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BY HARRY SCHNEIDERMAN

I

THE UNITED STATES

While much of the attention of the American Jewish community continued to be centered upon events affecting their brethren in Germany, tragic occurrences in Poland and in Palestine also gave American Jews cause for great concern during the period under review.

REACTION TO BERLIN RIOTS

Almost at the beginning of the period, a wave of anti-Semitic riots and acts of brutality against Jews was reported from Berlin. These occurrences could not be denied by the Nazi government. Their incidence was authenticated by eye-witnesses, including Varian Fry, editor of The Living Age, who gave a vivid description of them to the Associated Press. Public opinion in the United States was aroused, and leading newspapers denounced the Nazi government as responsible for the conditions which had led to the riots. Senators David I. Walsh (Mass.), Millard E. Tydings (Md.), J. Hamilton Lewis (Ill.), and Pat McCarran (Nev.), gave public expression to their sense of outrage. Dr. Ivan Lee Holt, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, also issued a statement deploiring "the barbaric treatment of Christians and Jews in Germany." On July 24, 1935, Senator William H. King (Utah) urged that an investigation of Nazi persecution of Jews and Catholics be made to ascertain if the United States would be warranted in severing diplomatic relations with Germany.

*The period covered by this review is from July 1, 1935, to June 30, 1936. It is based on reports in the Jewish and general press of the United States and a number of foreign countries.
A huge mass meeting in Brooklyn, New York, adopted a protest resolution in which an appeal was addressed to President Roosevelt to intervene officially in the name of the people of the United States; some speakers demanded the breaking off of commercial and diplomatic relations with Germany, if persecutions did not cease. A similar mass meeting was held in Madison Square Garden, New York City. In Washington, a large public meeting, held on August 22, 1935, heard addresses by United States Senators, representatives of labor organizations, and religious leaders. Senator William H. King of Utah declared that he "would not hesitate to vote to rescind the commercial treaty between the United States and Germany if the Hitler regime continues its cruel and paganistic course against Jews, Catholics, and Protestants."

At about the same time, the Minnesota Federation of Labor at its annual convention held in Red Wing, Minnesota, unanimously adopted a resolution asking the United States Government officially to voice a protest against Nazi persecution of minorities.

In Boston, an unusually interesting event occurred. On August 12, the General Assembly of Massachusetts adopted a resolution condemning Nazi Germany’s persecution of minorities. The resolution, which was introduced by Representatives Albert E. Morris of Everett and Thomas Dorgan of Boston, Mass., declared that the General Assembly "views with alarm that certain inhabitants of Germany are being persecuted on account of their religious faith and nationality." It affirmed the "conviction and belief that freedom and equality of mankind, regardless of race, creed or color, is indispensable to the maintenance of modern civilization." A few days later Baron Kurt von Tippelskirch, German Consul General at Boston, issued a statement declaring that the State was overstepping the bounds of international propriety and threatening to bring the matter to the attention of the German Embassy for diplomatic action. This statement was, in turn, declared improper by Governor James M. Curley who retorted that the Nazi program was "abhorrent to right-thinking men
and women the world over." "I am quite satisfied," declared Governor Curley, "that the action taken by the Legislature of Massachusetts is but a formal expression of the opinion of the public as a whole."

Within the Jewish community, the anti-Jewish excesses in Germany were followed by two steps. On July 22, 1935, an emergency conference, sponsored jointly by the American Jewish Congress and the Jewish Labor Committee, adopted a resolution calling upon President Roosevelt to make representations to the German Government expressing the concern of the American people over the outbreaks of violence.

On July 26, a delegation, comprising representatives of the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the B’nai B’rith, and the Jewish Labor Committee, waited upon the Hon. William Phillips, Under Secretary of State who was acting as Secretary in the absence of the Hon. Cordell Hull, and submitted a remonstrance calling attention not only to the events which had just occurred but also to the continuing persecution of Jews as well as of Catholic and Protestant groups and liberal democratic elements in general; the United States Government was requested to protest against these persecutions and to take appropriate steps to inform the German Government of the sense of outrage of the American people. Mr. Phillips assured the delegation orally of the sympathy of the government of the United States, and, a few days later, embodied these assurances in a letter addressed to the signatories of the remonstrance. (For the text of these documents, see the Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee, printed in this volume).

While no public announcement has been made of any action by the United States Government in connection with events in Germany, that such action was taken was indicated by President Roosevelt in his annual message to Congress, delivered by him in person and broadcast by radio on the evening of January 3, 1935. In the course of this message, the President said: "We have sought by every legitimate means to exert our moral influence against
THE S. S. BREMEN AFFAIR

Besides events in Germany, occurrences in the United States during July and August 1935, also served to draw public attention to Nazi policies. The most striking of these happenings was the incident involving the Hapag-Lloyd liner *Bremen*. On July 26, a crowd estimated as numbering from four to five thousand persons staged an anti-Nazi demonstration at the New York City pier where this steamer was berthed. The demonstration reached a climax when a flag bearing the swastika symbol was ripped from the staff at the bow of the ship and was tossed into the river. This action precipitated a clash between police and demonstrators in which several persons were severely hurt and some of the mob were arrested, all of them non-Jews. The policeman most seriously injured, who, it was subsequently reported, gave the rioters most determined resistance, was Detective Matthew Solomon, a Jew.

This episode at once became the occasion for diplomatic exchanges. Although the Hon. Wilbur J. Carr, then Acting Secretary of State, at a press conference, expressed regret over the incident, the German Government instructed Dr. Rudolph Leitner, its chargé d'affaires, to present a formal protest. The note was transmitted to Governor Herbert H. Lehman of New York for an investigation and report. Subsequently, the Hon. William Phillips, Under Secretary of State, in an interview with newspapermen, replied to the German protest with a defense of the conduct of the New York police. While regretting that "the German national emblem should, during the disturbance which took place, not have received that respect to which it is entitled," Mr. Phillips blamed the steamship company for not having adopted precautionary measures, as the police had urged. He emphasized the fact that a Jewish detective had been injured while defending the Nazi emblem.
The affair was further complicated when, in September, six of the rioters came up for a hearing before Magistrate Louis B. Brodsky, a Jew. He ordered one of the rioters held for trial and freed the remaining five, explaining his act in a lengthy statement in the course of which he condoned the riot because, in his opinion, the demonstrators had regarded the swastika as similar to "the black flag of piracy," and the disturbance had been "provoked by this flaunting of an emblem to those who regarded it as a defiant challenge to society." Judge Brodsky's act and his explanatory statement attracted widespread attention. Newspapers in the United States were almost unanimously of the opinion that the incident was unfortunate. The press of Germany was indignant and some organs indulged in abusive personal attacks against the magistrate. Dr. Hans Luther, the German Ambassador, in person, lodged a protest with the Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, who sent a request for a report to Governor Lehman who, in turn, asked the Hon. Jacob Gould Schurman, Jr., chief city magistrate, to submit an account of the incident.

Several days later it was announced that, without waiting for the report of Governor Lehman, Secretary of State Hull had given an oral apology to Dr. Leitner, Counsellor of the German embassy, for Judge Brodsky's remarks. Secretary Hull had stated: "Although, in this country, the right of freedom of speech is well recognized by our fundamental law, it is to be regretted that an official having no responsibility for maintaining relations between the United States and other countries should, regardless of what he may personally think of the laws and policies of other governments, thus indulge in expressions offensive to another government with which we have official connections." Mr. Hull's act made it possible for Herr Hitler, in proclaiming the swastika banner as the official emblem of the Reich, to refer to "the insult to the German flag—which had been settled in the most loyal manner by the American government." This proclamation was made in the course of the celebration of the National Socialist Party Day (Der Parteitag der Freiheit), at Nuremberg, on September 15, 1935, when the infamous edicts were promulgated which have been aptly termed "ghetto laws."
In the course of the same speech before the Reichstag at Nuremberg, Herr Hitler attacked the Jews for their alleged link with Communism. This charge was repudiated in a declaration issued in October by Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of the American Jewish Committee; Alfred M. Cohen, president of the B'nai B'rith; and B. C. Vladeck, chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee. The German Chancellor repeated his allegations on November 27, 1935, in an interview with Hugh Baillie, president of the United Press. Shortly afterward, the United Press published an interview with Dr. Adler, refuting and ridiculing Hitler's statements.

In the meantime, another international incident had developed in New York City. Toward the end of July, Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia directed Paul Moss, Commissioner of Licenses, to deny the application of a German national for a license to practice as a masseur. This step drew from Dr. Hans Borchers, German Consul General in New York City, a protest in which he averred that the Mayor's act was a breach of the commercial treaty between the United States and Germany, which gave Germans in the United States the same rights as are accorded to American citizens in Germany. To this, the Mayor retorted that, while the treaty should be reciprocal "it is well known that American citizens of the Jewish faith have been discriminated against in Germany." The Mayor was not moved from his stand by protest meetings held by German residents of the city, which were made the vehicle for abusive anti-Jewish utterances and bitter denunciations of Mr. LaGuardia. And, when the State Department informed Paul Windels, Corporation Counsel of New York City, that the German-American commercial treaty of 1935 was still in effect and that no complaints of any violation of it had been received from American citizens, Mayor LaGuardia insisted that this assertion was "contrary to information I (he) received as a member of Congress during the latter part of my (his) term." Later, he supported this contention by referring to five press releases of the Department of State, all complaining of discrimination by Germany as against American holders of German bonds. At the same time, the German Government issued a semi-official
declaration asserting that Mayor LaGuardia's action was a breach of the German-American treaty, but made no attempt to take official steps. The incident was eventually closed by the departure of the license applicant for Germany.

Probably the first legal controversy involving the Nazi racial laws to be brought into an American court was based on the claim of one, Marcel M. Holzer, against the Reichsbahn (German State Railroads), for damages because, in violation of a contract, he had been discharged from employment. In deciding that Holzer could bring suit in an American court, Justice William T. Collins of the New York Supreme Court bench declared on June 20 that "we are . . . not obligated by the law of comity to enforce the law of Germany when its enforcement is sought here contrary to our every sense of justice, liberty and morality." "We are in no wise seeking to interfere with the internal affairs of Germany," Justice Collins said. "We are not at the moment concerned with the conscience of Germany, but with our own. We are but applying our public policy to an action pending here because the policy of Germany so shockingly conflicts with ours."

**The Olympic Games**

All these events served to give impetus to the movement against the participation of American athletes in the Olympic Games, scheduled to take place in Berlin in the summer of 1936. It will be recalled that there had been agitation against participation in 1933 and 1934 (see American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 36, p. 126 et seq.; Vol. 37, p. 138–139).

Former Judge Jeremiah T. Mahoney of the New York State Supreme Court, president of the Amateur Athletic Union, became the recognized leader of the anti-Olympic movement when he announced, on July 25, 1935, that he would personally vote against American participation, if reports of discrimination against Jewish athletes were substantiated. He reaffirmed this stand in a radio address over a nation-wide network in August. Avery Brundage, president of the American Olympic Committee, declared
in reply that he had not heard of any discrimination and that he would continue to support the Games.

During succeeding months a number of protests against American participation in the Games were heard. The *Christian Century*, a Protestant journal, urged that the Games be moved to some other country where fair play would be guaranteed, and in August the *Commonweal*, Catholic weekly, demanded a boycott of the Olympics. On August 13, Senator Peter G. Gerry of Rhode Island demanded in the Senate that American sportsmen "give serious consideration to the question of whether we should participate in the Olympic Games if conditions in Germany continue as they are." Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts supported his demand that the United States consider withdrawal from the Olympics. Several days later, Representative Emanuel Celler of New York introduced a resolution in the House, intended to discourage American participation by prohibiting the use of public or semi-public funds to defray expenses of Americans seeking to compete in the events.

Other American leaders and important organizations also expressed their opposition. In September, Governor George H. Earle of Pennsylvania demanded withdrawal of American teams from the Games because, he said, Nazi policies were "wholly contrary to the Olympic spirit of fair sportsmanship." The National Council of Methodist Youth appealed, in October, to American church leaders to urge their parishioners to shun the Games as "one of the most effective means of expressing the moral indignation of civilized people at the return to barbarism" in Germany. Several weeks later, the 55th Annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, at Atlantic City, voted to oppose American participation.

These views, however, were not shared by men who were connected with the arrangement of the games. William M. Henry, technical director of the 1932 Olympiad at Los Angeles, returning from Germany in August, and Frederick W. Rubien, secretary of the American Olympic Committee, returning in September, both defended the plans for American participation, declaring they had seen no signs of anti-Jewish discrimination in sports. This view was
upheld by General Charles H. Sherrill, American member of the International Olympic Committee, who warned that continued agitation against participation would intensify anti-Jewish feeling in this country. In October, he made public a letter from Captain Hans von Tschammer und Osten, chief of the German Olympic Committee, giving assurance that there would be no discrimination in Germany on racial grounds. The General's statements amazed Jewish and liberal opinion throughout America, and were vigorously refuted by William B. Chamberlain, Secretary of the Committee on Fair Play in Sports, which had been organized to carry on the struggle against participation, with George Gordon Battle and Dr. Henry Smith Leiper acting as co-chairmen. Mr. Chamberlain declared that fair play had "been denied not only to Jewish athletes in Germany but also to Catholic and Protestant sport clubs which do not accept Nazi doctrines of conscience."

In October, Mr. Mahoney cited a formidable list of Nazi violations of the Olympic pledge in answer to assertions, made in Germany by Dr. Theodor Lewald, that Germany was living up to her obligations. Though he had been ousted from the presidency of the German Olympics Association and the Reich Sports Association because of his partial Jewish ancestry, Dr. Lewald had been retained by the Nazi Government as a temporary sports expert. His statements were also ridiculed by Dr. Charles S. MacFarland, general secretary emeritus of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

On October 24, leading Catholic and Protestant figures issued a statement advocating American withdrawal from the Games. Signers included Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; Michael Williams, editor, and George N. Shuster, managing editor, of the Commonweal; Dr. Henry Smith Leiper; Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt; Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president of the Union Theological Seminary; Dr. Tyler Dennett, president of Williams College; Dr. John H. Finley; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick; former Ambassador to Germany, James W. Gerard; William Green, president of the A. F. of L.; Rev. Dr. John Haynes
Holmes; Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia; Amos Pinchot; and Dr. Mary E. Woolley, president of Holyoke College.

In November, representatives of 75,000 German-Americans went on record for the postponement of the Olympics and their removal from Berlin, at a special meeting of the German-American League for Culture. Later in the same month, 138 Protestant clergymen and educators joined in a public statement demanding American withdrawal to make it clear "to the Nazi government that its cruel treatment of 'non-Aryans' is repugnant to the conscience of the world." A few days later, Ernest Lee Jahncke, one of the three American members of the International Olympic Committee, caused a sensation by the publication of letters to Dr. Lewald and to Count Henri de Baillet-Latour, chairman of the International Olympic Committee, in which Mr. Jahncke declared that to hold the games in Germany would be a blow to the Olympic ideal. Father Charles E. Coughlin, Detroit radio priest, also urged support of the Olympic boycott, as did the presidents of 41 American colleges, in a statement made public on December 2.

The anti-Olympic movement received a temporary set-back in November when, after several denials of ever having received an invitation, Helene Mayer, 1932 Olympic fencing champion, who was living in Los Angeles, accepted a hurried Nazi bid to take part in the Berlin Games. It was reported that the fact that Miss Mayer had relatives in Germany had influenced her acceptance. Officials at Mills College, California, where she was a language instructor, announced that "she would represent Germany only if granted full German citizenship rights." The Nazi government granted her request by declaring her an "Aryan," although she was of mixed parentage.

Opposition to the Berlin Olympics reached a climax in New York at a mass-meeting held on December 3. Speakers included Governor Earle of Pennsylvania; Mayor La Guardia of New York; Alfred J. Lill, member of the American Olympic Committee; Jeremiah T. Mahoney; Dr. Frank Bohn, publicist; Walter White, secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Joseph Schlossberg of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union;
and Francis A. Henson, treasurer of the Committee on Fair Play in Sports.

A large section of the American press strongly upheld the anti-Olympics movement, as did former Olympics participants, including Jesse Owens, track; Jack Shea, ice-skating; Lillian Copeland, discus; Stella Walsh, sprint; Frank Wykoff, relay; Irving Jaffe, ice-skating, and many others. Organizations advocating non-participation in the Olympics included the New Jersey American Legion, the International Typographical Union, the New Jersey Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baltimore City Council, the Catholic War Veterans, the American Youth Congress, the American League Against War and Fascism, and innumerable others.

In October, the New York Amateur Athletic Union, largest of the 34 groups in the national organization, voted down a resolution to boycott the Olympics. Several other district A. A. U. groups, however, voted for the boycott of the Games; they included the Pacific Association, the Indiana-Kentucky Association, the South Atlantic Association, the New Jersey Association, and the Middle Atlantic Association.

On December 7, at the annual convention of the national Amateur Athletic Union, in New York, petitions containing 500,000 names and resolutions from organizations numbering a total of 1,500,000 members, all demanding non-participation in the Berlin Olympics, were presented just before the sessions began. Avery Brundage was elected president of the A. A. U. after Mr. Mahoney withdrew his name as a candidate. Mr. Brundage told the convention that, no matter how it voted, an American team would be sent to Germany. He repeated many charges he had previously made, and the debate was the most bitter in the organization's history. In the midst of the heated discussion, a compromise measure, offered by Supreme Court Justice Aron D. Steuer, proposing the naming of a commission of three to investigate conditions in Germany, was rejected by a margin of 2½ votes. In the closing hours, the convention adopted a resolution backing participation in the Games, with the reservation that the sending of an American team "must not be taken to imply endorsement
of the principles or practices of the Nazi Government.” The resolution recognized that the situation in Germany would require the “vigilance” of the International Olympic Committee and the International Amateur Athletic Federation.

The adoption of this resolution, however, did not satisfy many individuals and groups. Mr. Mahoney declared that he would continue “to devote my (his) energies to preserving the honor of American athletes.” He also resigned from the American Olympic Committee Executive. His example was followed by several other active members. Several individuals invited to compete in the Olympics also refused to do so. These included Henry Neugass, co-holder of the world’s record for the 100–yard dash; Charles Wakefield Cadman, invited to take part in the musical aspects of the Olympics; and members of the League of American Artists, who voted against participation in the Olympic art exhibits.

The winter games of the Olympiad were held from February 6 to 16, 1936. Returning to the United States in February from Garmisch-Partenkirchen, where the events were held, Gustavus T. Kirby, treasurer of A.O.C., declared he had seen no sign of anti-Jewish discrimination. At the same time, Westbrook Pegler, columnist for a newspaper syndicate, who also attended the games, cabled a series of articles in which he scathingly condemned Nazi treatment of Jews and other minorities, which evoked widespread comment.

Later, scattered reports indicated that the American Olympics Committee was experiencing considerable difficulty in its campaign to raise $350,000 to send the American team to Germany. At their annual winter meeting in December, the club owners of the National and American Baseball Leagues flatly rejected a request from the Amateur Baseball Federation for a $20,000 appropriation to help send an American team to Berlin. On December 31, Mr. Brundage announced that only $16,000 had been collected for the American Olympic team. On the same day, the American Olympic Committee unanimously voted to remove all members not in sympathy with its policies.
A new drive to raise funds for the American Olympic team was begun June 24, when leaders in industry, finance, transportation and trade organized a New York Olympic Committee. On July 2, the New York Olympic Committee, in a newspaper advertisement, appealed for contributions to enable American athletes to go to the Games. The appeal revealed that $140,000 was still required for the $250,000 objective. The Committee placed emphasis on the statement that “the Olympic Games are run by an International Olympic Committee which functions entirely apart from the German or any other Government.” The Committee continued: “The Games are to be held this year in Berlin. The German Government provides the arrangements, but, at the ‘starting gun,’ retires from any authority over the conduct or judging of the Games.”

Late in June the Committee on Fair Play in Sports announced that a team of outstanding American athletes was sailing for Barcelona, Spain, to take part in the Peoples Olympics to be held there from July 19 to 26. The Committee described the decision to send a team to represent the United States as “our final gesture of protest against the Hitler Nazi Games in Berlin.” The statement went on to say: “We are acting in response to an invitation from the organizing committee in Barcelona, which appealed to all democratic countries to defend human freedom, culture and progress by taking part in an international, truly Olympic manifestation, free to all progressive sportsmen.”

American Colleges and the Heidelberg Festival

Public attention was drawn to the German situation also by the discussion of the propriety of the acceptance by American colleges and universities of the invitation to participate in the 550th anniversary celebration of the Heidelberg University, scheduled for June 27 to 30, 1936. Early in March, 1936, a news report from Berlin stated that eight institutions in the United States and one in Canada had accepted the invitation. The American colleges and universities said to have done so were Columbia University, Harvard University, University of Michigan,
Vassar College, Amherst College, Cornell University, the College of the City of New York, and Western Reserve University. Authorities of the last two denied having received invitations. Under-graduate organizations at Columbia University protested against its acceptance of the Heidelberg invitation. Hendrik Willem van Loon, noted author, an alumnus of Cornell, declared that it "was incredible that Hitler's bright boys would care to associate with representatives of a university founded by that eminently broad-minded Quaker Ezra Cornell." Dr. John L. Newcomb, President of the University of Virginia, announced that the institution had declined the Heidelberg invitation "promptly, firmly and politely." On the other hand, President Alexander G. Ruthven of the University of Michigan confirmed acceptance of the invitation of the Heidelberg fete. He was quoted as saying that the German persecution of Jews and Catholics is not any worse than Italy's onslaught on Ethiopia.

Although there were some refusals, more than a score of American universities were represented at the celebration, which began June 27. They included Birmingham Southern College, Carleton College, Columbia University, Cornell University, Davidson College, Dickinson College, Harvard University, Johns Hopkins University, Louisiana State University, Municipal University of Omaha, Stamford University, University of Idaho, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, Vanderbilt University, Vassar College, Yale University, Dallas University, Hendrix College, Wittenberg College, University of Montana, Downer College and Pennsylvania University.

British universities were not represented, for both Oxford and Cambridge had refused to send delegates, and invitations issued to other British universities had been hurriedly withdrawn. American visitors, acquainted with the new university building presented to Heidelberg in 1931 by former Ambassador Jacob Gould Schurman and other American alumni and friends of Heidelberg, including many Jews, were startled by a notable change in its facade. Until a few days previous, the inscription above the entrance had read: "To the Eternal Spirit," and was surmounted by a statue of Athena, the Goddess of Wisdom. The
inscription had been changed to read: "To the German Spirit," and the statue was replaced by a golden swastika and German eagle. Dr. Schurman, who, because of his services to Heidelberg, had been expected to be the chief foreign guest of honor, was absent. It was reported that he was prevented from attending because he was detained in Geneva by work connected with the approaching League of Nations Assembly.

OTHER PROTESTS AGAINST NAZI POLICIES

While discussion regarding the Heidelberg fete was going on, a storm of protest was aroused by the appointment of Dr. Wilhelm Furtwaengler, Director of the Prussian State Opera, as musical director of the New York Philharmonic Symphony Society, on the ground that his acceptance of an honorary appointment by the Nazi government implied his approval of Nazi policies. Some patrons of the organization announced that they would cancel their subscriptions unless Furtwaengler's appointment were cancelled; the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League threatened a boycott of the concerts, and the Jewish Labor Committee sent a letter to the members of the orchestra appealing to them to refuse to work with a Nazi sympathizer. Not all who publicly expressed opinions on the matter, however, approved of the movement to oust Furtwaengler, nor was there agreement on the matter among Jews. The controversy was closed by the withdrawal of the conductor who, in a cablegram to the Society, stated that he would decline to serve "until the public realizes that politics and music are separate."

Several months later, it was announced that the United States Conference of Mayors which had met at Washington in November, 1935, had refused to attend the congress of the International Union of Local Authorities which was to be held in Berlin in June, 1936. In a letter to the director of the United States Conference of Mayors, Mayor LaGuardia of New York City cited a previous unofficial decision of the Conference not to attend. "It seems rather paradoxical," the letter declared, "for municipal author-
ities to gather for the purpose of discussing local self-government in a country where all local self-government has been completely obliterated."

On the similar argument that "there is nothing in the teaching methods of Germany which we wish to use here," advanced by James Marshall, vice-president, the New York City Board of Education voted, in mid-May 1936, against granting a leave of absence to a High School official for the purpose of studying methods of foreign language instruction in European countries, including Germany. Later, the Board granted the leave with the understanding that Germany would not be among the countries visited.

In the preceding month, Rabbi Jonah B. Wise, one of the co-chairmen of the Joint Distribution Committee campaign for funds for European relief and reconstruction, made public telegrams from presidents and chancellors of thirteen important American colleges and universities, deploring the exclusion of Jewish children from the public schools of Germany which had been ordered under a recent decree.

Synagogues and churches in the New York area offered a common prayer for the oppressed of the earth on Saturday and Sunday, May 2 and 3, 1936. The prayer was sponsored by the American Christian Committee for German Refugees, the Committee for the Relief and Liberation of Victims of Persecutions in Europe, and the New York Board of Jewish Ministers.

Other protests against Nazi policies included that of Governor George H. Earle of Pennsylvania, in the course of an Armistice Day radio address broadcast under the auspices of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States; that of the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America which, on November 22, 1935, adopted a resolution endorsing the protest of dignitaries of the Church of England; that of 3,500 German-Americans who, on December 15th, 1935, attended a German Day meeting in New York City called by the German-American League for Culture; and that of William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and other labor leaders, on May 3, 1936, at a mass meeting in
Madison Square Garden in New York City attended by 16,000 persons, marking the opening of a nation-wide campaign to raise funds to aid the victims of persecution in Europe.

**THE TRADE BOYCOTT MOVEMENT**

In connection with the movement to boycott German goods and services, the following interesting facts are worthy of note here. In July, 1935, Samuel Untermyer, president of the World Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi Council, called upon Catholics "as a body" to join in the boycott against Germany. He declared that such a united campaign was "the only effective weapon" which would "result in a restoration of their rights to the oppressed German racial, religious and political minorities."

In mid-November, 1935, protests rose from the American Federation of Labor and many other groups when it was revealed that German steel had been purchased for the New York Triborough Bridge, a project which was being financed in part by Federal funds. Authorities declared that the transaction had been carried out according to the regulations requiring purchase from the lowest bidder. It was admitted in Berlin that the steel had been sold under cost, in violation of the tariff law against "dumping." Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced in a letter to William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, that the Public Works Administration would change its regulations to make impossible the purchase of foreign materials for P.W.A. projects unless approval is first obtained from the P.W.A. Administrator. President Roosevelt confirmed the ruling. The original $19,000 order was cancelled, and American steel was used.

In February, 1936, a Joint American Council for Boycott to extend the boycott of German goods and services was established by agreement between the American Jewish Congress and the Jewish Labor Committee. At a conference in New York, the Council decided to send out some 200 sympathizers to picket stores selling German goods.
ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES

The expression of public opinion in the United States was not restricted to protests, however. It will be recalled that, in May 1934, an American Christian Committee for German Refugees had been established by a number of Christian leaders, lay and clerical. In September, 1935, the organization of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Political Refugees from Nazism, under the chairmanship of Dr. Frank Bohn, historian and publicist, was reported. At the same time it was announced that the two committees would cooperate with James G. McDonald, High Commissioner for Refugees (Jewish and Other) Coming from Germany.

In October, 1935, Dr. Albert Einstein and Alfred E. Smith, former Governor of New York, joined in an appeal for funds to aid “non-Aryan” refugees from Germany, and a similar appeal was issued by more than 150 Catholic and Protestant clergymen and laymen, headed by Dr. S. Parkes Cadman.

In the meantime, at a meeting of the governing body of the High Commission, held in London, in July, Mr. McDonald announced the formation in the United States of a Refugee Economic Corporation, with an authorized capital of $10,000,000, of which $1,250,000 had been subscribed “for the purpose of assisting and furthering the constructive settlement of the refugees.” He also disclosed the fact that approximately $10,000,000 had been devoted to aiding refugees from Germany; virtually all of these funds had come from collections made by Jewish relief organizations, including the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee. Mr. McDonald voiced the demand for an organization directly responsible to the League of Nations to deal with all international refugee problems.

At about the same time, announcement of the establishment of the Refugee Economic Corporation was made in New York by Mr. Felix M. Warburg, its president, who said: “It is not our intention to duplicate the philanthropic activities now ably carried on by a number of organizations for the relief of these unfortunate homeless people. We hope to render financial assistance on a constructive economic and business-like basis for their settlement.”
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RESIGNATION OF HIGH COMMISSIONER MCDONALD

Shortly after his arrival in New York in December, Mr. McDonald made public a letter in which he submitted his resignation as High Commissioner. His letter, which was dated London, December 27, demanded that the League intercede with Germany in behalf of Jews and other persecuted minorities, and urged that his Commission be made a part of the League organization rather than be maintained as a separate unit.

"The moral authority of the League of Nations and of State Members of the League," Mr. McDonald wrote, "must be directed towards a determined appeal to the German government in the name of humanity and of the principles of public law in Europe. They must ask for a modification of policies which constitute a source of unrest and perplexity in the world, a challenge to the conscience of mankind, and a menace to the legitimate interests of the States affected by the immigration of German refugees."

Mr. McDonald described Nazi measures against Jews and "non-Aryans," pointing out that more than half the German Jews had already been deprived of their livelihood and that, in many towns, starvation drives against Jews have been conducted. He praised the cooperation of philanthropic groups and stressed the necessity of "renewed efforts of the philanthropic bodies," but he emphasized that the "Governments, acting through the League of Nations, must make possible a solution."

Declaring his efforts were weakened by the separation of the Commission from the League, Mr. McDonald reiterated the necessity for League action and expressed the hope that intercession would meet with response. "Without such response," he said, "the problems caused by the persecution of the Jews and the 'non-Aryans' will not be solved by philanthropic action, but will continue to constitute a danger to international peace and a source of injury to the legitimate interests of other states."

The letter of resignation was accompanied by an appendix analyzing German administrative decrees and jurisprudence and their effects on the problem of the refugees.
Mr. McDonald's letter of resignation and its annex attracted country-wide attention. Both letter and annex were reprinted in full or in extensive quotations in the press. *The Christian Century*, a leading Protestant weekly, reprinted the documents in a special supplement, copies of which were widely distributed. At its twenty-ninth annual meeting, held in New York City, on January 6, 1936, the American Jewish Committee adopted a resolution expressing its appreciation and gratitude for Mr. McDonald's "unstinted and courageous efforts" on behalf of the refugees, and "the hope that the League of Nations, to which Mr. McDonald addressed his strong and noble plea for intercession to 'avert existing and impending tragedies,' will act in conformity with its principles to call the German National Socialist Government before the bar of international justice." (For complete text of resolution, see Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee, below.)

About a week later, in a letter to Mr. McDonald, Matthew Woll, Chairman of the Chest for Liberation of Workers of Europe, representing the 3,000,000 workers in the American Federation of Labor, supported Mr. McDonald's demand that "the nations of the world use all the influence and all the legal means they possess to stop the complete annihilation of the Jewish race in the Third Reich and the brutal suppression of civic and religious freedom."

In March, 1936, the Joint Distribution Committee made public a letter of felicitation which it had addressed to Sir Neill Malcolm who had been appointed to succeed Mr. McDonald as High Commissioner for Refugees. The letter conveyed to the new High Commissioner assurances of the organization's complete cooperation in his task.

Discussion of the refugee situation evoked, in some quarters, a demand for the facilitation of the admission into the United States of such victims of persecution. Thus on January 23, 1936, in the United States Senate, Senator William H. King of Utah urged that the United States open its doors as a haven to Jewish refugees from Germany. Declaring that 600,000 Jews were subject to "ruthless persecution under decrees of the present German regime," Senator King said it was evident that these people would be driven from Germany and would face the necessity of
finding a place of refuge. In May, the Massachusetts General Court (Legislature) adopted a resolution to memorialize Congress “to afford the privilege of entry into this country to those persons who are being discriminated against and persecuted in Germany on religious or racial grounds, by a suspension of the present immigration laws for a period of two years with reference to such persons.”

In this connection, it is interesting to note that, on June 6, 1936, the Department of State announced that while the United States would be represented by an observer, it would not take active part in the inter-governmental conference on refugees, to be held in Geneva on July 2, under the auspices of the League of Nations High Commission for Refugees, on the ground that “the status of aliens coming to the United States is already regulated by law, whether or not they are refugees.”

In connection with the subject of refugees from Germany, it is interesting to note that, according to an announcement by the United Palestine Appeal, early in April 1936, a total of 36,372 Jews coming from Germany had entered Palestine, from January 1933 to December, 1935, this number comprising seventy percent of the refugees who had found homes overseas. The German-Palestine barter agreement (Haavara), under which is made possible the salvaging of part of the property in Germany of Jewish immigrants to Palestine, was the subject of widespread discussion in the United States toward the close of 1935. The opposition to the project was led by B. C. Vladeck, chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee, New York City, who charged that those in control of the Haavara received a considerable commission on each transaction and that the company was acting as a distributing agency for German goods in the Near East. These charges were denied in cablegrams from the Histadruth, the Palestine labor union; and the Palestine Jewish Agency defended the Haavarah in a cable to the American Hebrew, declaring: “The opponents of Haavarah must be challenged to show an alternative method for saving the German Jews, or else they should state publicly that they prefer abandoning them to their fate.”
ANTI-JEWISH OUTBREAKS IN POLAND

Up to the time of the outbreaks of anti-British and anti-Jewish disorders in Palestine, the situation of the Jews of Poland was second in the minds and hearts of Jews in the United States, the catastrophe in Germany continuing to be first as it has been since February, 1933. In the fall of 1935, began what at first appeared to be the perennial anti-Jewish riots in the colleges of Poland. The excesses were resumed, however, in the early spring of 1936. They were so widespread and so frequently accompanied by unprecedented barbarity that many observers came to believe that they were organized and directed by a central authority. The belief was also current that local authorities in Poland did not always act as vigorously as they could in preventing the riots or in quelling them after they had broken out. The outrages were watched with much anxiety by Jewish organizations in America, which protested in various forms. In November, Dr. Sylvester Gruszka, Polish Consul-General in New York, speaking for the Polish Chargé d’Affaires, gave assurances to a delegation of the Federation of Polish Jews in America that his government would take action to halt the excesses and punish the perpetrators.

The outbreak of a new series of anti-Jewish outrages in March, drew further protests from the Federation of Polish Jews. On March 22, the American Jewish Congress called an emergency conference, which adopted a resolution urging American intervention in behalf of Polish Jews. The conference also called upon the Polish Government "to take immediate and effective steps to protect Jewish life and property" and asked the League of Nations to "investigate these wrongs and to take such measures as will lead to the re-establishment of law, order and equality." Prior to the emergency conference, the American Jewish Congress made public messages from members of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives, condemning the persecution of Jews. At about the same time the New York office of the World Federation of Polish Jews, which had been formed in London in November, 1935, declared that April 12 had been set aside as a day of protest against
anti-Jewish excesses in Poland. The Jewish Labor Committee, headed by B. C. Vladeck, announced that it would call on the 500,000 persons in its affiliated trade unions and labor organizations to observe a "hunger day" on April 2, 1936, during which they were to be asked to forego one meal and contribute its cost to a fund for the stricken Jews.

On April 14, a delegation representing the Jewish Labor Committee and the American Federation of Labor, which included B. C. Vladeck, chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Joseph Schlossberg, Morris Feinstone, and Reuben Guskin, Jewish labor leaders, submitted to Secretary of State Cordell Hull a plea for intervention in behalf of Polish Jews, in the light of recent excesses and discrimination. In a memorandum, the delegation charged Poland with openly and wilfully violating the minorities treaty in discriminating against Jews in state and municipal utilities and by eliminating Jews from employment in economic activities converted into government monopolies. It expressed hope that the United States government "will find it possible to intervene" for reasons of humanity, because President Wilson helped establish the Polish Republic, and because Americans "have contributed money and lives in order to make the independence of Poland possible." In the same month, protest meetings were held in Philadelphia, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, and Buffalo.

In the meantime, additional ground for anxiety regarding the lot of the Jews of Poland was supplied by the introduction in the Polish Sejm of a bill requiring the stunning of animals, prior to their slaughter. This bill, if passed, would have made impossible the slaughter according to the traditional Jewish ritual (Shehitah). The proposal aroused much opposition in the American community, and protests were forwarded to the Polish Embassy at Washington by a number of organizations, including the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, the Federation of Polish Jews in America, the American Jewish Congress, and the American Jewish Committee. In reply
to the letter of Dr. Cyrus Adler, the President of the Committee, Mr. Sokolowski, Charge d'Affaires of the Polish Embassy declared that the government had introduced amendments to the bill which would safeguard the right of Jews to slaughter cattle according to the Jewish ritual. The Federation of Polish Jews also sent a delegation to Secretary of State Hull with a petition asking the United States government to use its good offices to prevent the passage of the slaughter bill. Probably in response to this request, the American consulate in Warsaw was requested to submit a report on the bill, with particular reference to its possible effect on the Jews of Poland. Late in March, the bill was passed by both houses of the Sejm, amended so as to permit slaughter without prior stunning, but only as to a sufficient number of cattle to supply the needs of the Jewish population.

During the excitement attending protests against anti-Jewish excesses in Poland, the more permanent economic aspects of the Jewish situation in Poland were not overlooked by the Jewish community. While proceeding methodically with its regular program of economic help to Polish Jewry, the Joint Distribution Committee sent special funds to aid victims of the recurrent excesses. In January 1936, the Federation of Polish Jews in America brought about the organization of the American Committee Appeal for the Relief of Jews in Poland, which announced its intention to raise a fund of $1,000,000. This Committee also sent emergency funds from time to time.

In June, a new project to help Jews in more than five hundred small Polish towns was announced through the Joint Distribution Committee. A fund of $400,000 was to be made available for the purpose of assisting the creation of home industries in the villages. Half of the fund had been granted by the Polish Government, $100,000 by the Joint Distribution Committee, and $100,000 had been raised by Polish Jews themselves.

**Disquieting Reports from Roumania**

Disquieting reports regarding Roumania also engaged the attention of Jewish organizations during the period under review. When, on September 12, 1935, the Associated
Press reported an impending march of supporters of the Roumanian National Peasant Party to Bucharest, connected with which was a threat against what was referred to as "sinister Jewish influence at the Palace," the American Jewish Committee expressed its concern to the Roumanian Legation at Washington. The Legation's reply contained assurances that any party entrusted with the formation of the Roumanian Government considers it a duty to defend all categories of citizens and that there would never exist in Roumania a governmentally fostered anti-Semitism. In December, further reports concerning anti-Jewish activities during the winter months caused the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the B'nai B'rith, and the United Roumanian Jews of America, to telegraph the Roumanian Minister, requesting him to convey to his government the expression of their profound concern. The Minister replied that he was communicating with his Foreign Office. Subsequently, he reported that the rumors concerning anti-Jewish agitation were unfounded, that order reigned throughout the country, that such sporadic student manifestations as had taken place were of no consequence, and that measures had already been taken to prevent their recurrence. On December, the Joint Distribution Committee announced that it had received reports that serious conditions threatened half the Jewish population of Bessarabia and part of the population of Moldavia, provinces of Roumania, as a result of famine.

