organizations held a meeting in Vienna to discuss a common effort to combat the increasing influence of the anti-Jewish elements.

Considerable discussion was aroused when the cabinet gave in to the demands of the Nationalist students and agreed to introduce a law legalizing the organization of the university student body along "national" lines, with the German students in control and enjoying special privileges. The Cabinet introduced the measure in the Diet, attempting to justify its action by asserting that peace demanded it. The proposed law passed on its first reading at the end of April 1932. There were the usual clashes between Jewish and non-Jewish students, during the year.

As is well known, the economic crisis has hit Austria harder than many other countries. The Jews of Austria are, therefore, in a most wretched condition. Being largely concentrated in Vienna and comprising a great proportion
of intellectuals and professionals, a great number of the Jews are Luftmenschen. Unemployment is increased by a silent but effective boycott against Jews both in private business and in Government administration. But the Jewish community is suffering also morally. It is divided into groups and factions, and it is slowly but steadily being diminished by the three forces of erosion,—assimilation, intermarriage, and apostasy. Added to these factors, are a diminishing birth rate and an increasing death rate. The decrease in the number of Jewish children of school age has become so marked, that the educational authorities have found it possible to transfer a number of Jewish teachers to other departments. In October 1931, the Vienna Rabbinical Seminary was not able to open.

Hungary

The picture does not become any brighter when we turn to Hungary. According to a statement made public, in August 1931, by the rabbinate of Budapest, the Jewish population of the country is generally decreasing because of excess of deaths over births, and conversion. During 1930, a total of 390 Jews left the Jewish faith, and the excess of Jewish deaths over births averages about 1000 annually. According to official figures published in January 1932, the Jewish birth rate in Budapest in 1931 was 36% lower than that for the preceding year. The assimilation of Jews was made easier during the year by an order of the Minister of the Interior that every facility be extended to Hungarian citizens desirous of Magyarizing their surnames.

Measures to relieve material distress among the Jewish population were taken in November by the Jewish Community of Budapest, which opened several soup kitchens. In January 1932, the Mayor announced that the municipality would open fifteen such kitchens to supply daily meals to 3000 Jewish adults and 12,000 school children. In the same month, seventy-two physicians on the staffs of Jewish community hospitals went on strike because they were unpaid. In this connection, the statement of Kehillah officials, that two-thirds of the seventy-two thousand patients treated annually at these institutions are non-Jews, is interesting. In the same month, Hatzofeh, the only
Hebrew publication in Hungary, suspended for lack of funds; it had appeared for twenty years under the editorship of Dr. Ludwig Blau, Director of the Rabbinical Seminary.

Like other central and eastern European countries, Hungary also has its student problem. In November, part of the Hungarian press demanded martial law in order to prevent anti-Jewish outbreaks at the University of Budapest, where considerable agitation had been going on since the beginning of the semester, under the inspiration of events in Poland. Placards calling upon students to “follow the Polish example,” were posted on the campus and in the streets. At about the same time, the Minister of Education complained to Parliament that the increase of the number of Jewish students in Hungary was “alarming.” While the Jews constitute only six percent of the population, he declared, from ten to fifty-five percent of the students in the various faculties are Jews. In March, an extraordinary lawsuit was instituted by a Jewish student who charged that, two years earlier, a University official to whom he had given money to secure his (the Jew’s) admission to the University, had applied to a Catholic priest for, and had been given a baptismal certificate, made out in the name of the Jewish student. The student learned only two years later that this had happened, and he asked the court to declare the baptismal certificate invalid.

Although the new Karolyi Cabinet, which came into power in August 1931, had three anti-Semitic members, the Premier announced that the new Government stands on a “Christian national” basis but without religious distinctions. This did not, however, prevent the “Awakening Magyars” from carrying on a violent anti-Jewish propaganda. When, in September, a railroad train was bombed at Torbagy and twenty-two persons killed, this organization at once charged that this outrage was the result of a Jewish plot as it had been perpetrated on Rosh Ha-Shanah, when Jews are forbidden to travel. Anti-Semites who were circulating leaflets making this charge were arrested by the police. Later, the Government announced that persons caught spreading this libel would be tried by court martial. At the same time special police were ordered to guard Budapest synagogues and homes in the Jewish quarter.
In October, in an address at a special meeting of the Union to Convert Jews to Catholicism the papal representative in Hungary warned Catholic priests to refrain from encouraging anti-Jewish activities lest the progress of the work of converting Jews to Catholicism suffer.

In November, a plot of extreme nationalists to overthrow the government was frustrated. It was learned that the terrorization of the Jews, along the lines of 1920-21, was part of the plan of the conspirators. One feature of the plan was to bomb synagogues during religious services.

**ROUMANIA**

The outstanding events of Jewish interest in Roumania, during the period under review, were, characteristically enough, three outrages involving Jews, namely, (1) the shooting of a group of Jews attempting to cross the Dneister, at Soroca, into Russia; (2) the wrecking of shops of Jews and a synagogue in Jassy, and (3) the sadistic torturing of Samson Bronstein, of Yedinez. These three incidents were widely commented upon in many parts of the world.

With regard to the Soroca affair, the facts which emerge from the mass of assertions and contradictions, appear to indicate that early in January 1932, three Jewish young men and two women engaged a professional non-Jewish smuggling agent to help them cross the Dniester river into Russia; that they bribed a member of the frontier guard to allow them to go; that this soldier, after accepting the bribe, informed his superior officers of the matter, and the guard was ordered to shoot the fugitives as well as the smuggling agent when, relying upon his connivance, they would attempt to cross; and that, instead of ordering the fugitives to stop, he shot them down without warning. The news of this affair aroused vociferous protest throughout Roumania, and in Parliament. The Government, fearful of impairing its relations with the military clique, found it expedient to give credence to the officers at the frontier who explained that the six persons were Communists and were shot when they resisted arrest, but failed to explain why Communists who are attempting to leave the country should be shot, and how it happened that persons resisting arrest were shot in the back. In Parliament, the anti-Semites, led by
Professor Cuza, hailed the atrocity as a patriotic act, but the Jewish deputies, supported by liberal elements, demanded a parliamentary inquiry, which the Government promised but failed to institute before it went out of power; nor were the perpetrators of the outrage punished. An interesting sequel of the affair was the closing of a Jewish school at Soroca where one of the women shot at the frontier had been a teacher, on the alleged ground that the school was a center of Communist propaganda.