The Biro-Bidjan Project

The effort of the Soviet Government to settle Jews in the Biro-Bidjan region in the Far East interested some sections of the Jewish community. The American Committee for the Settlement of Jews in Biro-Bidjan had been formed in February, 1934. In December 1935, this Committee announced plans to raise a fund of $350,000 to finance the settlement of Polish, German and other European Jews in the region. The campaign was launched with a dinner in New York City. Soviet Ambassador Alexander A. Troyanovsky, who was the guest of honor, delivered an address in the course of which he declared that there was n
Jewish problem and that "anti-Semitism has almost completely disappeared in Soviet Russia."

In May, 1936, more than five hundred delegates, representing some two hundred organizations, took part in a conference held in New York, under the auspices of the American Committee for the Settlement of Jews in Biro-Bidjan. The conference expressed satisfaction with the Soviet program which enabled 5,000 Jewish families from Poland, Roumania and other countries to settle in the Jewish Autonomous Region, and urged that negotiations be entered into with the Soviet Government for the purpose of permitting as many Jews as possible to settle there in the coming years. It was emphasized that Biro-Bidjan is not to be considered in competition with Palestine, as a place for the permanent settlement of Jews.

Proposed Legislative Council in Palestine

In the earlier months of the period under review, attention was focussed on the proposed establishment of a legislative council in Palestine, but in the spring of 1936, the outbreak of what is virtually an insurrection against British rule, in the course of which Arab malcontents perpetrated many outrages, pushed the legislative council matter into the background.

Opposition to the legislative council on the part of Zionist organizations in the United States was noted in last year's Review. (See Volume 37, p. 147). This opposition became more intense early in January when the outline of the plan for the council was made public by the British High Commissioner in Palestine. Morris Rothenberg, president of the Zionist Organization of America, pledged the support of American Zionists to the Executive of the Jewish Agency in opposing immediate establishment of the council. Characterizing the council as an Arab weapon against the Jewish Homeland, he warned of the danger "that the council by devious ways will circumvent its lack of jurisdiction and constitute a continuous threat to Jewish rights and Jewish progress in Palestine."

On January 27, representatives of the Zionist Organization of America, the Poale Zion-Zeire Zion Party, the
Hashomer Hatzair and Hadassah, meeting jointly in New York, adopted a resolution branding the proposed Palestine legislative council as "undemocratic and contrary to the spirit and intent of the Mandate." Messages supporting the protest were received from various Zionist and non-Zionist leaders and organizations throughout the country. Several days later, the resolution was presented to Sir Ronald Lindsay, British Ambassador to the United States, by a delegation headed by Morris Rothenberg.

In February, speakers at the convention of Mizrachi Organization, held in Washington, declared that the Jewish homeland movement was being handicapped by Great Britain's efforts to establish a legislative council in Palestine. Speaking at the convention, Charles Edward Russell, president of the Pro-Palestine Federation, asserted that England had "manifestly no intention of carrying out the provisions of the Balfour Declaration." A similar view was expressed by Herbert Morrison, British labor leader, member of Parliament and leader of the London County Council, at a New York meeting of Zionist leaders, held in April.

THE RIOTS IN PALESTINE

The bloody rioting in Palestine, beginning about April 17, turned the attention of the entire Jewish community to that country and enlisted the interest of large sections of non-Jews as well.

On April 23, the Zionist Organization of America announced that David Ben-Gurion, chairman of the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, had given assurances by telephone from Jerusalem that nothing had occurred to swerve the Jewish community from its rebuilding work, that the heroism, self-restraint and discipline of the Jewish community under attack was a source of pride to the Executive, and that the High Comissioner had assured the Agency that the government was prepared to cope with any emergency. At the same time, the Zionist Organization of America announced the formation of a special committee, representing all Zionist parties, for the purpose of organizing American Jewish support for Palestine Jews during the
emergency. A small sub-committee was also formed, which was to meet daily during the riot crisis.

In May, a resolution urging Arabs to ignore the propaganda of hatred and animosity stimulated by their leaders was adopted at the annual convention in New York of the Federation of Palestinian Jews, members of which are native Palestinians.

In the same month, reports that the Italian government was responsible for the Arab general strike and disorders in Palestine elicited a denial from Ambassador Augusto Rosso, who ascribed the reports to anti-Italian propaganda.

On May 31, a Christian delegation headed by Bishop James E. Freeman of Washington submitted to British Ambassador Sir Ronald Lindsay a petition urging Great Britain to steer a course favoring establishment of a free Jewish national home in Palestine. The petition, sponsored by the Pro-Palestine Federation of America, expressed the opinion that enlightened Christian leadership in the United States favors a larger Jewish immigration into Palestine. It urged a clear and definite policy on the part of the British government in carrying out the stipulations of the Palestine mandate. Signers of the petition included Samuel Harden Church, president of the Carnegie Institute of Pittsburgh; Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, president of the Union of Congregational Churches in America; Dr. Ivan Lee Holt, president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ; Dr. Frederick B. Robinson, president of the City College of New York; and Dr. John Haynes Holmes, of the Community Church, New York.

The petition presented by the Pro-Palestine Federation elicited a reply from Dr. William Ernest Hocking, professor of philosophy at Harvard and chairman of the Laymen's Foreign Missions inquiry, who described the proposals as "positively mischievous" in an article in the Christian Century, an undenominational journal, on July 1. He asserted that "the Balfour declaration, even if it had a basis in international right, does not give Palestine to the Jews, nor obligated Great Britain to transform it into a Jewish state, nor promise to make Palestine as a whole the national home of the Jewish people." Pointing out
that Palestine does not belong to Great Britain, but is held
as a British mandate under the League of Nations, Professor
Hocking declared: "Like all mandates, the presumption
is that it is to be administered for the benefit of the inhabi-
tants, most of whom are Arabs." He attacked the right-
wing Zionist program. "Whatever and whoever turns
Palestine into a place of discord, a scene of clashing claims
and hatreds, as the revisionist policy apparently does," he
said, "is false to the meaning of Palestine and treasonable
to the spirit of Zionism and the true interest of the Jews,
for it presents them to the world in the unhappy light of a
group which, when released from opposition, becomes at
once the oppressors of others."

In an abridged form, Professor Hocking's article had
been previously published in The New York Times, The
New York Herald Tribune, and several other important
newspapers, as letters to the editor. His views attracted
wide attention, for they were considered representative of
one section of opinion among liberal American Christians.
On June 21, The New York Times published a reply from
Charles Edward Russell, president of the Pro-Palestine
Federation, who refuted Dr. Hocking's interpretation of
the Mandate, quoting the late Sir Arthur James Balfour
as having said in a speech, on June 21, 1932, that it was the
intention of the British Government to "help transfer
Palestine into a Jewish homeland." Mr. Russell declared
that "the world of Islam has not been betrayed," since
"the millions of hounded and persecuted Jews have no
place in the whole world that will admit them, while the
Arabs have an empire of their own."

The serious crisis in Palestine evoked wide editorial
comment in the American press, which took the attitude
either that Great Britain should fulfill her responsibilities
as mandatory power by putting down Arab uprisings, or
that, as The New York Times declared, "it should be
obvious that Arab-Jewish cooperation is the only solution."
The press was unanimous in characterizing the friction in
Palestine as extremely regrettable, particularly in view of
the delicate international situation.
Activities of Zionist Organizations

Communal concern with Palestine and its upbuilding was, however, not restricted to the proposed legislative council and the Arab riots. The normal activities of the various organizations especially interested in Palestine and the Zionist movement were continued without abatement.

At its thirty-eighth annual convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey, in July, 1935, the Zionist Organization of America, voted a sweeping reorganization in its fundamental structure. The convention also demanded the allocation of a larger number of immigration certificates to Americans desiring to settle in Palestine, and warned against the danger of special party interests reducing the World Zionist Congress to a state of impotence. During the latter half of June 1936, on the eve of the thirty-ninth annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America, a lively discussion arose within the ranks of the Organization as to candidates for the presidency. Mr. Morris Rothenberg, who had been president for four years, denied rumors that he would not accept nomination for re-election. At the same time, it was reported that Dr. Stephen S. Wise had expressed the willingness to accept the nomination for president, to a group of Zionists who had appealed to him to stand for election. The discussion which ensued indicated that the choice of a president was likely to be the subject of much debate at the Zionist Convention.

In July 1935, it was announced that the Mizrachi Youth Organization had severed all connection with the Mizrachi Organization of America, and was to be an independent body called Hapoel Hamizrachi of America. In October, an agreement for cooperation was reached between the Mizrachi Organization of America and youth groups. The differences between the two organizations were said to have been "primarily administrative rather than ideological." In the same month, the executive board of the Mizrachi Organization decided to establish a Mizrachi Land Development Corporation for the Colonization of American religious Jews in Palestine and, in February 1936, the same organization decided to found a colony in Palestine for orthodox laborers and middle class Jews.
In July 1935, Hadassah, the Women’s Zionist Organization, announced that its struggle for equal property rights for Jewish women in Palestine had ended in victory when the Jewish National Fund granted a demand that a wife be permitted to be a co-lessee with her husband on leases of National Fund land. In November, the same organization announced plans to include the transferring of Jewish refugee children from European lands to Palestine as a part of its 1936 program. At the annual convention of Hadassah in Cleveland, in December, $75,000 was raised for the Rothschild-Hadassah University Hospital to be built in Palestine. The organization decided to support the Youth Aliyah movement for transferring youth to Palestine. The seventy-fifth anniversary of the birthday of Miss Henrietta Szold, founder of Hadassah and one of the leaders of the Zionist movement in general, was widely celebrated in the United States. The national celebration was arranged by the 300 chapters of Hadassah. Many prominent persons paid tribute to her work, although she refused to participate in any of the celebrations arranged for her. She was received at City Hall, New York, and given the key to the city by Mayor LaGuardia. Hadassah chapters purchased more than 1,000 trees through the Jewish National Fund as a birthday gift, and the National Board of Hadassah presented her with $5,000 for the establishment of model kitchens in several Palestinian colonies.

Elections to the first international Congress of the New Zionist Organization, the independent body formed by the Zionist Revisionists, were held in many countries in August, 1935. The Zionist Revisionist headquarters in New York reported that 35,846 votes had been cast for the single list of delegates to the Congress, which was held in Vienna in September.

Reports of economic organizations interested in Palestine reconstruction indicated progress and improvement. Thus, the American Branch of the Jewish National Fund reported that during the twelve months from June 1, 1935, contributions totalled $406,937, as compared with $262,382 collected during the corresponding period beginning on June 1, 1934, an increase of over fifty percent. The report of the Palestine Economic Corporation revealed that the Corporation
had, in 1935, made new investments in Palestine aggregating $508,981. Its net assets amounted to $3,549,564, more than a four-fold increase of the original capital.

The American Economic Committee for Palestine, organized in 1932 to develop methods, and to reveal and utilize opportunities and resources for the furthering of Zionist work in Palestine, reported in June that, in the year ending May 31, 1936, the Committee’s Central Bureau for Economic Information at Tel Aviv, Palestine, had serviced a total of 1,715 inquirers. The inquiries came from persons from more than 40 countries. More than half (55%) of those who inquired in person were immigrants from Germany, and 48% of the mail requests for information came from German Jews: The 710 inquirers who stated their capital resources reported an aggregate capital of £P2,984-850 (approximately $14,924,250), or an average of about $21,000 per person.

THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS MOVEMENT

The proposed establishment of a World Jewish Congress again aroused discussion during the period now under review as it had in several previous years. (See Vol. 34, pp. 29–31; Vol. 36, pp. 240, 241; and Vol. 37, pp. 144–146).

At a meeting of its national executive committee on January 5, 1936, the American Jewish Congress adopted a resolution favoring the calling of a world Jewish congress no later than the summer of 1936, and calling for preparations for nationwide elections of delegates. In February, the Executive Committee for a World Jewish Congress, meeting in Paris, decided to hold the Congress in August, 1936. A tentative program was drawn up, including the Palestine question, creation of a permanent Jewish representative body, the struggle for Jewish economic and political equality, the problem of the German Jews, the fight against anti-Semitism, economic reconstruction among the Jews, democratization of Jewish philanthropic institutions, emigration of Jews from certain countries, and creation of a world-wide central Jewish fund. It was reported that the question of the basis of representation was debated with considerable heat at this meeting. Louis Lipsky, who
represented the American Jewish Congress, opposed elections by direct individual ballot in the United States, holding that the choice of delegates to the World Congress by existing organizations is democratic. In April, Mr. Lipsky made public a tentative program for the World Congress, according to which it would seek 1) the establishment of an "executive body representative of the organized Jewries of the world for the defense of the political and economic rights of the Jews"; 2) the establishment of "an economic institute to gather the facts with regard to the economic life of the Jewish people and to cooperate in the reconstruction of the economic life of the Jews in any country in which their existence is threatened through discrimination and inequality"; 3) the creation of "an institute for the regulation and coordination of all Jewish immigration agencies."

In the same month, Dr. A. J. Rongy, chairman of the National Governing Council of the Zionist Organization of America, announced that he had polled the members of the Council, and that thirty-two of the fifty replies opposed immediate convocation of a world Jewish congress, thirteen favored it, and five were non-committal. In connection with the poll, Dr. Rongy had written a letter, expressing opposition to the congress on the ground that it might detract from the importance of Palestine and Zionism, and that holding of the congress would be used to stir up anti-Jewish feeling during the presidential election campaign in the United States.

A few days later, the American Jewish Congress announced that seventeen national organizations, all of them affiliated with the Congress, had responded to its call to participate in preparations for the first session of the World Jewish Congress. At a meeting on April 19, by a vote of twenty-seven to three, the administrative committee of the Zionist Organization of America decided to participate in the election of delegates to the World Jewish Congress.

On May 7, the Hon. Alfred M. Cohen, president of B'nai B'rith, international fraternal order, announced that the organization would not participate in the proposed World Jewish Congress. Mr. Cohen said "the vote of the Order's executive committee showed an overwhelming unfavorable
sentiment to the holding of a world Jewish congress in the near future." On May 13, the American Jewish Committee announced that its executive committee, at a meeting on May 11, had adopted with only one dissenting vote a resolution not to participate in the World Jewish Congress. This resolution, the Committee declared, confirmed the position previously taken by the American Jewish Committee and unanimously supported by delegates to the annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee held in 1935.

On June 1, a statement urging proponents of the World Jewish Congress "to give further consideration to this project before this step is actually taken," was issued by Dr. A. J. Rongy, chairman of the National Governing Council of the Zionist Organization of America; I. D. Morrison, New York attorney and Zionist worker; Judge Edward Lazansky; E. I. Kaufman of Washington, D. C.; James N. Rosenberg of New York City, and others. The statement expressed the view that such a Congress at this time will be productive of more harm than good; that it will not and cannot truly represent the Jews of the world, because a number of important communities and sections of communities were not participating; and that such a convention with such a name would be exploited by anti-Jewish agitators as a separatist Jewish movement within the various countries of which Jews are citizens.

On the following day, in its weekly Bulletin, the American Jewish Congress made public a letter marked "private and not for publication," which Dr. Cyrus Adler had sent to a number of American Rabbis, in which Dr. Adler had expressed the view that the World Jewish Congress might lead to a pan-Arabic congress. This view the Congress Bulletin refuted, asserting that the convocation of an Arab congress depends not on any Jewish action but on internal Arab affairs.

In a public statement issued June 8, the American Jewish Committee outlined the reasons for its opposition to the proposed world gathering. The statement, signed by Dr. Cyrus Adler, president, and Sol M. Stroock, chairman of the Executive Committee, said the proposed Congress "would have no power to enforce its decisions and would
not even be in a position to command the support of the representatives who vote for the propositions placed before the Congress.” The statement said also: “It [the Congress] would have no right to speak in the name of the responsible bodies, here and abroad, who oppose the entire concept, and who represent large constituencies. While it cannot serve any useful purpose which is not now being served by voluntary Jewish organizations in these countries, the proposed world Jewish congress can only endanger the status of the Jews in the countries of which they are citizens.”

Dr. Adler and Mr. Stroock attacked the expressed aim of the proposed Congress “to establish, and become responsible for, a permanent agency for economic life of Jews in those lands in which discrimination is practiced against them, and where they are the victims of social and economic persecution.”

“This proposal,” Dr. Adler and Mr. Stroock said, “is, in effect, a plan to supplant tried agencies which have done notable service for the Jews of the world, and which enjoy the respect and confidence of both the general and Jewish public, and to endeavor to take their direction out of the capable hands in which they are, or, if this does not succeed, to bring about a confusion which would weaken these existing agencies and replace them by an organization which would be without means or power to carry into effect the plans which have been and are continuing to be set up, and which have been of great benefit to the Jews in those countries in which such benefits are so urgently required.” Lastly, they declared that “the proposed Jewish parliament would give aid and comfort to those who promote hostility against Jews on the ground of alleged ‘national’ solidarity.”

The views of those opposed to the world congress were bitterly attacked at a “nominating convention” in New York City, on June 7, by Dr. Stephen S. Wise and other speakers, including Dr. Georg Bernhard, former editor of the *Vossische Zeitung* in Berlin, Germany, and subsequently of the *Pariser Tageblatt*, who had come to the United States to help arouse American Jews to the need for a world Jewish congress. Such nominating conventions were held by representatives of local organizations in a number of com-
munities throughout the country; they elected delegates to a "national electoral conference" to be held in Washington on June 13 and 14, which, in turn, would elect the seventy American representatives to the world congress.

On June 10, James N. Rosenberg again expressed opposition to the proposed Congress, reporting that he had received similar expressions of opinion from organizations and representative Jewish leaders in more than two hundred cities. He expressed the hope that Dr. Stephen S. Wise "will, in the interests of democracy, tell the meeting in Washington [the electoral conference] the extent of the opposition throughout the country." On June 12, a pamphlet, sponsored by Mr. Rosenberg, Dr. A. J. Rongy and Edmund I. Kaufman, appealed to delegates to the national electoral conference to postpone the world gathering and promised that "we will cooperate with you in a sincere effort to find a way of accomplishing unity of method among us."

The opponents of the world congress project were again attacked at the two-day national electoral conference which opened on June 12 in Washington. Dr. Stephen S. Wise told the 1,100 delegates that plans for the holding of the gathering in Geneva would be carried through, and assured opponents that he was willing to accept whatever consequences would arise from the holding of it. The conference selected fifty-two delegates who, together with twenty to be named by organizations affiliated with the American Jewish Congress and five delegates at large, were to represent the United States at the World Congress. The conference instructed the delegates to submit to the World Congress proposals which were substantially the same as those set forth by Louis Lipsky, and referred to above.

On June 15, James N. Rosenberg issued a statement, signed by seventy-one American Jewish leaders, expressing opposition to the convocation of the proposed World Jewish Congress. The statement declared that "the project is opposed by many important Jewish organizations and by many thousands of Jews throughout the country. The proposed 'World Jewish Congress' cannot therefore be regarded as representing them or as having any authority to speak in their or our names."
Several weeks before this, on May 26, Mr. Rosenberg made public an open letter to Dr. Stephen S. Wise, condemning statements made in a pamphlet issued by the American Jewish Congress, in defense of the plan to establish a permanent central relief agency at the proposed World Jewish Congress. These statements had criticized existing relief organizations because “they derive their funds largely from public appeals, and they use these public funds as trustees, but do not hold themselves accountable to any forum of public opinion,” and because “they have been able to accomplish only palliative work.” Mr. Rosenberg denied these charges, pointing out that the Joint Distribution Committee and other relief organizations carry on economic aid, educational and agricultural work in Poland, Russia, Palestine and elsewhere. He reviewed the constructive activities of these organizations instancing “the wide development of agricultural and industrial life, the rebuilding of homes, housing, a vast program of medical, health and sanitary work, child care work and much cultural work.” The Joint Distribution Committee, Mr. Rosenberg declared, had devoted $9,700,000 in Palestine to malaria control, medical work, promotion of cooperative societies, and erection of low-cost houses for workers. Referring to relief work in Germany, he said that it had been developed along three lines: 1) retraining of young German Jews for productive work in agriculture or industry in Palestine; 2) assistance for emigrants from Germany to find homes in other lands; 3) setting up of a Jewish school system, which at the present time cares for 20,000 of the German Jewish children excluded from general public schools in Germany.

ASSISTANCE TO OVERSEAS COMMUNITIES

Two important events in connection with fund-raising for overseas relief and reconstruction occurred during the period under review. The first was the separation of the hitherto joint appeals of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (J. D. C.) and the United Palestine Campaign, sponsored by some of the organizations which are especially interested in raising funds for work in Palestine. The second important event was the visit of three
leaders of British Jewry, who presented proposals for a cooperative large-scale effort to promote the emigration of Jews from Germany.

It will be recalled that joint fund-raising, under the name United Jewish Appeal, was agreed to in March 1934, when announcement was made that a fund of $3,250,000 would be the objective. Early in September, 1935, it was reported that, up to September 1, the sum of $1,500,000 had been raised. In October, a call to Americans of all creeds and races to contribute to the United Jewish Appeal was issued in a joint statement of more than 200 non-Jews, including bishops, deans of theological schools, leaders of Christian organizations, university presidents and other notable laymen.

On October 28, the Executive Committee of the United Jewish Appeal agreed to the termination of the joint fund-raising effort. This decision was explained in a statement declaring that while the united effort had important advantages and had conferred benefits on the Jewish community, yet "the sums raised had not shown an increase commensurate with the great need, nor did they measure up to what was expected of American Jewry, in view of improved economic conditions." The statement declared further that it was recognized "that one of the advantages of separate campaigns was that both the Joint Distribution Committee and the American Palestine Campaign would be free to intensify their special appeals and could enlist in their particular efforts additional supporters for their respective programs in the field of European aid and reconstruction, and Palestine upbuilding." It was noted, however, that the decision "does not preclude the possibility of joint local drives, on an optional basis, in such communities where a joint campaign may be regarded as advisable."

In a statement issued early in December, the Joint Distribution Committee reported that American Jews had contributed $2,654,000 for the relief of Jews in Germany and Eastern Europe from the Spring of 1933 to September, 1935. The statement emphasized that the condition of the Jews was becoming increasingly worse. The report, written by Joseph C. Hyman, declared that "millions face complete destruction" and that "the situation of the refugees in all
countries has become most precarious.” Felix M. Warburg, honorary chairman, stated that “we will continue, as we have from the beginning of our work in 1914, to include Palestine in our efforts, but we will have to concentrate on bringing aid to the German and Polish Jews.”

The Joint Distribution Committee campaign and that of the Palestine organizations, which was given the name United Palestine Appeal, were both launched at about the same time; each set itself the objective of $3,500,000. The Joint Distribution Committee drive was launched in December, at a conference in Chicago of one hundred fifty Jewish leaders from thirty states and Canada. Felix M. Warburg accepted the chairmanship of the campaign.

The United Palestine Appeal launched its campaign in New York City, in January 1936, with Dr. Stephen S. Wise as national chairman. Early in July, Dr. Israel Goldstein reported that in the preceding five months the United Palestine Appeal and affiliated agencies had raised $1,551,606, the largest comparative total since 1928.

Toward the end of April 1936, the Joint Distribution Committee announced that it would not allot any money for Palestine in 1936 because it was “faced with almost unbearable burdens” in Germany, Poland and other countries. The statement went on to say that the Joint Distribution Committee has paid one half of the transportation expenses of German refugees to Palestine, spent large sums in training them for work in Palestine and plans to continue such expenditures, “but it feels justified in expecting other agencies to give them their start in Palestine.” At the same time, the Joint Distribution Committee announced that no further expenditures would be made in Russia because “the work of farm settlement in the Crimea and the Ukraine, and of placing Jews in Russian industrial life has proceeded so successfully that we are happily freed from such a duty at this time.” On June 18, Isidor Coons, National Campaign Director of the J. D. C. reported at the mid-year meeting of the Plan and Scope Committee that $2,136,998 had been pledged by 642 communities in the J. D. C.’s $3,500,000 campaign. This sum was nearly three times the amount pledged at the same time the previous year.
On November 10, the Peoples ORT Federation launched a $500,000 campaign for funds to carry on its work of promoting agriculture and technical trades among Jews in Poland, Russia and other Eastern European countries. The ORT later arranged to incorporate its campaign with that of the Joint Distribution Committee, receiving a share of the funds raised in the latter’s campaign.

Visit of Delegation of British Jews

Early in 1936, widespread discussion was aroused by a report of the intended visit to the United States of three British Jewish leaders—Sir Herbert Samuel, former High Commissioner of Palestine; Viscount Bearsted, leading industrialist; and Simon Marks, merchant, and vice-president of the English Zionist Organization. Much of the discussion grew out of a report from the London correspondent of The New York Times, which turned out to have been inaccurate, that these British Jews were coming to America to discuss with Jewish leaders here a plan for the transfer, from Germany to Palestine and British territories, of from 100,000 to 250,000 Jews at a cost of $15,000,000 of which $500,000 had already been pledged by three British Jews. According to the same report, the emigrating German Jews would be enabled to realize on their property in Germany out of the proceeds of the sale of German exports abroad, by an arrangement similar to the transfer agreement which has enabled German Jews going to Palestine to obtain part of the value of property left by them in Germany. This part of the report in The New York Times evoked denials and protests from Jewish organizations.

A categorical denial was issued by the executive committee of the Zionist Organization of America. The statement declared that the visit of the three British Jews was for the purpose of helping to raise funds to facilitate large-scale settlement of German Jews in Palestine. “It is unthinkable,” the statement said, “that Jews will participate in any such scheme as has been reported in the press, under which German Jews are to be held as hostages until
they are ransomed by Jewish money to be used in stimulating German trade."

*The New York Times*, which had originally reported the plan from London, editorially criticized the scheme as "further evidence of her [Germany's] disregard of fundamental decency and her tramping under foot of elemental morality." The reported scheme was condemned also by the Executive Committee of the Non-Sectarian Anti-Nazi League in a public statement which declared that the proposal which, incidentally, proved the effectiveness of the anti-Nazi boycott, would "put a premium upon barbarous and medieval methods of government"; and that an emigration plan "not involving an increase in German exports can and should be worked out." A number of other organizations interested in the German situation also expressed their opposition to the reported plan. It was pointed out by critics of the plan that aside from objections to it on the ground of the aid it would afford German trade, the plan was exceptionable because it would benefit only those German Jews who have property and would not help those sections of the German Jewry which are suffering most acutely from the present situation.

Upon their arrival in New York City on January 21, the three men denied reports that the plan which they wished to discuss involved flooding the world with Nazi goods. They said their mission was "to agree upon methods for aiding the Jews who are forced to leave a country in which their lives have been made intolerable."

At a convention in St. Louis of the National Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Sir Herbert Samuel, spokesman for the British delegation, and Felix M. Warburg outlined plans for aiding German Jews, particularly youths, to emigrate with the aid of gifts and loans. The Council pledged American Jews to help raise the sum necessary to transfer 100,000 Jews from Germany, estimated at $10,000,000 for this country and $5,000,000 for Great Britain. Assuring the delegates that there was no plan to "ransom" German Jews or specifically to help the wealthy, Sir Herbert emphasized the necessity of bringing Jewish youths "to countries where they can fill their lungs with the
fresh air of liberty and where they are free from discrimina-
tion and degradation."

On January 28, the plans of the British delegation were
enthusiastically endorsed by six hundred Jewish leaders
at a reception in New York, given by the Joint Distribu-
tion Committee. A resolution, presented by William
Rosenwald and unanimously adopted, pledged cooperation
in the effort to raise $15,000,000 throughout the world.
The resolution declared that the plans in no way "con-
template or include any measures which will aid or facilitate
the export of German goods," adding that this stipulation
was "an essential condition." It was disclosed that Mr.
Marks and Lord Bearsted had each pledged a personal
contribution of $500,000 to the Fund.

Lord Bearsted and Mr. Marks addressed the National
Conference on Palestine, held in Washington on February 1,
and attended by some 1,200 delegates. The conference
adopted a program to facilitate settlement in Palestine of
100,000 oppressed Jews in Germany and Poland, going on
record in support of the plan proposed by the British
mission. In explaining the broad outlines of the plan to
aid 100,000 to leave Germany within four years at an
average cost of $150 for each man, woman and child,
Lord Bearsted declared it was necessary "to avoid doing
anything which might be construed as dumping the Jewish
population of Germany in any country" and called for
orderly and planned emigration. In his address, Mr. Marks
declared that unless Jews are helped to leave Germany,
there would be "a complete breakdown in the structural
life of German Jewry, a stampede into neighboring coun-
tries, the existence among friendly nations of thousands
of wandering, impoverished Jews, the heavy and wasteful
costs of relief for refugees, and a direct stimulus to the
forces everywhere making for anti-Semitism."

On the eve of their departure, early in February, the
British delegation expressed gratification over the results
of their visit to this country, and Sir Herbert Samuel
disclosed that an executive committee, (later called the
World Council for German Jewry) including American
members, would be set up to work out details of the plan.
Subsequently, the directors of both the United Palestine
Appeal and the Joint Distribution Committee announced that no additional fund-raising would be required to obtain American Jewry's quota of the fund required to effectuate the British plan, as a considerable part of the $3,500,000 which each of the campaigns was seeking, would go into that fund.

ANTI-JEWISH MOVEMENTS

While a great deal of the time and attention of the Jewish community of the United States was devoted to the foregoing events and movements, all of them connected with concern for the welfare of Jews overseas, the community was not without problems of direct concern to its own members. As in several years past, the most important of these problems, during the period now under review, were those which grew out of anti-Jewish movements. Except for the comparatively short-lived phenomenon of the Ku Klux Klan, antagonism to Jews in the United States never assumed the proportions of a movement until 1933. As we have pointed out in previous reviews, it was in that year that the beginning of two virtually distinct though related anti-Jewish movements had their beginning in the United States.

The first was evoked by repercussions to events in Germany. It was partly a response on the part of German residents of more recent origin to the reaction of American Jews to the anti-Jewish policies of the Hitler regime, but it was undoubtedly stimulated by agencies in Germany which had been set the task of justifying these policies before public opinion abroad.

The second type of anti-Jewish movement found its adherents in native American circles. It was essentially prompted by a desire to apply the scapegoat technique, which had been so effective in Germany, to divert public attention from the real, complex causes of unrest in the United States. This movement was undoubtedly given impetus and inspiration by the Nazi anti-Jewish policies; it is very unlikely that it would have acquired its comparatively large following, had it not been for the emboldening effects of the example of a reputedly civilized state.
NAZI AGITATION IN AMERICA

There were, during the period, a few scattered events which showed that these anti-Jewish movements still constitute a real threat to the well-being of the Jews of America and a menace to the peaceful cooperation of all ethnic elements in the United States. But, owing chiefly perhaps to the improvement in economic conditions, neither of these movements made much progress during the twelve-month.

Early in September 1935, Fritz Gissibl, newly-elected head of the Friends of New Germany, discussed plans, at the group's third annual convention, for "a year of renewed battle" for the purpose of "uniting the German elements in this country in one block in support of the National Socialist Weltanschauung." But, aside from the publication of several newspapers of limited circulation, and denunciations of Magistrate Brodsky for his statement in the S. S. Bremen affair, and of Mayor Fiorello H. LaGuardia of New York for his refusal to grant a license to a German masseur, the only signs of "battle" vouchsafed to the general public were reports of dissensions within the ranks of the groups seeking to Nazify America. In July 1935, these dissensions had resulted in the splitting of the Friends of New Germany. The new group—the American National Socialist League—declared it was interested more in American than in German affairs. Its leader, Anton Haegele claimed a following of 4,000.

At a rally protesting against Magistrate Brodsky's statement, the Friends of New Germany proclaimed a campaign to introduce Nazi principles in the United States. Their stand deepened the rift between the moderate elements represented by the United German Societies, and the more violent pro-Hitler groups. The cleavage was accentuated by the exclusion of the Friends of the New Germany from the German Day celebration, held in New York City on October 8, 1935. Fritz Gissibl, national leader of the Friends, attacked the United German Societies, the Steuben Society, and other German-American groups, at a rally several days after the celebration. Incidentally, it was remarked that while the speakers at the German Day celebration, including Ambassador Luther, all voiced strong
support of the Nazi régime, anti-Jewish attacks were neither as frequent nor as violent as at previous celebrations. Late in December, the National Socialist Party in Germany ordered all Germans in the United States who were not yet American citizens to withdraw from politically active bodies such as the Friends of New Germany. At a convention in Chicago, held in March 1936, the Friends of New Germany officially changed the name of the organization to the German-American League. The League announced that it would “combat the Moscow-directed madness of the Red world menace and its Jewish bacillus-carriers.” It limited membership to American citizens of German origin. At a mass meeting on April 1, leaders declared that the League would seek a “firm foothold” in the political life of the United States.

There are no indications that efforts along these lines have so far met with any success. On the contrary, considerable opposition to the propagation of Nazi ideas was shown. Thus, in August, 1935, two hotels and a club in New York City refused accommodations to the Association of German-American Technologists which insisted on flying the Nazi swastika flag at its convention, because, as one of the hotels put it, “display of this flag on a number of recent occasions here in New York incited riots and major disturbances.” In October 1935, the Friends of New Germany were barred from holding a German folks festival in a large auditorium in New York City. In the same month, delegates to a meeting, held in Milwaukee, of the Wisconsin Central Federation of German Societies defeated, by a substantial majority, attempts to have the swastika displayed at a German-American celebration in Milwaukee. Later, by a vote of 53 to 19, the Nazi leader and his followers were expelled from the meeting.

In September 1935, the Friends of Democracy, organized in New York City and headed by Eugene F. Grigat, announced its intention to oppose pro-Nazi organizations in America as well as all manifestations of “the rotten Hitler philosophy.”

The dangers to public peace inherent in the Nazi movement were shown when, in October 1935, six New York Hitlerites who were driving a truck through the New York
City garment center to advertise a Nazi rally, were assaulted.

It will be seen, therefore, that the decline in the Nazi anti-Jewish movement noted in the preceding Review continued during the period covered here. From the beginning, the movement did not have the support of representatives of the decent and respectable German-American elements in various parts of the country. The factional squabbling among the leaders of the movement, and the conduct of the Nazi Government, especially its re-arming policy and its violation of treaties, did not inspire the American public with any great desire to adopt Nazi ideas or methods. In this connection, the following paragraph from the report submitted by the Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee at the Twenty-ninth Annual Meeting of that organization on January 5, 1936, is noteworthy:

"The disrepute into which the Nazi movement here has fallen is not unknown to the Nazi leaders in Germany. Your Committee has reason to believe, however, that efforts to influence public opinion in this country have not been abandoned by the propaganda authorities in Germany, but that such efforts are likely to be made along much more skillful and subtle lines and on a wider front."

THE SENTINELS OF THE REPUBLIC

There were also a number of events and sensational disclosures which showed that native, as distinguished from imported, anti-Jewish movements have gained a considerable following. These movements seek recruits largely among those opposed to, or dissatisfied with, the economic and social policies of the present national administration. Part of the stock-in-trade of the demagogues who lead these movements is the entirely groundless assertion that these policies are inspired by "the Jews." Some agitators go further and say that the "New Deal" is part of the alleged Jewish plot to dominate the world, outlined in the oft-repudiated "Protocols of the Wise Elders of Zion."
As was pointed out in last year’s review, this school of agitators exploit latent anti-Jewish prejudice by making a great deal of ado about the number of Jews connected with the administration. Some of these demagogues go further and spread rumors that certain government officials are of Jewish origin, who are in fact not so. Miss Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, was especially the target for such rumors. In April, 1936, she found herself forced to issue a public statement denying continued undercover gossip that she was Jewish and that her real name was Matilda Wutski. In her statement, Miss Perkins declared: “If I were a Jew, I would make no secret of it. On the contrary, I would be glad to acknowledge it.”

On April 17, 1936, at a meeting of a committee of the United States Senate, appointed to investigate lobbying, Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach of Washington read into the record an exchange of letters between Alexander Lincoln of Boston, president of the Sentinels of the Republic, an anti-administration organization, and one, W. Cleveland Runyon, an attorney of Plainfield, New Jersey. In his letter to Lincoln, Runyon referred to President Roosevelt and “the Jewish brigade” he took to Washington. Runyon wrote: “This fight for Western Christian Civilization can certainly be won, but only if we recognize that the enemy is world-wide and that it is Jewish in origin.” In his reply, Lincoln said: “I think, as you say, that the Jewish threat is a real one. My hope is in the election next autumn, and I believe that our real opportunity is in accomplishing the defeat of Roosevelt.” In a second letter Runyon said: “The old-line Americans of $1,200 a year want a Hitler.”

The Senate Committee also produced a large number of letters which had passed between Lincoln and Captain William H. Stayton, secretary of the American Liberty League, an organization of Democrats opposed to the Roosevelt policies. The letters discussed a merger of the Sentinels and the League, which however, was not consummated.

The first reaction to these disclosures was a demand by Governor James M. Curley of Massachusetts that Lincoln be ousted from his office as member of the State Tax Appeals Board. In a radio address, Governor Curley
declared: "It must be apparent in the light of the Lincoln correspondence that the Sentinels of America, whose real name should be the 'Vultures of America,' were organized for even more insidious and sinister purposes than the defeat of Roosevelt. They were organized to destroy the standing of the Jews in America, which standing has been built up through faithful, devoted and patriotic service since the foundation of the Republic." A few days later, Lincoln resigned from the State Board of Tax Appeals and withdrew his candidacy for the Republican state primary convention. In a public statement, Lincoln said his anti-Jewish utterances had been misinterpreted, and that he had referred solely to those of Jewish origin active in the communist movement.

Early in May, the American Liberty League announced that a regular meeting of its administrative committee had adopted a resolution declaring "false and without foundation" allegations that the League was anti-Semitic. The resolution said that because of "the studied attempt" made to convey the impression the League was anti-Jewish, it wished to deny that it "is opposed to any individual or to any groups of individuals because of creed, race or color." It declared that "the League resents the attempt of those who, because of self-interest or for any other reason, seek to convey impressions concerning its attitude that are wholly erroneous and for which there is no possible basis of fact." The resolution called attention to the League's platform, which specifically upholds the American principle of civil and religious liberties.

THE BLACK LEGION

Scarcely was the discussion on this incident over when, on May 22, 1936, the existence of a secret society of night riders, known as the Black Legion, was bared during investigation of the murder of a Detroit W. P. A. worker. The organization, whose membership was variously estimated at from 50,000 to 6,000,000, was an outgrowth of the Ku Klux Klan. In the course of the investigation of murder charges brought against seven members, evidence was produced which pointed to a widespread, well-knit organiza-
tion in Michigan, Ohio and other middle-western states. Further investigations revealed that "prospective members are asked if they will take up arms against Jews, Negroes and Catholics"; that membership was open only to former members of the Klan; and that the membership application blank declared that "the object of this Order is: to promote, protect, and preserve Protestantism; to create and guard the welfare of the Protestant people socially as well as politically." Investigation of the activities of the Legion are still in progress. Resolutions authorizing a congressional inquiry regarding the Legion and other reputedly subversive organizations were introduced in the House of Representatives by the Hon. Samuel Dickstein of New York City, and in the Senate by the Hon. Elmer Benson of Minnesota; these resolutions, which were introduced in the closing days of the Congress, were not reported by the committees to which they had been referred.

On the heels of the Black Legion exposé, a new sensation was created when, early in June 1936, Mayor LaGuardia issued a summons charging criminal libel against one, Robert E. Edmondson, who had been sending out anti-Jewish literature from a printing shop in downtown New York. In a letter to District Attorney William C. Dodge, the Mayor declared that "unless checked, this type of agitation may incite to a breach of the peace and public disorder." The Mayor added: "Since the offense of criminal libel is an offense against the public in that it may lead to a breach of the peace, it is proper that the criminal process should be invoked. The right of free speech is based on the recognition that those who indulge in it or claim it as a right must be prepared to be held responsible for their utterances or their writings if they transgress. The remedy is not by suppression or curtailment of speech or writing, but by invoking the law of criminal libel if the statement is not truthful or the motive unlawful."