According to an investigation by Deputy Michael Landau, the Jassy outbreak followed a meeting of the Iron Guard, an anti-Semitic organization, to protest against newly-issued regulations reducing the stipends to university students. Those in attendance, followed by a street rabble, invaded the synagogue, demolished much of its furniture, broke almost all its windows, and after mutilating the Torah Scrolls, threw them into the street. Although a squadron of cavalry was stationed in the square where the Iron Guard house is situated, no effort was made to prevent the invasion of the synagogue, after which the mob broke through a police cordon which had in the meantime surrounded the place, and proceeded to assault the shops of Jews. This event, too, was the subject of discussion in Parliament, in the course of which anti-Jewish deputies endeavored in the most truculent manner to silence all protests, one of these deputies attempting even to assault a Jewish member who had the temerity to interpellate the Government on the affair. But the Government was as inactive in this matter as in the Soroca episode.

The Bronstein affair occurred in May. It appears that this was only one, albeit the most scandalous, of a number of like incidents. The first report published by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, based on a news item in Unser Zeit, a Yiddish daily newspaper published in Kishineff, stated that in an effort to extort a confession of Communist activity from him, Samson Bronstein of Yedinez, Bessarabia, was first tortured, and then, with his hands and feet bound together, was dragged by a horse through the streets of the town until he expired. This report was branded as an invention by the Roumanian legation in the United States, but subsequent investigation demonstrated that, while it
was exaggerated and was inaccurate as to the death of Bronstein, the man was tortured in a fiendish manner and sustained severe injuries which would require months to heal. In this case the Government also attempted to sidestep the issue, and up to the time these lines are being written, no reports are available as to any steps having been taken to punish the perpetrators of this outrage.

These three incidents are the high lights of an entire series of numerous occurrences of like nature, in various parts of Roumania. It is clear that the Jorga Government, like most of its predecessors, except the Peasant Party Government of Dr. Juliu Maniu, did not have the courage to risk losing popularity by taking a firm stand against the anti-Semitic organizations. With the Government so tolerant, and with two representatives in Parliament, these anti-Semitic groups became more arrogant than ever, and allowed no opportunity to pass for harassing and badgering the Jewish population. It would serve no useful purpose to catalogue in this place these numerous incidents most of which were a repetition of excesses which have become quite common since the World War. To some extent this situation is explained by the political instability, which paralyzes all Government action of a decisive character. In some quarters, it is hoped that with the fall of the Jorga ministry in June, last, and the return to power of the National Peasant Party of Dr. Maniu, which appears to be likely, as these lines are being written, the new Government will show a greater measure of statesmanship in the direction of maintaining order and suppressing the anti-Semitic groups, whose antics reflect nothing but discredit upon the Roumanian people.

Although, despite these vexations and irritations, the normal life of the Jews of Roumania went on, even this was beclouded, as in other countries, by economic difficulties. Owing to the collapse of the Kredit Anstalt of Vienna and to the general crisis, two large banking institutions maintained by Jews were forced to close their doors during the year, although it was declared that the assets of both were sufficient to meet all liabilities, with a reasonable time being allowed for liquidation. These banking houses were the Banca Berkowitz and the Blank-Marmorosch Bank, both
in Bucharest. These and other business causes of economic distress were supplemented by the destruction caused by fire and flood in a number of places in which many Jews were affected. The resulting suffering created new responsibilities for Jewish communal organizations whose funds were naturally greatly reduced not only by reason of their inability to raise funds, but also because the drop in the State income forced the Government to reduce its subsidies to the institutions of the minorities. In this connection, discrimination as against Jews was charged in Parliament by a Jewish deputy who declared that the subsidy for Jewish institutions is fixed at a rate of nine lei per capita, while that for the Greek Orthodox is 34 lei, for Roman Catholics, 31 lei, and for the Protestants, 32 lei, per capita. Naturally, the Jewish community, especially its educational agencies, suffered as a result. In July, an All-Roumanian Ort Center was opened in Bucharest, with the blessing of the Government which had promised to help the Ort schools in which Jewish youth are taught handicrafts, by waiving customs duties on machinery and tools, and in other ways.

GREECE

The outstanding event of the year in Greece was the anti-Jewish riots in Salonika. The disturbances began on June 23, following the distribution of leaflets charging that the delegates of the Maccabee Sport Club of Salonika, at a convention of Maccabee societies held in 1930 in Sofia, Bulgaria, at which speakers demanded the liberation of Macedonia from Greek rule, failed to protest, and inciting Greek patriots to avenge this treason against Greece by boycotting the Jews. In spite of the fact that Premier Venizelos and other influential leaders denounced this charge against the Jews as false, the disorders kept on and culminated on June 29 in a mass assault upon a Jewish quarter in which two hundred and fifty families resided, during which the entire quarter was set fire to, rendering the inhabitants homeless and destitute. They were given temporary shelter in Jewish schools and in the high school maintained by a French Lay Mission. Thereafter vigorous measures taken by the government succeeded in preventing further outbreaks.
The matter was called to the attention of the Department of State of the United States by the American Jewish Committee, and the Department asked for a report from the American Minister. Subsequently the Greek Government instituted an inquiry into the matter, and ten Greeks who were accused of being the instigators of the outbreak were brought to trial in April 1932. After a lengthy trial, the defendants were all acquitted as measure of calming public agitation. In March, it was announced that the Government had made a grant of 500,000 drachmas ($6,500) for the relief of the families who had suffered as a result of the fire, and had bought the section from the Jewish owners for 3,500,000 drachmas ($45,000), making possible the creation of a new Jewish quarter near the old.

In April, a ritual murder charge was made against a Jew at Cavalla, who was almost lynched. Arrested by the authorities, the Jew had no difficulty in proving his innocence. The Greek populace, however, remained in a ferment of hostility for several weeks, during which it was unsafe for Jews to appear on the streets, and several shops of Jews were attacked.

The economic situation of the Jews of Salonika continued unfavorable during the year, and many left the city for other parts of the country or for foreign lands. The Greek government also was compelled, by reason of budgetary cuts, to reduce subsidies to Jewish institutions, whose very existence was endangered by these reductions. In some quarters, the cuts in these subventions were regarded as discriminatory.

Czecho-Slovakia

Probably the outstanding subject of discussion in Czecho-Slovakia during the year was the wretched condition of the Jews of that section of Slovakia known as Carpatho-Russia. During the past few years, several foreign travelers who visited the region had been amazed by the extreme poverty of both its non-Jews and its Jews, especially the latter, and had published accounts of what they had seen. The writings of these travelers aroused public opinion in Czecho-Slovakia. In December 1931, the B'nai B'rith in Prague appointed a commission to make a survey of the situation; in February 1932, a conference of Jewish organizations to consider the
matter was held; and in March, an organization of women was formed in Prague to undertake emergency measures to alleviate acute distress in this region. The press has not reported any further action in connection with this matter.