In a statement to the press, Edmondson, who described himself as a newspaper man of forty years' experience, declared that he started his "educational campaign" "for Americanism" in 1934, by distributing leaflets at cost, and that he had thus far circulated 5,000,000 copies. On June 11, the New York County grand jury voted indictments against
Edmondson, charging malicious criminal libels of Dean Virginia Gildersleeve of Barnard College, Miss Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, and the Jewish religion. The case is still pending as this review is being written (mid-July).

**RE COURSE TO LAW**

In connection with the question of recourse to law as a means of suppressing publications which are libelous of a group, it is interesting to note that on January 9, 1936, the Hon. J. J. Schwartzwald, member of the Senate of the State of New York, introduced a bill which would have made it illegal to incite or advocate "hatred, violence or hostility against any group or groups of person residing or being in this State, by reason of race, color, religion or manner of worship." Jewish organizations were urged by the New York City Civil Liberties Committee to take a strong stand against this bill. Miss Fiorina Lasker, chairman of the Committee, declared: "No organization detests religious or race prejudice more than the New York City Civil Liberties Committee. But the way to cope with this ugly problem is not through gag legislation. Here is another case where the suggested cure is worse than the disease itself."

That a similar attitude had been taken by the Lawyer's Advisory Committee of the American Jewish Committee was revealed in the report which the Executive Committee submitted to that body at its twenty-ninth annual meeting on January 5, 1936. According to this report, the Lawyers Advisory Committee, which had been established in order to study the dissemination of malicious anti-Jewish libels, had reached the conclusion that recourse to law and efforts to secure additional legislation were seldom advisable. The report pointed out that "although it is easy to understand the desire of many Jews to avail themselves of the legal protection to which they are entitled, due consideration must be given not only to the legal questions themselves, but to other factors which are just as, or even more, important: namely, the possibility of evoking undesirable publicity; the need of avoiding the intrusion of selfish publicity-seekers; the difficulty of bringing an action which will not make a martyr of the defendant; and the para-
mount necessity of refusing to take any action that would violate the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly." "In such cases," the statement concluded, "it may be the part of wisdom to adopt other means of defending the civil rights of Jews, principally, a long-range program of education against the deep-rooted, but not insoluble, prejudice."

In connection with the subject of legislation, it is worthy of note that, in August 1935, the legislature of Pennsylvania enacted a law, similar to one in force in New York State, declaring unlawful and providing penalties for discrimination "because of race, creed and color" by places of public resort, such as hotels, restaurants, hospitals, theatres, schools, universities, and public conveyances.

A religious or racial issue was injected into the political campaign now in progress, even in advance of the national conventions of the major parties. On May 18, Daniel F. Cohalan, former New York State Supreme Court Justice, made public a letter to James A. Farley, Chairman of the National Democratic Committee, asking whether he wanted Governor Herbert H. Lehman to stand for re-election "because he is a Jew; and does he undertake to deliver the Jewish vote to Roosevelt in the coming critical crisis?" The letter added: "If the President and Mr. Farley desire to select a Jew as the Gubernatorial candidate, could not an outstanding figure be selected from the many men in the forefront of the business and professions in New York City?" Mr. Cohalan's letter was widely condemned by individuals and in the press.

A few days later, Governor Lehman announced that he would not be a candidate for re-election, but, following the Democratic National Convention, in June 1936, he announced that he would stand for re-election, if nominated. As this review is being written (mid-July) there are indications that the religious issue may be raised by adherents of both the major political parties.

An attempt to measure the extent of the anti-Jewish movement in the United States was made in a significant article entitled "The Jews in America," published in the
February 1936 issue of the monthly magazine *Fortune*. The article, subsequently printed in book form, attracted much attention. The editors of *Fortune*, referred to as the writers of the article, declared that organized anti-Semitism in this country is impotent. “Although an estimated half million people may attend occasional anti-Semitic meetings, etc.,” the writers declared, “there are probably no more than 15,000 loyal Jew-hating group members in the whole United States and many of these are loyal only in a negative and receptive way.” Declaring that anti-Jewish agitation gained a following chiefly by asserting that industry, commerce, finance, and the professions in the United States were largely under the control of Jews, the writers produced the results of a survey which had led them to conclude that “there is no basis whatever for the suggestion that Jews monopolize United States business and industry.” The writers also denied that Jews preponderate in the communist movement in the United States.

** Movements for Better Understanding  

Happily, the forces of intolerance and ill-will did not have the field to themselves. Organized and systematic efforts to spread tolerance and good will continued to be vigorously prosecuted, principally through the initiative of the National Conference of Jews and Christians. Almost at the beginning of the period under review, a conference was held which drew country-wide attention to these efforts. From August 25 to August 30, 1935, an Institute of Human Relations was held at Williams College, at Williamstown, Massachusetts. It was sponsored by the National Conference of Jews and Christians as a new and major feature of the nation-wide educational program undertaken by that organization in collaboration with its three hundred local committees over the country. The Institute was organized to give Catholic, Protestant and Jewish leaders an opportunity to consider their common interests and concerns as Americans, “an occasion for study and exchange of experience, not for debate or the passing of resolutions.” Four hundred and fifty-one delegates
attended the proceedings, over which presided Newton D. Baker, Professor Carleton J. H. Hayes and Roger W. Straus, co-chairmen of the National Conference. Condemnation of Hitlerism, a program of education to prevent Nazism from gaining a foothold in the United States, and greater understanding among the religious faiths, were urged by speakers representing the major religious denominations. Besides discussions of general problems at public meetings held morning and evening of each day, round table discussions and seminars, presided over by authorities in various fields, took up the problems of human relations.

This highly successful Institute was followed by other conferences and seminars, notably one at Northwestern University under the auspices of the Chicago Round Table of Jews and Christians, toward the end of March, and an institute of human relations in New York City in May, 1936.

The National Conference of Jews and Christians also sponsored the third annual observance of Brotherhood Day on February 22 and 23, 1936. This celebration took for its slogan “Make America Safe for Differences.” The Day was celebrated far and wide, and culminated in a network radio broadcast of addresses by President Roosevelt, Michael Francis Doyle of Philadelphia, an outstanding Catholic, and Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of the American Jewish Committee.

A “good-will tour,” similar to pilgrimages which had been so successful in previous years in dramatizing the movement for a better understanding, was undertaken in April 1936. Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, director of the National Conference of Jews and Christians; Father Michael J. Ahern of Weston College, Weston, Mass., and Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron of Baltimore, set out from Washington, April 13 on their “pilgrimage of neighborliness.” The trio traveled from coast to coast, visiting twelve states and twenty-seven cities, addressing 45,000 persons at meetings, and speaking on the radio in fourteen cities. They returned to Philadelphia, May 28, reporting that while interfaith relations were improving, an increase of anti-Jewish feeling on the Pacific coast was noted. It was reported that, when attempts were made to exploit such feeling in Spokane,
Washington, the Roman Catholic Bishop and the Episcopal Bishop joined with other citizens in condemning them vehemently, so that the attacks were universally repudiated.

In connection with good-will movements, it is interesting to note that considerable discussion was aroused in Jewish and non-Jewish circles by a series of editorials, on "The Jewish Problem" in The Christian Century, a prominent undenominational Protestant journal published in Chicago, beginning April 29. The magazine attacked the characterization of Judaism as a civilization rather than a religion, as formulated by Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan and his followers, and warned that "if the Christian community were once convinced that an impassible gulf is fixed between itself and the Jewish community, precluding any possibility of reaching a high synthesis through tolerant discussion, reinforced by the healing and reconciling forces in such a democracy as ours, its spirit of tolerance would shrivel." In letters to the editor and in articles in Jewish periodicals, this stand was attacked and defended by Jewish spokesmen (see especially The Reconstructionist, May 29, 1936; and Opinion, July 1936). The Christian Century clarified its stand on July 1, declaring that "though tolerance is necessary it is not in itself a solution of the problem," and that what it opposed was "advocacy of the development of Judaism as a civilization, a culture, a nationality of its own, insulated within the body of American national culture." The periodical again warned that "Judaism, in so far as it follows the leadership of those who would make of it a permanent cultural cyst in the body of American civilization, will make gentile tolerance more difficult and play into the hands of the non-Christian and non-rational forces inherent in every culture."

The activities of the National Conference of Jews and Christians were supplemented by those of another agency, more recently organized, the National Committee for Religion and Welfare Recovery. This Committee sponsored the celebration of "loyalty days" in churches and synagogues, aimed at increasing attendance at religious services. Such celebrations were held on Saturday, October 5 and
on Sunday, October 6, 1935. The movement had the support of President Roosevelt, many other prominent individuals, national church organizations, 2,000 Kiwanis Clubs, Rotary and women's clubs, national news agencies, radio stations, and prominent representatives of the three faiths.

This Committee also sponsored a large dinner in New York City, on February 18, 1936 as a demonstration for cooperation of all faiths in a spiritual revival in the United States. The diners were addressed by Secretary of War, George H. Dern, who brought greetings from the President. In April, in connection with the celebration of Easter and Passover, the same Committee arranged a nation-wide radio broadcast in which Rev. Philip J. Farlong, vice-president of St. Patrick's Cathedral College; Rev. Dr. W. Russell Bowie, rector of Grace Episcopal Church, and Dr. Abraham L. Feinberg, rabbi of Mount Neboh Temple, made a joint plea for the "religious cooperation" of the principal faiths of the world in a united front against persecution, intolerance and hatred.

The preservation of religious liberty was also the subject of cooperation between Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. In November 1935, a closely integrated fight by Protestants, Catholics and Jews to regain religious liberty in Germany, Russia, and Mexico, and to preserve it in this country, was urged at a large meeting in New York City by Rev. Dr. Arthur J. Brown, chairman of the American Committee on Religious Rights and Minorities; William F. Sands of Washington; and Carl Sherman, former New York Attorney General.

In April 1936, began a movement by Catholic, Protestant and Jewish leaders, which culminated, in June, in the establishment, by fifteen prominent business men, bankers, clergymen and lawyers, of the American League for Religious Liberty. The League announced that it will work for the protection of religious freedom everywhere, and that it would devote its first activities to the relief of victims of religious persecution in Mexico and Germany, vowing to continue the work "until the anti-God laws are repealed." George Gordon Battle, a distinguished New York attorney, was elected president.
A number of interesting examples of inter-faith cooperation in other directions deserve recording here. In September 1935, leading members of the Catholic and Protestant communities of Rochester rendered active assistance to the Jewish community in a $200,000 drive for the completion of the local Jewish Young Men's and Young Women's Association building. In the same month, Rabbi Sidney E. Goldstein, chairman of the social justice commission of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, announced that a number of Jews had offered to cooperate with Protestant and Catholic groups in guaranteeing the continued existence of *The Churchman*, Protestant Episcopal publication, which had been threatened with extinction as a result of an adverse decision in a libel suit growing out of its campaign for clean motion pictures. In October, Bishop Maurice F. McAuliffe, Catholic, Dr. Douglas MacKenzie, Protestant, and Rabbi Morris Silverman, took part in a Union Religious Service at Hartford, which climaxd the Connecticut Tercentenary celebration.

In December, Rabbis Sidney E. Goldstein, chairman of the Commission on Social Justice of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and Milton Steinberg, Chairman of a similar committee of the Rabbinical Assembly, joined with eleven Protestant clergymen in a reply to an address against birth control by Cardinal Hayes of New York City. In January 1936, seventeen rabbis joined with Catholic and Protestant clergymen in signing a manifesto declaring that slum conditions in New York City constitute an "awful offense against the sanctity of human life," and demanding that these conditions be ended. In June, twenty-two rabbis and twenty-seven Protestant ministers joined in publishing a protest against the attack of the German Government on the Roman Catholic clergy of that country, in which many charges of immorality were made.

The record of significant efforts to promote inter-religious and inter-racial good-will, during the past year, would be incomplete without reference to important declarations of President Roosevelt, in addition to those which have already been mentioned. On October 2, 1935, in an address to 45,000 persons in San Diego, California, President Roosevelt made it clear, without mentioning the country by name,
that Americans find religious persecution in Germany abhorrent. "Our flag for a century and a half," he said, "has been the symbol of the principles of liberty of conscience, of religious freedom and equality before the law, and these concepts are deeply ingrained in our national character. It is true that other nations may, as they do, enforce contrary rules of conscience and conduct. It is true that policies that may be pursued under flags other than our own are beyond our jurisdiction. Yet in our inner individual lives we can never be indifferent, and we assert for ourselves complete freedom to embrace, to profess and to observe the principles for which our flag has so long been the lofty symbol." Again, in his annual message to Congress, broadcast to the nation on January 3, 1936, President Roosevelt declared: "We have sought by every legitimate means to exert our moral influence against repression, against intolerance, and against autocracy, and in favor of freedom of expression equally before the law, religious tolerance and popular rule." In diplomatic but unmistakable language, the President laid the war threat to nations that have "reverted to the old belief in the law of the sword, or to the fantastic conception that they, and they alone, are chosen to fulfil a mission and that all the others among the billion and a half of human beings must and shall learn from, and be subject to, them."

Again, on May 25, 1936, at a dinner in New York City sponsored by the United Palestine Appeal, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, who delivered the principal address, said that he had been asked to say on the President's behalf that "he is distressed and disturbed by the reversion in certain parts of the world to days and deeds of an era which all enlightened people had long hoped would never return," and that it is "his conviction that so long as minorities of the nations of the world are deprived of liberty of thought and religion, and the right to lead a normal, civilized life there can be no true and permanent understanding between nations." Mr. Ickes went on to say: "The President expresses through me to you, the representatives of a great and virile race, the hope that calmer and more dispassionate judgments will prevail and asserts the belief that the Government of the United States,
in carrying out the will of the people, will ever give watchful care to the minorities within its borders, and will maintain inviolate those vital rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution even to the most humble of our citizens."

JEWISH COMMUNAL LIFE

We turn now from recording significant occurrences in the field of Jewish-Christian relations, to note important happenings within the Jewish community in connection with religion, ritual, social welfare, and culture.

In the field of religion, the following events are noteworthy: The annual convention of the Northeast Region of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, held in New York City in January 1936, attended by over 1,000 delegates from eight states; the meeting of the Executive Board of the Union, in Buffalo, in February, 1936, at which the need of becoming a counterpart of the liberal movement in world Judaism and of correlating and coordinating the work of the 286 constituent congregations with the organized Reform movement in America generally, was stressed by Jacob W. Mack, chairman, and Roger W. Straus, of New York, on behalf of the Committee on Good Will between Christians and Jews, warned that the stress of social forces was making it even more essential to keep open those agencies for the exchange of opinion and promotion of better understanding between Christian and Jew; the national biennial conventions of the United Synagogue of America and the Women's League of that body, held in Washington, D. C., in March, which were addressed by Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and adopted a resolution expressing the view that discussion of social and economic problems properly belongs in the synagogue, and that it is not only the right but the duty of the clergy and laity to espouse all causes which, in their opinion, further the ends of social and economic justice; in another resolution, the convention urged synagogues to discourage distinctions based upon social differences among their members, and encourage the laboring masses to enter the synagogue and participate in the management of its affairs; the national
conference in New York, in April 1936 of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, which set up a permanent committee for social justice, empowered to fight for the five-day week, slum clearance, and social security legislation; and the 47th convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis in Cape May, New Jersey, on June 23 to 27.

The conference denounced Fascism and Communism as incompatible with the democratic philosophy of Judaism and reaffirmed its support of a "thoroughly socialized democracy." In another resolution, the delegates petitioned the Government of the United States "to grant to Jewish religious conscientious objectors to war the same exemption from military service as has long been granted to members of the Society of Friends and similar religious organizations." A committee on marriage, family and home was created for the purpose of formulating a program of education and service to aid rabbis in their efforts to safeguard marriage and the family. The conference endorsed Senator Robert M. LaFollette's resolution for investigating violations of civil liberties; voted to establish constructive children's clubs and classes to help eliminate crime by eliminating child delinquency; objected to "the policy of any State which strikes at the very practice of religion, specifically the treatment of Catholics in our sister republic of Mexico;" expressed "pride at the fine spirit of restraint and calm which has characterized the great mass of Palestine Jewry during the crisis"; and lamented the "strained relations" between the United Palestine Appeal and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee.

QUESTIONS OF JEWISH LAW

The problem of the agunah, the deserted wife, was again taken up by the Rabbinical Assembly of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, in November 1935. (See also Vol. 37, pp. 163-164). Replying to the rebuke of the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, the Assembly stressed the hardship of deserted women, and warned that law which became "fossilized and inert" led to contempt of law. It asserted that it strove "to make
Jewish tradition and Jewish law function in the lives of the Jews." The same question was brought up at the biennial convention of the United Synagogue in Washington, when Dr. Louis M. Epstein of Brookline, Mass., reporting for the Rabbinical Assembly, urged the delegates to "strengthen the hands" of the 250 rabbis who had committed themselves to revision of accepted Jewish law on this point. He explained that under the reform, the principle that a man can appoint a "shaliah," or agent, to act for him is extended to the "Ketubah," or marriage contract. A special clause is written into the contract authorizing the wife to act as agent for him in obtaining a divorce, so that if she is deserted she can seek a divorce in his name from the Central Court of the Rabbinical Assembly. The convention approved the proposal of the Rabbinical Assembly "as a measure calculated to preserve in modern life the spirit of fairness and equality in the relation between husband and wife and to enhance reverence for Jewish law and obedience to its precepts."

Jewish rabbinical law was invoked in two law-suits which reached the civil courts. In July 1935, the Schulchan Aruch, code of orthodox Jewish ritual, was upheld by Judge William A. Moncure of the Richmond, Va., Chancery Court, in a case growing out of the attempt of the children of Abraham Goldman to remove his remains from an Orthodox to a Reform cemetery, although exhuming corpses is contrary to orthodox law. When the Orthodox congregation trustees refused permission, the children brought a bill in equity to enjoin them from preventing the disinterment. After hearing the testimony of Orthodox and Conservative rabbis, Judge Moncure refused the injunction on the ground that the Schulchan Aruch is still binding on Orthodox Jews. In January 1936, in an opinion that traced the Hebraic law back to Moses, New York Supreme Court Justice McCook handed down a decision upholding the right of the Kashruth Association of New York, a semi-official organization of laymen and orthodox rabbis, to declare a ban against all poultry not killed under the supervision of the organization and not bearing leg-bands or seals sold by the Association. Another legal case of Jewish interest involved a pre-nuptial agreement in which Jacob Miller,
a Jew, and his wife, Mrs. Helen White Miller, a Catholic, had agreed that their children should be raised in the Catholic faith. The agreement was upheld by New York Supreme Court Justice Meier Steinbrink, after conferring with the priest and the rabbi, who had each, without knowledge of the other, married the couple in separate religious ceremonies.

**Jewish Education**

In the field of Jewish education, a sharp decrease in the economic difficulties experienced by Jewish schools, with attendant strikes of teachers, was noted during the period under review. There were several important developments in connection with the provision of facilities for Jewish education for adults. In December, the National Council of Young Israel announced a plan to open rotating colleges in seven American cities, with night courses in Jewish philosophy, Hebrew language, literature, codes and ceremonials. The courses, which began in January 1936, were given in Chicago, Cleveland, Louisville, Rochester, Detroit, Toronto and Cincinnati. In the same month, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, in cooperation with a number of New Jersey congregations, conducted an Institute of Jewish Affairs at Newark. The Institute brought together scholars, rabbis, educators and laymen for lectures and discussion, in “an experiment in bringing Jews together to discuss their problems under the direction of experts in each field.” In March 1936, the People’s University and Jewish Teacher’s Seminary, New York City, announced that one of the four schools it would open in the fall of the year, would be a labor college “to equip men and women for the successful accomplishment of industrial, political and cultural tasks in the organized labor movement.” The other schools will be a college of liberal arts and sciences, a teachers’ seminary and a vocational training school. In May 1935, a nation-wide movement for the establishment of institutes for adult Jewish study was launched by the B’nai B’rith under the auspices of the Order’s Bureau of Membership and Cultural Activities. The project is intended to round out the B’nai B’rith’s cultural program.
ACTIVITIES OF WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS

In February 1936, over 2,500 women delegates representing 250 constituent groups of the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of New York met in convention to discuss "Women's Responsibility in World Affairs." Resolutions were adopted recommending continuance of the boycott against Nazi Germany, approval and appreciation of the efforts of James G. McDonald on behalf of Jewish refugees from Germany, indorsement of the social service bureau of the Magistrates Court, avoidance of attendance at the Olympic Games, support of the neutrality policy of the United States, and other measures looking toward the end of war, and amendment of the state labor law to include all working for hire.

In the same month, Dr. Gabriel Davidson, general manager of the Jewish Agricultural Society, declared in his annual report that Jewish farmers in the United States had weathered the economic difficulties of the last few years and have been making steady progress in agriculture.

In March, at the 51st annual meeting of HIAS (Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society), it was reported by Isaac L. Asofsky, general manager, that the number of Jewish emigrants from Poland exceeded the 1934 figure by 75%. Other reports showed that 13,428 German Jews had been forwarded by HIAS and its foreign affiliate, the ICA, to overseas countries, including the United States, Canada, and Latin American countries. The Society adopted a resolution urging Congress to humanize sections of the immigration law affecting resident aliens, by enacting a bill, which had been introduced in both Houses by Senator Marcus A. Coolidge of Massachusetts and Representative John H. Kerr of North Carolina.

Tribute was paid to Judge Irving Lehman for his devotion to Jewish youth, education and the community center movement at a dinner, May 3, 1936, in honor of his fifteen years as president of the Jewish Welfare Board and his sixtieth birthday. The dinner concluded the annual meeting of the Board's national council at which a plan was approved to bring the 300,000 members of the 316 Jewish centers throughout the country into closer touch with the central
organization. The Board, which promotes the religious, intellectual, physical and social well-being of American Jewish youth, reported, in June, that during 1935 it had served 41 summer camps of Jewish centers with an enrollment of 20,400 and 46 home camps and play schools with an enrollment of 9,000; the Board's Army and Navy Service Department conducted welfare and religious activities at 270 army posts, naval stations and government hospitals in the United States and outlying possessions. The Board conducted 969 special services for Jewish holidays, with a reported attendance of 329,354, and the Lecture and Concert Bureau arranged 139 forums and programs, serving 311 Jewish community centers.

In December 1935, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds announced that a total of $11,144,985 had been received during the fiscal year 1934 by the 68 federations of Jewish charities and welfare funds in the United States. In April 1936, a permanent body, the Western State Region of the National Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, was formed in San Francisco at the first Western States regional conference of communal agencies. The conference decided to broaden the activities of local federations, develop vocational and professional guidance for Jewish youth in view of unemployment and discrimination by employers, and recognized the responsibility of larger Jewish population centers to act as "spheres of influence" for smaller Jewish communities.

The National Conference of Jewish Social Service held its 37th annual meeting May 31–June 3 at Atlantic City. Among the many controversial topics discussed were 1) the "rank and file" movement in social work—the movement of social workers as distinct from executives; 2) the problem of the increasing anti-Jewish sentiment in America; and 3) the employment problems facing Jewish youth in America. Harry L. Glucksman, president of the Conference, called upon Jewish social work to retain its "natural and logical underlying Jewish grouping without being dogmatically chained to the past, and allow itself to be shaped by current social conditions and the needs such conditions create." Discussing the major problems of
social work, Dr. Solomon Lowenstein of New York declared: "We must re-evaluate the work, adequacy, efficiency and sufficiency of our functional agencies of social service in the light of changed conditions and we must stop to examine the effect upon our work of the difficult circumstances under which Jews now exist in a number of foreign America; and 3) the employment problems facing Jewish countries." Mr. Glucksman was reelected president of the conference, which changed its name to the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare.

The annual convention of the Independent Order B'rith Abraham, at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., on June 28, 1936, voted to celebrate the golden jubilee of the order in connection with its 50th convention in New York City in 1937. Grand Master Max Silverstein, of New York, recommended that he be authorized to call a non-sectarian conference of the heads of all American fraternal organizations to "combat dictatorship tendencies, un-Americanism and attacks on human rights and liberties."

**Jewish Cultural Activities**

In the field of Jewish cultural activities, there were but few significant events, during the period. The *Jewish Daily Bulletin*, the only Jewish daily printed in English, suspended publication July 20, 1935. A weekly *Bulletin*, inaugurated on August 9, was discontinued after the December 13 issue. In October, the first issue of the Washington *Jewish Review*, a new English-Jewish weekly, appeared.

In November, the Jewish Publication Society announced that Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Miss Fannie Hurst, and Edwin Wolf, 2nd, had consented to serve as judges for the Edwin Wolf Award of $2,500 offered by the Society for the best novel of Jewish interest. In addition to Volume 37 of the American Jewish Year Book, the Society brought out, during the review period, "The History of the Jews in Vienna," by Dr. Max Grunwald of Vienna, translated from the German by Dr. Solomon Grayzel and Albert Mordell, as the fourth in the Historical Jewish Community Series, and "The Jews of Germany—A Story of Sixteen Centuries," by Marvin Lowenthal.
In February 1936, the last two of eight volumes of the first modern Yiddish translation of the Bible, prepared by the late Solomon Bloomgarden (Yehoash), Yiddish poet and scholar, were published. It was reported that the author had worked for twenty years on the project.

"The Land of Promise," a screen drama portraying the rebuilding of Palestine, produced by the Palestine Foundation Fund, was presented in November 1935 at the Astor Theatre, New York, where it drew audiences for many weeks. Beginning in March 1936, the Federal Theatre Project produced in New York City, several plays in Yiddish, and began a series of productions in the Anglo-Jewish Theatre with "The Idle Inn," translated from the Yiddish of Peretz Hirshbein.

The world premiere of the English operatic version of "The Dybbuk," based on the famous play by S. Ansky (Rappaport), was met with an ovation at the Detroit Civic Opera on May 6, 1936. The opera, which was composed by Ludovico Rocca, with Renato Simoni as librettist, had been translated into English by Archie Coates. It was produced by the Detroit Symphony Orchestra, conducted by Franco Ghione of La Scala of Milan. On May 14, the production was brought to New York where it was greeted unenthusiastically by music critics.

Again, with the exception of the "Artef" (Arbeiter Theater Verband), in New York City, most of the 40 Yiddish plays produced in New York City, during the 1935–1936 seasons, were of little artistic significance. Although the Yiddish theatre seasons during the period under review were more successful than during the previous year, the Yiddish stage was not able to recover its former standard of successes. Plays in Yiddish were produced in Boston, Philadelphia and Cleveland, as well as in eight New York theatres.

Besides those referred to in the foregoing sections of the Review, the following distinguished Jews from overseas countries visited the United States during the period under review: Professor Franz Oppenheimer, sociologist, economist, father of German agrarian reform and of cooperative colonization in Palestine; Professor Max Reinhardt, famed theatrical and motion picture producer; Matias Stoliar,
editor and publisher of Gazetta Israelita, Argentine Yiddish daily; Dr. Bruno Weil, noted international lawyer and German Jewish communal leader; Franz Werfel, distinguished Austrian author; and Dr. Michael Wilensky, Hebrew scholar formerly of Berlin, to catalogue the manuscript collection of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati.

II

OTHER COUNTRIES

LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Argentina.—In January, 1936, Dr. Perez Virasoro, the Governor of the Province of La Pampa, expressed his admiration for the colonization efforts of the Jewish Colonization Association (Ica) in Argentina. His praise was considered highly significant by the Jewish press, which pointed out that “at a time when the anti-Semitic campaign is gaining ground, this visit of the Governor should show to the Government the great usefulness of the Jews in the economic life of the nation.” Mass meetings in protest against anti-Jewish excesses in Poland were held on April 19, 1936 in Buenos Aires and other cities. Fifty Jewish organizations participated in the Buenos Aires meeting. On May 4, a 300,000 peso campaign for the Palestine Foundation Fund was announced at an extraordinary convention of the Argentine Zionist Organization, held in Buenos Aires.

Brazil.—On July 11, 1935, the government of São Paulo, Brazil, issued a decree to facilitate a larger immigration into this state, and guaranteeing racial and religious freedom to all immigrants. On July 15, the Integralists (Brazil Nazis) held their Congress in Rio de Janeiro. No official action was taken, although the speeches were violently anti-Jewish. Yet, the same week, the government closed

¹ For other items of a personal nature, the reader is referred to the appendices which comprise lists of appointments, honors and elections, special bequests and gifts, and necrology.
down the anti-Nazi Aliança Nacional Libertadora (National Liberation Alliance). In April 1936, leading newspapers throughout Brazil started an intensive campaign against racial hatred. Many articles favorable to Jewish citizens and to increased Jewish immigration appeared in the press. On April 28, police closed the offices of the Fascist and anti-Jewish Integralist Organization in the State of Parana following a decision of the State Tribunal that its activities were harmful to the welfare of the country. The anti-Jewish movement received another setback at the same time when Asischaute Briand, president of the Diarios Association, organization of newspaper publishers, published an article sharply attacking Jew-baiting and praising the Jewish people.

Cuba.—On March 30, 1936, the publisher and the manager of Cuba’s only Yiddish publication, the weekly Havaner Lebn, were arrested on a charge of having printed proclamations by leftist Cuban students and workers calling for a general strike against the civil and military authorities; they were cleared of the charge and released by the Emergency Tribunal on April 26. In the same month, Colonel Fulgencio Batista, chief of staff of the Cuban Army, in an interview with the Jewish leader, Ben Segnior, promised that all Jew-baiting manifestations in Cuba would be crushed. His assurances served to calm fears of the Jewish community, which had been aroused by a violent anti-Jewish campaign conducted over the radio by a group known as the Anti-Judea Society of Cuba.

Ecuador.—On July 18, 1935, the Daily Herald, London, reported that 500,000 hectares (approximately 1,250,000 acres) had been offered by the Government of Ecuador for the settlement of Jewish refugees. The offer, which would cover 50,000 refugee families, was in the form of an agreement, signed by the President and ratified by Parliament, with the Committee for the Study of Agriculture, Industry and Immigration in the Republic of Ecuador. On October 14, the Hilfsverein der Juden in Deutschland, leading Jewish emigration society in Germany, issued a warning against premature mass emigration of German Jews to Ecuador. It asked that intending Jewish emigrants await the official report of the agreement. At the turn of the year,
however, the Comite Internacional de Immigracion, which had been set up in Ecuador, announced that it had completed its plans for the settlement of refugees on more than 1,000,000 acres ceded by the Ecuador Government, and that it was about to begin actual construction of roads, building of homes and clearing of land. The contract ceding the land in Ecuador and Galapagos guarantees settlers all social and political rights as well as Government aid in the form of free transportation within Ecuador to the point of destination, exemption from taxes and from import duties on machinery and personal necessities. The Committee proposed to establish a cooperative bank as a central purchasing and export agency. In making the announcement, the Committee emphasized that anti-Jewish feeling in Ecuador is “virtually non-existent.” Shortly after this announcement was made, the Hias-Ica Emigration Association (Hicem) issued a warning against “the dangerous illusions which might rise among the Jewish population in the countries of emigration, owing to misleading reports about the possibilities of immigration and colonization in Ecuador.” “At the present moment,” declared the statement, “the possibilities in Ecuador are practically nil.” This warning elicited a reply from the International Committee of Immigration in Ecuador, which declared that five of the seven objections brought forward by the Hicem, namely, economic poverty of the country, low wages, incapacity of absorption of a large number of artisans, lack of openings for professional people, and general political instability, are equally applicable to the rest of the South American countries; the statement further denied that the territories ceded for immigrants are of inferior quality and unadapted to colonization, or that they are far from roads and waterways.

Mexico.—In January 1936, in compliance with the demands of labor organizations, President Lazaro Cardenas acted to withhold Mexico’s participation in the Berlin Olympics; all preparations for the Games were stopped. In March, the anti-Jewish Golden Shirts and similar Fascist organizations were banned by President Cardenas, who ordered
heads of all Government departments to use every legal means within their power to curb their "destructive activities."

*Paraguay.*—In January 1936, official announcement was made that the government had relaxed its immigration regulations to permit Jews who are not farmers to enter the country, provided they possess 50 gold pesos; previously, only farmers had been permitted to enter.

**Canada**

In August 1935, the Canadian Jewish Congress asked Premier Taschereau, of Quebec, to take action against perpetrators of anti-Jewish outrages at Val David, a summer resort. The Congress charged that swastikas were painted on synagogue walls and that a Sefer Torah had been stolen and destroyed. Montreal Jewish leaders accused a local priest of inciting the French-Canadian population against Jewish visitors. At about the same time, the Congress issued a book on "Jew-baiting in Canada," outlining the activities of the 12 major anti-Jewish organizations in Canada.

In order to avoid the virtual disenfranchisement of Jewish voters, the Canadian Government postponed the general elections from October 7, 1935, which was the Day of Atonement, to October 14. Anti-Jewish candidates for the parliament were overwhelmingly defeated. Jean Tissot, French-Canadian private detective, on trial for criminally libelling A. J. Freiman, president of the Canadian Zionist Organization, polled only 3,890 votes as against 16,000 for his liberal opponent. On October 16, Tissot was sentenced to a fine of $50.00. It was charged that Tissot had approached a number of department store owners with a demand for financial assistance in his campaign against Jewish merchants, and that these activities had particularly harmed Mr. Freiman's department store business.

In December, an anti-Olympic demonstration took place in Toronto when Werner Haag, a well-known figure in local Nazi groups, opened an office for the promotion of the Berlin Olympics. Speaking before the Toronto Ministerial Association, in March 1936, Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath
pointed to the wide-spread distribution of anti-Jewish literature in Toronto and other parts of Canada as "foreboding and ominous." Protestant ministers replied that their faith was deeply interested in preventing the spread of anti-Jewish sentiment, and attributed Canadian hatred of Jews to ignorance and lack of personal contact. In May, Mayor Houde of Montreal protested against the forthcoming visit of the German cruiser *Emden*, on the ground that it might lead to breach of the peace. On April 29, in reply to a question from Samuel W. Jacobs, in the House of Commons, Premier McKenzie King had indicated that his Government would take no action. On May 3, the Canadian League Against War and Fascism sent a radiogram to the commander of the *Emden*, declaring: "The people of Canada will deeply resent a visit from the representatives of the most brutal Government in all history, the oppressors of the great German people and the main instigators of war in the world today."

On April 2, 1936, the King George V Jubilee Forest Committee announced that $20,000 had been raised by Canadian Jews for planting a section of the Jubilee Forest Memorial Park in their name. On April 20, in an address before the National Council of the Zionist Organization of Canada, Lord Tweedsmuir, Governor General of Canada, stressed the importance of Palestine as a place of refuge for persecuted Jews and as a key to the British position in the Near East. He declared that Zionism was a solemn obligation of the British people, accepted by every party.

**Great Britain**

The important general events of Jewish interest in Great Britain may be conveniently classified in the following groups: 1) reaction to events in Germany or to Nazi policies in general; 2) reaction to events in Palestine; and 3) activities of anti-Jewish factions in Great Britain itself. Outside of its normal activities, important events within the Jewish community centered about 1) relief measures on behalf of German Jews; 2) events in Poland, and, 3) events in Palestine.
Protest Demonstrations.—In July 1935, a public inquiry into "certain killings and kidnappings of refugees from Germany which have occurred in Europe during the last few years" was conducted in London under the auspices of the Bishop of Birmingham, Lord Rhayader, Eleanor Lessing, M.P., James Maxton, M.P., Vyvyan Adams, M.P., Lady Bonham Carter and Professor J. B. S. Haldane. The widow of the murdered Professor Theodor Lessing and the wife of the kidnapped journalist Berthold Jacob were among the witnesses.

On the same month, however, members of the British Legion, headed by Major Fetherston-Godby, chairman, returning from a visit to Germany during anti-Jewish riots in Berlin, had only words of praise for the Nazis. They described Hitler as a "practical idealist" and declared they had found the concentration camps comfortable and healthful. The British press ridiculed their statements, and protested against the political aspects of the trip.

On August 22, the Executive Committee of the Society of Friends (Quakers) made public in London a memorandum which had been sent to the foreign office of every country in the world, declaring that "the Society of Friends is convinced that the present situation, with regard to political and religious refugees, ought not any longer be tolerated by nations that call themselves Christian."

In October, anti-Nazi groups organized a campaign in opposition to the holding of a match in London, on December 4, between English and German football teams. In Germany, the press warned the Jews of London to refrain from such opposition and called on the London police to intervene before "hell breaks loose." British trade union groups also protested to the Government against the holding of the match. The British Home Office informed the General Council of the Trade Union Congress that the Government would not interfere with plans for the game; it maintained that the match "has no political significance whatever, and does not imply any view of either Government as to the policy or institutions of the other."
On October 27, over 18,000 people took part in a non-sectarian, anti-Nazi demonstration in Hyde Park, London. A resolution was adopted protesting against the continued persecution of Germany Jewry, and pledging an intensified boycott of German goods “until complete civil and religious liberty have been restored in Germany.” Speakers included many British leaders, Jewish and non-Jewish.

In an article in the November, 1935, issue of the Strand Magazine, Winston Churchill, former member of the British Cabinet and Chancellor of the Exchequer, attacked the anti-Jewish doctrines of the Nazi Government, declaring: “The twentieth century has witnessed with surprise, not merely the promulgation of these ferocious doctrines, but their being enforced with brutal vigor by the government and by the populace... Can we believe that by such powers the world may regain ‘the joy, the peace and glory of mankind?’” In reply to a protest, the German Ambassador was informed that Mr. Churchill was an independent personality and that the Foreign Office did not exercise any power over him.

On November 20, the National Assembly of the Church of England took the unprecedented step of condemning Jewish persecution in Germany in a unanimously adopted resolution, in which the Assembly expressed its sympathy with the sufferings of the German Jews and requested Christians in England and elsewhere to make it plain to the Nazi Government that continuance of its policy would arouse widespread indignation. In a separate message, the Archbishop of Canterbury also voiced his protest against the economic and social discrimination against Jews. He declared that “a continuation of this situation will seriously affect the good will with which the people of this country desire to regard Germany.” On April 19, 1936, a resolution appealing to the world to intensify the boycott of German goods and services was adopted at the annual general meeting of the World Non-Sectarian anti-Nazi Council. The resolution, introduced by Walter Citrine, general secretary of the British Trade Union Congress, condemned increasing persecution of minorities in Germany and charged the Reich with ceasing to respect treaties and with creating a gigantic war machine.
The Olympic Games.—In December 1935, The National Workers' Sports Association urged that the Amateur Athletic Association of Great Britain withdraw from the 1936 Olympics. In January, an editorial article in Isis, Oxford undergraduates' weekly, also advised against British participation in the Games.

In a letter published in the London Times on March 7, 1936 the British Olympic Council declared its members "are convinced that in sending a team to Berlin they are acting in the best interests of sport"; that "Great Britain's team will be chosen without any regard whatever to the origin, religious belief or political creed of the competitors"; and that "the Council have the full assurances of those responsible for organizing the games that there will be no demonstrations or discriminations against any competitors."

On March 21, the British Amateur Athletic Association, at its annual general meeting in London, decided to convene a special meeting to consider a resolution urging withdrawal from the Games, submitted on behalf of the National Workers' Sports Association, an organization of 3,000,000 members. At the special meeting held on May 24, the Amateur Athletic Association rejected the resolution by a vote of 200 to 8. While all speakers deplored racial persecution in Germany, the majority opinion held that non-participation would not help the victims of persecution.