In all probability the Jews of other parts of the country could do very little in the direction of helping their brethren in Carpatho-Russia, as their own situation was far from prosperous. In the western provinces, the acute agrarian situation is forcing the Jews out of the villages into the cities, where they increase the intensity of the competitive struggle. The Jewish community lacks sufficient funds to maintain its institutions, and the crisis has compelled the government to reduce its subsidies. Here, as in several other countries, the Jews complain that the reduction is inequitable and discriminatory.

And yet, politically, the Jews of Czecho-Slovakia enjoy full equality of rights, and, according to a news dispatch, the Government was considering at the beginning of 1932, a legislative project for facilitating the naturalization of the so-called staatenlose, persons without nationality, about ten to fifteen thousand of whom are Jews. The Government’s attitude toward the Jewish question is very progressive. Anti-Jewish agitation is sternly discouraged and its outward manifestations are quickly suppressed. There were a number of such manifestations during the period. The most serious was an outbreak, in November 1931, of students at the universities of Prague and Bratislava, instigated by inflammatory articles in the nationalist press. In February, there was another such outbreak at the University of Bratislava, where a group of students threatened to go on strike unless the enrollment of foreign Jews was restricted. At the same time, students at the German university of Prague announced their intention to agitate for such a numerus clausus.

An event which attracted world-wide attention was the trial of one, Karol Horak, who, in 1919, while a corporal in a detachment of legionnaires, brutally killed seven young men of two families in the townlet of Velkyvitch. Although soldiers, who had been eye-witnesses of the atrocity, testified against Horak, the atmosphere of the court was so charged with anti-Jewish feeling that the jury acquitted him. This outcome aroused indignation in many quarters.
BALTIC COUNTRIES

Although Lithuania as a whole, being largely agricultural, suffered comparatively little from the world-wide economic depression, the Jewish population which depends on commerce and industry continued to suffer distress. This was aggravated by an increase of taxes on small traders, and of a government order for the dismantling of many dwellings in Slobodka, Shanz, and Ponemun, where town-planning changes were contemplated. In March 1932, a Jewish Relief Committee issued an urgent appeal for contributions to a fund to relieve suffering. In December, a report stated that the famous Slobodka Yeshibah was on the point of closing its doors; in May, the authorities of the institution stated, in an appeal, that students were actually starving.

But, despite this suffering, an association of merchants came out in March 1932, with an anti-Jewish boycott suggestion in which it was alleged that the Jews monopolize the best posts in the commercial, industrial and artisan fields. This agitation for the Lithuanization of trade and industry was promoted at a convention of merchants and industrialists held at Kovno in May 1932, which was attended by the Premier.

There were several other unsavory incidents. In August 1931, a Jewish cemetery in Memel was desecrated, and in April 1932, a burial ground in Alita was damaged by boy vandals.

The economic situation of the Jews of Latvia was similar to that of their brethren in Lithuania. In August, the American Joint Distribution Committee received an appeal for urgent aid from the Jewish Credit Cooperatives, to save many Jewish businesses from dissolution. In January, it was reported that twenty-five per cent of the Jews of Riga were unemployed. In the same month a mob of about three hundred unemployed Jews stormed the headquarters of the Riga Kehillah, demanding aid. In April, the Government Department of Agriculture and Economics announced that it would make an effort to find work in the rural districts for the unemployed Jews. At the same time, however, the Government was compelled to reduce the subsidies to
Jewish schools and other institutions. There was also a movement in Government circles to substitute the Latvian for minority languages in the schools of racial and linguistic minorities. In October 1931, the Government issued new regulations for naturalization under which the acquisition of citizenship by Jews was facilitated.

**Poland**

The period under review would have been for the Jews of Poland a melancholy counterpart of the preceding twelve-month if it had not been for the tragic interlude presented by a wave of anti-Jewish riots which swept through the Universities and then overflowed into the cities themselves. A demonstration in October 18, 1931, at the University of Lemberg to celebrate the opening of the scholastic year was a fitting prelude to the succeeding acts of the series which began, on October 29, at Cracow University where a dispute between Jewish and non-Jewish students in the medical school, over the question of corpses for dissection, developed into so violent a riot that the institution had to be closed. Three days later, on November 2, Nationalist students of the University of Warsaw attacked the first year Jewish students of the law school, driving them off the campus. When these attacks were renewed, the following day, this University also was closed. On the same day the deans of all Polish universities were notified by the Ministry of Education that the Government would not tolerate anti-Jewish disturbances. The National Democratic organ *Gazeta Warszawska*, in commenting upon these events, averred that only a *numerus clausus* for Jews could insure peace in the universities, and the National Democratic Party officially announced that it approved of the attacks upon the Jewish students.

The following day, the disorders were renewed in the streets of Warsaw, culminating in a battle between Polish students and Jewish cab-drivers in which a number on both sides were wounded. Twenty students were arrested when a mob broke into the Jewish Seminary and attacked those in attendance. Jewish students organized themselves into units to defend themselves against a repetition of attacks when the University would be reopened. On November 7,
the club of Jewish Sejm deputies submitted an interpellation asking the Government what steps it intends to take to end the disturbances. In its reply, the following day, the Government expressed its regret at the occurrences and assured the Jewish community of Government protection against attacks, promising that the perpetrators of previous outrages would be punished. Up to that time one hundred and eighty students had been arrested.

On the same day, however, there was another fracas at the Commercial High School and Polytechnic Institute. Two days later the disorders spread to Vilna where Jewish students were attacked at the University and the Jewish business section and the residential quarter of the poorer Jews were invaded. Sixteen Jewish and four non-Jewish students were injured. Later, one of the non-Jewish students succumbed to the injuries he had received. The mob also broke shop windows, attacked a group of Jewish journalists who were just returning from a press conference with the governor of the province, and hurled stones at the windows of the Kehillah headquarters where a meeting was being held. When the local police appeared to be unable to suppress the disorders, the Governor sent for a special military detachment to aid.

In the meantime, disorders continued in Warsaw, with the result that all Colleges and High Schools were closed by the authorities. Disorders also broke out afresh in Cracow and Lemberg, and spread to several other cities. By this time, the Jewish press of Poland became convinced that the outbreaks were not spontaneous, as was at first thought, but that they were planned, and charged the Government with lack of vigor in suppressing the disorders, pointing out the National Democratic press is permitted to publish instigatory articles. It was not until about November 27 that the Government had the situation in hand, although sporadic outbreaks occurred thereafter in Vilna, Posen, and other places.