International Penal Congress.—In August 1935, Miss Cicely M. Craven, honorary secretary of the Howard League for Penal Reform, announced in London that the League would not be represented at the International Penal Congress in Berlin in September. She asserted that the League would not participate in a Congress where freedom in choice of delegates, of discussion, and of reporting the proceedings outside the congress, was not guaranteed.

The Heidelberg Festival.—A plea of the Bishop of Durham that British universities should refuse to take part in the 550th anniversary celebration at Heidelberg University was supported in February 1936, by the Academic Freedom Committee in London. On February 18, the Senate of the
University of Birmingham announced that it had unanimously decided not to accept its invitation to be represented. Oxford University followed suit, and many noted British scientists including Sir Frederick Gowland Hopkins, professor of Bio-Chemistry at Cambridge, and Sir William H. Beveridge, director of the London School of Economics, urged that all British universities and learned societies refuse to send representatives. Sir Ernest Graham-Little, Conservative M.P. for London University, declared that "it is unthinkable that London University will accept the invitation." On February 28, Cambridge University also refused the Heidelberg invitation. On March 3, the Heidelberg University authorities withdrew all invitations to British universities. Its announcement declared the University's unwillingness to involve British students and professors in a political controversy, since "by such action it appears that public opinion has been influenced in such a manner as to make it difficult for an Englishman to accept an invitation which has been sent in a friendly spirit." The movement against the participation of British institutions had been supported by the press with virtual unanimity.

**Congress of Municipal Officials.**—On April 7, the London County Council refused to send a delegation to the conference of the International Union of Local Authorities, to be held in Munich and Berlin in June, 1936. The Council cited the harsh treatment of the Jews by the Nazis and the suppression of local self-government as the reasons for its refusal. On May 22, the City of London Corporation took similar action.

**Refugees.**—In February 1936, a Society for the Protection of Science and Learning, to assist scholars and scientists displaced by the Nazi and other oppressive regimes, was formed in London by the Academic Assistance Council. Several weeks later, Lord Rutherford, world-famous English scientist, appealed for funds to help the Society in its work of reestablishing the displaced scholars; he declared that the Society would also build up an Academic Assistance Fund to award research fellowships for distinguished refugee scholars.
In a foreword to "The Refugees from Germany," by Professor Norman Bentwich, published in London, March 10, Viscount Robert Cecil condemned the "criminal insanity" of Nazi persecution of the Jews, branded the anti-Jewish policy of Hitler Germany as "one of the greatest national crimes that has ever been committed," and appealed to the British Government to open its doors unreservedly to all "non-Aryan" Germans. This, he declared, "would not only be a fine action in itself, but in the end would increase our national prosperity."

On March 19, 1936, Geoffrey Lloyd, Under-Secretary to the Home Department declared in the House of Commons that refugees from Germany had founded more than 200 industrial enterprises in England, providing employment for about 7,000 British workers.

In March 1936, an inquiry into the number of German Jewish physicians settling in England was publicly demanded by Dr. A. Welply, general secretary of the Medical Practitioners' Union, who declared that "they are competing strongly against our own doctors." The British Medical Association, however, took the attitude that the problem was not acute enough to warrant action, since it was estimated that only about 200 foreign physicians were practicing in the country.

In a letter published in the London Times on April 25, the Archbishop of Canterbury described the plight of refugees from Germany as desperate, and urged support of the campaign for $250,000 to be used for relief of "non-Aryan" Christians forced to flee the country. He appealed for aid of people "who, through no fault of their own, have been cast adrift into a world bereft of home and hope."

ANTI-JEWISH MANIFESTATIONS

During the period under review, London was the scene of street meetings and gatherings of other kinds sponsored by organizations calling themselves Fascist, chiefly the British Union of Fascists, popularly called "Blackshirts," whose leader is Sir Oswald Mosley. Anti-Jewish agitation formed an important part of the propaganda of these organizations and led to sporadic acts of petty terrorism, such as intimida-
tion of Jewish shopkeepers, marking the property of Jews with the swastika, etc. These activities aroused considerable discussion in the press and in Parliament.

On February 13, 1936 an assurance that intimidation of Jewish shopkeepers in the East End of London by Fascists would not be tolerated by the police was given by Sir John Simon, Home Secretary, in the House of Commons. He denied that police looked on indulgently when Fascist organizations smashed windows and threatened merchants. A few days later, Ernest Thurtle, Labor M.P., for Shoreditch, handed Sir John a petition signed by 1,000 Shoreditch tradesmen, seeking protection against Fascists attempting to destroy their trade.

On February 28, as a result of Sir John Simon’s assurances in the House of Commons, London police were instructed by the London Police Commissioner to arrest anyone indulging in anti-Jewish talk. Announcement of this fact was made during the trial of Richard A. Houston, a propaganda officer for the British Union of Fascists, who was charged with uttering anti-Jewish expressions while addressing an outdoor meeting. On March 5, Sir John Simon repeated the Government’s views in a lengthy statement in the House of Commons. He declared that “there was no doubt a man was breaking the law in regard to sections of the community if he used the language of insult, abuse and provocation to such an extent that he was in fact encouraging people to be violent or to behave without respect to the rights of those whom he attacked.” The British press voiced strong approval of this stand. But Sir Oswald Mosley, leader of the British Union of Fascists, declared in a letter to the Home Secretary that “we have as much right to attack Jews as Mr. Lloyd George had the right to attack landlords when Chancellor of the Exchequer in the pre-War Liberal Government, of which you were Home Secretary.” He admitted “that anyone guilty of an act of violence should be prosecuted.” In line with the government policy, London judges dealt sternly with Fascist agitators. On March 18 Magistrate Herbert Metcalfe warned that “I shall have no hesititation in sending straight off to prison the first man brought before me for interfering with Jews, Gentiles, or anyone else.” Several days later Magistrate Metcalfe fined
two Fascists for sticking labels bearing the word "Jew" on automobiles. In imposing sentence, he said to one of the defendants: "It must be a horrible movement if it has a man of your character hanging on to its fringe."

On March 22, six persons were arrested for creating disturbances at Albert Hall when Sir Oswald Mosley, leader of the British Fascists, appealed for support and delivered one of the bitterest anti-Jewish tirades of his career. At a meeting several days later, Lord Melchett characterized Mosley as "a hobbledehoy Hitler who spends his time attacking Jews, of whom he should know a great deal since his wife was a Jewess and his children have Jewish blood in their veins."

On March 25, members of the House of Commons again charged that, in making arrests at the mass meeting at Albert Hall, police had discriminated against anti-Fascists and had used excessive force. Sir John Simon, Home Secretary, denied these charges and pledged the Government not to draw distinctions between political groups. Again, on June 16, James Hall, Laborite, charged in the House of Commons that Fascists were deliberately attempting to create racial strife in England and were using methods calculated to provoke violence and bloodshed. Sir Percy Harris, Liberal, pointed out that violence against the Jews was not confined to the Stepney district of London, but was going on all over the East End in the most offensive and provocative manner. Geoffrey Lloyd, Under Secretary of the Home Office, replied that the police commissioner was taking special steps to deal with any attempt to insult or molest Jews. In reply to questions in the House of Commons June 22, Sir John Simon, Home Secretary, declared it impossible to ban such organizations as Sir Oswald Mosley's Blackshirts without new legislation, because the present laws do not prohibit the wearing of uniforms.

In May, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in Edinburgh, adopted a unanimous resolution urging Christian people of Scotland to "rid their minds of all narrow anti-Jew prejudice." Regret was also expressed at the religious intolerance on which "anti-Semitic hatreds" are based. A day of special intercession throughout the Church for the Jews was appointed.
REACTION TO PALESTINE RIOTS

The Arab riots in Palestine naturally evoked considerable discussion in Great Britain. In the debates on the subject in the House of Commons, a total absence of sympathy for the Arabs was noteworthy. There was, both in Parliament and in the press, a disposition to ascribe the outbreaks to the incitation of an outside influence, either German anti-Jewish or Italian anti-British propaganda, especially the latter. The government consistently set its face against permitting itself to be intimidated by the outbreaks into making any concessions to Arab demands for a reduction of Jewish immigration.

On April 21, 1936, in answer to a question in the House of Commons, J. H. Thomas, Colonial Secretary, denied that there was any danger of Nazi propaganda in Palestine. He said there was no indication that such propaganda was spreading outside the German community there. Two days later Mr. Thomas told the House of Commons that "His Majesty's Government is determined to maintain law and order and will do so." In an official statement on the developments, the Colonial Office stated that the High Commissioner for Palestine had not found it necessary to use troops against the mobs, although certain troop movements had been ordered as a precautionary measure.

On May 6, Mr. J. H. Thomas told the House of Commons that the British Government would not be deflected from its policy on Palestine "by riots or by threats of any kind and there is no question of the Government stopping Jewish immigration in consequence of the strike." Mr. Thomas said that the government had no knowledge of Italian, German or other foreign propaganda among the Arabs, and emphasized that, despite all threats, the High Commissioner intended to maintain law and order. On May 18, Mr. Thomas announced in the House of Commons that the cabinet would advise King Edward to appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the Palestine disturbances. He also disclosed that the Government had decided that the proposed Arab delegation to London would no longer meet the conditions which had arisen and that, in its place, it was desirable that an inquiry be undertaken on the spot. The announcement was received with general scepticism by
the London press, and the London *Times* advised the Government to make a plain statement of its policy and stick to it. The New Zionist (Revisionist) Organization declared, on May 19, that the decision was "a further surrender to violence on the part of the Colonial Office and of the Palestine Administration, and a further defeat of the Jewish Agency."

In Jerusalem on May 20, the Arab Supreme Council issued a proclamation rejecting the proposal to send a Royal Commission to Palestine, and announcing the continuation of the strike against Jewish immigration and sale of land to Jews. When questioned on this development in the House of Commons, Dominions Secretary Malcolm MacDonald replied for the Colonial Office with the declaration that the projected Royal Commission being a decision of the Government, and not an offer, the question of Arab acceptance did not arise. Mr. MacDonald also disclosed that the Government’s decision to send a commission to Palestine after order shall have been restored had been communicated to the Arabs, on May 14, by High Commissioner Wauchope and to Dr. Chaim Weizmann, president of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, by former Colonial Secretary J. H. Thomas, on May 18, and that Arab and Jewish leaders had alike expressed opposition to the plan. On May 21, Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin was cheered in the House of Commons when he declared that the "Government, responsible for the administration and protection of Palestine, intends to discharge its responsibilities to the full." Four days later, Captain Anthony Eden, Foreign Secretary, declared in the House of Commons that representations had been made in Rome against the spreading of anti-English propaganda in Palestine in Arabic broadcasts from the Italian radio station at Bari as well as elsewhere. He added that the dissemination of anti-British propaganda among the inhabitants of Palestine was being carefully watched. On June 9, in his first statement to the House of Commons as Colonial Secretary, William Ormsby-Gore announced that the Government had no intention of appointing a Royal Commission until "the British administration is once more master of the country and until law and order are definitely established." He voiced confidence that "ultimately, upon the basis of
recommendations by the Royal Commission which His Majesty's Government has been advised to appoint . . . a means will be found within the framework of the Mandate to establish a more lasting peace and contentment among the various peoples in Palestine.”

Outside of Parliament, press and public urged the government to maintain a firm stand. In an editorial on May 3, the Manchester Guardian branded the development of the Arab general strike and the refusal of an Arab delegation to come to London for a conference on the proposed Legislative Council as “no more than organized blackmail of the British Government,” and declared that “it would be a great mistake for the Government to make any concession to demands which such methods are used to support.” On May 13, the British press openly charged Italy with fomenting Arab unrest in Palestine, in order to embarrass the British Government during the Ethiopian crisis. On the same day, both Italy and Germany were mentioned in the House of Commons by Emanuel Shinwell, Laborite, who asked whether emissaries of these countries had provoked the Arab general strike. J. H. Thomas, Colonial Secretary, replied that it was difficult to state who was responsible, and that he believed it unwise to place responsibility unless there was absolute proof. On May 21, at the refugee conference of the League of Nations Union in London, Sir Herbert Samuel, noted British statesman and the first High Commissioner for Palestine, declared that, regardless of the disturbances in Palestine, it would be impossible to believe that the Balfour Declaration can be withdrawn. “At the moment, Palestine is seriously disturbed,” Sir Herbert said, “but no one can imagine that the Balfour Declaration, favoring establishment of a Jewish National Home there and promising facilities for its establishment, can be withdrawn. That declaration has been endorsed by all the chief nations of the world and the League of Nations. On the faith of it, 300,000 Jews went to Palestine and have thrown in their fortunes with the country. On the faith of it, some ten million pounds of capital has been invested there and it is certain that, whatever means may be necessary to restore tranquillity, stoppage of immigration
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into Palestine and repeal of that part of the Mandate cannot be among them."

On June 8, the Daily Telegraph of London published an authorized statement by Emir Abdullah, ruler of the Transjordan, that the Palestine Arabs have the support of all Arab nations. He was quoted as expressing the belief that the Palestine Arabs would immediately call off the general strike if Jewish immigration were stopped, and declared that they had no objection to the present Jewish population in Palestine but objected to excessive immigration. On June 17, an unofficial delegation of Palestine Arabs, composed of Jamaal al Husseini, president of the Palestine Arab Party, Shibley Jamal, secretary of the 1922 Arab delegation, and Dr. Izzat Tannous, a member of the Husseini Party, arrived in London to place the Arab case concerning the disturbances in Palestine before the British people. The delegation was received June 23 by Sir John Maffey, Permanent Under-Secretary for the Colonies.

JEWISH COMMUNAL LIFE

Territorialist Conference.—The preliminary conference of the Freeland Movement for Jewish Territorial Colonization took place in London in July 1935, with the Haham Dr. Moses Gaster as Chairman. The conference considered a number of Jewish settlement projects in South America, Africa and elsewhere, and a report on activities in Birobidjan, and resolved to transfer further consideration of these projects to special commissions. The conference formally constituted the Freeland League for Territorial Colonization, and Dr. Gaster was elected honorary president.

British Plan for German Jewry.—On January 15, 1936, Sir Herbert Samuel, Lord Bearsted, and Simon Marks, sailed for the United States with a plan to promote the mass emigration of Jews from Germany and to assist the refugees in starting enterprises and finding occupations in their new homes. On March 12, a detailed and comprehensive program for aiding the emigration of Jews from Germany was outlined by the Delegation on behalf of the British Section of the newly-formed Council for German Jewry. The
Council proposed 1) to aid between 20,000 and 25,000 German Jews, chiefly youths and children, to leave Germany each year; 2) to provide moderate loans to help refugees establish enterprises in the countries in which they settle; 3) to undertake special retraining projects; 4) to carry on further specialized training for youths going to Palestine; 5) to continue temporary help to refugees; 6) to undertake some of the functions previously carried on by the League of Nations High Commission for Refugees; 7) to continue the work of the Central British Fund; and 8) to help coordinate activities and suggest fresh plans for the raising of supplementary funds.

A campaign for $15,000,000 to carry out this long-range project was launched in March, and it was announced that two-thirds of the sum would be raised in the United States, while the remainder would be gathered in the British Empire and in other European countries. A special conference to launch the drive, was held in London on March 15, was addressed by Anthony de Rothschild, Sir Herbert Samuel, Simon Marks, Viscount Bearsted and Dr. Chaim Weizmann, president of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. Several days later, a delegation, representing the Jewish Agency, headed by Dr. Weizmann, presented to the Council a project for the emigration to Palestine of from 12,000 to 15,000 Jews from Germany during 1936 and 1937. The proposal embraced settlement of German Jews having means of livelihood, and from 7,000 to 8,000 refugees whose settlement would require subsidies. In the latter group would be included persons under 35 years of age, the majority of whom would be placed on farms.

On April 7, the first Day of Passover, anniversary of the exodus from Egypt, the Council for German Jewry and Dr. Joseph H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, issued an appeal to Jewish communities and rabbinates throughout the world to come to the aid of the new British plan for aiding the emigration of German Jews. On May 14 the Council reported that approximately $2,800,000 had already been raised in Great Britain and other European countries.
Palestine Disorders.—The disorders in Palestine brought forth many protests from Jewish bodies in Britain. On April 26, a mass-meeting of East London Jewry, under the joint auspices of the Agudath Israel and the Pro-Palestine Fund, adopted a resolution expressing its deepest sorrow and indignation at the riots in Palestine. A mass-meeting of the New Zionist (Revisionist) Organization, the next day, heard Vladimir Jabotinsky, president, and Colonel John Henry Patterson, Irish commander of the Jewish Legion during the World War, blame the Palestine Government’s pro-Arab policy for the outbreaks. The meeting unanimously adopted a resolution demanding the creation of a Jewish defense force in Palestine and the reestablishment of the Jewish regiment.

The 36th annual convention of the English Zionist Federation, held in London on June 1, 1936, adopted a resolution protesting against the proposed Royal Commission to investigate the Palestine disorders, declaring that such a Commission could not serve any useful purpose. Other resolutions adopted denounced the proposed Legislative Council, welcomed Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin’s declaration in the House of Commons that Great Britain would fully discharge its responsibilities to Palestine, urged the British Government to permit increased immigration into Palestine and demanded extension of colonization into Transjordania, supported the campaign to redeem Palestine land, and voted confidence in Dr. Chaim Weizmann, president of the World Zionist Organization and of the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

David Ben-Gurion, chairman of the Palestine Executive of the Jewish Agency, told the convention that the Arab terror was aimed primarily at intimidating the British Government. Dr. Weizmann characterized the disorders as “the murder in cold blood of a peaceful people,” and declared: “We have no quarrel with the Arab people. We have not come to Palestine as conquerors or exploiters, but as common workers who, through the labor of our hands, are creating a home and a livelihood for a people who wish to live in peace.” He expressed the fear that the projected
Royal Commission would "create tension and endless discussions, suspend a good many activities and hold back development of the country."

On April 24, announcement was made that the issue of 300,000 non-voting shares of stock in the Anglo-Palestine Bank in London was heavily oversubscribed in a day. The issue, offered by Robert Benson and Sons, Ltd., was authorized by a shareholders’ meeting of the Jewish Colonial Trust, founded by Dr. Theodor Herzl to finance Jewish settlement in Palestine, which controls the bank.

The death, in London on May 17, of Dr. Nahum Sokolow, honorary president of the World Zionist Organization and long one of the most outstanding of Zionist leaders, shocked Jewish circles throughout the world, especially in Palestine.

Shehitah in Poland.—The establishment of a United Committee for the Defence of Shehitah in Poland was announced at a conference in London on February 27. The conference was convened by the Association of Rabbis (Agudath Harabbonim), the Federation of Jewish Relief Organizations, the Agudath Israel of the United Kingdom, and the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations. It was revealed at the conference that, at the request of Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz, the British Foreign Office had, through the British Ambassador at Warsaw, made representations against the proposed anti-Shehitah law. A few days later, another conference, called by the Federation of Polish Jews and the Rabbinical Association of Great Britain and Ireland, adopted a resolution protesting against the proposed prohibition of Shehitah and appealing to the Polish Government to oppose the measure.

Anti-Jewish Excesses in Poland.—A resolution protesting against attacks on Jews in Poland was adopted on April 19, by a mass meeting at which Nahum Sokolow, honorary president of the World Zionist Organization, presided. The resolution voiced the conviction that the Polish Government was well able to suppress the excesses, and called for a halt in economic discrimination against the Jews.
Death of King George V.—Jews throughout the British Empire learned with deep grief of the death on January 21, 1936, of King George V. In public statements, Neville Laski, president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and Leonard G. Montefiore, president of the Anglo-Jewish Association, paid tribute to the dead monarch, in the name of his Jewish subjects.

On April 2, 1936, a deputation representing the Jews of Great Britain waited upon King Edward VIII at Buckingham Palace to present him with an address expressing the sympathy of the Jews of the British Empire on the death of King George V, and congratulating him on his accession to the throne. The deputation, which was led by Neville Laski, president of the Board of Deputies, included Leonard Montefiore, president of the Anglo-Jewish Association, Sir Osmond E. d'Avigdor Goldsmid, Lady Spielman, Sir Isidore Salmon, and Lionel de Rothschild. An address of sympathy was also forwarded to Queen Mary.

Death of Lord Reading.—The death on December 30, 1935, of Rufus Daniel Isaacs, Marquess of Reading, shocked British and world Jewry. He had been the first Jew to be Attorney General, Lord Chief Justice of England, Ambassador to the United States, Viceroy of India, and, only as recently as 1931, British Foreign Secretary.

Union of South Africa

During the period under review, the attention of the Jewish community of the Union of South Africa was largely focussed upon the anti-Jewish agitation carried on by several organizations which had come into being after the triumph of Hitlerism in Germany. The leaders of these organizations were Weichardt, head of the South African National Party, and Terblanche, head of "The People's Movement." They addressed many meetings throughout the Union, delivering violently anti-Jewish speeches. Leaflets and pamphlets against the Jews were distributed in wholesale quantities throughout the country. It was also reported that the various anti-Jewish bodies were planning to nominate candidates for the approaching Provincial Council
Elections, and that persons with avowed anti-Jewish tendencies would run as independent candidates.

In September 1935, documents seized by police who raided offices of Nazi organizations in South Africa, revealed that the German Nazis were aiding the anti-Jewish Grey Shirt movement there. In the same month, evidence submitted to the South West Africa Commission at Windhoek, revealed that Nazi agitation had made itself felt in the former German colony. Local Jewish businessmen declared several long-established Jewish firms had been forced to close down because of the anti-Jewish boycott. Speaking on behalf of the Jewish Community of Luderitz, Hyman Wasserstein asserted that conditions in the local German school were so bad that Jewish children were no longer able to attend it.

Despite these movements, however, the Johannesburg City Council turned down, early in 1936, the application of the South African Olympic and Empire Games Association for financial assistance to send a team to the Berlin Olympics. The action was taken without a vote, after members of the General Purposes Committee, which passes on such applications, had vigorously opposed financing a team if the Games were held in Nazi Germany.

Within the Jewish community, two important decisions were taken during the year. Toward the end of 1935, the Inter-Provincial Conference of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, held at Cape Town, decided that, in view of the many demands for funds from overseas, the Board would in future regulate and control all collections for overseas Jewish purposes, without undertaking any such collections. Beginning July 1, 1936, the Board asked that no campaign be begun without its consent, except for the Keren Hayesod and Keren Kayemeth, which are regulated by the South African Zionist Federation. In February, South African Zionists organized a South African Economic Committee for Palestine, as an affiliate of the American Economic Committee for Palestine. The new group planned to furnish economic information to South African Jews planning to establish themselves in Palestine.
IRISH FREE STATE

In July 1935, an attempt to inject Jew-baiting into political affairs in Ireland came to naught when the Aontas Gaedheal Weekly Post ceased publication after five weeks existence. The paper had advocated the creation of an anti-Jewish party in the Irish Free State, and the elimination of Jews from public life. Press and public ignored the weekly.

FRANCE

Olympic Games.—In a letter, written in November 1935, to the President of the French Bobsleigh and Tobogganing Federation, Philippe de Rothschild and Jean Rheims, French bobsleigh champions chosen to represent France at the Olympics, announced their refusal to take part in the Games. They declared: “We do not choose to run on the territory of a nation which draws a distinction between ourselves and our compatriots.” In December, opponents of French participation in the Berlin Olympics organized a “Fair Play” committee in Paris. The group was headed by the well-known lawyer, Cesar Campinchi. Les Amis des Sports, French sports organization, headed by President Albert Lebrun and the writer, Tristan Bernard, issued a manifesto in January protesting against the elimination of Jewish athletes by Germany from the Olympic Games and demanding that the German Sports Association be eliminated from the Olympics. In March 1936, formation of a Committee for Fair Play in Sports, with the slogan, “Not one man and not one penny for the Berlin Olympics,” was announced. Jean Bernhard-Levy, president of the Paris Racing Club, demanded that the Games be moved from Berlin, as did M. Jacob, president of the Paris Athletic League. In the same month, a protest meeting of noted French sportsmen and political leaders, with Senator Justin Godart presiding, adopted a resolution demanding removal of the Games from Berlin. On May 22, the Marquis de Polignac, French member of the International Olympic Committee, issued a statement bitterly attacking the Committee for Fair Play, accusing it of bad faith and affirming that Germany was keeping its pledge to admit Jews to its
Olympic team. He pointed to the invitation to Helene Mayer and demanded that France unreservedly participate in the Games.

On June 7, a "fair play" conference, convened in Paris by the International Committee for Preserving the Olympic Ideal, decided to continue the fight against Nazi sports ideals after the Olympic Games in Berlin, to propagate knowledge of the true aspects of Nazi sports, to send a committee of inquiry to Germany to study sports conditions there, and to support the July Peoples Olympiade in Barcelona, Spain. On June 22, the International Conference on the Right of Asylum concluded its sessions in Paris, with the adoption of resolutions urging protection of political refugees from deportation unless other countries were ready to give them shelter; demanding legislation to bar extradition to countries from which refugees have fled, to give them passports and permission to work; appealing for protection for refugees against criminal attempts and a general amnesty for political refugees in transgressions because of uncertainty as to their status; and supporting the establishment of an international office to safeguard the right of asylum to political refugees.

Stateless Persons.—The position of stateless persons in France was alleviated, in January 1936, by the French Government, which issued a circular stipulating that a stateless person should not be deported in the future on a simple administrative order but that every case must be referred to the Ministry of the Interior.

Pariser Tageblatt.—On June 11, 1936, a sensation was created in Paris German emigré circles by the charge of the editorial staff of the Pariser Tageblatt that its proprietor, Vladimir Poliakov, had agreed with the Nazi propaganda office to change the spirit of the paper and had consequently dismissed Dr. Georg Bernhard, who was in the United States at the time, as its editor. The charge was made in a front page statement in the Pariser Tageblatt itself, signed by the entire editorial staff who announced they were starting a new emigré paper, the Pariser Tageszeitung, with Dr. Bernhard as editor. It was reported in Paris, however, that
M. Poliakov had not gone over to the Nazis, as had been asserted, but had dismissed Dr. Bernhard, because of dissatisfaction with his sensational editorial policies. On June 15, Richard Lewinsohn, the new editor of the Pariser Tageblatt, was beaten and stabbed by unknown persons, as he was leaving the paper’s printing plant. The Tageblatt failed to appear on the 16th, as a result of a strike by printers, in sympathy with the former staff. On June 24, M. Poliakov announced that he had started legal proceedings against former members of his staff. He also brought charges of theft and defamation before a court of honor which planned to deal with the moral aspects of the case.

Anti-Jewish Manifestations.—Minor manifestations of anti-Jewish feeling in France occurred during the Fall of 1935, when several of the ultra-nationalist political groups demonstrated in the Jewish quarter. Jewish groups protested, and the police promised to prevent the recurrence of such disturbances. In March 1936, the French Council of State declared null and void the attempt to interfere with Shehitah by the Mayor of Valenciennes, a northern industrial city of France. In April, Michel Pares, who presented himself in the fourth arrondissement of Paris as a candidate for Parliament on an anti-Jewish platform received a rude shock, at an election meeting convoked by him, when his listeners, by 3,000 votes to 12, condemned his candidacy; the arrondissement embraces the Jewish quarter.

The elevation of Léon Blum, a Jew, to the post of Prime Minister, as a result of the general elections, early in June, caused a flurry of anti-Jewish agitation, led by extreme conservative groups. Under the heading “France Under a Jew,” the Action Francaise, Royalist daily, attacked Blum violently. On June 5, the anti-Jewish councillor, D'Arquier de Pellepoix, submitted to the general council of the Seine Department a motion professedly aimed at Jews who had entered France since August 1918, to cancel all naturalizations granted since the end of the World War. On June 6, an attack on Premier Blum on the ground of his Jewish origin, was made in the Chamber of Deputies by Xavier Vallat, member of the extreme Right. Vallat objected
bitterly that “this Gallic-Roman country is now going to be governed by a Jew” and demanded to know how a Jew could govern “a peasant nation like France.” The Left deputies protested strongly, and Edouard Herriot, president of the Chamber, rebuked the speaker, declaring, “I know neither Jews, Protestants, nor Catholics—only Frenchmen.” The attack created a furore and led to a brief suspension of the sitting. On June 16, the Union of Israelite Frenchmen, a patriotic organization, issued a statement warning against the development of an anti-Jewish movement under the pretext of opposition to Premier Blum.

**Jewish Communal Events.**—On April 26, 1936, a large protest meeting against Arab attacks on Jews in Palestine was held in Paris under the auspices of the Palestine Labor Federation; on the same day, the New Zionist (Revisionist) Organization held a memorial meeting for Jewish victims of the disorders.

Following the death of Professor Sylvain Lévi, on October 31, 1935, Dr. Arnold Netter, vice-president of the Alliance Israélite Universelle and member of the Administrative Council of the Jewish Colonization Association, was elected president of the Alliance. On March 1, the 84-year-old physician died suddenly while addressing a meeting of the Medical Association in Paris. On May 8, Professor William Oualid was elected vice-president of the Alliance.

On June 29, 1936, a conference on Jewish emigration opened in Paris under the auspices of the Hicem Emigration Association, which includes several Jewish immigrant aid and colonization bodies in various countries.

**ALGERIA**

**Constantine Outbreaks.**—On July 10, 1935, a number of Moslems, found guilty of having taken part in the serious anti-Jewish outbreak that occurred in Constantine and elsewhere in Algeria in August 1934, were sentenced to terms of imprisonment varying from 4 to 15 years. At the time the sentence was handed down, further outbreaks occurred at Tiaret, in the district of Oran. In February
1936, the criminal court at Orleansville sentenced 2 more Moslems to life imprisonment for their part in the outbreak. Three others received milder sentences.

Anti-Jewish Manifestations.—In October 1935, the Algerian Court of Correction sentenced 8 Europeans and one native to brief terms of imprisonment for plastering Sidi-Bel-Abbes with scurrilous anti-Jewish posters and for having caused anti-Jewish disorders during the previous summer. In December, M. Bricaut, president of the Croix de Feu, French fascistic organization, in Algeria, denounced Jew-baiting in a speech before 4,000 members, and declared that no distinction whatever ought to be made between those who fought for France during the War, whether Christian, Jew or Mohammedan. During February 1936, Bernard Lecache, president of the International League for Combating Anti-Semitism, addressed a number of meetings in Algeria with a view to organizing propaganda committees to fight the anti-Jewish agitators in the region. On April 16, after a protest from Jewish war veterans against the violently anti-Jewish campaign conducted by M. Coston, of Paris, a candidate in the general elections, the Mayor of Algiers took a hand in checking anti-Jewish propaganda by personally tearing down Jew-baiting placards during the night and placing Jewish pickets to prevent display of others. On June 16, following clashes between police and a procession of members of the People’s Front, in Sidi-Bel-Abbes, Jewish shops were demolished. Troops intervened and restored order; no serious casualties were reported. On June 30, Arabs demonstrated against Jews and lynched one in the course of disorders in Oran, accompanying tension between Rightists and Leftists in Algeria.

SYRIA

Arab Strike in Damascus.—The anti-French disturbances in Syria, in February 1936, during which more than 10 people were killed and more than 300 arrested, seriously affected the Jews of Damascus, who were forced to close
their shops and join the general strike under the threat that their shops would be burned if they refused. A special committee, formed by local Jews to provide relief for many Jewish families facing starvation, could do little because of lack of funds, and issued an appeal to Jews in other lands for aid. Despite the Arab threats, Jewish businessmen were forced to open their shops by French gendarmes, seeking to end the stoppage of commercial life resulting from the Arab Nationalist disorders.

BELGIUM

Anti-Nazi Boycott by Catholics.—On July 7, 1935, La Libre Beige, leading Catholic daily newspaper of Belgium, asserting that the position of Catholics in Germany is worse than that of the Jews, urged that Catholics all over the world begin a boycott of German-made goods.

Heidelberg Festival.—In April 1936, the State University of Liège and the Free Universities of Louvain and Brussels announced that they would not take part in the celebration in June of the 550th anniversary of the establishment of the University of Heidelberg, Germany. The commercial, technical and civil high schools in Antwerp, Charleroi, Mons and Vervier also decided not to send any delegations to Heidelberg.

Anti-Jewish Manifestations.—In December 1935, “The Jewish Peril,” a new organization established to “defend the ‘Aryan’ race,” was registered in Brussels. In March 1936, the Jewish question was debated for the first time in the Belgian Lower Chamber when a Catholic deputy criticized the appointment of Dr. Henri Buch, a Jew, as judge. A sharp rejoinder was made by Deputy Henri Jasper, a Liberal, who declared: “We cannot allow the existence of first and second class citizens.” Eugene Soudan, Minister of Justice, Paul Hymans, and other members of the Government defended the appointment and assailed the raising of the Jewish issue.
**Switzerland**

**Kidnapping of Berthold Jacob.**—On July 2, 1935, as a result of the tension existing between Switzerland and Germany, following the kidnapping of Berthold Jacob in March 1935, the government banned the sale of three Nazi papers, viz., Julius Streicher’s *Stuermer*, the *Allemante*, and the *Reichsdeutsche*, organ of Germans living in Switzerland.

On July 27, 1935, the German and Swiss Governments agreed on the appointment of arbitrators to examine the case of Berthold Jakob, German Jewish journalist kidnapped on Swiss soil by Nazi agents in March and held for seven months in a Berlin prison. Contending that the kidnapping was in violation of Swiss sovereignty, the Swiss Government demanded his release under the German-Swiss Treaty of Arbitration of 1921, and threatened to bring the issue before the World Court at The Hague. After months of negotiation, Jakob was released by the Nazis on September 18, and, on his return to Swiss soil, was deported by the Swiss Government. On May 4, 1936, the trial of Hans Wesemann, Nazi agent accused of kidnapping Jakob, opened in Basel. Wesemann immediately pleaded guilty to the charge, declaring that he was an accredited agent of the German Gestapo (Geheime Staatspolizei) and had arranged the kidnapping under instructions from his superiors. On May 6, Wesemann was sentenced to three years penal servitude and payment of 1,500 Swiss francs as damages to Jakob. The verdict was appealed by Wesemann’s counsel.

**Assassination of Wilhelm Gustloff.**—On February 4, 1936, Dr. Wilhelm Gustloff, chief Nazi agent in Switzerland, was shot dead at Davos-Platz by David Frankfurter, a 27-year-old Yugoslavian Jew. Frankfurter immediately gave himself up to the police, stating that he had committed the murder as a protest against the Nazi regime in Germany, that he had no political affiliations, that he had acted of his own free will because of ideological reasons, wishing to strike at Hitler through Gustloff, against whom he bore no personal grudge but whom he considered to have poisoned the atmosphere in Switzerland. The German Ambassador at Berne made representations to the Swiss Government in an attempt
to make it censor the attacks on the Hitler regime in the left-wing Swiss press, which, it was claimed, had led to the assassination. This attempt of the German Government was condemned by the majority of the Swiss newspapers, including organs of the Right.

On February 18, the Swiss Government decided against permitting the continuation of propaganda activities by the German Nazi Party in Switzerland, such as had been conducted by Dr. Gustloff. It deported a suspected German student believed to be a representative of the Gestapo, German secret police, and all activities of German students in Swiss universities were closely watched.

Later, it was officially announced in Geneva that the trial of David Frankfurter would take place at the September 1936 session of the Grison Cantonal Court. Frankfurter’s family retained Eugen Curti, well-known Zurich advocate as chief defense counsel. On March 20, Jerome de Vries, noted Dutch advocate, joined the defense counsel.

On May 31, it was learned that the prosecutor of Grison Canton had, four months previously, requested the editors of the Judenkenner of Berlin and the Weltdienst, an anti-Jewish news service with headquarters at Erfurt, Germany, which had published sensational and fantastic allegations concerning the motives behind the Gustloff murder, to come forward with proofs of their charges. Although four months had passed, no information had been received from either of the Nazi publications. On June 8, the entire Swiss press attacked a Nazi pamphlet on “The Gustloff Case,” by Wolfgang Dierwege. Advertised as “indispensable when the trial opens against the Jew Frankfurter, because dark powers are attempting to help with all their forces a murderer,” the pamphlet was filled with undisguised accusations that the Swiss Government was in the pay of German refugees. The Basler National Zeitung stigmatized the pamphlet as a “dastardly attack against Switzerland” and an attempt to interfere with Swiss justice.

Heidelberg Festival.—In June 1936, by a majority vote, the Council of the Canton of Basle decided that the University of Basle would not send a delegation to the 550th jubilee of Heidelberg University.
Protocols Trials.—On June 22, 1936, the Swiss Supreme Court at Berne rejected a plea by Colonel Fleischauer, who gave "expert" testimony in the famous Berne "Protocols" trial in 1935, for payment of 80,000 francs in witness fees. The court allowed him 8,000 francs, but ordered payment suspended pending the outcome of the libel and perjury actions which had been brought against Fleischauer.

On June 9, 1936, the libel action against Dr. A. Zander, former editor of the Iron Broom, organ of the anti-Jewish National Front, was settled. The action, pending since June 21, 1933, had been brought by three well-known Jewish leaders, Dreyfus-Brodsky, president of the Basle Jewish Community, Dr. Marcus Cohn, president of the Swiss Zionist Federation, and Dr. Marcus Ehrenpreis, chief rabbi of Stockholm. Dr. Zander agreed to withdraw the assertions published in his paper alleging that Dr. Ehrenpreis had called the "Protocols" genuine. He admitted that, contrary to an allegation made by him in his paper, the "Protocols" had no connection with the first World Zionist Congress held in Basle in 1897. Dr. Zander paid the costs of the action, and promised to destroy some 780 copies of a spurious document imported from Germany by the Basle National Front.

International Conferences.—In August 1935, the International Women's League for Peace and Freedom, with headquarters in Geneva, issued a manifesto "to the non-Jews of Europe" condemning the silence of civilized Europe vis-à-vis the persecution of Jews in Germany. In September, the Congress of European National Minorities in Geneva adopted a resolution stating that oppression of national minorities in Europe proceeds unhindered and warning the League against the dangers which beset not only the states with mixed nationalities, but all other states and peoples of Europe.

NETHERLANDS

Effect of Nuremberg Laws.—The German law, promulgated at Nuremberg on September 15, 1935, forbidding marriage between Jews and "persons of German or racially related blood," gave rise to a great deal of discussion in the Nether-
lands, because of the existence of a convention with Germany, providing for the observance in each country of the marriage laws of the other. Shortly after the Nuremberg law was announced, the Dutch Government was reported to be considering the advisability of denouncing this convention of 1902, when it was found that the agreement had been so interpreted by some Dutch officials as to forbid marriages between German Jews and "Aryans" in Holland. It was stated in Berlin that the law making illegal, marriages of Jews and German citizens, including those residing abroad, was also enforceable in Poland, Italy, Hungary, Sweden, Danzig, and Luxemburg, which had signed similar pacts.

The question of the agreement's effect on Holland gave rise to much concern in Dutch parliamentary circles and was discussed, in November, in the Dutch Chamber. The agreement was denounced by Dr. G. A. Boon, Liberal member. The Minister of Justice declared that a German Jew could marry any Dutch subject in Holland in spite of the Nuremberg laws. Because of the treaty, however, marriage could not take place between a German "Aryan" woman and a Dutch Jew.

This statement however, was not accepted by the Dutch Courts. On June 20, 1936, the Civil Court of Rotterdam ruled that a Dutch Jew could marry a German "Aryan" woman, despite the fact that German authorities refused to give a marriage certificate to the woman. The Court declared that, "according to Dutch law, a Dutch Jew is a Dutchman who belongs to the Israelite community." The decision went on to say: "Apart from belonging to this community no distinction at all exists which would designate a certain group of Dutchmen as 'Jews,' and a certain other group of Dutchmen as 'non-Jews.' The distinction which the German law has created between Jews and non-Jews can be applied only to Germans. The German law has no application to Dutchmen."

Olympic Games.—Dutch participation in the Berlin Olympics was opposed in October by the Committee for the protection of the idea of the Olympic Games. The new Committee was sponsored by Bernard van Dam and Dr. J. C. Bruyn, director of the Amsterdam municipal athletic
grounds. A protest meeting was staged in Amsterdam in November. Later in that month, the Netherland Athletics Association voted overwhelmingly against participation in the Olympics.

**Heidelberg Festival.**—In March 1936, the Senate of the famous University of Leyden announced that it would not send a representative to the Heidelberg celebration because it sends delegations only to centenary celebrations. The press criticized the statement, declaring that Leyden should have followed the example of British universities by denouncing the persecution of Jewish professors and students. Later, the State University of Groningen also refused its invitation as did the Amsterdam Municipal University.

**Anti-Jewish Manifestation.**—On March 4, the court at The Hague sentenced Dr. P. Molenbroek, the well-known 75-year-old anti-Jewish propagandist, to 100 days' imprisonment or 300 'guldens' fine for publishing anti-Jewish pamphlets and articles.

**World Jewish Congress.**—In October, at the annual conference of the Amsterdam branch of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, the proposal to participate in a world Jewish congress was defeated.

**Spain**

**Anti-Jewish Manifestations.**—During the February election campaign, one of the right-wing parties put out violently anti-Jewish posters. As Jew-baiting had not previously been an issue in Spain, the Jewish community was shocked, and its leaders protested to the Civil Governor of Madrid as well as to the Prime Minister.

**Olympic Games.**—On May 4, 1936, a delegation representing workers' organizations presented a petition to Premier Manuel Azaña, praying for the withdrawal of a government subvention of 400,000 pesetas for the Spanish Olympic team. The Premier replied that he was personally opposed
to Spain's participation in the Games, but that the Government was obliged to keep its international obligations and follow the example of other democratic governments.

Stateless Jews.—On June 5, 1936, the Spanish authorities granted Spanish citizenship to 144 stateless Sephardic Jewish families under a measure recently announced by Premier Manuel Azaña for the facilitation of the repatriation of old Spanish-Jewish families.

Spanish Morocco.—In April, Jewish public education was reorganized in Spanish Morocco. The special Jewish schools were converted into ordinary schools, with schoolmasters engaged without regard to their religion. The rabbis, however, remained in charge of religious instruction.

SWEDEN

Shehitah.—The practice of Shehitah in Sweden, an acute problem for years, was again menaced by the new slaughtering law, drafted in July by the Ministry of Justice. It required compulsory stunning before slaughtering of all animals except poultry and rabbits. In November 1935, a conference of Scandinavian Rabbis appealed to the Swedish Government to alter the proposed law. The conference also adopted a resolution to create a permanent Federation of Scandinavian Rabbis to meet from time to time, to consider ways and means for strengthening Jewry in the Scandinavian countries.

In March 1936, the proposed law for the compulsory stunning of animals before slaughter was discussed in the Riksdag. The Minister of Justice announced that the draft of the proposed law was almost completed and that it would be introduced into the Riksdag in 1937.

Immigration.—In March, in a memorandum to the Riksdag committee studying proposals for the tightening of immigration control, the Royal Social Office declared that Sweden should assume certain moral responsibilities by assisting international humanitarian work in behalf of refugees from Germany. The memorandum rejected the
proposal to establish restrictions on racial bases, and declared that existing regulations were sufficient for the control of immigration. In June, several proposals for tightening the alien legislation in Sweden, which would have prevented the entry of some German refugees, were rejected by the Swedish Parliament, which decided, instead, to instruct the Government to examine the possibilities of improving the technical control of the admission of foreigners, in accordance with the suggestions of the Parliamentary Legal Commission, which had recommended the rejection of any proposal aiming at introducing further restrictions.

**Community Elections.**—In November 1935, for the first time in the history of the Jewish community of Stockholm, the elections to the Board of the Community were contested by four different parties. The results of the elections gave the Liberal Jewish Party seven mandates, the Zionists two mandates, the Orthodox group two mandates, and the Workers' Party one mandate.

**Austria**

During the period under review, the attitude of the Austrian government toward the Jewish population of the country continued to be a wavering one because of the government's indecision in respect of its foreign policy,—an indecision growing out of its effort, because of Italy's opposition to an Austro-German entente, to resist tremendous pressure to bring about Nazification. Since the close of the period, however, this situation has been changed by the conclusion of the agreement of July 11, 1936, with the tacit approval of Italy. A change for the worse in the situation of the Jews of Austria may, therefore, be looked for during the forthcoming twelve-month. The events of the preceding period, however, were characterized by evasiveness and straddling on the part of the Government.

**Jews in the Bar Association.**—In July 1935, the Union of Bar Associations for the whole of Austria adopted a resolution rejecting the *numerus clausus* for Jews in the legal profession and calling for the preservation of the status quo in admissions to bar associations. The action was a
result of reports that the government was contemplating division of the bar association into separate "Aryan" and "non-Aryan" sections. In November, the Government abolished the policy of electing officers of the Vienna Bar Association and assumed the responsibility of filling the posts by appointment. Dr. Siegfried Kantor, Jewish president of the Association, was removed from his office, and his place was taken by Dr. Emil Krasser, brother of the president of the Christian Socialist Party. When it was revealed in December that none of the current Jewish members of the Bar Association Board would be renominated, and that non-Jews would take their places, the associations of Jewish lawyers throughout Austria protested to the Chancellor, the Minister of Justice, and the General Secretary of the Fatherland Front. They pointed out that the Austrian Constitution of 1934 prohibits discrimination as against Jewish citizens.

Jewish Physicians.—In July 1935, a social insurance reform was adopted, which barred Jewish physicians from representation on the Medical Committees. Protests from the Union of Jewish Physicians were of no avail. In November, the Union again protested to the Minister of Social Welfare against discrimination in appointments to positions in the state hospitals. A deputation which visited him was assured that he was not an anti-Semite. He made no promise, however, to remove the discrimination.

Nazification of Sports.—In September 1935, the Austrian Skiing Union adopted a resolution introducing the "Aryan paragraph" into its statutes by providing that "all members must be persons of Aryan origin and all members of the administration of the societies in Austria must belong to the Germanic nation." In connection with sports, it is interesting to note that, on June 30, 1936, the Hakoah Sports Club of Vienna was faced by conflicting orders concerning participation in the Olympic Games. The Austrian Maccabi Union, Jewish sports organization, issued an order forbidding athletes of the Hakoah club to go to Berlin. The Austrian
sports authorities, however, threatened the club with two years’ disqualification if it refused to participate in the Games.

_Dissolution of an Inter-Marriage._—In March 1935, the verdict of a Vienna court dissolving the marriage between a Jew and a Catholic woman, on the ground of “racial” incompatibility, was appealed to the Vienna High Court, on the ground that Austrian law does not recognize any “racial” differences. A State official pointed out that since the Austrian Government has repeatedly declared that Austrian laws do not recognize any racial discrimination, the dissolution of the marriage was illegal, and that there was danger that the racial differences stressed in the Nuremberg laws in Germany might find their way into Austrian marriage laws.

_Refugees From Germany._—On May 26, 1936, the Austrian Government announced that it did not intend to participate in the inter-governmental conference on German refugees scheduled to open at Geneva on July 2. The conference had been called by Sir Neill Malcolm, League of Nations High Commissioner for German Refugees, to set up a system of legal protection for refugees and adopt other methods to alleviate their plight. Austria’s abstention was based on the ground that questions of the legal status of the refugees did not affect Austrian interests, owing to the small number of German refugees in Austria. It was emphasized, however, that the Government was eager to treat German refugees in accordance with the principles of humanity, and would follow the deliberations of the conference with interest.

_Anti-Jewish Agitation._—In November, Professor Emmerich Czermak, a leader of the reactionary Christian Social Party, demanded the reorganization of the economic life of Austrian Jews and restriction of their participation in Government affairs, by a _numerus clausus_. In December, the semi-official _Reichspost_, published in Vienna and generally regarded as the mouthpiece of the Vatican in Central Europe, discussed “threatened rights in Palestine,” and demanded a guarantee from the League of Nations for the protection of Catholic privileges in Palestine.
On January 16, 1936, a mass meeting of the Vienna Catholics was addressed by speakers who attacked the Jews and Zionism. With the exception of a moderate speech by Dr. Theodor Innitzer, Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna, all of the addresses were outspokenly hostile to the Palestine Jews, and were generally anti-Jewish in tone. Several days later, in a public statement, Chief Rabbi Feuchtwang replied that it was against the spirit of religious Jewry to attempt any action against other religious communities in Palestine.

In February 1936, Jewish circles were alarmed over the publication by the Catholic journal, Neue Ordnung, of the draft of a bill for the regulation of the Jewish question, said to have been approved by the late Dr. Ignaz Seipel, leader of the Christian Socialist Party and onetime Prime Minister. The draft provided that the Jews be regarded as a national minority, and that their position be regulated on the basis of a numerus clausus.

The Catholic clergy in Austria made repeated demands for social and economic ostracism of Jews and the introduction of a numerus clausus against converted Jews. On March 18, 1936, the Jesuit Father Bichlmaier, Austrian Catholic leader, made such a demand. At the same time, Bishop Hudal, rector of the Institute for the Promotion of Christian Science in Rome, delivered a similar address, but on more moderate lines. Vice-Mayor Kresse of Vienna expressed approval of Father Bichlmaier's attack on the Jews. At about the same time, State Councillor Leopold Kunschak, editor of the Catholic Neue Ordnung and President of the Christian Workers' and Employes' Union, voiced a threat of widespread pogroms in Austria if the Jewish "question" were not solved in accordance with Nazi precepts. He demanded the ousting of Jewish influence in the economic and spiritual life of the German people.

Kunschak's proposal was supported by the influential Catholic monthly, Schoenere Zukunft, in an editorial urging that Jewish influence be removed from public life. Advising gradual introduction of the anti-Jewish program, in order to obviate the danger of a world boycott, the periodical demanded an ordinance recognizing the Jews as a national minority, introducing the numerus clausus in the civil
service and educational and legal fields, and establishing separate electoral colleges for Jews.

In the meantime, on February 24, 1936, Jewish tradesmen in Vienna were alarmed when Jew-baiters spread leaflets bearing the admonition, "Jews, buy only from your co-religionists!" throughout the city. The Board of the Vienna Jewish Community demanded a police investigation. On March 3, police arrested a well-known anti-Jewish printer of Vienna for printing the circular. He was also the printer of the Wegweiser, the Christian-German organ. Agitation of this kind caused the Union of Jewish War Veterans, on March 26, to lodge an official protest with the Government demanding justice for Jews and cessation of illegal anti-Jewish activities. But protests were of no avail, for in May, the press service of the Ostmaerkischer Sturmscharen, Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg's own troops, began to disseminate anti-Jewish articles concerning the Palestine disorders. They stated that not every Jew-baiter is a Nazi, and listed as anti-Semites former Premier Ignaz Seipel, the late Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss, and Cardinal Theodor Innitzer. On May 12, following the demand of the Jewish community board, the anti-Jewish leaflets which were being distributed were ordered confiscated.

On May 10, although 250,000 violently anti-Jewish handbills had been distributed throughout Vienna, few people attended an anti-Jewish demonstration of the Freiheitsbund, convened by Dr. Leopold Kunschak, Christian Social leader, with the purpose of demanding elimination of Jews from the economic and social life of Austria. The speakers refrained from raising the Jewish issue beyond an occasional reference, at the urgent appeal, it was said, of Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg. At the same time, a thousand members of the Heimwehr, a rival faction, held a counter-demonstration nearby, with speakers attacking the Freiheitsbund.

Austrian Jews were relieved when, early in June, the Government prohibited political meetings and street demonstrations from June 20 to September 30, in order to prevent any interference with, or hampering of, tourist traffic.
Insurance Company Scandal.—In March 1936, the exposure of irregularities in the management of the Austrian Phoenix Insurance Company, one of the most important organizations of its kind on the continent, created consternation in Austrian Jewish circles, because the authorities and Jew-baiters attempted to place the responsibility for the mismanagement entirely on Jewish shoulders. In February the company's director, Dr. Wilhelm Berliner, a Jew, had committed suicide because the organization was unable to meet its obligations, and his post was filled by an "Aryan." On March 25, the Government announced that the company's reserves were insufficient, and it assumed full responsibility. Several banks with large claims against Phoenix were forced to suspend payments. The Government published lists of public and political bodies and individuals to whom "commissions" had been paid by the Company. Among those listed was the Jewish National Fund, which received 500,000 schillings as agent's commission on insurance sold to Zionists. This and the fact that several high officials of the company had been Jews caused Jew-baiters and Nazis to intensify their anti-Jewish campaign. The official Nazi press made much of the money received by the Jewish National Fund, overlooking the 494,000 schillings paid to the Austrian Nazi organization, besides payments made to many of the Nazi leaders. Phoenix had also made payments to the Heimwehr, the monarchists, the Christian Socialists, the Fatherland Front, and other groups. Nevertheless, the entirely innocent Jewish aspect was exploited by anti-Jewish agitators, and, on March 30, Burgomaster Schmitz of Vienna used the Phoenix crash as a spring-board for a bitter anti-Jewish tirade. The large financial aid given by the Phoenix Company to the Fatherland Front did not hinder its General Secretary, Colonel Adam, from accusing the Jews, in a radio address, of being responsible for the collapse of the company. On April 29, resentment in Jewish circles was stirred anew when the Jewish National Fund was included in a list of allegedly "irregular" recipients of sums from Phoenix. The next day, the Jewish National Fund issued a statement denying that it had been one of the recipients of money gifts from the company, and pointing
out that its agreement with the Phoenix Company was
similar to an agreement with the Prudential Assurance
Company, and contained no secret clauses of any kind.

Communal Items.—In February 1936, the Vienna Pales-
tine Office announced that more than 1,000 Jews had left
Austria for Palestine in 1935. Of these, 889 entered Palestine
on labor certificates.

In the same month, the Board of Directors of the Vienna
Jewish Community was faced with a crisis, following the
resignation of the eleven members who represented the
Union of Austrian Jews. Following the abortive Socialist
revolution in February 1935, all Labor Zionist members
of the organization had been forced to leave, so that a dead-
lock existed between Zionist and non-Zionist factions repre-
sented. The members of the Union of Austrian Jews left
because they felt that the Zionist majority did not con-
stitute the necessary quorum to elect their candidate, former
vice-president Dr. Josef Loewenherz. Later, Dr. Loewenherz
was named acting president of the Board for one year.

On April 28, a mass meeting of all Zionist parties was
held in Vienna to protest against the Palestine disorders.
The New Zionist (Revisionist) Organization held a separate
protest meeting which was also well attended.

Hungary

Governmental Policy.—The attitude of the government
toward Jewish questions continued, during the past year,
to be marked by a sort of half-hearted benevolence, as in
the preceding period. No positive steps prejudicial to the
status of Jews were taken. At the same time, the govern-
ment did little if anything to suppress anti-Jewish agitation
which, however, did not reach alarming proportions during
the period. Whether a change is to take place because of
the recent agreement between Germany and Austria,
remains to be seen.

In a statement to the press on July 7, 1935, Geza Bor-
nemissza, Hungarian Minister of Trade, promised to relax
the Hungarian Sunday Law to enable Sabbath-observing
Jews to keep their establishments open on Sunday. Later,
however, when a delegation of Orthodox Jews called on him, he declared that, while respecting the Orthodox desire to observe the Sabbath, he could not violate the wish of the Christian population for complete Sunday rest.

In September 1935, a conference of the Hungarian Bar Associations adopted a resolution protesting against a clause in the new Government bill regulating admission to the Hungarian bar on the basis of religious and racial affiliations. The Budapest Bar Association acted similarly. Dr. Emil Nagy, former Minister of Justice, declared that the bill violated Hungarian traditions. "When we demand justice for Hungary, then Hungary must deal justly with every race, religion and nationality within her borders," he said. Later in the month, the Ministry of Justice, which was sponsoring the bill, announced that the bill would be redrafted.

In February, Prime Minister Julius Goemboes, in a statement to the Lower House of Parliament, denied that his Government intended to introduce a *numerus clausus* for Jews in industry. He admitted, however, that a survey was being made of those industries in which Jews were alleged to predominate. He said: "The Government does not intend . . . to take any legal steps in this matter, and I am convinced that the enterprises where Jewish employees are at present predominating and which, to a certain extent, are also moved by higher national interests, would alter this proportion in favor of the Christian youth, and, for this reason, I hope that the Government will not find it necessary to apply any measures."

On July 15, 1935, an important decision upholding the autonomy of the Jewish Community of Budapest was handed down by the Supreme Court. A medical officer in the Jewish Hospital had refused to retire on reaching retirement age, and applied to the Court for an injunction to stop the Community from forcing him to do so. The Community argued that the matter was wholly within its own jurisdiction, whereas the physician contended it was a matter for the civil courts. The court upheld the contention of the Jewish Community.
Anti-Jewish Manifestations.—In July 1935, the Pfeilkreuzler, Hungarian Nazi organization, admitted its failure to gain ground in Hungary, and announced its intention to reorganize and select new leaders.

On November 21, 1935, anti-Jewish students at the Budapest University demonstrated and 32 of them were arrested and fined. The Ministers of Education and of the Interior issued statements deploiring the incident. The president of the Turul Academic Union, whose members were reported to have taken part in the outbreak, declared that irresponsible elements had made use of the group's name to incite the students. He declared the Turul Union was against illegal measures. Emericana, the Catholic University Union, issued a strong protest against the disturbances and forbade its members to take part in such activities.

In January 1936, the activities of a new anti-Jewish organization, calling itself the "Party of the Nation's Will," or "Life Union," were exposed in the Hungarian press. It was reported that the group was flooding provincial centers with thousands of leaflets demanding a ruthless solution of the Jewish question and the establishment of a dictatorship. During March, the anti-Jewish campaign of the Hungarian National Socialists increased in intensity, with the posting on walls and boardings of violent Jew-baiting slogans and caricatures. The Nazi press launched an economic campaign against Jewish tradesmen, doctors and lawyers. In May, the Pfeilkreuzler became active once more, distributing anti-Jewish material freely in the city of Debreczin. A Budapest newspaper reported that the Pfeilkreuzler main office at Debreczin maintained 17 local branches, spending many hundreds of thousands of pengoes to foster a boycott against Jewish business men.

At a meeting of the Union of the Hungarian Future, on May 25, a "fundamental purge" of Jewish influence from public life was demanded by speakers, among whom were the parliamentary deputies from Debreczin, Dr. Franz Rajniss, Stephen Miltay and Dr. Makkai.
Communal Item.—In July 1935, the District Conference of Jewish communities, held at Mako, unanimously adopted a resolution to take the pro-Palestine movement in Hungary out of the hands of the Zionists. The resolution stated that most Hungarian Jews are hostile to Zionism, and, therefore, it was advisable not to have Zionists directing the movement.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Czechoslovakia continued, during the period under review, to be a sort of oasis in a Central Europe bare of democracy and equality of rights. The government consistently showed a broad-minded and liberal attitude toward all problems involving the Jewish population, and did not leave in doubt its abhorrence of racial prejudice and agitation based upon such prejudice.

In December 1935, the Jews of the country were gratified at the election of Dr. Eduard Benes to the Presidency of the Republic. This election was everywhere regarded as assuring a continuation of the democratic course in the internal policy of the country which had been all along pursued by Thomas G. Masaryk, former President. On April 22, 1936, President Benes received a Jewish deputation, to whom he promised support for the establishment of a Czechoslovakian pro-Palestine Committee. He also promised to help the promotion of Hebrew studies in the schools of Carpatho-Russia, and the introduction of democratic institutions for Jewish communities.

In October 1935, the High Court of Maehrisch-Ostrau overruled the objection of defendant’s counsel, in an action brought against an editor for publishing an incendiary anti-Jewish article, to having the case tried before a judge who happened to be a Jew. When the lawyer asserted that the Jewish judge would be prejudiced, the latter at once suspended the hearing and submitted the objection to the High Court which decided that removal of a judge, because of his religious faith, was illegal in Czechoslovakia.

Shehitah.—In November, the threat to Shehitah, in Czechoslovakia, contained in a bill for the prevention of cruelty to animals, which the Government had submitted
Refugees and Aliens.—In October, 1935, in response to a complaint by Deputies Angelo Goldstein and Marie Schmolka against the deportation of Jewish refugees in Bohemia and Moravia, Josef Cerny, the Minister of the Interior, promised to remedy all cases of injustice and to instruct the authorities that Jewish aliens in Czechoslovakia must be treated the same as other aliens.

Anti-Jewish Manifestations.—During December 1935, anti-Jewish sentiment became widespread in the strong German minority districts of Czechoslovakia. Terroristic methods were used to force non-Jews to boycott Jewish shops. The social boycott of Jews was intensified with some schools segregating Jewish children from other pupils. The press placed the responsibility for this development upon Konrad Henlein, leader of the Sudetendeutsche Party, although Henlein was not outwardly anti-Jewish. When a deputation of representatives of the Czechoslovakian Jewish Party called his attention to the situation, Prime Minister Milan Hodza declared that "the Czechoslovakian Government rejects race anti-Semitism and adheres to the principle of equality of rights for all citizens." On April 27, 1936, serious anti-Jewish excesses broke out at the University of Bratislava (Pressburg), following a demonstration by Slovak anti-Jewish students, in connection with the exhibition of the film, "The Golem." Lectures at the medical and philosophical faculties of the university were suspended, as a result of the disorders.

Jewish Communal Items.—On September 13, 1935, the World Maccabi Congress opened in Brno. Dr. Hermann Lelewer, president, reported that the organization had 200,000 members in 37 countries. The Congress passed a resolution requesting the Olympic Games Committees and other sports bodies in various countries to permit Jewish athletes not to participate in the Berlin Olympics. The German delegates voted against the resolution. The Congress also adopted a resolution declaring that "membership
of the New Zionist (Revisionists) Organization is incompatible with the membership of the Maccabi." The Revisionists soon after issued orders to its affiliated groups to strengthen opposition to this decision among the Revisionist members of the Maccabi, threatening to sever connections with the Maccabi World Union if the protests did not avail. Professor Selig Brodetsky, member of the Zionist Executive, was elected president of the World Maccabi Union, and Dr. Lelewer was elected honorary president.

On February 17, 1936, the second Winter Maccabiade opened at Banska Bystrica, in Czechoslovakia, with 250 Jewish athletes taking part in the games.

ITALY

Ethiopian War.—A large number of Jews were among the Italian volunteer regiments, marching into Ethiopia during the military campaign. In December 1935, the Union of Jewish Communities of Italy appealed to Italian Jews to make offers of gold, silver and other metals for the war needs of the Italian State. Dr. Aldo Lattes, Chief Rabbi of Rome and president of the Rome Jewish Community, together with other members of the Rabbinical Council, delivered the golden key of the Ark of the Covenant and a large silver candlestick from the Roman Synagogue to the Secretary of the Fascist Party, as an expression of loyalty on the part of Italian Jews. So great was the number of Jews in the Italian armies invading Ethiopia that in March 1936, the Governor of Eritrea assigned a sum of 150,000 liras for the building of a synagogue in Asmara to serve their religious needs, as well as those of the local Jewish inhabitants. On June 22, 1936, the Union of Jewish Communities in Italy announced that with the approval of the Colonial Ministry, it would send a delegation to Ethiopia to investigate Jewish religious conditions, to organize the first Jewish communities in Addis Ababa and elsewhere, and to establish contact with the Falashas (Ethiopian Jews).

The Rabbinate.—In September 1935, Professor S. Arton, the Chief Rabbi of Florence, resigned his position to join the faculty of the Italian Rabbinical Seminary in Rome.
This event again brought home to Italian Jewry the fact that so many large Italian cities were without Chief Rabbis. In November, the Jewish community of Milan unanimously decided to invite Dr. Gustavo Castelbolognesi to become Chief Rabbi of Milan. He had been removed from his previous post as Chief Rabbi of Tripoli when he became involved in a religious controversy with Italian authorities there.

Arab Outbreaks in Palestine.—On May 19, 1936 official circles denied the charges published abroad of Italian complicity in instigating the Arab disorders in Palestine. London newspapers had carried reports that Italian agents were fomenting disorders to embarrass Great Britain in the Italo-Ethiopian crisis.

Lithuania

Governmental Policies.—In October 1935, following upon the dissolution of the Lithuanian Social Democratic Party, the Government outlawed the Zionist Socialist and the Zionist People’s Parties. In December, it was learned that, for the first time, the budget estimates of the Kovno Municipality for 1936 did not contain any allocations for Jewish social and cultural institutions. It was reported that similar “Jew-free” budgets were being drawn up by many provincial municipalities. On March 2, 1936, the Government refused permission for the holding of a conference of Jewish town councillors to establish a Lithuanian organization of Jewry as well as an organization coordinating the activities of Jewish councillors in various Lithuanian towns.

On April 28, the Government declared that it would not recognize the Rabbinical Association as a confessional representative body but merely as a professional rabbis’ union, and proposed that a representative Jewish body be formed, to be headed by a chief rabbi. On April 22, the Ministry of Education announced the closing of all Jewish teachers’ institutes. The new regulation stated that only Lithuanian schools for the training of teachers will be permitted to operate, but made no provision for the study of Jewish subjects in these schools.
In June, the Government enacted a law permitting Jewish children to attend only Hebrew and Yiddish schools, and the Ministry of Education and Public Worship announced that, during the preceding nine years, the 214 rabbis in Lithuania had received about 943,990 lits (approximately $160,000), in salaries and that Jewish religious teachers had received subsidies to the amount of 83,887 lits (about $15,000).

On May 6, 1936, in a statement to a representative of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, reports in the British press to the effect that the Lithuanian Government had “declared war on the Jews” were denied by General Julius Caplikas, Minister of the Interior. Pointing out that anti-Jewish disturbances had been energetically put down by the Government, he declared that “in Lithuania all citizens, irrespective of nationality or creed, enjoy full equality of rights, and the Government is determined to combat with the utmost energy all attempts at sowing racial hatred among the population.” General Caplikas continued: “The fear entertained abroad that the compulsory examinations for artisans might gravely affect the position of the Jewish artisans in the country is without any cause, for the Government has changed its attitude toward this question and the law is no longer of any actual importance . . . I can assure you that the livelihoods of the old Jewish artisans will not be endangered by the new law.” “It is further unjust,” he added, “to say that Jews do not enjoy the right to receive higher education or to join the civil service. The percentage of Jews in the liberal professions is a very high one, and so far as the civil service is concerned, the Jews themselves do not appear to be very much interested in joining it.” General Caplikas went on to say: “So far as the economic position in the country is concerned, it must be emphasized that the Government does not interfere with the principle of free competition, and it is, therefore, not true to speak of any persecutions and restrictions so far as the Jews are concerned. So far as the general political life in the country is concerned, the Jewish interests will be carefully considered in the new Parliament which will soon be convoked. Jewish representation in this new Parliament will consist of no less than two seats among fifty.” The interview was reprinted
by the entire Lithuanian press and caused great relief among the Jewish population. On May 26, the Government nominated two Jews for membership in Parliament. They were the editor, Rubinstein, and the war veteran, Goldberg. When the election returns were made public on June 17, however, it was found that neither of the two Jewish candidates had been elected.

Jews in the Legal Profession.—The statement of General Caplikas that all was well with the Jews of Lithuania evidently did not apply to Jews in the legal profession. In June 1936, a Jewish delegation, headed by Rabbi Shapiro, Dr. Gregory Wolf, and Leon Ashinsky, vainly attempted to call upon M. S. Silingas, the Minister of Justice, to discuss the difficult position of the Jewish lawyers in the country. It was pointed out that, according to the law promulgated in 1933, a total of 66 lawyers had been excluded from the legal profession, of whom 58 were Jews, and that the eight non-Jews were later either readmitted or given government positions, whereas only three of the Jews were readmitted. Applications by 37 Jews for permission to obtain the necessary training for law had been refused, and not a single Jew had been admitted to the courts as a candidate for the bar. It was further emphasized that there was not a single Jewish judge or public prosecutor in the country.

Artisanship Law.—In December 1935, Jewish artisans were gravely concerned over the proposed law requiring every artisan to undergo an examination for a diploma. It was generally considered that the provisions of the law were aimed chiefly at ousting Jewish artisans from their positions. The Government consulted with the anti-Jewish Verslininkas Organization in drafting the law, but it did not take steps to learn the views of Jewish workers. On April 23, 1936, the Government issued a law obliging all artisans, shop assistants and business men to possess certificates attesting their general and professional knowledge and proficiency in the Lithuanian language. The law caused grave concern among Jewish artisans and business men, thousands of whom feared the loss of their livelihoods.
In April, a sensation was caused by the proposal of the artisans' section of the Lithuanian anti-Jewish Verslininki Organization to make peace with the Jewish Artisans' Union, in order to carry out coordinated schemes in favor of Lithuanian artisans. A special delegation of the Verslininki visited the Executive Committee of the Jewish group to confer on the establishment of a joint committee to represent all Lithuanian artisans, irrespective of race or creed. The committee consisted of 3 Jews and 4 Lithuanians. This unusual step of the anti-Jewish organization was explained by the fact that a number of Government officials had recently joined the Verslininki, and were influencing the group to modify its anti-Jewish attitude.

Anti-Jewish Manifestations.—In July 1935, a delegation from the Union of Rabbis in Lithuania visited President Antanas Smetona and drew his attention to the growing anti-Jewish agitation in the country. They informed him of the steady process of pushing Jews out of all branches of economic life. In October, following a series of incidents between individual Jews and Lithuanians, grave anti-Jewish disturbances took place in Telshy. The famous Telshy Yeshivah was stoned by a mob, which also attacked houses of Jews and beat individuals. The police arrested more than 20 Jew-baiters, and the situation in the town became less tense. A delegation visited General Julius Caplikas, Minister of the Interior, to call attention to the dangerous situation of the Jews of Telshy as a result of the riots. The Minister assured the delegation that the Government would not tolerate any further anti-Jewish excesses. Meanwhile, the Military Commandant of Telshy sentenced 18 rioters to prison. In response to the appeal of the Jewish Community, Bishop Staugaitis agreed to appeal to church-goers to stop anti-Jewish agitation. In November, a conference of Telshy social workers adopted a resolution condemning the excesses, in the name of Lithuanian intellectuals. On November 8, the Lithuanian Government ordered an investigation into the riots, although the demonstrators chiefly responsible had already been sentenced to imprisonment.

In November, the Verslininki, anti-Jewish organization, at a conference at Ponieviej, demanded that the Govern-
ment "rescue the Lithuanian people from the hands of the aliens," and that Jews be excluded from Lithuanian trade, industry and artisanship by means of special examinations. Despite its promise to prohibit the broadcast of the proceedings, the Ministry of the Interior allowed all the anti-Jewish speeches and resolutions to go on the air. In December, the secretary of the Lithuanian National Front, the Government Party, announced that "anti-Semitism in Lithuania must be exterminated." He declared that the National Front would launch a campaign against all illegal elements in the country, and especially against the anti-Jewish organizations.

On December 23, in a joint statement, the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Finance and the Mayor of Kovno, condemned the continued anti-Jewish agitation conducted by the notorious Verslininki Organization, and declared that the policy of the Lithuanian Government must be tolerance and equality of rights for all citizens.

In January 1936, new anti-Jewish outbreaks were organized by peasants in the vicinity of Telshy and 33 Jews were injured. The police made a number of arrests and order was restored. In March, the Jewish population in the Ponieviej district was thrown into panic when the disappearance of a Lithuanian boy and a girl gave rise to ritual murder agitation among the populace, who began attacking Jews in the streets. It was later learned that the girl had been abducted by a white slave trafficker. On March 21, the Lithuanian Government published a sharp condemnation of anti-Jewish ritual murder accusations, which had been creating much trouble in the provincial centers. Sinister forces are conducting agitation against the Jews, the Government statement pointed out, citing many instances of anti-Jewish incitement in previous weeks. The Government called on the population to deliver the slanderers over to the police, and threatened imprisonment as punishment for such incitement. On March 30, the commandant of the Ponieviej district sentenced seven persons to two months' imprisonment for spreading ritual murder libels. Again, on May 4, four more persons were sent to prison for spreading ritual murder libels in Telshy. In May, the Congress of State Cooperatives meeting in Kovno adopted a resolu-
tion demanding that the Government perfect the existing state monopoly in flax by excluding the few private Jewish traders who were still allowed to continue business. In June, the opening of the Lithuanian Fair in Kovno was used by Jew-baiters as an occasion for launching a campaign for a boycott of Jews.

Anti-Nazi Boycott.—On July 23, 1935, the Commandant of Kovno suppressed the Jewish anti-Nazi Boycott Committee. Nevertheless, the boycott continued to be effective, causing the German Government, during the negotiations for a new trade agreement, in April 1936, to request the Lithuanian Government to combat the movement. The German delegation demanded the abolition of the existing boycott committee and the imposition of severe penalties on persons spreading boycott propaganda.

Lithuanian-Palestine Transfer Agreement.—On April 20, 1936, a transfer agreement between Lithuania and Palestine, permitting export of currency, was signed in Kovno by Dr. Alfred Werner, representative of the Anglo-Palestine Bank. Under the terms of the agreement, the Palestine Foundation Fund and the Jewish National Fund are permitted to send to Palestine from Lithuania a total of $32,500 annually. In addition, Lithuanian emigrants to Palestine are allowed to take with them a total of $37,500 annually, to be covered by exports from Lithuania to Palestine.

Other Baltic Countries

Latvia.—In September 1935, the only remaining anti-Jewish paper in Latvia, Volkswaffen, which had advocated a "scientific" anti-Semitism, was prohibited by the authorities. On March 23, 1936, a Latvia-Palestine transfer agreement to facilitate transfer of funds to Palestine was concluded in Riga. According to its terms, the Anglo-Palestine Bank guaranteed to clear Latvian exports to Palestine to the value of $500,000 and Palestine exports to Latvia valued at $50,000. The agreement would help Latvian emigrants to Palestine to withdraw currency from the country, which had previously been forbidden.
Esthonia.—Jewish national cultural autonomy practically ceased to exist during 1935. The political upheavals there had put an end to every expression of independent public life, and no meetings of the Board of the Jewish community took place. Nevertheless, in June 1936, Government officials took place. Nevertheless in June 1936, Government officials and representatives of all Jewish societies and political parties participated in a celebration of the 10th anniversary of Jewish cultural autonomy in Esthonia. Speaking at Tallinn for President Paets, Colonel Alexander Jaakson, Minister of Education, paid tribute to Jewish autonomy as an equitable solution of the Jewish problem.

ROUMANIA

Events of Jewish interest, reported in the press during the twelve months under review, constitute a dreary recital of attacks upon Jews or threats to their citizenship rights. In the face of these, government officials made high-sounding declarations, but took only half-hearted action. In recognition of the menace to their status, the various organizations united, in February 1936, in joining a Central Council, under the leadership of Dr. William Filderman.

On November 2, 1935, the Ministry of the Interior issued orders authorizing stern measures against anti-Jewish agitators, forbidding the wearing of uniforms by political groups, and the displaying of badges.

In the same month, Ion Inculet, the Minister of the Interior, received a joint deputation of the Union of Roumanian Jews and the Jewish Party, whom he promised, to take every possible measure against the extremist anti-Jewish agitators. When, however, Chief Rabbi Niemirower was publicly insulted by a Cuzist deputy who prevented him from attending a banquet in honor of the new Archbishop in Czernowitz, the Government censored the Jewish newspapers which criticized the police for not protecting the Rabbi.

In the same month, a conference of followers of Dr. Cuza, anti-Jewish leader, to be held in Czernowitz, was prohibited by the Minister of the Interior after a Jewish delegation,
headed by Dr. Mayer Ebner and Ex-Deputy Fischer, protested against it. In their anger at the order, a band of Cuzists attacked and injured Jews in Czernowitz. The conference was, however, held October 20. It adopted a resolution demanding that the Jews be ousted from their economic positions, and that Jewish houses and property be confiscated.

Apparently the government fears to antagonize the anti-Jewish elements, for, in November, when the anti-Jewish press furiously attacked the action of the government in granting a permit to the ICA (Jewish Colonization Association) to establish a branch in Bessarabia, to promote Jewish agriculture in the province and provide vocational training for the impoverished Jewish residents, the government withdrew the authorization. The anti-Jewish papers had accused the Jews of wishing to buy up Roumanian soil and settle foreign Jews there. Following this victory, the anti-Jewish press began a campaign against the Jewish People's Banks, accusing them of wishing to buy up the land of Roumanian peasants.

In December 1935, a United Parliamentary Party was formed by Professor A. C. Cuza, head of the Roumanian anti-Jewish Party; Octavian Goga, leader of the National Christian Party; and former Minister Alexandru Vaida-Voyvod, founder of the "Roumanian Front." The new party, third largest in the Parliament, is not overtly anti-Jewish in its program, but the aims it announced would bring about the total elimination of Roumanian Jews from trade and politics. The by-election in Bukowina in January, which had attracted wide attention because of the brutal anti-Jewish outbreaks caused by it, resulted in the election to the Senate of Professor A. C. Cuza, who received 6,271 votes out of a total of 12,000. In December, an anti-Jewish demonstration took place in Bucharest, in connection with the elections to the Board of the Bucharest Bar Association. The outbreak was condemned in Parliament where Ion Inculet, Minister of the Interior, declared that energetic measures would be taken to prevent the repetition of similar incidents.

On January 11, 1936, Chief Rabbi Jacob Isaac Niemirower of Bucharest narrowly escaped death when five revolver
shots, fired at him while he was walking to the synagogue, passed through his clothing and inflicted a slight flesh wound on his arm. One of his assailants was arrested but several others were able to escape. A semi-official statement described the prisoner as a religious fanatic and tried to give the impression that the attempted murder was "without political character." In March, the attacker was sent to a lunatic asylum. Nicolas Titulescu, Roumanian foreign minister, addressed a message to Rabbi Niemirower, condemning the "criminal attempt" on his life, and other government officials also expressed their regret. The Jewish community demanded that the government take action to end anti-Jewish excesses. At the same time an anti-Jewish mob, near Czernowitz, stoned a synagogue and Jewish houses.

In February, democratic and progressive elements among the students of the University of Bucharest decided to create a Democratic Students' Front, with defense troops to preserve order and prevent terrorist outbreaks, such as had been frequent until then.