As a tragic sequel to the Vilna disorders, came the trial of three Jewish students accused of responsibility for the death of one non-Jewish student,—the only fatality in the entire course of the riots. The Jews of Poland watched with great anxiety the trial of the two young men which began
in the middle of April, and a great deal of resentment was expressed when, sentencing the one Jew found guilty to two years imprisonment, the court expressed the belief that, in the particular fracas in which the Polish student was killed, the Jews were the attackers, and stated further that it is quite natural that Jews should feel vindictively toward non-Jews because, "The Jews have been inspired with deep and strong hatred against Christians, particularly against the Christians of Poland, since the time of the Inquisition when Jews were burned."

In March, it was feared that student riots would break out again, when a National Democratic bill to establish a numeros clausus for Jews at the universities was rejected by the Sejm by a large majority. But there was no noticeable increase in the number of anti-Jewish incidents at the universities and elsewhere, following this event. There were a number of such incidents in various parts of the country throughout the year, in spite of the fact that, whenever possible, the authorities took stern measures to prevent outbreaks, and punished those responsible.

The wave of anti-Jewish riots which began in the Universities in October and spread to many cities, was followed by intensification of the already existing boycott propaganda, in which chauvinist nationalists resorted to every means their ingenuity could devise to influence the populace against doing business with Jews. These efforts were but too effective and helped to destroy much of such little business as had survived the economic crisis.

The widespread unemployment, especially among the Jews, who suffered from discrimination, led in many cases to despair and suicide. In July, eighty per cent of all Jewish needle workers in Poland were without work, and twenty per cent of the Jews of Warsaw were receiving charity; most of the 34,000 unemployed in Lodz were Jews. In September, seventy-five factories in Vilna closed, throwing hundreds of Jews out of employment, and it was stated that no less than seventy per cent of the Jews of Lodz were destitute; thirty-eight per cent were applicants for charity. The Government could do little, if anything, to help in this situation. On the contrary, it was compelled to reduce relief activities and
subsidies to institutions by reason of the reduction in the public income. Floods and fires, especially in small villages, added to the wretchedness of the Jewish situation.

Preoccupied with the problem of maintaining a bare existence, the Jews of Poland had little time and less humor for any new departures in their communal and cultural life. In regard to the former, drastically reduced budgets made possible only the maintenance of the most elementary service, and the facts showing cultural progress are meager. There was excitement over a new Government ordinance which limited the rights of Kehilloth to administering only the religious affairs of the communities, and giving a controlling voice in these affairs to the Agudath Israel, the ultra-orthodox wing of the community.

In this connection a decision of the Supreme Court of Poland regarding the matter of conversion is interesting. In the case of a Catholic whose application to be converted to Judaism had been denied by the Warsaw rabbinate on the ground that the Tsaristic law of 1905 forbade Christians to adopt non-Christian faiths, the court ruled that this prohibition was intended by the Russian Government to apply only to members of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Several events connected with occurrences in Germany are of great interest. In September 1931, the Polish Government lodged a complaint with the German ambassador in Warsaw against the Rosh Ha-Shanah riot in Berlin, on the ground that several of the Jews injured were Polish citizens, demanding that these victims be compensated for their injuries. In June 1932, mass meetings were held in many cities of Poland in protest against the passage by the Prussian diet of the law seeking to confiscate the property of East European Jews in Germany, and the Council of Polish Kehilloth called upon the Polish Government to protect its nationals in Germany from such expropriation.

Russia

The past may be regarded as a normal year for the Jews of Russia. Almost entirely devoid of unusual events, the year was for our brethren a continuation of the comparatively drab incidents of the year before, revolving around
the three subjects of the greatest concern to the Jewish population, namely, (1) economic adaptation through agriculture and industry, (2) developments in the status of religion, and (3) the fight against anti-Semitism.

In respect of agricultural colonization, little of any of great importance occurred. A decree issued in September 1931, by the Comzet, as the Government department for settling Jews on the land is called, and the Collectivization Center, indicates that there are factors at work which render Jews reluctant to go onto land far removed from their homes. The decree prohibited the compulsory transfer of Jews engaged in agriculture in their native villages to the Crimea and Bira-Bidjan. In March 1932, a report stated that the older settlers in the Crimea were vigorously opposed to the granting of equal benefits to newcomers, on the ground that they (the older settlers) had, for five years, done the more difficult pioneering work. The conflict, it was said, was particularly sharp among the women. In April, a considerable stir was created by the complaint of thirty Jewish families who had gone to the Kalinindorf colony in the Ukraine, that they had been compelled to return to Zhitomir because of shabby treatment at the colony. An official investigation disclosed the existence of highly unsatisfactory conditions which had caused the colony to dwindle from 1,916 families to only 350. In May, owing to a shortage of grain between crops, the Agro-Joint (American Jewish Joint Agricultural Foundation) was compelled to send ten car-loads of flour to Jewish colonists in the Kherson and Krivoy Rog districts.

On May 23, 1932, the Government announced the abolition of all taxes, tolls, market dues, and license fees, formerly levied on private trade insofar as food products are concerned; only producers, however, are permitted to sell these products. In June, Emes, Moscow Yiddish daily, reported that this "new economic policy" was encouraging Jewish colonists to greater activity.

Little progress was reported, during the past year, in the colonization of Bira-Bidjan in the Far East. The news dispatches generally indicated that the Jewish communists who are eagerly supporting this project have been meeting with profound disappointment, owing to the unwillingness
of Jews to go to that distant region. Efforts continued to persuade Jews in other countries, even Palestine, to go to Bira-Bidjan. A group of Lithuanian Jews who did go complained, in letters to the Jewish press, of the difficult conditions they found and expressed eagerness to return to Lithuania; they had, however, been required to renounce their Lithuanian citizenship before securing permission to leave for Russia. In February 1932, announcement was made that the Government had revised its plan for settling Jews in Bira-Bidjan. Instead of 19,000 only 14,000, of whom 4,000 are to be foreign Jews, are to be colonized there during 1932. In June, Emes, explained that the Bira-Bidjan scheme is failing because the Government agents there are opposed to the settlement of any but qualified workers, that is, persons with experience and training. The newspaper expressed the view that the 14,000 quota would not be filled.