In the same month, the newly-formed Central Council of Jews in Roumania issued a manifesto urging Jews to rally against the danger of the introduction of a "racial" regime in Roumania. The Council also protested to Government authorities when it was learned that the five Jews, permitted to study in the Medical Faculty of Bucharest University, under the numerus valachicus, were forcibly refused entrance to the classrooms. In March, as the highest political representative organ of Roumanian Jewry, the Council appealed to the conscience of the Roumanian people to stop anti-Jewish agitation. Addressed to "Roumanian fellow-citizens," the declaration concluded: "We appeal to your conscience in these difficult times in which we are being treated with more injustice than ever before. We appeal to the sense of justice and the tradition of harmonious collaboration of all the inhabitants of the country. We appeal to your intelligence to repudiate the falsehoods spread about us and to denounce those who are attempting to sow discord among our people. Let us live in brotherly cooperation and let us work together for the common welfare of our country, so that we can serve the interests of Roumania and protect the security of her frontiers." Dr. Wilhelm
Filderman, president of the Central Council, announced that the Council's task would be to enlighten public opinion in Roumania about the growing dangers of the anti-Jewish movement, and to maintain a constant watch over the rights of the Jews in the country. He declared in a statement to the press: "Anti-Semitism in Roumania is by no means a movement of youth only, but a big political organization which aims at forming its own Cabinet and which has a budget of hundreds of million lei. We, as Jews, fulfil our duties, and we demand that our rights as citizens should be safeguarded. We live in this country and we shall remain here. Roumania is our mother country, and we demand that the Government guarantee us our rights." Several days later, in another statement, Dr. Filderman refuted the charges of Jew-baiters that Jews occupy too prominent a position in Roumanian economic life. He pointed out that Roumanian Jews are, in fact, the poorest section of the population, and declared that 65% of the Jews in Bucharest live in such misery that they cannot afford one bed per person in their homes.

In a statement to the press in March, Julius Maniu, leader of the Roumanian National Peasant Party and former Prime Minister, condemned anti-Jewish agitation in Roumania, declaring the "Roumanian people will not tolerate a serious anti-Semitic movement of a general character." In the same month, seven Jews were seriously injured in the town of Cudin, Bukovina, when a crowd of 600 Cuzists climaxed a party meeting with an attack on Jewish pedestrians, homes and synagogues. Two of the leaders were arrested.

In statements issued on May 11, by Dr. Filderman and former deputy Mischu Weissmann, grave anxiety concerning the Jewish position in Roumania was expressed. They accused the Roumanian Government of failing to carry out promises to safeguard the economic and political position of the Jews, and of tacitly condoning the anti-Jewish excesses of the extremist Right parties. "The position of the Jews in Roumania," Dr. Filderman declared, "is growing worse from day to day. All statements issued by the Government are insincere and are made for the purpose of calming public opinion until new disorders occur, when new
On April 30, the Galatz Court ordered the arrest of Corneliu Zelea Codreanu, the leader of the extreme Right Iron Guard Organization and Ion Stelescu, his lieutenant, on charges of organizing disturbances during the parliamentary elections. On May 11, however, the Court acquitted the pair. On June 21, one person was killed and two seriously wounded in anti-Jewish disorders in Bucharest; eight others required treatment. The disturbances broke out when students demonstrated against the Jews, marking trolley cars with swastikas and anti-Jewish slogans. In the same month, anti-Jewish disorders, arising partly from animosity between liberal and right-wing newspapers, spread throughout the country, resulting in injuries to a large number of Jews, including Dr. William Filderman, who was slightly hurt when Cuzist students attacked him and other Jewish lawyers at the Supreme Court Building in Bucharest. Other disorders occurred at Kishinev, Beltz, and elsewhere. As the uniformed Cuzists converged on Bucharest for a convention to be held on June 28, one Jew was gravely wounded and many were beaten. The Cuzists announced their determination to hold their convention despite a ban issued on assemblages until July 12. The Roumanian Federation of Labor issued a statement accusing the Government of inactivity and warning that unless the authorities halt the wave of terror, the Federation would be compelled to take action itself. Hopes that King Carol would influence the Government to take action disappeared when he left on a hunting trip. Meanwhile, Dr. Filderman charged that the Government was encouraging anti-Jewish actions by tolerating violation of law. The entire democratic press denounced the attack on him as "a desecration of the emblem of justice." Despite expectations, however, the threatened anti-Jewish disorders in connection with the Cuzist convention did not take place, as Jews remained in their homes and special gendarmes, brought from the provincial cities, patrolled the streets of Bucharest. The French Government registered an official protest against the use of the name of Premier Léon Blum, a Jew, in Roumanian anti-Jewish propaganda, and demanded a clarification of the Roumanian Govern-
ment's attitude toward France, in view of the continued anti-French demonstrations.

On June 30, Dr. Alexander Cuza, leader of the National Christian Party, told a rally of 40,000 peasants in northern Roumania that his party's principal aim was to solve the Jewish problem in Roumania exactly as Hitler had done it in Germany. He urged his followers to discard their European dress because it was worn by Jews, and to return to the peasant costumes of their ancestors. He attacked the Franco-Roumanian alliance, and advocated reapproachment with Germany and Italy.

In January 1936, it was reported that some 50,000 Bessarabian Jews were suffering from famine and that whole communities had been reduced to starvation. The Jewish sufferers were in a worse position than the non-Jewish villagers who had managed to keep some reserves from previous years, whereas the Jews had been ruined by a combination of the general depression and the anti-Jewish boycott. Jew-baiters were inciting the peasants against the Jews, attempting to make them believe that the Jews were responsible for their sufferings. As a result, the Jews of Bessarabia were living in a state of unmitigated terror. A special fund for these victims was set up in London by the Executive Committee of the Federation of Jewish Relief Organizations.

In March, the Ministry of Education cancelled the subsidy for Jewish religious institutions, which had amounted to 6,000,000 lei in 1935. The subsidies for other sects were continued without any reduction; in some cases they were increased. The Central Council of Jews of Roumania submitted a memorandum to King Carol protesting against this action. Later in the month, the Government announced that 2,000,000 lei would be allotted for Jewish religious education.

In April, the Congress of the Union of Secondary School Teachers of Roumania, held at Jassy, voted in favor of maintaining amicable relations between Roumanian and minority teachers and of adopting an educational policy of friendliness and understanding with the minorities, especially the Jews.

In July, 1935, Chief Rabbi Senator Dr. Niemirower
opened a new wing of the Bucharest great Synagogue, endowed by Micu S. Zentler, the Jewish philanthropist, housing the Jewish public library, Jewish museum and historic archives of Roumanian Jewry.

**Other Balkan Countries**

*Bulgaria.*—In July 1935, the government promulgated a new law regulating the administration of religious communities, which recognized only religious minorities. The Jewish Community, which had previously been considered a national-cultural group, was now considered exclusively religious in character, with a purely religious representation. The Jewish school system was removed from its jurisdiction, and the state secured the right of intervention in Jewish communal affairs, including control of the budget. The Jews took steps to register opposition to the new law. At about the same time, the Minister of the Interior, General Athanasoff, decided to permit the Rodna Saschtita (Home Guard) and National Legion, anti-Jewish groups which had formerly been outlawed, to resume their activities. Other political organizations continued under the ban. The General later clarified the ruling, declaring that the groups were permitted "to continue their activities only as national and educational bodies," and were forbidden "to preach intolerance against the religious and national minorities." Meanwhile, General Sokoinoff, the leader of the Rodna Saschtita, denied that his organization was anti-Jewish, insisting that it was only fighting Jewish as well as Christian speculators. In August, a delegation representing the Jewish Consistory, called on Andreja Toscheff, the Prime Minister, to appeal for retention of the status quo of the Jewish Communities. The Prime Minister said that, in principle, he agreed with the delegation's views and would take the matter under advisement. Concerning the anti-Jewish groups, he promised that they would not be permitted to carry on Jew-baiting tactics.

On August 25, 1935, the Government decided to enter into a transfer agreement with Palestine, according to which Jewish emigrants from Bulgaria are able to take capital out of the country in the form of Bulgarian goods.
Greece.—In July 1935, the growing movement for a Greek Monarchy was welcomed in Jewish circles, which feared continued anti-Jewish agitation under the Republic. During the campaign preceding the plebiscite on the proposed restoration, leaders of the Venizelist Republican Party attempted to revive anti-Jewish sentiment in Greece. The proclamation of a monarchist regime in Greece, in October, did not affect the Jewish situation there. General Kondylis, the new Premier, was known to have expressed himself as a friend of the Jews. King George II of Greece cabled to Chief Rabbi Sevy Koretz of Salonica a message of appreciation for the greetings and expressions of loyalty sent him in London on behalf of the Greek-Jewish population. In December, upon his arrival in Athens, the King received a deputation of Jews from Salonica, whom he assured of his fullest sympathy.

In January, former Premier Panayoti Tsaldaris warned Greek Jews against setting up a separate Jewish electoral list in the approaching elections. He declared that such a list "sets them apart in political life, robs them of their rights, and creates a 'political Ghetto'." No such separate Jewish electoral list was put up, although eleven Jews were among the candidates on various tickets running for Parliament in Salonica, and one was elected.

In December 1935, the Jewish Community of Salonica was greatly shocked to learn that the Ministry for Public Works had ratified the decision of the Salonica Municipality to convert the Jewish cemetery in the center of the city into a university sports ground. A delegation protested to the Governor of Macedonia. On April 1, 1936, Governor Rall of Salonica suspended the decree prohibiting the teaching of Hebrew, and promised to repeal it. The Greek Minister of Education, who received the former Jewish Senator Sciaky at his home to discuss the threat to Hebrew teaching, promised to reach a settlement of this question.

On June 20, 1936, the Parliamentary Commission for Constitutional Reform unanimously decided to include in the new Greek Constitution a clause prohibiting conversion of persons under 21 years of age. The clause provides also that persons over that age must present written permission
from their religious authorities before conversion to another faith is allowed, enabling such authorities to make a final effort to prevent apostasy. The step was widely hailed in Jewish communities throughout Greece, which had been alarmed by numerous conversions to Christianity of Jewish boys and girls.

There were but few and mild anti-Jewish manifestations during the period under review. In July 1935, Nea Alithuci, organ of the Venizelist faction in Salonica, which had previously been friendly to the Jews, published several bitterly anti-Jewish editorials. In September, local Jewish communities lodged a protest with the Greek authorities against a violently anti-Jewish speech by Commander Telemahos Papadopoulos who declared that the Jews wanted to destroy Christianity. The Commander's speech was disowned by the authorities. General A. Papagos, Commander-in-Chief of the military forces in Macedonia and Thrace, instituted an inquiry, as a result of which, Papadopoulos was relieved of his post. In October, the appointment of Peppo Mallah, the Jewish Deputy, as one of the two Greek representatives to the Parliamentary Economic Conference at London, provoked futile criticism in the anti-Jewish press. In November, a new law was promulgated by the Government, prohibiting "incitement of citizens, directly or indirectly, to mutual contempt and hate, to dissension and to exaltation of religious and political passions in every respect." Within a month, however, this was replaced by another statute, declaring the defamation of any community, in the press, to be criminal offense.

In March, the Executive of the Central Federation of Jewish Small Traders of Salonica issued an official denial that the Greek Government was pursuing a policy of "economic anti-Semitism." The statement declared that "the new taxes imposed by the Municipalities and by the Government have no anti-Jewish character, as they apply to Jewish and non-Jewish traders alike."

On October 21, 1935, the Rector of Salonica University issued, through the Chief Rabbi, an invitation to Jewish students to attend the University. The Rector declared: "The number of Jewish students in our University is very
limited and does not correspond either with the Jewish population of the country or with the number of Jewish students in every other university in Greece. We are interested in changing this state of affairs and we are prepared to facilitate the entry of Jewish students to the University.”

Yugoslavia.—In December 1935, the police closed down the Swabian-German Cultural Society in Velika Kikinda, which was one of the most important centers of Nazi propaganda. Revelations that this society had been in close touch with the German Propaganda Ministry and had taken an oath not to have any social relations with Yugoslavs, Magyars and Jews, had caused a wave of indignation throughout the country.

In April 1936, the sixth Congress of the Union of Jewish Communities, held in Belgrade, adopted a resolution demanding that the authorities fully respect equality of Jewish rights, declaring that the latest anti-Jewish attacks in the press had provoked consternation among Yugoslav Jews, and charging that the attacks and the rising tide of anti-Jewish propaganda were inspired from Nazi sources. Later in the same month, Dr. Vlatko Macek, Croatian leader, voiced opposition to attempts to introduce anti-Semitism into the Croatian National movement. Calling attention to anti-Jewish leaflets distributed in the name of the Croatian Peasant Party, he declared that the Party did not judge people by religion or descent, but by humaneness and honor.

Soviet Russia

Press reports of Jewish interest which came from Russia during the period under review, were mainly concerned with the efforts of the Soviet government to settle Jews in the Biro-Bidjan region in the Far Eastern territory. The few remaining items dealt with the punishment of persons convicted of Jew-baiting, and with the rather quiescent attitude toward Jewish religious observance, on the part of the Jewish Communist press.
Biro-Bidjan.—In July 1935, the government decided to allot 60,000,000 roubles ($30,000,000) for the industrial development of the Jewish Autonomous Region of Biro-Bidjan during the ensuing six months. A report stated that 2,529 persons arrived in Biro-Bidjan during the first half of 1935, and that the number of schools had increased from 89 to 107. In the same month, the chairman of the State Planning Committee for Biro-Bidjan announced that the number of Jewish settlers in 1935 would be reduced from 12,000 to 6,500. The Moscow Yiddish daily, Stern, published a severe criticism of the settlement work, declaring that many more colonists should have been settled in the region.

In September, the Commissariat of Agriculture decided to put 150,000 hectares of fallow land under cultivation in Biro-Bidjan and to settle some 200,000 people on it within a few years. It was also proposed to transform the region into the largest center for light industries in the Far East.

In January 1936, speaking at a meeting of the Central Executive Committee of the U. S. S. R., S. Dimantstein, president of Ozet, the Society for the Settlement of Jews in the Soviet Union, declared that many Jews had been settled in Jewish agricultural regions: Kalinindorf, Stalindorf, the New Zlatapol Region in the Ukraine, and the Freidorf and Larindorf Regions in the Crimea, and that plans had been made for the settlement of 10,000 new Jewish settlers in Biro-Bidjan during 1936.

In March, the Central Statistical Department in State Planning of the Soviet Union presented a budget estimate for Biro-Bidjan to the Central Government, calling for an appropriation of 51,636,000 roubles in 1936, an increase of 241% over the budget of 1935. This sum was to be spent on agriculture, industries, new buildings, education and health work.

In April, sharp criticism of the methods employed in selecting immigrants for Biro-Bidjan was voiced by the Biro-Bidjan representative of the Comzet, who declared that many families had been sent to the region although the trades in which they were proficient were unnecessary there. He pointed out that people who were totally unfit
for hard work had been sent as "unskilled laborers." In the same month, the Plenary Committee of the Executive of the Jewish Autonomous Region, was informed at its meeting that there were 9,000 illiterates in the region, and that steps were being taken to eliminate this illiteracy immediately. On April 27, at a conference in Minsk, the secretary of Ozet declared that it was not intended that Biro-Bidjan become a second Palestine. He pointed out that the territory's functions were not to save the Jewish masses in foreign countries, but only to recruit Jewish workers in certain occupations which at the present time are not sufficiently represented in Biro-Bidjan.

In May, Sergej Chutzkayev, president of the Comzet, announced that a total of 6,000 Jewish settlers would be selected to leave the Ukraine for Biro-Bidjan during 1936. These new settlers, he declared, would be composed chiefly of tailors for the new clothing factory, lumbermen, members of collective farms, railwaymen and builders. In the same month, in connection with the celebration of the second anniversary of the proclamation of Biro-Bidjan as a Jewish Autonomous Region, the Moscow Emes, Yiddish Communist daily, reported that a plan was being worked out to settle 100,000 Jews in Biro-Bidjan within two years. It was also announced that a metallurgical institute with 152 students had been opened in Biro-Bidjan. In the same month, the Soviet Peoples Commissariat officially confirmed plans for Biro-Bidjan involving a total expenditure, in 1936, of 76,036,000 roubles for capital investments, long term credits and migration activities.

In June, the Comzet reported that less than one-third of the 10,000 quota for immigration into Biro-Bidjan had been filled, with only 2,913 settlers arriving in the autonomous region.

Jew-Baiting.—In September, the Kharkov Court ruled that anti-Semitism is a penal offense in Soviet Russia, and imposed a two year sentence upon a local landlady who had made insulting anti-Jewish remarks to a tenant. In February, the Soviet Court in Novozybkov, in the Ukraine, sentenced three members of the local artisans' group to imprisonment
for anti-Jewish activities. Two of them were accused of having driven a Jewish member of the group, named Kabalkin, to suicide by their anti-Jewish attacks.

In May, a great impression was created throughout Russia by an official visit by a group of Jewish collective farmers from the Zlatopol Jewish Region to the collective farms of the Don Cossacks in the village of Zimlianskaya, in the Black Sea region. The Cossacks, who had been the spearhead of Jew-baiting under the Czars, greeted the Jewish delegation with great cordiality, and elected one of the Jews an Honorary Cossack.

Religious Observance.—For the first time in many years, the Jewish Communist press refrained from an anti-religious campaign prior to the Passover holidays. Baking of matzoth was unrestricted.

GERMANY

The events of Jewish interest in Germany constitute a chronicle of persecution, whose darkness is unrelieved by a single ray of hope. With characteristic German thoroughness, the Nazis proceeded, during the period being reviewed, upon the path of self-degrading oppression of the Jews upon which they entered with the rise of their leader to supreme rulership.

The past year, however, has the distinction of witnessing the enactment of the so-called Nuremberg laws, which turn the hands of the clock of civilization back at least a century. But the pages of the recorded history contain no precedent for the purposeful and ruthless campaign of a state to render an entire section of its population contemptible in the eyes of the rest of its own population and, at the same time, by a world-wide propaganda, despicable in the eyes of the peoples of all other lands.

Anti-Jewish Excesses.—Almost at the beginning of the period, incidents of physical maltreatment of Jews were reported. Despite the efforts of conservative elements in the Nazi Cabinet to check the mounting tide of Jew-baiting out of fear of the effects of such publicity on the international
negotiations in which Germany was engaged, the local leaders of the Nazi party continued their anti-Jewish agitation. In many instances acts of hooliganism were officially sanctioned, and in some cases the Ministry of the Interior even rebuked Nazis for relenting somewhat in their hatred of Jews. On July 4, 1935, Mayor Graebner von Schellert, of Neustadt, was dismissed from his post for this reason. Farmers in Thuringia had to be threatened with ostracism from the society of "true Aryans" if they continued to trade with Jews.

In the middle of July, anti-Jewish outrages as vicious as any that had yet occurred in Nazi Germany took place in Berlin. The rioting began after the Voelkischer Beobachter reported that Jews had booed a Swedish anti-Jewish film in a theatre in the Kurfuerstendamm. Jews in the cafes and terraces were seized by an angry mob, and were beaten. While the police stood by, rowdies attacked all Jewish-appearing passersby. Foreign correspondents asserted that the riots were well-organized and were led by uniformed Storm Troopers. Fears aroused by the outbreak were heightened when it was announced that Count Wolf von Helldorf, Nazi Storm Troop leader for Berlin, had been appointed Chief of Police. The Count had won notoriety as the instigator of the anti-Jewish excesses in Berlin on Rosh Hashanah in 1931. On July 22, the Juedische Rundschau, official organ of the German Zionist Federation, was suspended for three months for reporting the excesses. Meanwhile anti-Jewish disturbances continued in Berlin and spread throughout Germany. On July 27, Count Helldorf issued an order forbidding individual anti-Jewish action, and stating that the State and Party would conduct the fight against the Jews in a different way.

The actual rioting gradually came to a stop toward the end of July, but the Nazi Government continued its systematic anti-Jewish policy. On July 31, the Berlin City Council announced that no more Jews would be permitted to come into Berlin from the provinces. German health resorts everywhere refused admission to Jews. On August 4, a new period of tension began after inflammatory anti-Jewish speeches by Dr. Goebbels, Dr. Frick and Dr. Rust at a celebration in Essen. Uniformed Storm Troopers again
demonstrated in the Kurfuerstendamm, shouting anti-Jewish slogans. The *Voelkischer Beobachter* interpreted Dr. Goebbels' speech as the proclamation of a more vigorous warfare against Jews and Catholics. On August 6, mass arrests of Jews, accompanied by terror, suicides and the closing down of Jewish enterprises, took place throughout Germany. In Mecklenburg, Breslau and elsewhere, Storm Troopers swooped down on Jewish families, stoning houses and even attacking homes for children and the aged. In Parchim, Mecklenburg, the entire Jewish population of 34 was suddenly arrested. On August 9, the entire Jewish population of Riedersdorf near Berlin was ordered to leave town, after a raid by Storm Troopers. Similar tactics were followed in other German cities. The intensified campaign was accompanied by a movement, started in the provinces, to refuse to sell food to Jews. Count Helldorf, Berlin Police President, conferred with Nazi officials on the best means to prevent the further influx of Jews and to introduce food restrictions for Jews in Berlin.

In September, the Kosener Students' Corporation defied the Hitler regime by announcing that it would not adhere to the Aryan principle and would not expel its Jewish members. As a result, Storm Troop headquarters issued an order forbidding Storm Troopers to be members of the Corporation which was one of the oldest and best-known student bodies in Germany and had many Nazi officials among its members. Shortly afterward the Organization was dissolved by the authorities.

On October 1, the Ministry of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda ordered the German press to describe Nazism as anti-Jewish rather than anti-Semitic. The order declared: "We have nothing against the Arabs and other Semitic peoples, not even against the Jews in Palestine. But we are opposed to the international Jewish influence in Germany and we do wish to restrict the part played by the Jews as guests in our country."

In the same month, the Reich Institute for History of New Germany announced that "scientific anti-Semitism" would be made a compulsory subject in all German schools. The Institute announced that it would "bring scientific
clarity to bear on the racial basis of the solution of such a tremendous problem as the Jewish question."

In October, Dr. Otto Hirsch, president of the Executive of the Reichsvertretung der Juden in Deutschland, and Chief Rabbi Baeck, president of the Reichsvertretung, were arrested by the Gestapo. Rabbi Baeck, who was released after twenty-four hours, was arrested for issuing a Yom Kippur message to German Jewry which, although of a purely religious nature, contained passages referring to the Nazi oppression of the Jews. The secret political police prohibited the reading of the message. Dr. Hirsch was released a week after his arrest. No charges had been preferred against him at any time, but it was intimated that his arrest had been an attempt on the part of Nazi authorities to force the Reichsvertretung to declare its complete satisfaction with the Nuremberg decrees.

On October 9, the Nazis also arrested Fraulein Edith Taglicht, daughter of Rabbi Israel Taglicht of Vienna, who had been visiting Berlin. She was accused of having written an anti-Nazi article, but this accusation was denied when it was pointed out that she had never been interested in political matters. She was released March 19, 1936. On December 13th, the political police arrested Dr. Ignatz Maibaum, rabbi of Frankfort-on-the-Oder, after he had addressed a Jewish gathering; he was held until January 21, 1936.

In December, the highest bail ever demanded in Germany was supplied by the Jewish banker, Sigmund Wasserman, for his release from prison, where he had been held a week on charges of alleged currency law violations; bail was set at 1,200,000 marks.

On December 20th, the Gestapo held Rabbi Emil Cohn, eminent German Jewish writer and scholar. He was accused of ridiculing the provisions of the Nuremberg laws prohibiting the employment of German servant girls in Jewish homes. On January 8th, Rabbi Cohn was released from prison, pending trial.

Segregation of Jewish School Children.—The long-expected definition of the legal status of the Jews, at the 7th Congress of the National Socialist Party at Nuremberg in September.
was preceded by a decree issued by Dr. Bernhard Rust, Minister of Education, which foreshadowed the return of ghetto conditions in Germany. Dr. Rust ordered compulsory segregation of all non-Aryan pupils in special public elementary schools, beginning in 1936. All Jewish children as well as children of non-Jews of Jewish descent were included in the decree. The text of the decree read in part: "The establishment of a National Socialist School community, based on the foundation of the educational ideas derived from the conception of German nationhood, is only possible if a clear cut division in accordance with the racial possible if a clearcut division in accordance with the racial origin of the children is brought about. I, therefore, intend to carry out this complete division in accordance with the racial origin of the children for all pupils in all types of schools in Germany. The so-called 'quarter-Jews,' whose one grandparent only is a Jew, I do not intend to include in the separate schools. A separate Jewish elementary school is to be established wherever a sufficient number of Jewish children are to be found in one community or within the area of one educational district (urban or rural). It will be necessary, in this case, to put children of different school ages in one class-room, because, for the establishment of these separate Jewish schools, 20 school children are to be considered as a sufficient number."

The Reischsvertretung der Juden in Deutschland, the all-German Jewish representative body, immediately began negotiations with the Minister of Education with regard to the law for the segregation of Jewish children. The organization demanded that the separate Jewish schools be maintained by the Government on the basis of national minority rights. The Judenstaat Zionisten, Revisionist group led by Dr. Georg Kareski, and the Juedisches Volksbund, Berlin Zionists led by Dr. Alfred Klee, repudiated the negotiations. The Volksbund demanded that the Government assist Jewish emigration, that it assist the development of Jewish cultural autonomy in Germany, that it support Jewish social and religious institutions, and that it subsidize the Jewish school system.

The practical effect of the decree was to force the Jewish community to hasten the creation of facilities for the educa-
tion of Jewish children under its own auspices and at its own cost. Great difficulties were experienced in this process. By the middle of April 1935, it had been found possible to arrange for school facilities for only 20,000 of the 44,000 Jewish children of elementary school age. Difficulties were encountered in obtaining buildings suitable for conversion into schools, and in training the teachers necessary for a Jewish school system. The requirement of a minimum of 20 children to open a new school rendered it difficult to provide for Jewish children in towns where the Jewish population was small. In recognition of these difficulties, the authorities agreed to a program of gradual elimination of Jewish pupils, as rapidly as Jewish schools could be established.

Nuremberg Laws.—The so-called Nuremberg Laws were promulgated on September 15, at a special session of the Reichstag in Nuremberg during the seventh annual Nazi Party Congress. Under these laws the Jews of Germany are deprived of citizenship and of political rights, forbidden to display the German flag or to employ women of “German or racially related blood” under forty-five, as servants in their households, or to marry persons of “German or racially related blood;” while extra-marital sexual intercourse between Jews and such persons was declared a crime.

The laws went into effect immediately, with the exception of the servant law, which went into effect January 15, 1936. Severe punishment, ranging from one year’s imprisonment upwards, was provided for violators. Marriages prohibited under the law, which are performed abroad, were declared invalid. In introducing these measures, Reichsminister Hermann Goering emphasized that they were “basic and fundamental.” He extolled racial purity, declaring: “It was God who created racial differences. We can reach internal freedom only by purity of race. Our women and girls must be protected by law from the Jewish race.”

The new legislation was presented to the Reichstag after Hitler had delivered a bitter attack on “insolent Jewish provocations” and a warning that worse would befall the Jews if their opposition to the Hitler regime continued. Characteristically attacking the supposed link between
Jews and Marxists, he made it clear that those hoping for moderation in his anti-Jewish policy would be disappointed.

On September 20, an official interpretation of the Nuremberg laws was issued by the Nazi Party. "The Jew in Germany," the declaration pointed out, "is merely a guest like any other non-Jewish alien. He is, however, a guest in a special sense, because he has no territory of his own. He is, thus, numerically a member of a minority, but not a minority in the national sense of the word, because while other national minorities enjoy equal rights, Jews are excluded from the enjoyment of such rights and are subject, at the same time, to the laws regulating the status of aliens."

Following the Nuremberg decrees, the Reichsvertretung der Juden formulated a program for German Jews in an attempt to create the "tolerable" relations between Germans and Jews to which Hitler had referred. The demands were (1) that the defamation of Jews be stopped, (2) that the boycott of Jewish enterprises be discontinued, (3) that the Government recognize the autonomy of Jewish cultural and religious rights within Germany, (4) that the Reichsvertretung be recognized by the Government as a Jewish autonomous organ. In turn, the organization took upon itself the obligation (1) to supervise education of Jewish youth with a view to eventual emigration to Palestine, (2) to plan and organize such emigration, (3) to maintain and support Jewish social and religious institutions, (4) to render assistance to needy Jews. The program was supported by Herr Heinrich Stahl, president of the Berlin Jewish community, but the Zionist Federation of Germany demanded "an equal share in the leadership of the Jewish people in Germany, which alone will make it possible for the constructive work contained in the program of the Reichsvertretung to be carried out satisfactorily." In March, the Reichsvertretung and the Union of Independent Orthodox Jews in Germany reached an agreement whereunder the Reichsvertretung would act on behalf of the Union in all official business, while the Union retained its independence of action in religious and cultural affairs.

The new law against intermarriage precipitated a series of arrests of Jews married to "Aryans." Stiff sentences
were given defendants accused of "Rassenschande" (race defilement), and many cases were reported of Jews receiving long terms of imprisonment for kissing "Aryan" girls, even though the girls themselves consented. In March, however, the German Federal Court ruled that marriages between Jews and non-Jews contracted before the promulgation of the Nuremberg laws were still valid.

The passage of the Nuremberg Laws resulted in the cancellation of all exemptions from the "Aryan paragraph" in previous laws, which had applied to Jews who were front-fighters in the World War or were the children of front-fighters who had been killed in the War. As a result Jews who, under these exemptions, had remained in public office, were automatically dropped. In March, Deutsche Justiz, official organ of the Ministry of Justice, announced that 763 Jewish notaries, who had not been barred under the "Aryan paragraph," had lost their posts as a result of the Nuremberg laws. On October 22, Professor Issai Schur, the last Jewish professor holding an appointment at a German university, resigned from the faculty of the University of Berlin. It was reported that the "purging" of the German school system of Jewish professors and their assistants had resulted in an actual shortage of teachers at German universities and colleges.

On November 15, decrees giving detailed regulations for the execution of the Nuremberg laws were published. Further details of the Reich Citizenship Law, were announced on December 3, by State Secretary Otto Stuckardt. Jews were no longer to be considered citizens of Germany, and were forbidden to hold such public offices as judge, notary, public auctioneer or juror; the practice of medicine and that of law were not placed in the category of public office. In the meantime, however, the Labor Court at Magdeburg had ruled on July 5, 1935, that permission for Jewish lawyers to defend Jewish clients had been a temporary expedient and was not to be continued. And, in September, the Nazi Party Legal Department had forbidden Nazi lawyers from representing Jewish clients against Germans, explaining that "it is not honorable to defend those who have brought misfortune to the German people." This action was sup-
ported by the German Federal Chamber of Jurists, which issued a similar order.

In December, it was reported that the executory decrees for the Nuremberg laws, concerning maids in Jewish households had worked such great hardship on some 50,000 "Aryan" servant girls, that many of them had appealed to the authorities for permission to retain their positions, and the law was modified to allow them to remain in Jewish households where there were no males over sixteen years of age. Most of the girls were forced to join the unemployed, and several special Labor Camps were created for those in dire need. On December 31, the Government issued a supplementary order prohibiting "Aryan" girls from working as typists or secretaries for Jewish employers.

Other Anti-Jewish Edicts.—In December, the Government prohibited the importation of kosher meat by German Jews from neighboring countries. Since the slaughtering of animals in accordance with Jewish religious practice had long been prohibited by the Nazis, Orthodox Jews found themselves forced to go on a meatless diet.

On December 13, the German Cabinet adopted a new series of anti-Jewish laws introducing further restrictions for Jews in medical, legal and other professions. Jewish lawyers were forbidden to act in any professional capacity. No Jews may be graduated as doctors from German universities.

On December 26, the Ministry of the Interior issued an administrative order to the police authorities, not to renew the permits of the 30,000 Jewish commercial travellers in the Reich, on the ground that "Jews are no longer politically reliable."

On January 21, 1936, an order eliminating Jewish accountants from German business life was issued by the Ministry of Finance. About 500 licensed Jewish accountants lost their positions on the ground that only "reliable elements" of the population may act as comptrollers in matters concerning taxes. In February, the Nuremberg laws were extended, by interpretation, to forbid German physicians from consulting, and German lawyers from sharing offices with, their Jewish colleagues.
On February 14, a judgment of the Higher Labor Court in Berlin extended the Nuremberg laws to the field of private enterprises. In ruling that the fact that an employee was a Jew was sufficient cause for his dismissal from an "Aryan" firm, the Court declared that the "Nuremberg law which prohibits 'Aryan' girls from serving in Jewish homes, as well as the recent order prohibiting 'Aryan' lawyers from sharing offices with Jewish lawyers, definitely show that the political developments tend to prevent Jews and non-Jews from working together even in commercial enterprises." The ruling was expected to lead to the dismissal of Jewish employees in private enterprises regardless of their length of employment or their competence, and without exception being made for wounded war veterans.

On March 29, a Government order revealed that although Jews are not admitted into the German Army in time of peace, they would be drafted in time of war. They were classified under existing military regulations as belonging to "Military Reserve Unit No. 2." Two days later, the Government issued an order prohibiting Jews of military age from emigrating without obtaining special emigration permits from both the military and the civil authorities. At the same time, permission was given Jewish World War veterans to leave the country, after the Jewish War Veterans' Association had notified the Government that the Jewish Ex-servicemen's League of England had offered to aid German Jewish veterans in leaving the Reich.

On March 31, new anti-Jewish measures were announced, prohibiting Jews from leasing drug stores, ousting Jewish pharmacists from the druggists' associations and providing that when a Jewish druggist with a permanent license dies, his widow must lease his license to an "Aryan."

On April 8, an order issued by the Ministry of the Interior provided that the results of the Reichstag elections be used as a racial census to establish the racial purity of German citizens in the future. Thus, all Germans unable to prove that they voted on March 29, 1936, were to be considered Jews. This simplified the complicated Nazi machinery for investigating racial descent, and rendered family records dating back to 1800 unnecessary.
Economic Persecution.—Spurred on by the Nuremberg Laws, the campaign to deprive Jews of food spread from the provincial cities to Berlin itself during the month of September. Jewish grocery stores met with refusals by the wholesale dealers and cooperative organizations when they attempted to replenish their stock of foodstuffs such as butter and eggs, of which there was an acute shortage. It was established that such a starvation campaign was being carried on in more than 70 German cities and towns. In some places hotels and barber shops refused to give Jews any service whatever. In many cities the Mayors ordered the names of “Aryans” dealing with Jews to be struck off the public relief rolls, and forbade Jews to buy real estate or sell food from carts. In September, the gas and electric association of the city of Mayence cut off service to all Jewish homes and shops “in accordance with the spirit of the Reichstag citizenship law.” This action was imitated by many other German cities.

In the same month, drafts of a new law, prohibiting Jews from acquiring real estate and regulating the status of Jewish landlords, were completed by the Association of National Socialist Jurists together with the Legal Department of the Nazi Party. On October 2, the National Socialist economic organ, Wirtschaftsdienst, issued an order to the effect that “Aryan” firms may accept credit from Jewish banks, but that German banks must refuse credit to Jews.

In October, the mayors of many cities announced that “Aryans” maintaining commercial or social relations with Jews would be deprived of their “municipal citizenship rights.” In the same month, Dr. Wilhelm Frick, Minister of the Interior, announced that the Government was planning economic measures against the Jews. Many Jewish firms immediately began negotiations for selling out their interests to “Aryans,” before the new laws could be put into force, in order to prevent further drastic depreciation of their holdings.

In October, also, agents of the Gestapo (Geheime Staatspolizei) began a house to house canvass in the course of which they demanded accounts from individual Jews of money received by them for the transfer of their properties and businesses to “Aryans.” These “sudden visits” of the
secret police agents were part of a new Nazi policy to force Jews to sell their businesses and property to “Aryans” and to compel them to keep the proceeds within Germany. The rapid liquidation of Jewish property in Germany assumed such large proportions that it began to affect the Berlin Stock Exchange. Not only were the Jews forced to dispose of their real estate, but also of securities they had held for many years. This sudden flood of sales caused a marked decline in the values of many industrial stocks. This new development caused increasing concern in German business circles, and foreign diplomats in Berlin were reported as expressing the opinion that the anti-Jewish economic policy in Germany was not one of liquidation of the Jews, but rather of liquidation of Jewish property. In several cases, Jews who refused to sell out to “Aryans” were arrested several times until they were forced to agree to the sale of their property. German shares in almost every branch of industry dropped markedly on the Berlin Stock Exchange in November, as a result of the flood of shares offered by Jews seeking to realize on their investments before the promulgation of decrees for the execution of the Nuremberg laws, which they feared would mean the practical confiscation of their capital. The situation became so grave that the Executive Board of the Berlin Stock Exchange was forced, on November 13, to appeal to members not to encourage further sales of stocks.

In the same month, the drive against Jewish bakeries, grocery stores and butcher shops, based on alleged non-compliance with the sanitary regulations, resulted in numerous arrests throughout the country and the closing of many Jewish enterprises. On November 21, Jewish “sworn brokers” were forbidden to retain their seats and membership in the Berlin Stock Exchange. About 80 Jews were expelled from the Bourses throughout the country. Dr. Friedrich Sahm, chief burgomaster of Berlin, was removed from office because he and his wife had patronized Jewish stores.

In December, the police were officially informed that they were at liberty to arrest, without warrant, any Jews and “Aryan” women seen together, and also “Aryans” selling real estate to Jews. Every policeman was permitted
to act according to his own discretion, “in the spirit of the Nazi will.”

Attempts made by Minister of Economics Hjalmar Schacht to mitigate the anti-Jewish campaign in the Reich were unsuccessful. On January 31, 1936, Julius Streicher gave members of the Nazi Party in Franconia instructions to ignore Dr. Schacht's orders not to molest Jews in commerce. The process of forcing Jews to sell their enterprises to “Aryans” continued unabated, and almost every day the press reported the transfer of large firms from Jewish to non-Jewish hands.

In February, Der Stuermer reported that Jewish passengers on German liners are kept under close surveillance and their mail traced thoroughly. On February 16, it was announced that the N. S. Hago (National Socialist Trading and Industrial Organization), which had been very active in conducting the anti-Jewish boycott in the early days of the Hitler regime, was to be revived. The silent economic drive against the Jews seemed, in fact, to take on new life during February. This was influenced in large part by the Gustloff assassination in Switzerland and also by the fact that the winter Olympic Games, which opened in Garmisch-Partenkirchen on February 6, ended on February 16, and there was no longer so much need to impress foreign visitors with the alleged falsity of Jew-baiting reports in the foreign press. The Labor Front ordered its members to stop all dealings with Jewish enterprises, making the boycott against Jews inclusive of all Germans. On March 25, German writers who had voluntarily exiled themselves, were deprived of their nationality and their property confiscated.

On the eve of the Reichstag elections of March 29, Der Stuermer displays in Germany, which had been erected two years previously, carrying anti-Jewish propaganda into every corner of the country, were suddenly removed and replaced by large sign-boards inscribed: “Our Desire is Peace.” At the time of the Winter Olympic Games, Hitler had rejected the proposal that these displays be removed. While there was little anti-Jewish propaganda during the election campaign, many posters accusing Jews of preventing Germany from making peace with the world were displayed. The German Jews were, under the Nuremberg
laws, forbidden to vote in the elections. The press campaign against the Jews was renewed shortly after the elections ended, and Nazi organs once more carried on their daily attacks.

In April, Jewish owners of large stores, whose business had already been crippled by the anti-Jewish boycott, were notified by local Nazi authorities that they could not liquidate their enterprises, since such action would adversely affect "Aryan" employees and increase unemployment. An indication of the serious position in which Jewish businessmen found themselves was contained in an official report showing that, during the month of March 1936, an average of 170 Jews, most of them merchants, daily applied to Jewish emigration societies for advice. At the same time, the Reichs Union of German Trade Associations issued an order instructing members not to sever commercial relations with Jews and not to expel them from the organization, declaring that such action would "adversely affect German economic interest, and is against the wishes of the Reich Government." And yet, a few days later, officers and privates of the Reichswehr were instructed not to patronize Jewish enterprises, and the celebration of Adolf Hitler's forty-seventh birthday, on April 20, was accompanied by the renewal of the anti-Jewish boycott campaign under a nation-wide slogan: "German money for the German trader." This campaign was now directed specifically against Jewish retailers in all branches of commerce. The provincial press called on Germans "to prevent the further activities of profit-making Jews," and to remember that the aim of the Nazi Party is to eliminate Jews entirely from Germany's commercial life.

As a result of continued pressure on Jewish businessmen in the provinces, aimed at forcing them to turn their concerns over to "Aryans," the Berlin Central Bureau for Jewish Economic Relief was compelled, in April, to organize a bureau of economic advisers to cover the country, assisting Jews forced to sell their holdings against their will. The two agencies chiefly responsible for the drive to force Jews out of commerce have been the German Labor Front and the Reichsnaehrstand, the Government department regulating food distribution. These two organizations, together with
Nazi district leaders, acted in complete disregard of the fact that neither the "Aryan paragraph" nor the Nuremberg anti-Jewish laws had yet been extended to apply to Jews in commerce. The new bureau took upon itself the difficult duty of sending representatives to challenge illegal actions of provincial Nazi leaders against business enterprises of Jews.

*The Olympic Games.*—Despite official promises that there would be no discrimination against German Jewish athletes eligible for the Olympic Games in 1936, a series of actions succeeded in squeezing out many Jewish athletes. On July 27, 1935, a large Jewish sports club in Berlin was closed down by the authorities, and Jewish athletes were barred from training elsewhere. On August 5, Greta Bergmann, high-jump champion, was barred from taking part in the try-outs for the 1936 Olympiade.

Reports from America and elsewhere that demands would be made for the shifting of the Games from Berlin created perturbation in official Nazi circles. On August 11, a Government statement was given out, insisting that the pledge against Jewish discrimination would be kept. On September 30, in order to allay foreign public opinion, Hans von Tschammer und Osten, the Reichs Commissar for Sports, announced that he had invited Helene Mayer and Greta Bergmann, Jewesses, to represent Germany in the Olympics.

On the other hand an official order, issued October 4, forbade participants in the approaching Olympics, as well as foreign guests, from lodging in the houses of Jews. Prospective hostesses were required to attend courses of instruction on methods of carrying on Nazi propaganda among their guests.

In October, reports began to appear in the European press to the effect that a Jewish youth named Edmund Baumgartner, who had attended a football game in spite of the prohibition of Jews, had been set upon and killed. According to some reports the scene of the alleged outrage had been Ratibor in Upper Silesia; other reports placed it at Breslau. The Nazi News Service issued a strong denial of the story. Investigators expressed the opinion that the
report had been invented by the Nazi Propaganda Department, so that if it were used in connection with foreign agitation against the Berlin Olympics, it would be truthfully refuted and cited as an instance of the spreading of foreign "atrocity" propaganda.

The Winter Olympics opened at Garmisch-Partenkirchen on February 16. It was revealed that Rudi Ball, German Jewish hockey star, would play on the German team, but the press reported that he was participating against his will.

The anti-Jewish campaign abated during the Winter Olympics, because the Nazi regime desired to create a favorable impression upon the thousands of foreign visitors. Even the assassination of Dr. Wilhelm Gustloff in Switzerland by a Jew was not exploited, in the interests of the Games' success. On February 6, secret instructions were issued to the entire German press not to print any reports concerning anti-Jewish disturbances and not to publish any court decisions in cases of anti-Jewish attacks. Many of the villages in the vicinity of Garmisch-Partenkirchen, however, failed to remove signs bearing anti-Jewish slogans, and some foreign visitors were shocked at the crudities of many such signs.

In preparation for the summer 1936 games, the last of the red-painted signs announcing that "Jews Are Our Misfortune—Whoever Buys From Jews is a Traitor" were removed April 8, from all public places in Berlin. In the same month, in order to counteract charges of discrimination against Jewish sportsmen, Nazi authorities issued an order declaring that expulsion of Jews from German sports organizations contravenes existing law; the order granted sports leaders the right to "reject application for membership on the ground of unfitness, but lack of 'Aryan' qualifications is not to be given as ground for rejection." The order, however, was seen as mere window-dressing for the approaching Olympics, since practically all Jews had long since been expelled from German sports groups, and the order did not state that they should be readmitted. At the beginning of June, the Judenkenner, notorious anti-Jewish sheet, suspended publication until the conclusion of the Olympic Games in August.
Jews in the Saar Region.—Although the provisions of the Franco-German agreement of January 13, 1935, required that minority rights be respected by the German Government for a period of one year, Joseph Buerckel, Nazi Commissar for the Saar region, announced on December 15, that “not a single Jew will be left in the Saar by next March.” In violation of the agreement, the Nazi anti-Jewish restrictions had been completely applied to the Jews in the Saar long before the year of grace ended. More than 2,000 Jews residing in the Saar made last-minute preparations to leave the district before the expiration of the one-year period in which they were permitted to take their capital out of the Reich. Herr Josef Buerckel, Nazi Commissar for the Saar, announced that the Nuremberg and other anti-Jewish laws which, under the Franco-German agreement, had not been applicable to the Jews in the district, would be introduced in the Saarland on March 1, 1936. By the end of February, the exodus of Jews from the Saar was completed. Of the 4,800 Jews who resided there before the region was returned to Germany, only about 500 remained after March 1. These people were forced to remain because the French authorities refused to give them residential and labor permits allowing them to settle on French soil. In April, Dr. Oscar Schloss, a Jewish lawyer, was appointed State Commissar for Jewish religious affairs in the Saar. Dr. Schloss, who was unknown in Berlin Jewish circles, was given control of synagogues and Jewish religious communities in the district, under instructions of the Nazi authorities and with direct responsibility to the Section for Religious and Educational Affairs of the Reich Commissariat for the Saar.

Maltreatment of Foreign Jews.—In October 1935, the case of Rudolf Selz, British subject of German-Jewish origin, arrested by the Nazis under the law “for the protection of German blood and honor,” became an international incident when the British Government decided to test the measure of protection afforded foreign citizens under the new anti-Jewish Nuremberg laws. It was feared that the German Government would use the case as a precedent for separating foreigners into two classes—“Aryan” and “non-Aryan.”
Released after several days under arrest for alleged "Rassenschande," only to be rearrested pending inquiry, Selz was again freed in Munich on October 29, and deported as an "undesirable alien." The charge of violating the Nuremberg laws was not pressed against him.

On November 1, the Government announced that the Nuremberg laws are applicable to foreign as well as to German Jews. An Altona court prepared to try a Polish Jew on charge of violating the law "for the protection of German blood and German honor." The Polish Embassy announced that it would not interfere "because the case is not a political matter." It was later revealed that the defendant was not a Polish citizen but was "staatenlose." In sentencing the defendant to nine months' imprisonment, the Court declared that the Nuremberg laws "are intended not only for German Jews, but also for Jews of foreign citizenship."

In Warsaw a delegation, consisting of the Presidium of the United Jewish Committee for German Refugees, presented a memorandum on the discriminatory treatment of Polish Jews in Germany, in connection with the Nuremberg laws, to Dr. Adamkiewicz, Polish representative of the High Commissariat for German Refugees and Head of the Legal Department of the Polish Foreign Office. They were told that the Polish Government was watching the situation and that the German Government had agreed not to apply its laws to Polish citizens, if they were willing to leave the country.

A few days after the German-Polish trade agreement came into force in November, the German authorities launched a new campaign against Polish Jews in Germany, with the aim of driving them out of business and employment. Hundreds of Jewish citizens of Poland sought protection from the Polish Consulate. A similar campaign against Czechoslovak Jews brought a sharp reminder from the Czech Legation that retaliation against German businesses in Czechoslovakia would be carried out.

On December 6, the Nazi Labor Department rejected the intervention of the Polish Consulate on behalf of several hundred Polish Jews whose labor permits had been revoked. Jewish tradesmen had been deprived of their livelihood
despite their Polish citizenship, and the Nazi officials were reported to have declared to Polish consular officials that “in Poland Jews are treated in a similar way.” On December 10, local German authorities began ordering Polish Jews to leave the country. Polish diplomatic representatives failed to take energetic measures and their indecisions encouraged the Nazi authorities to continue the deportations.

On January 9, 1936, the Secret Police entered the apartment of Boris Smolar, chief European correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, searched his papers, and confiscated his passport. The next day the police returned his passport with apologies. In the same month, an unnamed Central European Government was reported to have warned Germany that international action would be taken against her if she continued to force Jews of foreign nationality to liquidate their businesses in the Reich, along the same lines as German Jews. On January 28, the German authorities rejected the intervention of the Czechoslovak Legation in behalf of Rudolph Saudek, well-known Jewish sculptor of Czech citizenship. The Legation had demanded that he be permitted to carry on his art work in Germany, and that he be granted a permit to engrave tombstones for Jewish cemeteries. This the German Government refused to allow, since Jews are not permitted to do any work associated with art. The Czech request was rejected “because Czechoslovakian Jewish citizens in the Reich are not treated any differently from the German Jews.”

In February, Dr. Kurt Blumenfeld, former president of the German Zionist Federation, who had become a Palestine citizen, was compelled to leave Germany when the authorities declined to extend his leave to remain in the country. It was reported that instructions had been issued to German consular authorities in Palestine not to grant any visas to Jews holding Palestine passports who wished to visit Germany. These instructions made it difficult for the Zionist Organization in Germany to continue its work of training youths for Palestine settlements and its migration activities, which had been conducted by instructors from Palestine.

In March, the Dutch Government concluded an agreement with the German Government regarding the repatriation of Dutch Jews residing in Germany. More than 100
Jewish families of Dutch nationality had applied to the Dutch consulates to assist them to transfer their capital to Holland. It was reported that each Jewish family would be allowed to transfer between 15,000 and 20,000 marks, provided they could prove that they are no longer able to do business in Germany and that they need the money to start a new business in Holland.

In the same month, the Gestapo threatened Jews who left Germany after Hitler's accession to power, with arrest if they attempted to return for the Passover holidays of 1936. The Jewish Community of Berlin was advised by the authorities to inform refugees of this decision. Another Gestapo order directed Jewish organizations desiring to bring Jewish leaders from abroad to advise with them or otherwise help in their work, to secure Gestapo permits for them first, lest the visitors be deported as undesirable aliens.

In April, the Polish consulate in Berlin asked Polish Jewish realty owners residing in Germany to register their holdings as the first step in negotiations between Poland and the Reich for a transfer project permitting a number of Polish Jews to remove their capital to Poland. Consular officials explained that, in negotiating for payment of an old debt to Germany, the Polish Government would attempt to arrange payment in a manner permitting Polish Jewish nationals to liquidate their property in the Reich.

Reactions to Events Abroad.—In September 1935, the German press abusively attacked Magistrate Louis B. Brodsky of New York City for his decision in the S. S. Bremen incident, in which he characterized the swastika as a “pirate flag,” and freed five of the six demonstrators arrested. On September 8 a special protest meeting of lawyers was held in Berlin, at which Dr. Hans Frank, president of the Academy for German Law, attacked “the Jew Brodsky” and protested against the “unheard of vilification, in the name of German justice.” Nazi anger over the incident was appeased by the verbal expression of regret by American Secretary of State Cordell Hull. Hitler attacked Magistrate Brodsky's decision in his speech at Nuremberg. General Goering also referred to the decision,
declaring: "This impertinent Jew, in his hatred towards us, cannot insult us. I only regret that the American nation was compelled to witness the desecration of our flag."

The immediate reaction in Germany to the assassination of Dr. Wilhelm Gustloff by a Jew in Switzerland, resulted in an order by Dr. Josef Goebbels, Minister of Propaganda, prohibiting the Jewish Culture League to conduct any activities "until further notice, in order to prevent anti-Jewish disturbances as a result of the assassination." The ban was lifted March 4. Since the Winter Olympic Games were due to open on February 6, at Garmisch-Partenkirchen, it was understood that no anti-Jewish acts could take place in the Reich, lest such acts would antagonize the thousands of foreign visitors. The Nazi press, however, launched a vigorous anti-Jewish campaign, blaming all Jews for the assassination of Dr. Gustloff. On February 6, the Central Union of Jews in Germany issued a statement strongly condemning the assassination. A strong anti-Jewish tone marked the memorial meetings for Dr. Gustloff. On February 10, as the funeral cortege passed through German cities, fiery anti-Jewish speeches were delivered by Nazi officials along the way, but no disturbances took place. Delivering the funeral oration at Schwerin, Adolph Hitler openly threatened Jews with reprisals and accused them of having murdered countless Nazis in Germany. On the other hand, he declared, "on the way to National Socialism there is not to be found the grave of a single man murdered by us." This statement was denounced and ridiculed by the foreign press. Meanwhile, Chancellor Hitler's overt threat threw German Jewry into panic. Jews throughout Germany feared drastic action after the conclusion of the Olympic Winter Games and the departure of foreign visitors. On February 14, the Executive Board of the Berlin Jewish Community instructed all synagogues in the Reich to include in their Sabbath services a condemnation of the murder of Dr. Gustloff as being "in contradiction to the teachings of the Jewish religion and the ethics of the Jewish people."

**Jewish Communal Life.**—In July 1935, it was announced that the number of shekel (certificate) holders in Germany had reached a total of 100,863, four times as large as the
number participating in the seventeenth Zionist Congress in 1931. The Zionist delegation was undecided as to participation in the nineteenth Zionist Congress at Lucerne. They considered the sending of a memorandum to the Nazi authorities asking permission to attend the Congress, and agreed to walk out of the convention hall in a body if the German Government would be attacked.

In August, the conflict between the Zionists and the non-Zionist liberal Jews in the Berlin Jewish community administration, over leadership of the community and control of its affairs, was settled by an agreement, under which the Liberals retained a majority in the community council, while the Zionists were given control of a number of administrative departments. In November, another agreement gave the Zionists 50% representation in the Executive of the Berlin Jewish Community and all its departments. This ended the long-lasting controversy which had threatened to disrupt the Berlin Jewish Community.

On December 6, Georg Kareski, president of the State Zionist Party in Germany and member of the Executive of the Berlin Jewish Community, was appointed by the German Government, Reichspresident of the Federation of Jewish Cultural Societies, in charge of the entire cultural life of the Jews in Germany. The appointment which was made by Special Commissioner Hans Hinkel, empowered Herr Kareski "to decide upon the entire cultural work conducted by the Kulturbund and its affiliated organizations," although artistic activities remained under the direction of Dr. Singer. Herr Kareski's appointment aroused much indignation in the Jewish community. In an interview published in Der Angriff, official organ of the Propaganda Ministry, on December 23, Herr Kareski attempted to justify many of the Nazi policies towards the Jews. In April 1936, the Jewish Culture League in Berlin was ordered by the authorities to dismiss all Jewish artists and musicians who were not German-born. More than 100 Jewish families were thus ousted from employment in the theatre and orchestras maintained by the League.

On August 25, the Ministry of Propaganda and Enlightenment, in agreement with the German Secret Police, appointed
Dr. Kurt Singer as director, and Dr. Werner Levié as Secretary General, of the League of Jewish Cultural Associations. All Jewish artistic and cultural organizations, except religious schools and communal bodies, were ordered to affiliate with the League by September 15th. The organizations must submit their programs to the League monthly, and must also submit regular reports of membership. In September, Hans Hinkel, Special Commissioner for Jewish Cultural Affairs, announced that the League had a membership of 180,000.

German Jews were excluded from the Nazi winter relief, in violation of Hitlers' previous promise that "everybody is to enjoy winter relief in the Reich." On October 9, the Reichsvertretung submitted a plan to the Government under which the Jews were to conduct their own campaign for winter relief. The campaign was officially approved. More than 75,000 Jews were the recipients of relief. At the same time, Jewish firms were ordered to contribute to the general winter relief, and forbidden to assist the special Jewish relief campaign. Individuals were permitted to contribute to the Jewish drive, but business firms were refused permission "since they enjoy the benefit of being patronized by 'Aryans'." Official data based on the records of Jewish relief organizations, made public April 26, revealed that one out of every five Jews in Germany was dependent on relief. The number of relief recipients was believed to have grown after the winter relief campaign ended.

In April, 1936, it was reported that more than 75,000 Jews throughout Germany, including 25,000 in Berlin, received free matzoth from the Jewish communities during the Passover holidays. This was by far the greatest number of applicants for Passover relief in the history of Germany. In Berlin, the police authorities set special police to guard the synagogues during the Passover services, to prevent anti-Jewish provocations. Gestapo agents attended all services, and made notes on the Passover sermons. Herr Heinrich Stahl, president of the Berlin Jewish Community, issued a Passover proclamation appealing for unity in the ranks of German Jewish leadership. For the first time in a century Passover communal services were not held in a number of small towns throughout Germany, because the
sharp decrease in the Jewish population of the small towns had made it impossible to find the necessary minyan.

In October, the Central Union of German Citizens of Jewish Faith (Central Verein deutscher Staatsbuerger juedischen Glaubens) changed its name to the Central Union of the Jews in Germany (Central Verein der Juden in Deutschland). The organization amended its statement of purposes to the fostering of Jewish life and the promotion of the spiritual, legal, and economic welfare of the Jews resident in Germany; Dr. Julius Brodnitz was elected president.

In November, the Government dissolved the Verband der deutschen national Juden, the Union of German Nationalist Jews which, led by Dr. Max Naumann, has been composed of a small group of Jews who had insisted that, as German nationals they did not deserve the same treatment as other Jews.

On January 15, 1936, the Executive of the German Zionist Federation issued a manifesto demanding national autonomy for German Jews, so that "they should settle their own affairs in the Reich independently as a solid national group or as a solid national unit," and asking that the Federation be recognized "as the only instrument to conduct exclusively the work of nationalization of German Jewry." This indirectly defied the appointment of Georg Kareski as virtual dictator of German Jewry's cultural affairs. In February, at its Twenty-fifth Annual Conference, the Federation asserted that "the Jews in Germany, especially the youth, see themselves completely dependent now on emigration," and pleaded with Great Britain, as the Mandatory Power, to keep the gates of Palestine open. Its resolution declared that "thousands of trained Halutzim in Germany are awaiting the opening of the Palestine gates as well as thousands of German Jewish families who possess sufficient capital and economic experience." Other resolutions stated that "the German Zionists recognize the necessity for Jewish emigration from Germany to other countries outside Palestine"; expressed hope that the Anglo-Jewish mission to the United States would be successful, demanded that supervision of the transfer agreement by the Jewish Agency be extended to countries outside Palestine, and
urged that no Zionist member accept a position in a Jewish community or any other Jewish institution without the consent of the Zionist administration in Berlin.

In February, the Zionist demand for recognition as representing the whole of German Jewry was attacked by Der Israelit, organ of the Orthodox Jews of Germany.

In February, the Jewish Familienschutz Organization, caring for aged German Jews, carried into effect a project to prevent the dissipation of Jewish capital tied up in Germany and provide for the older generation of German Jews who must remain behind in the Reich. Working under the control of the central Jewish organizations of Germany, the Familienschutz undertakes, in exchange for capital transferred to it, to make regular weekly payments to beneficiaries, based on an actuarial scale. On the death of the beneficiary, whatever remains of the capital deposited becomes the property of the organization, to be used for its other work.

Since 25,000 Jewish children were to be excluded from the German school system by Easter, 1936, Jewish leaders laid plans in February, for raising funds for, and organizing, the new "ghetto school system." A five-month special course was set up for training teachers in these schools, since there was a shortage of teachers. Since Jews were not permitted to lease State- or municipal-owned buildings, the Jewish communities were faced with the problem of finding school sites.

On April 5, it was announced in Berlin that the Hilfsverein der Juden in Deutschland had completed plans for the settlement of 12,000 Jews annually in countries other than Palestine, and was submitting the project to the Council for German Jewry, with headquarters in London. The cost of transferring these refugees to new homes, and of establishing them on a solid basis there, was estimated at $1,000,000. In addition, the plan required the setting up of a revolving fund of $500,000 for initial credits for the settlers, to be repaid by them within a year. On May 7, at the annual meeting of the Hilfsverein, Max Warburg, its president, announced that the Hilfsverein's future activities would be concentrated on emigration to overseas countries. Mr. Warburg attacked "the wild emigration projects of the
past year," and suggested that German Jewish emigration be regarded as part of the general Jewish migration from Eastern and Central Europe. He announced that the Hilfsverein was forming specialized groups of emigrants and was carefully selecting emigrants for the colonies of the Jewish Colonization Association in the Argentine; advocated that allotment of funds, raised for German Jews, be made on the basis of loans, instead of as gifts; and suggested the creation of a financial organization to regulate the issuance of such loans.

Basing its action on a law enacted on July 23, 1847, the Berlin Jewish Community announced, on April 10, new regulations governing the admission of "non-Aryans" to membership in the Jewish communities of Germany, in accordance with the Nuremberg laws defining their status. The new regulations provided that the following may be accepted into the community: (1) children of legally married Jewish parents; (2) illegitimate children of unmarried Jewesses; (3) children of Jewish fathers in mixed marriages; (4) anyone formally adopted by a Jewish religious community.

A report presented on April 19, to the Council of the Association of Jewish Communities in Prussia, representing 800 Jewish communities, declared that the number of Jews in Germany had dwindled to 445,000. The report stated that of the 800 Jewish communities which the Association embraces, 370 were on the verge of collapse and were depending on Jewish subsidies from Berlin, and that many synagogues had been sold because the Jewish population was practically compelled, by the anti-Jewish boycott and other measures, to leave towns in which these synagogues were located.

**Poland**

The wave of anti-Jewish agitation, accompanied frequently by physical attacks, was the most characteristic aspect of reports of events of Jewish interest in Poland during the period under review. This agitation and the excesses pushed into the background all other phases of Jewish life, because the Jewish community was so preoccupied with resisting, and protesting against them, that it
appears to have had but little time for attention to other matters.

In connection with the anti-Jewish excesses several points deserve emphasis: the laxity of local authorities in preventing excesses despite warnings; their half-hearted and perfunctory efforts to quell riots after they broke out; the leniency of the courts in punishing the non-Jewish offenders and their severity in punishing Jews who had, in defending themselves, killed or injured their assailants; the inclination and, at the same time, lack of power of the central authorities to maintain order; and a growing, though still ineffectual, opposition to the pogrom tactics of the National Democrats (Endeks) and their sympathizers and dupes.

In the meantime, events in Germany appear to have inspired some Polish political leaders to espouse a policy of encouraging the emigration of Jews from Poland, as a short-cut to the solution of the vexatious Jewish problem. The development of this policy will bear watching, for there is only a short step between encouragement and compulsion, which is likely to take the form of tacit condonation of, if not direct participation in, persecution.

Anti-Jewish Student Excesses.—The anti-Jewish excesses, during the year, began in Polish colleges. On November 9, 1935, Endek students at the University of Warsaw attacked and injured Jewish students; several were arrested. The Socialist students at the University issued an appeal against the spreading of anti-Jewish propaganda. Rioting also broke out in the Universities of Lemberg and Cracow. All the higher educational institutions in Warsaw were closed down temporarily in November. In that month, a representative of the Ministry of Education conferred with the rectors of Warsaw’s universities. He made it clear that if rioting recurred after the schools reopened, the Government would order a new roll of students to be compiled, as was done in 1933. On November 24, the Ministry granted special powers for the preservation of order to the rectors of schools in Lemberg, because of the brutal character of anti-Jewish excesses there. Many Endek students were arrested. Meanwhile, the Government prohibited the
holding of a protest meeting by the Bund, the Jewish Socialist Party.

After an investigation into the causes of the Warsaw student riots, the police liquidated an anti-Jewish student organization and arrested ten of the ringleaders, November 27. Meanwhile, the Rector of the Warsaw University warned students against a renewal of Jew-baiting agitation. The Warsaw Municipal Council unanimously adopted a resolution moved by a non-Jewish member condemning "the barbarous and blameworthy disturbances which make difficult the cooperation of all the citizens of the country."

Jewish students at Posen University were asked to keep away from lecture rooms for a time, after Endek students created new disturbances there on November 5.

The Endek argument that Jews were over-represented in Polish educational institutions was refuted in December by the semi-official Gazeta Polska, which pointed out that in many of the higher schools the number of Jewish students was less than one-half or one-third of the quota set for them by the Endek agitators. It declared that the number of Jews at the universities was decreasing, and that the number of scholarships awarded Jews was constantly shrinking. In the same month, Endek students at the University of Posen promised "protection" to restaurant owners if they would agree not to purchase commodities from Jews, nor to employ Jewish help. The students also delivered an ultimatum to the Rector of the University, demanding that no more Jews be admitted and that the Jewish students already there be denied privileges. In January, Jewish students at the Lemberg Polytechnic Institute were punished when they stayed away from lectures as a protest against the order segregating Jewish from non-Jewish students. Meanwhile, the Endeks attempted to introduce similar ghetto orders in all other Polish universities.

Late in January, seven members of the Board of the Jewish Students' Society of the Lemberg Technical High School, who had joined with 380 other students in signing a protest against the anti-Jewish excesses in the school, were sentenced to one year's imprisonment; the other students were not affected. The sentence was later rescinded by the Senate of the school, although the students were
suspended for three terms. In February, the Senate of the Lemberg Technical High School abolished the ghetto order forcing Jewish students to occupy separate seats in the lecture rooms.

On March 4, scenes unprecedented even at a Polish university took place at Warsaw University, when a mob of Endek students ran amok and attacked Jewish students with sticks to which razor blades had been attached. Fifty Jewish students, including a number of girls, were injured, several of them very seriously. A large number of the rioters were arrested, and the University was closed for an indefinite period.

In May, an Endek student demand that the Warsaw Politechnicum be closed to Jews and Communists was rejected by the rector of the institution. The Endeks charged that “it is clear that it is only through Jewish and Communist provocations that excesses took place.”

Anti-Jewish Agitation and Excesses.—In August, the National Democrats (Endeks) of Lodz proclaimed a week of intensified economic boycott against the Jews. Roving bands of Jew-baiters terrorized non-Jews patronizing Jewish shops. The police arrested several of them and some received small prison sentences. Upper Silesia also witnessed anti-Jewish excesses on the part of the Endeks. The agitation was intensified during succeeding months, and Catholic anti-Jewish papers joined in the demand for an anti-Jewish boycott.

In October, it was reported that membership of the National Democratic Party had doubled in the course of the previous six weeks, during which period 1500 Endek leaders had been arrested, at least half of whom had been sent to prison. In the same month, the Endeks of Lodz proclaimed a new boycott week against Jewish traders. In November, there were renewed riots in Grodno and the province of Posen. This new wave of excesses caused high tension in Jewish circles, and the Club of Jewish deputies in the Sejm made representations to the Polish authorities. The tension was further increased when two Jewish youths died November 18, as a result of the outbreaks. Another
delegation of Jewish deputies submitted information concerning these outbreaks to the Polish Minister of the Interior, who assured them that he would tolerate no further disorders.

In October, the trial of 22 Nara (National Radical anti-Semites) accused of a serious anti-Jewish outbreak in Warsaw, in which one Jew was killed and several injured, came to court. Most of the defendants were known as criminals, having served sentences for murder, theft and other crimes. After a three day trial, four of the Jew-baiters were sentenced to five and a half years hard labor, seven others were found guilty but released, pending an appeal, and eleven were acquitted. The public prosecutor condemned the demonstration as a minor pogrom.

On November 9, the Grodno District Court imposed heavy prison sentences on three Jews convicted of having killed a Polish peasant, in self-defense, in May, 1935. The sentence of one of the convicted men was later reduced by a court of appeals.

Meanwhile, the trial of 17 Endek rioters accused of having taken part in an anti-Jewish outbreak in Grodno in June 1935, during which two Jews had been killed and more than 30,000 zlotys' worth of Jewish property damaged, ended on November 13 with the passing of the mildest sentences on record for murder and pillage. The ringleader received a prison sentence of one year, and the others received even briefer terms of imprisonment. Six of the accused were acquitted. The court explained the mild sentences by declaring that the rioters had not been actuated by any feeling of ill-will.

During December, Endek agitators incited peasants in the Radom district to attack Jews. At least one Jew was killed in the disorders, and four rioters were slain when police were forced to fire on an attacking mob.

On December 9, bombs were exploded in the synagogue of Kattowice and in the homes of several Jewish tradesmen. Twenty-one persons were tried for this outrage and, on February 12, all but three of them were sentenced to from one to three years hard labor.

Anti-Jewish agitation became so pronounced in Polish Upper Silesia during December, that a delegation from the
Kattowice Jewish Community and the Silesian Union of Rabbis requested the Polish Governor to take measures to put it down. Shortly thereafter, the Endek Party and its affiliated organization in Upper Silesia were dissolved by the authorities.

On January 27, 1936, the association of small Jewish businessmen and traders issued an appeal for aid in the name of 600 Jewish families in Przytyk. They declared that the whole town was being terrorized by Endeks, who were forcing villagers to stop trading with Jews, that boycott activities were so thorough that the 2,500 Jewish inhabitants were faced with the entire loss of their livelihood. The continued anti-Jewish agitation forced the district Governor to close the weekly markets for a month. This was another severe blow to Jewish trade. On March 6, a Jewish delegation appealed to Tremarucek, the district commissioner in Radom, for precautionary measures against the heightened anti-Jewish agitation at Przytyk. He replied: “What do you Jews want? Not a single Jew has been killed so far.” Three days later Endek rioters killed two Jews, seriously injured three others, and left scores more, hurt. Their emotions played upon for many weeks, young anti-Jewish hooligans had gathered in the market place of the town, shouting Jew-baiting slogans, and had attacked all Jews. Police were unable to hold them back, although they forced Jewish youths attempting to defend their coreligionists to leave. On the next day, the district commissioner arrived to investigate, and immediately declared: “An impartial investigation has established that the pogrom was due to Jewish provocation.” The authorities prohibited newspapermen from photographing either the victims of the outbreak or the pillaged Jewish shops and homes. The entire press was forbidden to report the details of the pogrom. Fearing further outbreaks, the authorities ordered that the funeral of one of the victims, Peisach Minkowski, should not take place during the day, and he was, accordingly, buried at dawn. But his wife, Chaya Minkowski, who died in a Radom hospital of injuries received during the outbreak, was buried with an impressive demonstration in which thousands of Jews took part.

On March 12, the Jews of Przytyk appealed to their
relatives in the United States and Canada to assist them to leave the district where Jewish lives were still exposed to danger. A central Jewish committee to furnish relief to the victims of the Przytyk disorders, under the chairmanship of Chief Rabbi Schorr, was established by the Warsaw Jewish community, and Warsaw Jewish newspapers opened a campaign for funds. On March 23, this campaign was prohibited by the Government. On that day the Jews in Przytyk were again thrown into panic when the police, supposedly investigating the outbreak, began a house-to-house search of Jewish homes, in a vain attempt to discover concealed arms in an effort, it was believed, to find evidence to substantiate the assertions of the district commissioner, Tremarucek. Several days later, Tremarucek forced a number of local Jews to sign a statement recognizing Jews as having been equally responsible for the disorders. Further arrests of Jews were made, with the obvious intention of fixing the blame for the excesses on the Jews.

On March 23, the Radom Police Court sentenced Vincent Korczak, president of the Endek Party in Przytyk, to five months’ imprisonment for “conducting an agitation which led to the anti-Jewish riots in Przytyk.” The decision was later over-ruled by the Radom District Court and the Court of Appeals.

The third Jewish victim of the Przytyk pogrom died in Warsaw on March 29. Meanwhile, police arrested fourteen Jews for participation in the riots, eleven of them accused of having taken a part in street attacks, two of having fired revolvers without injuring anyone, and one of having shot a peasant. Thirty-five of the forty-two Polish defendants were imprisoned and seven released pending trial.

On June 2, fifty-six persons went on trial in the Radom District Court on charges growing out of the Przytyk riots. Twenty attorneys, including well-known Nationalist leaders, appeared for the forty-two Christian defendants. The fourteen Jewish accused were represented by a committee of five attorneys, two of them non-Jews. A total of 368 witnesses, including 80 Jews, were sworn in to testify at the trial. On June 26, after a long trial packed with dramatic incidents, the court handed down its verdict. Three of the fourteen Jews who stood trial were acquitted; eleven were
sentenced to jail terms ranging from six months to eight years. Four of the forty-three Poles charged with murder were acquitted, three were given sentences of one year, and the remainder, six months each. The court explained the heavy sentences given Jews by declaring that it had been established that the Jews had provoked the excesses. The judge declared there had been no need for any defense action by the Jews, and upheld the charge that they had attacked peasants as the latter were returning from the market. Polish Jews immediately set June 30, as a day of nation-wide protest against the verdict. This general strike was so effective that all Jewish shops in Warsaw were closed for several hours, and demonstrations were staged in several districts of the city. All Jewish organizations participated in the strike except the Agudath Israel, extreme orthodox group. In Lwow, Cracow, Lodz and Wilno, all large industrial centers, the strike was also effective.

The pogrom at Przytyk seemed to have touched off a new explosion of anti-Jewish terror in the middle of March. On March 11, outrages were reported in Lodz and Wilna. On the same day, the Jews of Pyzdry, near Konin, issued an urgent appeal for help, declaring that the intensified anti-Jewish boycott had reduced them to a critical position, that business was at a standstill; that windows of houses were continually being smashed; that no Jew was sure of his life; and that the whole Jewish population of the town was literally facing starvation.

On March 11, a conference of Polish Jewish leaders decided to proclaim a "month of mourning" to draw the Government's attention to the seriousness of the situation.

On March 23, the Jewish community of Czenstochow issued an appeal for the relief of Jewish victims of the anti-Jewish campaign in the district, declaring that "as a result of the wave of terror in the Czenstochow district, hundreds of Jews have been attacked, thousands of windows smashed, and much Jewish property looted." It stated further that "hundreds of Jewish families in this district are threatened with actual starvation because of the anti-Semitic economic blockade."

On April 1, a court in Wilno sentenced two Jewish business men to several years' imprisonment for having
wounded anti-Jewish attackers. They were also ordered to pay the victims 120 zlotys monthly for life. The jail terms were later reduced by order of the administrative authorities. In April, a Catholic association began issuing "Certificates of Pure 'Aryan' Descent" to prove the holder a true "Aryan" for the preceding six generations.

On April 1, Dr. Bernhard Kahn, European director of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, reported that 79 Jews had been killed, and more than 500 wounded, in Polish disorders during the preceding six months. In the same month, heavy sentences were pronounced by the District Court of Lodz on twenty-seven anti-Jewish rioters accused of having bombed Jewish businesses. The sentences ranged from one to four years, and created a profound impression throughout the country because of their severity.

On May 7, 120 members of the Nara Party were arrested in Warsaw for preparing bomb attacks on a vaudeville theatre and a restaurant owned by Jews. The police had kept the Naras under observation, and had thus been able to confiscate the bombs in time to prevent the outrages.

In May, Jewish homes and farms in Otwock, in the Czenstochow district, in East Galicia, and elsewhere, were set fire to by Jew-baiters. In the same month, the police discovered a school, organized by the National Radical (Nara) Organization, for the purpose of instructing school children in anti-Jewish terrorist activities. The police arrested twenty-one persons.

On June 5, the Vilna District Court sentenced seven Endeks to from two to five years' imprisonment for throwing bombs into Jewish shops.

Opposition to Jew-Baiting.—On November 25, 1935, a meeting of democratic groups of the Polish, Ukrainian and Jewish population of Lemberg adopted a resolution condemning the anti-Jewish excesses of the Endek students. A joint committee to combat anti-Semitism was established.

On January 25, 1936, in response to an appeal from the Jewish press, the official Catholic agency in Poland condemned acts of terrorism against the Jews of Poland. The
statement declared that Catholic clergy considered the excesses a violation of the Christian viewpoint, but it demanded social, economic and cultural segregation of Jews, and the Polonization of trade and industry.

In March, the Council of Polish Bar Associations condemned the action of the Gdynia Union of Polish Lawyers, which had issued an appeal to its members for a social boycott of Jewish lawyers. The Council resolved to discipline members who did not observe a correct attitude toward Jewish colleagues and who indulged in anti-Jewish demonstrations. On March 13, a conference of Jewish labor groups, held in Warsaw, decided to proclaim a general strike of Jewish workers and office employes throughout Poland as a protest against the growing anti-Jewish agitation in Poland and the "increased menace of reactionary forces which finds expression in an anti-Jewish boycott and the elimination of Jews from their economic positions, and ends with pogroms." Leaders of the Jewish Socialist Party (Bund), the Left Poale Zion, Socialist Zionist organization, and non-political labor groups, cooperated in the organization of the strike. The Polish labor unions in Radom joined the strike in protest against the Prsytyk outrages and the anti-Jewish propaganda conducted in the Radom district. On March 15, the Executive of the all-Polish Federation of Labor issued a proclamation expressing sympathy and solidarity with the general strike and declaring, "The Federation is determined to combat energetically the anti-Semitic forces in the country." A conference representing 100,000 organized Polish textile workers in Lodz also announced their solidarity.

On March 17, the entire commercial life of Poland came to a standstill, when all employed Jews together with thousands of Polish workers went on strike. Although organized by labor unions, the strike was observed by all classes, including rabbis, businessmen, lawyers, students and Jewish communal institutions. All Jewish, and a large number of non-Jewish stores, were closed. Impressive demonstrations throughout the country revealed the Jewish solidarity against anti-Jewish agitation. The strike passed off peacefully, and came to an end in the afternoon.
The next day, an aged rabbi and a Jewish alderman in Vilna and seventeen Jewish students in Lemberg were injured during the renewed outbreaks, Cardinal Hlond issued an appeal to all Catholics throughout the country urging abstention from participation in anti-Jewish pogroms, but advising the continuance of the economic boycott against the Jews.

In reprisal against the strike, the Governor of Czestochow ordered the closing down of a number of local Jewish sports and cultural organizations. Thirty-seven Jews of Lodz were sentenced to short jail terms for having led the strike. Meanwhile, violent anti-Jewish rioting continued unabated in Warsaw, Lodz and scores of provincial towns.

In April, the Polish journal Oblicze Dnia published a letter from Romain Rolland, the famous French writer, who appealed to the Polish nation to stop anti-Jewish agitation which, he declared, "makes me regret that I am not a Jew, for I am ashamed of my brethren, the Christians." In the same month, a joint meeting of the Polish Socialist Party, the German Socialist Organization, the Jewish Socialist Party (Bund) and the trade unions in Lodz adopted a resolution pointing out that the anti-Jewish agitation, by spreading lies and encouraging demagogy, would throw the country into a state of anarchy.

On May 11, the Council of the Polish Socialist Party concluded a two-day conference with the adoption of a resolution condemning race hatred propaganda and calling upon all Polish workers to combat with all their means the anti-Jewish agitation of the Endeks.

Government Policies.—The new electoral ordinance caused confusion in Polish-Jewish circles. The majority of Zionist parties, and most of the Jewish political leaders, urged Jewish voters not to participate in the Sejm elections. The Agudah Harabonim, however, issued a manifesto on August 12, 1935, declaring it to be the duty of every Jewish voter to cast his ballot. On August 4, Dr. Rosmarin, Jewish deputy from Lemberg in the Sejm, resigned his seat in protest against the action of the Zionist Party Council for
Eastern Galicia in nominating Deputy Dr. Emil Sommerstein as the Zionist candidate for the Sejm under the new electoral ordinance, which had reduced Jewish representation in the Sejm to seven deputies, and made possible the election of only one candidate. In September, when the elections took place, 84% of the Jews in Warsaw deliberately abstained from voting, with the result that a non-Jew was elected to represent a Jewish section of Warsaw. Only three Jews were elected to the Sejm.