The efforts of government and the Ort, Agro-Joint, and other private agencies to increase the number of Jews in industry continued during the year. In October 1931, the Ort announced that it had completed plans for employing Jewish farmers in the Crimea, in factories near the colonies, during the winter. In February 1932, official statistics indicated that 10,000 Jews are employed in the Ukraine in the heavy industries,—tractor assembly, electrical mechanization and locomotive construction. According to figures published in April, a total of 787,000 Jews are in Government employ, which includes not only civil service but also industry, and that this number is eighty per cent higher than the total at the end of 1926.

In March 1932, the American Jewish Congress made public the contents of a letter received from a group of prominent Jews in Palestine stating that they had received information to the effect that Jews in Russia were being arrested and tortured until they produced gold or foreign currency. In a communique given to the London correspondent of the Jewish Morning Journal of New York City, the Soviet Ambassador to Great Britain categorically denied this report. In June, the Jewish Telegraphic Agency made public several letters received by American Jews from relatives in Russia in which the latter complain that the Russian secret police arrest persons, Jewish and non-Jewish, believed
to have received foreign currencies, and imprison them until they produce such monies or gold.

The anti-religious movement continued during the period under review but by no means with the impetuosity of former years. The League of Militant Atheists, aided by the Yiddish communist press, carried on drives before the Jewish high holidays in the fall of 1931, and the Passover holidays in the spring of 1932, but with indifferent success. In October, Rul, the Berlin Russian (anti-Soviet) newspaper, published a report that, on the first day of Sukkoth, there occurred, in a suburb of Odessa, a clash between Orthodox Jews and members of the Comsomol (Communist Youth Organization), when the latter persisted in trying to interrupt religious services, and that two of the young communists were slain. The report was, however, not confirmed by other sources. In the same month, Emes complained of the government's inaction in the face of continuing religious observance by Jews, especially in the colonies. This journal asserted bitterly that the wives of colonists go to the towns in order to have their poultry slaughtered by shohetim. "New synagogues are springing up in the colonies," the paper continues, "while weddings are held according to Jewish religious tradition, and circumcisions are performed; Jewish religious teachers are even engaged for the instruction of children of the colonists." The anti-religious campaign preceding Passover was also a failure, according to the Yiddish communist press.

At the same time, however, there were reports of the confiscation of churches and synagogues and of communists being punished for observing Jewish rites. In April 1932, a report from Kiev stated that the All-Russian Central Executive Committee had ordered the restoration to the Jewish community of the only remaining synagogue, which had been confiscated by the local authorities; it was believed that this action was prompted by the unwillingness of the government to deprive the Jews of their only house of worship while the Russian Orthodox population of the city still had many churches. The Government also permitted the importation by individuals in foreign countries, of Matzoth and other Passover specialties.
A number of anti-Jewish manifestations in schools, factories, government service, and in the Red Army were reported in the press during the past year, but they did not differ in type from those of previous years. The government continued to punish severely those found guilty of overt acts, and the Communist party and press continued to condemn all anti-Jewish agitation.

C. PALESTINE

Events of Jewish interest in Palestine during the past year were, to a great extent, of local importance only. The period began with changes in administration. In July 1931, the British Colonial Office announced that Sir John Chancellor, High Commissioner for Palestine, who had submitted his resignation, would be succeeded by Lieut. Gen. Arthur Grenfell Wauchope, then commanding the Northern Ireland district. General Wauchope was sworn in on November 20, 1931. In the meantime, Norman Bentwich, Attorney-General for Palestine, had retired from service on October 31. He had been under Arab displeasure since the riots of 1929, and an attempt had been made on his life during the sessions of the Shaw investigating commission. In January 1932, announcement was made of the retirement of Albert M. Hyamson, director of the Department of Immigration.

In August 1931, when the Administration announced the questions to be required to be answered in the census to be taken in November, the Va'ad Leumi (Jewish National Council) adopted a resolution urging the fullest participation of all Jews in the census. Zionist Revisionists, however, urged Jews to boycott the census on the alleged ground that its purpose was to lead to the establishment of a legislative council in which Jewish representation would be small. "The Palestine census," declared Vladmir Jabotinsky, leader of the Revisionists, in a message from Paris, "is not intended for statistical purposes as is customary in civilized countries, but is simply a manoeuvre to prove that the anti-Zionist policy has borne full fruit; that the Jews are a small minority; and that the country is ripe for a Legislative Council with an Arab majority." A number of Jewish young men responded to the anti-census agitation by tearing down
placards posted by the administration and other acts, and some arrests followed. The census showed that the total population numbered 1,035,154 an increase of thirty-five per cent since 1922, when the census indicated a total of 757,182. In December, provisional figures were published showing that the Jews numbered 175,006, Moslems 759,952, Christians 90,607, and others 9,589. Later bulletins revealed that the total population of Jerusalem was 90,526, of whom 51,300 are Jews, 19,850 are Moslems, 19,000 are Christians and 376 others.

Relations between the Administration and the Arabs, and between the latter and the Jews, were, of course the matters of greatest moment. A sequel to the bloody riots of August 1929, was the agitation carried on, during the past year, by the Arab leaders and their press, against the provision of the administration of sealed armories in the Jewish colonies, so that arms would be available to the authorities in case of similar outbreaks. This measure was, the Arabs said, tantamount to “arming the Jews,” against the Arabs. Demonstrations were planned throughout the country for August 23, 1931, the second anniversary of the 1929 riots, but the Government announced that these would not be permitted, and it also forbade the Arab press from agitating in favor of these demonstrations. The Arab press suspended publication for a week in protest against this order. The situation was tense, and sections of the Jewish population feared a recurrence of disorders. Jews living in mixed Arab-Jewish quarters in Jerusalem left their homes a few days before the announced demonstration which took the form of a general strike of all Arabs. Except in Nablus, the day passed without untoward event. In that town, a large crowd of Arabs gathered in the bazaar section and tried to stage a demonstration, and threw stones and other missiles at the police when the latter tried to quell the disturbance, wounding the commanding officer who, thereupon, ordered his men to fire at the mob; three Arabs were wounded. Soon after, British troops arrived and quickly restored order.

The agitation against the sealed armories was only one of the occasions seized upon by the Arab nationalist leaders
for embarrassing the Palestine Administration and, indi-
rectly, the British government. They also rejected the land
development scheme announced by the Colonial Office in
July 1931. This prompted the influential *Near East and
India*, published in London, to condemn the Arab policy,
as being essentially anti-government and not anti-Zionist
in character. Arab leaders also talked of a tax boycott
against the government.

A powerful instrument for promoting anti-Zionist agita-
tion was the so-called Pan-Islamic Congress which took
place in Jerusalem from December 7 to December 16. This
was called by Amin el Husseini, the Grand Mufti of Pales-
tine, whose authority was questioned and leadership threat-
ened by a group of Moslem notables in Palestine. About a
week before the Congress, the Palestine Administration
called upon the Grand Mufti for a copy of the agenda of
the meeting. Although invitations had been sent to the
governments of countries having large Moslem popula-
tions, none of these agreed to participate, and the Congress
was, thus, merely a meeting of individuals.

When the Congress opened, anti-Jewish circulars were
distributed, two of them containing photographs, obviously
forged, showing British officers teaching Jews how to use
fire-arms and drilling them in military tactics. The Jewish
Agency Executive called upon the Government to put a
stop to the circulation of this propaganda. At the Congress,
delegate after delegate denounced the Zionist movement.
Some speakers alleged that it is the Jewish plan to oust all
the Moslems from Palestine and restore the ancient Jewish
temple on the site of the Mosque of Omar. The Congress
rejected the decisions of the League of Nations Wailing Wall
Commission on the grounds that “foreigners have no right
to decide the fate of a Moslem sacred shrine,” and that, as
the Palestine Moslems do not recognize the Mandate they
cannot accept the decision of a body appointed by the
League. Resolutions finally adopted were: 1) to protest to
the League of Nations (!) against the establishment of a
Jewish national home in, and the ousting of Arabs from,
Palestine; (2) to urge all Moslems to boycott all goods
manufactured or produced by Jews in Palestine; (3) to
broadcast to the Moslem world that Zionism is a catastroph
for Palestine; (4) to reject the decisions of the Wailing Wall Commission; and (5) to propagate throughout the world the Palestine Moslems' claims for independence. It was then unanimously resolved to form a $5,000,000 corporation, the shares to be subscribed for by Moslems all over the world, for constructive purposes in Palestine to counteract Jewish nationalist activities.

With such agitation rife, it is not to be wondered at that there were occasional clashes between Jews and Arabs, depredations by the latter on the property of the former, disputes regarding the possession of land, and even murder. A number of killings of Jews by Arabs caused sensations in Palestine, especially the brutal murder in July 1931, of a young couple, Johannan Stahl and Salvia Zohar, near Tel Aviv. It was not until four and a half months later, and largely as a result of private Jewish initiative and not of police activity, that their bodies were found, and several bedouins arrested; almost a year later, two of these were tried with the result that one was acquitted and the other sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment.

In the midst of such strained relations between Moslems and Jews, it was natural that the publication in February, 1932, of what purported to be a plan to bring an end to inter-racial strife should arouse profound interest. On February 5, the London bureau of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency gave out the text of a statement ascribed to Abbas Hilmi, formerly Khedive of Egypt, suggesting a round table conference of Jews and Arabs which should proceed to divide Palestine into two administrative units; one of these, in which Jewish interests would be concentrated, would be known as the "National Home of the Jews," but be part of the Palestine State and subject to its constitution, which would grant autonomy to the Jewish region in all internal matters and guarantee to the Jews a proper share in the government of the State as a whole. The proposal, it was said, had been sent to the British Pro-Arab Committee in London, and was accompanied by a letter ascribed to the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem. The project, which found no supporters in either the Jewish or the Arab camp, was disowned by both Abbas Hilmi and the Grand Mufti and was denounced as a forgery by everybody except the Revisionists
in Palestine, who charged that it was inspired by the British Government, which wished to feel out public sentiment, but that because of premature publication, the proposal was repudiated by its authors.

Economic conditions were comparatively good in Palestine during the past year. In December 1931, an official statement showed that there were 30,000 Jews employed in the country, 7,000 of them in agriculture, 4,500 in building and public works, 4,000 in factories and large workshops, 3,000 in small workshops; 1,000 in transport; and 9,500 in miscellaneous occupations. Previously, in October, it had been announced that 1,980 Jews were unemployed on September 1. In November, a flurry of excitement was caused by a strike of Arab and Jewish cab-drivers and freight handlers in Jerusalem, as a protest against oppressive government taxes and license fees.

An event which attracted world-wide interest was the Levant Fair held at Tel Aviv in April 1932. There were 1,200 exhibitors of local and foreign goods representing twenty-four countries. The exposition was the fifth annual event of its kind, but differed from previous fairs in being much more international in scope.

In June 1932, the first Jordan power house of the Rutenberg electrification project was opened with impressive ceremonies in the presence of high government officials.

A few interesting communal events remain to be recorded. In November 1931, announcement was made that twenty Jewish educational and philanthropic institutions in Palestine which are dependent upon contributions from the United States had organized a Federation. The following month, a Social Service Council was established in Jerusalem by the Va'ad Leumi, as part of a plan to create similar bodies in other cities to care for the needy. In February 1932, a center for Jewish women pioneers was dedicated at Haifa. The site had been contributed by the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association (Pica), and the building fund had been provided by the Palestine Women’s Guild of America.

Great enthusiasm attended the opening, at the end of
March 1932, at Tel Aviv, of a series of athletic games sponsored by the World Maccabee Union, in which Jewish athletes from many countries contested. The Levant Fair and this Maccabiad brought a great many tourists to Palestine.

While the world-wide depression did not greatly affect economic conditions in Palestine, its effect on Jewish communities in other countries was such as to slow down the raising of funds for Palestine institutions. One of the results of this condition was that the Jewish Agency for Palestine was compelled to make drastic reductions in the budget of its various activities, including education, and a revision of the salaries of the teaching staff in the Palestine schools. This led to dissatisfaction among the teachers, and the opening of the schools for the 1931 fall semester was delayed until October 21. Later, in December, there was a strike of teachers in protest against the non-payment of salaries; in January 1932, there was another strike which lasted an entire month.

There was trouble also at the opening of the 1932 spring semester of the Hebrew University, when young Zionist Revisionists rioted at the inaugural lecture of Norman Bentwich, former Attorney General of Palestine, who had been appointed to the newly-established Weizmann Chair of International Law and Peace. The Revisionist demonstration was a protest against the appointment of Mr. Bentwich.

A notable gift to the Hebrew University Library was made by a Warsaw group who, in July 1931, contributed 2,300 volumes of all kinds. At that time, the Library had a total of 230,000 catalogued volumes. At the same time, announcement was made of the gift by Dr. Henry I. Wachtel of New York City, who had established a dental clinic at the Straus Health Center in Jerusalem, of an extensive dental library. Later in the year, Doctor Wachtel made possible the printing and circulation, by Hadassah, among the children of Palestine, of an illustrated booklet, in Hebrew, on the care of the teeth.

On January 25, 1932, the first commencement exercises, since the foundation of that institution, were held at the Hebrew University, when master degrees were conferred upon thirteen students.
The 17th Biennial Congress of the World Zionist Organization which took place at Basle, Switzerland, during the first two weeks of July, 1931, was one of the most notable congresses in the history of the Organization. It was opened with the presentation of an address by Dr. Chaim Weizmann, who had been president of the organization since 1918, in which he outlined the difficulties which the movement had encountered during the past decade and presented a number of suggestions for the future conduct of the Zionist Organization including the following: (1) the settlement of at least 50,000 Jewish families in Palestine; (2) the floating of a Jewish loan for the development of Palestine; (3) the establishment of a department for Arab relations within the Palestine Zionist Executive; (4) the development and encouragement of private enterprise in Palestine; (5) the strengthening of the Jewish National Fund and of the Keren Hayesod; (6) the maintenance of Jewish rights under the Mandate; (7) the consolidation and extension of existing achievements in Palestine; and (8) the building up of the Zionist organization and the Jewish Agency on a broader and surer basis.

Dr. Weizmann declared that, because of the effect of the world-wide economic depression upon Jewish communities everywhere, Palestine reconstruction had been slowed down to a dangerous degree and that the Congress is faced with the serious problem presented by this situation. Referring to the White Paper issued by the British Colonial Office on October 20, 1930, Dr. Weizmann declared that the letter addressed to him by Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald, and published on February 13, 1931, righted the wrong done by the White Paper and emphatically reaffirmed the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate. At the same time, he charged that the civil administration in Palestine had shown a certain apathy and indifference since the beginning, and that the mandatory power had shown reluctance to take any active steps to promote the policy formulated in the Mandate. In concluding his report, Dr. Weizmann presented his formal resignation as the president of the World Zionist Organization.

The opposition to Dr. Weizmann and his policies, which had been developing for a number of years and had gained
great force since the issuance of the White Paper of October 20, 1930, came to a head at the Congress. His policies were bitterly condemned not only by the Radical Zionists (Revisionists), but also by a faction of the general Zionists. Dr. Weizmann was defended by the Labor delegates and by a small group among the general Zionists. He was especially censured for his acceptance of the MacDonald letter as superseding the Passfield White Paper, and he was attacked also for a statement made by him, in an interview with a representative of the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, to the effect that he had no sympathy with, or understanding of, the demand for a Jewish majority in Palestine because the world will construe this demand only in one sense,—that the Jews wish to acquire the majority in order to drive out the Arabs. The groups supporting Dr. Weizmann were greatly encouraged by a cablegram dispatched to Dr. Weizmann by Felix M. Warburg and Dr. Cyrus Adler, leaders of the American non-Zionist delegates in the Jewish Agency, stating that they shared with Dr. Weizmann responsibility for steps taken by him. The cablegram declared: "In all conferences held subsequent to the issuance of the White Paper you have adhered to the method set forth by the Jewish Agency and have consulted not only the members of your own committee but ourselves and our other colleagues in America who have had full opportunity to advise and to obtain counsel for the best way out of the difficulties which confronted us. We desire to share with you full responsibility for whatever action has been taken and for the results, which we believe were the best obtainable under the circumstances."

The proceedings of the Congress were marked by factional conflicts, especially between the Revisionists and the Labor delegates. A number of the sessions were stormy and one was broken up by the Revisionists, who left the meeting in a body when consideration of a resolution offered by them was refused; this resolution formulated the aim of Zionism as being the creation of a Jewish state with a Jewish majority on both sides of the River Jordan.

Instead of the resolution offered by the Revisionists, the Congress adopted the following: "Zionism is a national movement to secure the freedom of the Jewish people. It
adheres firmly and unalterably to its aims as laid down in
the Basle program (to create for the Jewish people in Pal-
estine a publicly recognized and legally secured home) and
to bring about in Eretz Israel a solution of the Jewish
problem. The homeless and landless Jewish people which
is compelled to migrate strives to overcome its abnormal
political, economic and spiritual conditions by reestablis-
ing itself in its historic homeland through large and unin-
terrupted immigration and settlement and by re-creating
in Eretz Israel its national life with all the essential features
of a people's normal existence. The Congress emphatically
rejects any attempt to minimize this fundamental aim of
Zionism." In another resolution the Congress expressed its
regret at the views uttered by Dr. Weizmann in his inter-
view with the Jewish Telegraphic Agency. The adoption
of this resolution was interpreted as an expression of lack
of confidence in Dr. Weizmann's leadership. By unanimous
vote the Congress approved the resolution of its Committee
on Immigration, protesting against the limitations upon
immigration set up by the Palestine Administration.

A motion offered by the Revisionists favoring the annul-
ment of the agreement between Zionists and non-Zionists,
which underlies the existing organization of the Jewish
Agency, was rejected by the Congress.

On the subject of the letter of Prime Minister MacDonald
to Dr. Weizmann, explaining the Passfield White Paper,
the resolution adopted by the Congress expressed "appre-
ciation of the assurances and definitions in the letter which
indicate a desire on the part of the Mandatory government
to meet the just demands of the Jewish people." The
resolution goes on to state, however, that the letter "con-
tains restrictions and principles which afford ground for
justified apprehension, and omits any reference to a number
of important questions that were dealt with in the White
Paper of October 1930, in a manner endangering the develop-
ment of the Jewish national home and unacceptable to the
Jewish Agency." The resolution proceeds to point out
that the assurances contained in the MacDonald letter
have not yet been carried out by the Palestine government,
especially in respect of the purchase of land by Jews, Jewish
immigration, and the employment of Jews on public works.
The resolution concludes: "The Congress accordingly regards the Premier's letter as a basis for further negotiations between the Jewish Agency and the Mandatory government with a view to the effective implementing of the assurances in the letter and the carrying out of the justified Jewish demands regarding the questions unsatisfactorily dealt with and those that are still open, and the creation of such conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home."

A special resolution protesting against the failure of the Palestine administration to carry out Prime Minister MacDonald's assurance regarding the employment of Jews on public works was adopted, as well as one obligating all institutions supported by Zionist funds to observe the principle of the employment of Jewish labor. Another resolution approved by the Congress protested against the persecution of Zionists in Russia and requested the Zionist Executive to facilitate immigration into Palestine of persecuted Zionists.

Despite the vigorous opposition of the Labor delegates, the Congress adopted a minority resolution submitted by the Revisionist members of the Education Committee, deploring the tendency of the leaders of the Hebrew University "to abdicate Zionist ideals," and requesting the Zionist Executive to safeguard the national spirit of the Hebrew University. This resolution was regarded as an expression of protest against the views of Dr. Judah L. Magnes, Chancellor of the Hebrew University, regarding the aims of the Zionist movement.

The most important resolution bearing upon economic questions adopted by the Congress, was one proposed by Israel B. Brodie, an American delegate, who recommended the establishment in all countries of private corporations to assist the flow of private capital into all the economic fields of Palestine, and the union of these corporations into a single association, the function of which would be to recommend safe and profitable investments, to assist persons of small means to settle on plantations or engage in small industries, to attract large capital for industrial enterprises, to organize an efficient information service in Palestine and in the more important Jewish centers, to organize
the marketing of Palestinian products, and to study opportunities for new investments and for opening new fields of industry. By the adoption of this resolution, the Congress brought about the separation of economic from political matters and the removal of Palestine economic work from the direct control of the Zionist Executive, an idea which had been advocated for a long time by a group of American Zionists led by Judges Louis D. Brandeis and Julian W. Mack.

Two weeks after the Congress opened, it elected Nahum Sokolow, President of the World Zionist Organization. It also elected a new Executive of five members, namely, Chaim Arlosoroff, Palestine Laborite; Selig Brodetsky, British General Zionist; Hershel Farbstein, Polish Mizrachist; Emanuel Neumann, American General Zionist; and Berl Locker, Palestine Laborite.

On July 11, the meeting of the Administrative Committee of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, opened at Basle. The Committee received the formal resignation of Felix M. Warburg of New York City as Chairman, Mr. Warburg having announced his resignation in October 1930 as a protest against the Passfield White Paper (see Vol. 33, page 24). Reports on the political situation and on the financial condition of the Agency were submitted by Dr. Weizmann, President, and Dr. Werner Senator, Treasurer; Joseph C. Hyman, secretary of the provisional committee of four, which had acted for the American members of the Administrative Committee following the resignation of Mr. Warburg, presented a report on the activities of the American section. The financial statement showed that, during the year ended September, 1930, the expenditures of the Agency had totalled $2,017,891, an excess over the receipts of $561,439, this amount representing the deficits not only for the year 1929–30 but for preceding years as well.

In its report, the Executive of the Agency recommended that the Jewish school system in Palestine be transferred to the charge of the new Jewish national council with an annual grant-in-aid from the Agency for a specified number of years.
Dr. Cyrus Adler, one of the two co-Chairmen appointed following the death of Louis Marshall, elected Chairman at the meeting of the Council in 1929,—the other having been Lord Melchett, who also passed away—presided at the meeting of the Council of the Agency which began on July 14. In discussing the financial problems confronting the Agency, Dr. Adler strongly advocated that the continuation of the great enterprise in Palestine be placed on a sound economic, instead of on a eleemosynary basis, and for the early assumption, by the Jewish population, of the support of the educational system and the health work. He deplored the duplication and overlapping of activities by the Agency, the Zionist organization and the Va'ad Leumi (Jewish National Council). Dr. Adler also expressed the view that an agreement between the three parties concerned with Palestine,—the British government, the Arab people and the Jewish people—is necessary, "otherwise the land will not prosper and we shall have recurring irritation, if not worse." While not professing complete satisfaction with its report, Dr. Adler pleaded for adherence by the Jews to the decisions presented in the report of the Wailing Wall Commission (see Vol. 33 pp. 102–103).

In his report to the Council, Joseph C. Hyman, Secretary of the American provisional committee, stated that the American members of the Agency would welcome any steps to bring about a round-table conference of Arabs, Jews, and representatives of the Mandatory government, to discuss Palestine development. He also stated that the American members urged that the budget for the ensuing year be drawn up with a full realization "of the troubled and depressed state in which the world now finds itself." Professor Selig Brodetsky, a member of the Agency Executive, reported on the political activities of the Agency since the issuance of the White Paper in October 1930. Reports were also presented by Dr. Arthur Ruppin, on the general Jewish situation in Palestine, and by Dr. Werner Senator, on the financial problems confronting the Agency.

The Council concluded its meeting with the election of the following officers: Nahum Sokolow, President; O. E. d'Avigdor Goldsmid, Chairman of the Council; Dr. Lee K. Frankel, co-Chairman; Prof. M. Speyer of Belgium and
Robert Szold of New York City, Vice-Chairmen. The following were elected members of the Executive to serve together with the five members of the Zionist Executive: Dr. Maurice Hexter of New York; Dr. Werner Senator of Berlin; Dr. Bernard Kahn, Berlin; Isaac Berkson and Harry Viteles, both of New York City. The Council also elected a new administrative committee. It also decided to appoint a Committee jointly with the Jewish National Council to consider proposals for the transference of the Palestine health work to the National Council and to the Hadassah and adopted a resolution expressing its "sincere desire for the creation of a durable understanding between Jews and Arabs in Palestine on the basis of mutual confidence and respect." The Council also adopted a resolution protesting against the failure of the Palestine administration to put into effect some of the assurances contained in Prime Minister MacDonald's letter of February 1931 to Dr. Weizmann. Another resolution approved of the action of the representatives of the Council in the negotiations which led up to Mr. MacDonald's letter, and characterized that document "as a basis for further discussions of the Jewish Agency with the Mandatory power." The Council decided to leave to the Administrative Committee the framing of the budget, within the limits of the budgets adopted by the Zionist Congress and the one recommended by the Agency's financial committee. Dr. Oscar Wassermann of Berlin was elected Chairman of the Administrative Committee and Dr. Leo Motzkin, Chairman of the Zionist Actions Committee, was named Vice-Chairman of the Administrative Committee.

D. INTERNATIONAL MATTERS

The agitation for calendar reform involving a "blank day" device, which would have the effect of destroying the periodicity of the Sabbath, was given a definite set-back during the year, when the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit of the League of Nations, after a conference at which Jewish organizations of various countries were represented, decided that, in view of present unsettled conditions in many countries it would not, in its report to the League, propose any further steps
in the direction of reform, but would merely suggest further study and efforts to secure the endorsement of public opinion. At this conference, a petition protesting against the blank day device, bearing the signatures of distinguished Jewish laymen of various countries, was submitted in order to demonstrate that the opposition to this device among Jews was not restricted to the rabbinate, as had been alleged. This petition was the outcome of a conference held at Basle, Switzerland, during the past summer, called jointly by the chairman of the Joint Foreign Committee and the president of the American Jewish Committee.

Much interest was aroused in the suggestion of Professor Guido Tedeschi of Rome University that the League of Nations urge its members to enact special laws to curb anti-Semitism.