In October, the new Polish Government, in a declaration on economic policy, promised to allow all sections of the populations to take part in the reconstruction, and to discourage the monopoly system. Jewish trade circles welcomed the announcement. Speaking before the Sejm, on October 24, Syndram Koscialkowski, the new Prime Minister, guaranteed that no national or religious discriminations would be tolerated by the Government. In the same month, the new Lodz City Council, named by the Government, annulled the previously adopted "Aryan" paragraph in regard to the City Prize for Literature.

The Government continued to pursue a pro-German policy in its foreign relations. The previous visits to Poland of German Propaganda Minister Goebbels and Air Minister Goering were returned, in July 1935, by Colonel Josef Beck, Polish Foreign Minister. It was revealed that one of the German conditions in negotiations for renewal of the German-Polish trade agreement was the suppression of the anti-Nazi boycott movement in Poland. In any case, following these negotiations, the Polish Government took steps to suppress all activities of the Boycott Committee. Following announcement that it might be officially liquidated, prominent Polish Jewish merchants organized a Jewish League for the Protection of Polish Products.

In December 1935, over the protest of Jewish Senators, the Polish Senate ratified the trade agreement. Senator Jacob Trockenheim warned that the opposition of the Jews to trading with Germany would greatly weaken the prospects of German imports. In January, the Polish authorities renewed their activity against the various boycott organizations. Police searched the premises of the anti-Hitler Committee in Lemberg and arrested three officers. They
acted similarly in Warsaw, dissolving the anti-Hitler Committee of Jewish Youth, and arresting two Jewish students.

In September 1935, the Government brought suit against Nahum Halberstadt, a Jewish business man, for insulting the head of a neighboring friendly state. In a letter to a German firm which had solicited his business, the merchant had declared that "as long as Hitler and his mob will rule Germany I shall not purchase any German goods." The Warsaw District Court sentenced Halberstadt to 8 months' imprisonment for the insult. The sentence was reduced from the maximum of three years because of his advanced age and the fact that he had acted while in a highly emotional state. The verdict caused great excitement among Polish Jews.

On January 23, the authorities dissolved the National Democratic (Endek) Party in Lodz because of its unceasing anti-Jewish attacks in the city and district. The Endek Party in Lodz had been one of the strongest in Poland, and had secured a majority in the City Council, which had to dissolve in the fall of 1935 because of the refusal of the representatives of other parties to work with the Endeks.

In February, replying to the interpellation of Dr. Sommerstein, the Minister of the Interior declared that the police had been given strict instructions not only to suppress all anti-Jewish excesses but also to prevent their occurrence. In his budget speech in the Sejm on February 17, Prime Minister Zyndram Koscialkowski referred to the recurrent anti-Jewish outbreaks and declared that Jew-baiting violated the authority of the Government and undermined the foundations of the State. Drawing a parallel between anti-Semites and Communists in Poland, the Premier said the Government would not hesitate to suppress both groups. He declared: "The security of all citizens without difference of nationality and creed is the foundation on which is built the legal authority of the State. We cannot allow that, under the pretext of solving the complicated national and social problems, the State should be converted into an arena on which the fights organized by irresponsible elements, which can only lead to anarchy, should be staged.'" Dr. Sommerstein declared in reply that despite these
promises the Jews of Poland continued to live in constant fear for their lives and property.

In January, a new political party, the Polish Radical Party, was organized under the leadership of Tytus Filipowicz, former Ambassador to the United States. Although generally liberal in its tendencies, the party's program demanded that emigration of Jews from Poland be sponsored by legal means and be accorded all facilities by the Polish Government. The influence of the new party soon became evident. Polish Jewry was greatly concerned when, on February 20, two Senate leaders openly demanded mass emigration of Jews from Poland, declaring that there were no prospects for amelioration of their plight. Prince Janusz Radziwill, president of the National-Conservative bloc, and Count Michal Wostworowski, demanded before the Senate Budget Committee that the Government approach American and British organizations for aid in expatriating Polish Jews. Prince Radziwill coupled his demand that the Government seek Palestine immigration certificates from England, with the ominous statement: "If Germany has by anti-Semitism obtained a high quota of certificates, the Polish anti-Semites might wish to follow Germany's example."

On March 9, the growing tension throughout Poland because of the anti-Jewish outbreaks, was discussed in the Senate, when many speakers demanded that the Government take energetic steps to suppress the anti-Jewish activities of the Endeks. Senator Artur Sliwinski, former Premier of Poland, declared that "the nationalism of the Endeks is a travesty of true patriotism." Several days later, Senator Zbierski, a non-Jew, demanded in the Senate that the Polish Government suppress the National Democratic (Endek) Party, the chief instigator of the anti-Jewish terror in the country. While steps in this direction were not taken, the authorities did refuse to approve the establishment, by a group headed by Senator Michael Ringel, of a League to Combat Anti-Semitism.

In March, as a result of the Przytyk pogrom, M. Dziadosz, the Governor of Kielce (the district in which Przytyk is situated), was dismissed from his post, and Police-Inspector Piatkiewicz, known to be more sympathetic
toward the Jewish population, was appointed in his place. On March 23, with the approach of Passover, the Government ordered the anti-Jewish press to stop publishing ritual murder stories, which had become widespread and frequent. A Polish trade week, scheduled to begin on March 30, at Czenstochow, was prohibited by the Government authorities after Deputy Emil Sommerstein demanded of the Minister of the Interior that measures be taken to halt boycott incitement.

In April, charging that Communist influences were spreading among Jewish organizations in Vilna, the police carried out a series of raids on numerous Jewish institutions, and made many arrests. In the course of a similar raid in Warsaw on April 6, Nathan Buxbaum, a leader of the Left Poale Zion, was arrested after a search of the offices of the Yiddish School Organization, of which he was vice-president.

In June, the authorities prohibited the holding of a Workers' Congress for Combating Anti-Semitism, which was to have taken place in Warsaw, in accordance with a decision of the trade unions affiliated with the Bund, Jewish Socialist Party. An appeal against the decision, lodged with the Ministry of the Interior, was unsuccessful. On June 17, Deputy Emil Sommerstein warned the Sejm that the campaign of economic extermination waged against the 3,500,000 Jews of Poland was driving them to Communism, and appealed to the Government to act against injustice to the Jews. Recalling the statement of former Prime Minister Kazimierz Bartel opposing economic anti-Semitism, he contrasted it with the speech of the present Prime Minister, Felicjan Skladkowski, who said that he could not interfere with the economic campaign against the Jews.

Anti-Shehitah Legislation.—Agitation against shehitah, Jewish ritual slaughter, has been current in Poland since 1928. Several organizations petitioned the Government to prohibit the practice, and the Jewish population suspected that agitation was instigated by elements desiring to oust Jewish merchants and workers from the meat industry, rather than to promote humane slaughter. Thus, it was significant that an anti-shehitah memorandum had been
submitted to the Government by the Guild of Polish Butchers. In July 1935, the agitation became more pronounced. In November, the National Democratic (Endek) Party launched a campaign against shehitah, charging that it is a barbarous method of slaughtering animals. The Endeks asserted that the cost of shehitah was borne chiefly by the Christian population.

In December, the Ministry of the Interior began drafting a bill to regulate animal slaughter. The Warsaw Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Artisans were reported to have submitted memorandums favoring prohibition of shehitah. The Agudath Harabonim began a campaign to combat the movement; it formed a joint committee, including Jewish members of the Polish Parliament and of the Union of Rabbis. The Appropriation Committee of the Warsaw City Council rejected the proposal of the vice-president of the Polish Butchers' Union to prohibit shehitah in Warsaw.

On February 7, 1936, a bill for so-called humane slaughtering was introduced in the Sejm by Mme. Janina Prystor, wife of the speaker of the Senate and former Prime Minister. The bill required compulsory stunning of animals before slaughter, a requirement which is equivalent to the prohibition of ritual slaughter. A special meeting of the Board of the Jewish Community, the Council of the Jewish Community and the Council of Rabbis adopted a resolution protesting against the proposed bill. Asserting that shehitah is one of the chief foundations of Jewish religion, they declared that the attack on shehitah was an attack on the Jewish faith, and therefore contrary to the Polish constitution. The General Council of the Union of Rabbis in Poland proclaimed March 5, as a fast day in protest against the threat to shehitah. On February 13, a conference of seventy rabbis from all over Poland declared itself in favor of proclaiming a period of mourning for four weeks, during which no meat should be consumed by Polish Jews. On February 11, the Jewish deputies and senators in the Sejm intervened with the Minister of Religions and Public Education, pointing out the serious danger of the anti-shehitah bill for Polish Jewry.
On February 14, without awaiting action by the Sejm on the bill, Governor Wieckowski of Posen acted on the basis of the old Prussian law of the province and issued an order prohibiting the slaughter of animals without previous stunning. As a protest against this law, the whole Jewish population of Posen refused on February 19, to buy any meat. Many other Polish communities passed local anti-shehitah laws.

On February 16, a conference convoked by the Board of the Warsaw Jewish Community adopted a resolution of protest in the name of all Polish Jewry, regardless of opinion or party allegiance. When, on March 3, it was announced that Father Trzeciak, a Catholic who had written a pamphlet claiming that shehitah is a Jewish custom rather than a religious law, had been appointed one of the experts to be examined on the matter by the Administrative Committee of the Sejm, a joint meeting of the Shehitah Commission, the Association of Rabbis, and the Executives of the Jewish Communities throughout Poland immediately sent a telegram of protest to Government and Sejm officials, emphasizing that Jewish clergy alone had the right to interpret Jewish religion. On March 4, a solemn declaration signed by 1,200 Polish rabbis, stating that shehitah is enjoined by the Torah and is one of the fundamental principles of Jewish religion, was forwarded to the President of the Polish Republic, members of the cabinet, and every Sejm deputy and senator.

On March 5, after heated discussion, the Administrative Committee of the Sejm voted in favor of the bill. Only the two Ukrainian members and Emil Sommerstein, Jewish deputy, voted against it.

On March 16, the Central Committee of the Zionist Organization in Poland issued a public protest against the bill, and the Jewish pro-Government Party, known as the "Non-Party Bloc," also protested.

On March 17, the Sejm decided by a large majority to return the bill to the Administrative Committee with a request to insert a clause to safeguard the religious requirements of the national minorities. This decision was reached after an address by M. J. Poniatowski, Minister of Agriculture, who pointed out that the passing of the bill without
authorizing the Government to provide for the religious rights of the national minorities would lead to serious economic and other complications for Poland. Expressing no objection to the bill, the Minister asked Parliament to vote in favor of giving the Government the right to solve the religious needs of the minorities, so far as meat consumption is concerned, by the introduction of a *numerus clausus* which should provide for the sale of meat under concessions. On March 18, the Administrative Committee of the Sejm adopted the Government's amendments to the bill, allowing for a limited quantity of kosher meat for the domestic consumption of the Jewish, Moslem and Karaite communities of the country. A sensation was caused when it became known that the modifications embodied in the bill, which seek to prohibit shehitah allegedly to prevent cruelty to animals, included provisions permitting ritual slaughter for export purposes. This was interpreted in Jewish circles as evidence that the alleged anti-cruelty motives of the bill were only a pretext to conceal the desire to eliminate Jews from the meat trade.

On March 20, a conference of rabbis and Jewish leaders from all parts of Poland decided to proclaim a seven-week meatless period as a protest against the expected passage of the bill. The period began on the first day of Passover, April 7, and continued through the first day of Pentecost, May 27.

The anti-shehitah bill was passed by the lower house of the Polish Parliament on March 20. The Jewish deputies were alone in opposing the bill, while Government and anti-Government deputies joined in voicing violent anti-Jewish utterances. According to the measure, Jews, Mohammedans and Karaites (a Mosaic sect) are permitted to maintain their own abattoirs, but the Government controls the supply of cattle to them under a *numerus clausus* system of concessions.

E. Mazur, president, and Moses Lerner, vice-president, of the Warsaw Jewish Community, submitted their resignation to the Polish authorities as a measure of protest against passage of the bill. The Polish Senate adopted the bill March 27. It is to come into effect on January 1, 1937.
Economic Conditions.—On September 8, 1935, the first World Conference of Polish Jews Abroad, opened in London with seventy-two delegates, representing eighteen countries, to consider concerted measures to relieve the economic distress of Polish Jewry. Benjamin Winter, President of the Federation of Polish Jews in America, was elected president of the Conference. Z. Tygel, executive director of the Federation of Polish Jews of America charged that the Poles were conducting "a definite, carefully-planned and persistent campaign to eliminate Jews from trade, industry and handicraft" in Poland. He declared that at least one-third of the three million Jews were unemployed and starving, urged a program of cheap credit for merchants and artisans and the productivization and restratification of the Jewish masses as the essential requirements of Polish Jewry, and appealed to the World Conference for united action in rendering assistance to the impoverished Polish Jews. Summarizing their situation, Mr. Tygel declared that there were some 200,000 Jewish workers and 47,000 other Jewish employes; that unemployment among these amounted to 60%, most of whom were not able to benefit by unemployment insurance; that of the gainfully employed Jews, 38% were traders, of whom the majority were receiving relief; that more than sixty thousand Jewish professionals were without any dependable income whatsoever; and that 100,000 Jews depended on soup kitchens for food. The conference, which set up a World Federation of Polish Jews, adopted resolutions: 1) authorizing its Executive to request the League of Nations to safeguard the interests of stateless Jews, and to approach the Polish Government with a request to intervene in behalf of Polish Jews who have lost their nationality while in Germany; 2) deciding to establish a special fund to promote immigration from Poland to other lands; 3) laying the foundation for establishment of a long-term loan bank to assist Polish immigrants in Palestine; and 4) deciding to assist Polish Jews, living in Germany, to emigrate to Palestine. A resolution protesting against anti-Jewish terrorism in Germany caused the German delegation to leave the hall in tears. On October 4, the first meeting of the European Executive of the World Federation of Polish Jews Abroad,
held in London, laid plans for the transferring of Jewish orphans and neglected children from Poland to Palestine. In November, at a meeting of representative Jews of Poland, the Federation was officially recognized.

In January 1936, the desperate plight of Jewish petty tradesmen was discussed at a conference of the Union of Jewish Small Traders in Poland. Delegates from various Polish provinces described the profound effects of anti-Jewish agitation and official discriminations in many parts of the country. The conference decided to send a deputation to the Minister of the Interior, to acquaint him with the hopeless position of the Jewish tradesmen and to demand assistance. In May, Morris Meisel, chairman of the Union of Jewish Merchants in Poland, declared at the Union's annual conference in Warsaw that the position of the Jewish trader in Poland was catastrophic. He pointed to the bureaucratic restrictions which were making the development of trade in Poland more difficult, and to the anti-Jewish propaganda which was undermining the foundations of the existence of the Jewish population in Poland. The conference adopted a resolution expressing the view that the current anti-Jewish agitation, directed particularly against Jewish tradesmen, caused great harm to the economic life of the country as a whole. On June 8, at a conference, the Federation of Jewish Traders charged that the position of Jewish traders had become worse as a result of the government "hands-off" policy on internal economic competition, announced by Premier Skladkowski. The meeting asserted that Jewish contractors were being excluded from servicing Government institutions, and that provincial Jewish traders were being victimized by local authorities. The next day, Premier Skladkowski received a delegation of traders and informed them that all tax-paying Polish citizens have full trading rights and that limitations against them would not be permitted.

Jewish Communal Life.—In July 1935, a proclamation addressed to the Jewish population of Poland, signed by leaders of Jewish communities and organizations throughout the country, called on Polish Jews to continue the fight
against Nazi terrorism by refusing to handle German goods or services.

In the same month, the Union of Polish Rabbis decided to oppose the action of the Rabbinical Assembly of America, modifying Jewish religious divorce law for Agunoth (women deserted by their husbands). The Union drew up a manifesto, signed by 1,500 Polish rabbis, warning American Jews that those adopting the reform would be excommunicated from the Jewish community, and that marriages to women so divorced would be prohibited.

A total of 205,681 votes were cast, on July 28, for delegates to the Zionist Congress. There were six tickets, which received votes as follows: Labor, 117,542; Confederation of General Zionists, 37,623; Mizrachi, 37,558; Jewish State Party, 6,738; General Zionist World Union, 5,133; Young Zionists, 1,087.

On August 13, the Mizrachi World Conference was held at Cracow. Rabbi Meyer Berlin, former president of the American Mizrachi, presided. The Conference elected Rabbi Wolf Gold of the United States to the presidency of its Executive, and struck out of its statutes the passage pledging Mizrachists to buy the Shekel, which entitles Zionists to vote for delegates to the Zionist Congress. It decided also to present the Zionist Congress with an ultimatum demanding the carrying out of the Mizrachi religious requirements, and to urge the Congress to safeguard a proper ratio for Mizrachists in the immigration and colonization quotas. Other resolutions expressed opposition to the creation of an educational fund by the Zionist organization; protested against the Palestine Government's immigration restrictions and the immigration policy of the Zionist organization; demanded the facilitation of immigration of rabbis, and called upon the Palestine Government to allow pilgrimages of non-Palestinian Jews for the Jewish High Holidays.

In September, the Council of the Zionist Organization of Poland adopted a resolution to continue the economic boycott against Nazi Germany; calling on all Polish Zionist organizations to organize mass protests against the Nuremberg anti-Jewish laws; and welcoming the decision of the Vaad Leumi in Palestine to withdraw from the committee
regulating business relations with Germany. In the same month, the proposed statutes for a Polish-Palestine Emigration and Export Bank were approved by the Polish authorities. The Bank, which is to operate as a cooperative society with limited liability, was organized by Jewish members of the Polish-Palestine Chamber of Commerce, for the purpose of supporting Jewish emigration to Palestine, by issuing necessary credits for the transportation to Palestine of idle workshops and factories and by financing the export of Polish products to Palestine.

In November, representatives of sixteen Jewish communities appointed a committee to draft the statutes for a central organization of Polish Jewish communities, representative of more than 140 communities in Poland, with headquarters in Warsaw, to intervene with the authorities in circumstances affecting the position of Polish Jewish communities.

Another movement for the establishment of a central organization of Polish Jewry was begun in December, when J. Schiffer, president of the Central Committee of the Polish Zionist Organization, announced that his organization had decided to establish an economic and political representative organization of Polish Jewry, and to convocate for this purpose a conference of all former Jewish deputies and senators in the Sejm, who are members of the Zionist Organization and the Jewish National Council; since the Zionist Organization in Poland had boycotted the Sejm elections, it did not recognize current Jewish deputies as representatives of Polish Jewry. In April 1936, conditions for the establishment of a political representation of Polish Jewry were laid down at a meeting, under the auspices of the Zionist Central Committee. A committee of five was appointed to formulate an independent Jewish policy; to lay plans for political, juridical and social aid for Polish Jews; to decide upon a political line for members of the various parties; and to explore the possibilities of calling a congress of Polish Jewry.

Miscellaneous.—On February 10, 1936, the trial in Lodz of five persons accused of having been involved in a fraudulent attempt to smuggle emigrants out of Poland into
Palestine ended in the acquittal of three and the conviction of two of the accused. The trial had aroused great interest in Jewish circles because, among the defendants, were two leaders of the Lodz Revisionist Party as well as Abraham Stavski, who had been involved in the Arlosoroff murder trial in Palestine several years ago. These three were acquitted. The chief of the accused, one Chanachowitch, was found guilty of defrauding a number of people of large sums of money on the promise that they would be smuggled into Palestine on a ship which later proved to be unseaworthy.

In January 1936, a Jewish film company “Kinur” was established in Warsaw, to produce talking films in Yiddish.

In May 1936, the customs authorities ruled that gifts from the United States to relatives and charitable institutions in Poland may be brought in free of duty.

Danzig

Anti-Jewish Movements.—In July 1935, two Polish Jews visiting Danzig were attacked by fifteen Storm Troopers. The police arrested the Jews on the charge of attacking the Nazis. On July 28, a series of anti-Jewish street demonstrations took place in Danzig. Storm Troopers drove through the streets in trucks, threatening Jewish passersby. A delegation of the German Refugee Committee visited the Polish Foreign Office in Warsaw to protest, and a group of Polish Jewish leaders wired the League of Nations Council July 31, appealing for protection for Danzig Jews. In August, the Board of the Danzig Jewish Community issued a proclamation placing the blame, for lack of protection, on the local authorities, and urging Jews to “remember that any action of ours will be misinterpreted as provocation.” On August 10, Jewish merchants who had been attacked by Nazis during the annual Danzig market day, began legal proceedings against their assailants; shops and stores had been looted and the Jewish proprietors, many of them women, seriously beaten.

In October, anti-Jewish demonstrations recurred, with Nazis attacking Jews and smashing windows, without interference by the police, in direct contradiction to official
assurances that the police would prevent any further anti-Jewish excesses. In November, the Propaganda Senator of the Free City of Danzig issued an order to all restaurants and hotels, prohibiting attacks on Jews, and individual boycott actions against Jews. In December, new outbreaks occurred when a group of fifteen uniformed Nazis forced their way into the Danzig Jewish theatre and attacked Jews in the audience. In April, following protest by Jews, the Senate instructed police to stop Nazi groups from the singing of anti-Jewish songs in the streets; such action was not taken, however, except where Jews lodged protest in specific cases.

In March 1936, in spite of their pledges to the Council of the League of Nations with regard to freedom of the press, the Danzig authorities commenced proceedings against the Danziger Echo, the only Jewish newspaper in the Free City. In December 1935, the State Prosecutor had brought action for publication in an article reviewing the attitude of British Church leaders condemning the anti-Jewish program of the Nazis in Germany. The Senate had made repeated attempts to halt the publication of the paper. Paul Bermann, its editor, had been arrested on October 20, 1935 and sentenced to four months' imprisonment, convicted of having cast a slur on the anti-Jewish Nazi marching song and having attacked Herman Wilhelm Goering, member of the German cabinet. Bermann's deportation had been subsequently ordered. Dr Theodor Loewy, whom Bermann had succeeded as editor, had been deported in July.

Petition to League of Nations.—In August 1935, the Jewish population of Danzig submitted a petition to the League of Nations High Commissioner at Danzig, protesting against the anti-Jewish discriminatory legislation adopted by the Senate. In its reply to the Jewish protest, the Senate minimized the seriousness of the anti-Jewish disturbances and declared that the Jew-baiting attacks in Danzig had been provoked by the insolent behavior of Polish and other Eastern Jews. In September, the Committee of Jurists of the League of Nations, to which the petition of the Danzig Jews, together with those of other minorities, had
been referred, made its report. The committee condemned the anti-Jewish measures of the Danzig Senate; declared that discrimination based on supposed racial inequality was not in conformity with the Danzig Constitution; attacked the observations made by the Danzig Senate, which tried to justify its actions by "the feelings of the great majority of the population" against the Jews and by the "principles of the new National Socialist conception of the State"; pointed out that the constitution specifically provided for equality of rights of all citizens, and that no political majority had the right to overrule this statute; and declared that the police and authorities should not countenance the agitation for a boycott movement against the Jews of Danzig.

On September 23, in submitting the report on the Danzig minorities' petitions to the League Council, Captain Anthony Eden, at that time British Minister for League of Nations Affairs, severely condemned the persecution of Jews by the Nazi administration of the Free City of Danzig; demanded that the constitutional liberties of all the sections of the population be observed; recommended the Council endorse the opinions of the Committee of Jurists; and declared that "the Council recommends the Senate to take the necessary measures to remedy the situation revealed by the petition to the Council and by the Jurists' report, by bringing the legislation of the Free City in conformity with the Constitution of which the League of Nations is the guarantor and by ensuring in future the strict observance of the principles of the Constitution in the application of all laws." The petitions were also supported by Colonel Josef Beck, Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Premier Pierre Laval, and Sean Lester, League High Commissioner for Danzig. Herr Greiser, president of the Danzig Senate, promised to forward the Council's proposals to the Senate, although he defended all the National Socialist activities in Danzig. In September, a new petition detailing the reign of terror against Jews and anti-Nazis on the part of the Danzig administration, was submitted to Eduard Benes, president of the 16th Assembly of the League, by a number of German emigré associations, on behalf of Danzig inhabitants who wished to remain unknown.
In December, the Permanent Court of International Justice, at The Hague, ruled by a majority of nine to three that the new Danzig judicial laws did not conform to the Free City’s constitution. The advisory opinion was handed down at the request of the League High Commissioner at Danzig, who had been petitioned to ask for the decision by the three minority parties of Danzig. The law would have made it possible to consider “popular feeling” as a legal precept in much the same way as the courts act in Nazi Germany. This, the Court ruled, was “not consistent with the Constitution and violates certain provisions and certain principles thereof.”

On January 20, 1936, the Council of the League of Nations discussed the Nazi persecution of political opponents in Danzig. High Commissioner Sean Lester recommended that the League send a committee of investigation to Danzig and, should the Senate fail to alter the course, take measures to insure the observance of the Constitution. Submitting the annual report for 1935, Mr. Lester gave a shocking picture of the unconstitutional repressions practiced by the Nazi regime in Danzig, both in the political and administrative spheres. On January 22, Captain Eden, acting as rapporteur on the Danzig question at the League Council meeting, rejected the plea made by Herr Greiser, President of the Danzig Senate, that the Administration of the Free City was not guilty of any violation of the Constitution. Captain Eden declared that the situation in Danzig was exceptionally serious because the Senate did not keep its promises and failed to carry out League recommendations. Replying in the general debate, Herr Greiser reaffirmed the Senate’s absolute determination to respect the Free City’s Constitution, and declared the Council’s apprehensions to be baseless.

According to a statement of Herr Berent, president of the Jewish Community in Danzig, who reported on the situation in May, the petitions submitted to the League as well as the many other protests against economic and social persecution of Jews had had no effect whatever. He pointed to the distribution of the Stuermer in Danzig, the singing of Jew-baiting songs in the streets, the posting of
anti-Jewish boycott placards, the smearing of Jewish shop-windows with anti-Jewish slogans and, particularly, the unconstitutional treatment of Jewish school children in the Danzig elementary and secondary schools.

**PALESTINE**

In August 1935, the report of the 27th Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations was published. It expressed satisfaction with the favorable economic and financial situation in Palestine, but found the Government report on Arab-Jewish relations discouraging. It expressed the hope that measures to stop illegal immigration of Jews and Arabs would be effected, and questioned the wisdom of permitting Japan, now a non-membre of the League, to continue dumping goods in Palestine.

That report, published a year ago, touches upon the most important subjects of Jewish concern in Palestine during the period now being reviewed, except that during this period, the crisis in Arab-Jewish relations, still continuing, over-shadowed all other events. Besides other points of controversy, discussions regarding a proposed legislative council for Palestine brought out, in high relief, the fact that a small but determined group of Arabs, unwilling to be reconciled to the establishment of a national home for Jews, still exercises tremendous influence over the Arab populace.

**ARAB-JEWISH RELATIONS**

*Proposed Legislative Council.*—As was mentioned in the preceding Review, the proposal for the establishment of a Legislative Council in Palestine was made by the Palestine Administration in opposition to the advice of Jewish leaders. In the earlier months of the period now being reviewed, many protests against the scheme were voiced by Jewish organizations in a number of countries. These protests proved of no avail for, on December 22, 1935, High Commissioner Sir Arthur Wauchope formally announced the Palestine Administration’s decision to proceed with the immediate establishment of a Legislative Council. The
plan announced by him called for a Council to consist of 28 members, including 7 Jews, 5 Government officials, 3 Christian Arabs, 11 Moslems and 2 merchants. Of the Jewish members, 3 would be elected and 4 appointed. Of the 11 Moslems, 3 would be nominated and 8 elected. One of the 2 merchants, it was believed, might be selected from among the Jews. The project conferred the right to vote for members of the Council on all persons over the age of 25, including women, who have resided in Palestine for two years. The Council would not have competence in all political matters, but would deal with budgeting and legislation.

The proposal was read by the High Commissioner to a delegation of leaders of Palestine Jewry and of the Zionist movement. It was met with a categorical rejection by all members of the delegation. When it was read to an Arab delegation, leaders informed Sir Arthur that they would make their decision known later, after a conference of the Arab parties.

Early in January 1936, Dr. Hussein Khalidi, Mayor of Jerusalem, announced that his party was in favor of participation in the proposed Legislative Council, and the Arab Christians also accepted the proposal. On the other hand, on January 7, the Arab Youth Congress Party and the Arab Palestine Party (Grand Mufti’s party) adopted a resolution rejecting the Legislative Council and demanding an Arab national government, with a parliament enjoying full legislative powers. At the same time, a joint meeting of the Actions Committee in Palestine, the Jewish Agency, the Vaad Leumi (Jewish National Council), the Agudath Israel, and Mayor Dizengoff of Tel Aviv, confirmed the previous Jewish decision to reject the proposal.

On January 19, members of the British section of the Jewish Agency of Palestine, Board of Deputies of British Jews, Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland, and the various Zionist parties, adopted unanimously, at a conference in London, a resolution demanding that any proposal for the development of representative institutions in Palestine be based on the inherent principle that the future of Palestine is the concern of the whole Jewish people. It described the proposed legislative council as
being "in conflict with the spirit of the mandate and as a
derogation from the status conferred on the Jewish National
Home clauses of the mandate." These views were expressed
to Colonial Secretary J. H. Thomas, who received a deputa-
tion representing British Zionist and non-Zionist bodies.

On February 12, Mr. Thomas declared in the House of
Commons that the provision for the establishment of a
Legislative Council in Palestine would be effected by an
Order in Council under the Foreign Jurisdiction Act of
1890. Again, in reply to questioning in the House on
March 4, Mr. Thomas declared: "I think no one would
challenge the Legislative Council as being contrary to the
Mandate. As far back as 1922, when Sir Herbert Samuel
was High Commissioner, he himself made a proposal for
a Legislative Council which, at that period, was accepted
by the Jewish community and refused by the Arabs."

On March 12, in reply to the memorandum submitted
by the British Section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine
on January 20, Mr. Thomas reaffirmed the Government's
intention to proceed with the establishment of a Legislative
Council in Palestine. The memorandum had objected to
the establishment of the Legislative Council because "it is
likely seriously to hamper the fulfilment of the Mandate
insofar as it provides for facilitating the establishment of
a National Home for the Jewish people." It pointed out
that the development of Palestine is fundamentally due to
the growth of Jewish immigration and the development of
Jewish activity, and expressed the view that an essential
preliminary to the establishment of a Legislative Council
must be the acceptance, by all sections of the population
of Palestine, of the principles contained in the Mandate.
In defending the projected Council, Mr. Thomas expressed
the view that Jewish opinion was unnecessarily apprehensive on this account, that a closer study of the scheme
will reveal that much of the criticism is based on insufficient
grounds, that the proposal has been made from the point
of view of Palestine as a whole, that there is nothing in the
scheme which will interfere with or prejudice in anyway
the discharge of the Mandatory obligations of His Majesty's
Government, that the suggestion that Jewish representation
in the Council be accorded on the basis of World Jewry
was inconsistent with the letter and the spirit of the Mandate and that “to make this an issue would not, in the end, help the cause we all desire . . . .”, and that serious dissatisfaction and unrest would find expression in Palestine if the impression were created that the British government “did not intend to give effect to their repeated assurances with regard to the Legislative Council.”

In a letter on behalf of the British Jewish deputation, Lord Melchett urged postponement of the Legislative Council, describing it as a step fraught with grave dangers to the peaceful progress of Palestine and its people.

On March 24, the proposed Legislative Council was debated in the House of Commons. Members of all parties united in criticizing the Government’s policy in Palestine. Participants in the discussion included Winston Churchill, Conservative leader; Sir Archibald Sinclair, Liberal whip; and Colonel Josiah Wedgwood, Laborite and noted pro-Zionist. Colonial Secretary J. H. Thomas defended the Government’s policy.

On the same day, the second hostile demonstration against High Commissioner Wauchope occurred in Tel Aviv, when right-wing Zionists showered him with leaflets and voiced protests against the Government’s policy and the proposed representative Legislative Council. Two Jews were arrested and sentenced to two months imprisonment, each. The marked distaste on all sides for the proposed Legislative Council caused the entire British press to counsel moderation in proceeding with the project.

On March 30, former Mayor Ragheb Bey Nashashibi’s Arab National Defense Party joined other Arab groups in signifying acceptance of the proposed Legislative Council. On April 2, a delegation representing the five Arab parties was received by High Commissioner Wauchope and was invited to send an Arab deputation of six to London to conduct direct negotiations with the Colonial Office there concerning the Legislative Council. The Arab leaders accepted the invitation, and asked permission to invite one Christian Arab to accompany them. This invitation prompted Hebrew newspapers to demand that a similar Jewish delegation be invited.
Later in April, it was reported that an internal struggle among Arab factions was likely to prevent the scheduled departure of the Arab delegation for London. A meeting of Arab parties called to select the six members of the delegation broke up because of a sharp difference of opinion as to the method of selection. Both sides decided to submit memorandums to High Commissioner Wauchope, seeking his decision in the matter.

On April 22, it was reported that, declaring that "our parties must make use of the bloodshed" caused by the Arab riots which had in the meantime broken out, leaders of the Arab parties decided to postpone for an indefinite period the acceptance of the invitation to send a delegation to London.

Miscellaneous Incidents.—On July 8, 1935, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem started a new propaganda tour throughout the country, appealing to Moslems not to sell land to Jews. Similar campaigns were carried on elsewhere by other Arab leaders.

Religious feeling ran high when in September the Gerrer Rebbe made an unauthorized visit to the Cave of Machpellah, a sacred shrine. Since he did not have official permission, he and his followers were stopped by the police who arrested ten of the latter. Five of the ten Gerrer Chassidim arrested received slight fines, and the rest were acquitted.

In October, great excitement among the Arabs resulted from the discovery of ammunition concealed in a cement cargo on a Belgian boat in Jaffa harbor. Rumors were spread that the cargo was meant for the Jews. It was later, however, generally believed that the ammunition was intended to be smuggled into Ethiopia, although the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and Ragheb bey Nashashibi, former Mayor of Jerusalem, utilized the incident to stir up their followers. The Government made four arrests and warned the Arab press against efforts to utilize the incident for partisan purposes. However, on October 22, the Grand Mufti's party proclaimed a general strike in Palestine. The proclamation followed the breaking up of a conference of Arab parties, which had been called for the purpose of reaching an agreement for united Arab action, which had
been initiated by the “national bloc” in Nablus. The Arab Youth Federation also demanded a general Arab strike in protest against the supposed smuggling of ammunition for Jews. The general strike, which was only partially effective, as many Arab shops and restaurants remained open and many Arab busses continued to operate, passed off quietly with only slight disturbances reported in Nablus. Another half-day strike was proclaimed November 13, by young Arab Nationalists on the occasion of High Commissioner Wauchope’s return from England. The strike was only partially successful in Jaffa and Nablus.

Tension was heightened in November, when Sergeant Moshe Rosenfeld of the Palestine Police was found shot dead at the foot of Mt. Gilboa. The police began an investigation and offered a reward of £200 for information concerning the murderer. One British policeman and five Arabs were killed, and five other Arabs were arrested in a pitched battle with the Arab murderers of Sergeant Rosenfeld. Wild disorders took place during the funeral of three of the Arab sheikhs killed in the encounter. Thousands of Arabs who attended the funeral attacked and wounded British officers and descended upon the Central Railway Station. A second Arab terrorist gang was uncovered on November 24, when police arrested two of its members.

On November 26, a delegation representing the five Arab parties submitted a memorandum to High Commissioner Wauchope, demanding the introduction of a democratic government, the complete suspension of Jewish immigration, and the prohibition of further sales of land to Jews. The memorandum was forwarded to J. H. Thomas, British Secretary of State for the Colonies, who replied in January 1936. Mr. Thomas declared 1) that the demand for democratic government had been answered by the proposal for a Legislative Council; 2) that the total stoppage of Jewish immigration is out of the question, as this is regulated by the absorptive capacity of the country; and 3) that the government approves legislation whereby, with certain exceptions, no landowner shall be permitted to sell his land without retaining a minimum area sufficient for the needs of his family. In February, the Palestine Government began an extensive survey of Jewish and Arab
land-holdings in Palestine in preparation for the promulgation of the new law, proposed by the British Colonial Office. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, president of the Jewish Agency for Palestine and of the World Zionist Organization, visited High Commissioner Wauchope and protested against the proposal as a danger to the foundations of the Jewish National Home. Other Jewish groups also protested against the proposed restrictions on land sales.

In the meantime, in December 1935, Palestine Communists were reported to be organizing demonstrations in the Nablus, Jenin and Tul-Karem districts, whither police reinforcements were sent as a precautionary measure. In January 1936, the Communists were reported to have issued a proclamation inciting Arabs to attack Jews. The proclamation was promptly repudiated by the Communist parties of Poland and France, and the Palestine Communists withdrew the leaflet, explaining that it had been intended as an attack on Jewish capitalists in Palestine. On February 21, the police arrested Tahr Achmed, Arab Communist leader, and deported him. In the same month, the Grand Mufti's Palestine Arab Party established a "Green Shirt" storm troop organization. On February 4, Palestine Arabs went out on general strike in sympathy with the Arab Nationalists in Syria. The day passed without any untoward incidents.

In April, false rumors that Jews of Haifa had killed 4 Hauranis in a Passover ritual resulted in an Arab near-riot and an attack on the police station. An enraged mob raided the Eastern European quarter of the city, injuring several Jews. Police finally succeeded in convincing the Arabs that the rumor had no foundation. The Hebrew press charged that the incident could be traced to the propaganda of Nazi groups which had intensified their activities all over Palestine, and especially in Haifa, during February. A large number of Nazi meetings had been held all over the country and leaflets had been distributed in many places. On May 3, the police arrested Dr. Paul Zuback and Greta Taumann, both of Vienna, after searching their Tel Aviv home and finding alleged seditious material and letters about the German Jews in Palestine. The pair was believed
to have organized Nazi headquarters for Palestine in Nazareth. It was announced on May 14, that they would be deported from Palestine.

**General Strike of Arabs.**—The tension between the Arab population on the one hand, and the Jews and British authorities on the other, flared up in mid-April into a series of outbreaks. The immediate cause was the slaying of a Jew, Israel Chazan, in a hold-up by Arab brigands on the night of April 15. Chazan’s funeral, two days later, developed into a political demonstration, and a police order to disperse was met by the crowd with a barrage of stones. The police opened fire, shooting four Jews; thirty were beaten and many arrested. On the same day, Arab passion was stirred by a report that two Arab laborers had been killed in reprisal. Later, it was learned that one of the two was a Jewish immigrant from Egypt. However, this did not prevent false rumors from circulating through the country and intensifying the distrust between the Arabs, the Jews and the police.

This ill-feeling came to a head on April 22, when the Arab leaders proclaimed a general strike which they agreed to terminate as soon as a number of demands were complied with, chiefly that the Government halt Jewish immigration immediately and prohibit further sale of land to Jews, and that the government of Palestine be transferred from the present constitution to a National Government responsible to an elected democratic assembly.

The immediate result of the strike was the complete cessation of trade and communication in Jaffa, Jerusalem, Nablus, Gaza, Tulkarem, Hebron, Jenin, Safed and other communities. At the same time, Arab bands began to attack the Jewish settlements. Busses were stoned, shop windows smashed, farmers’ huts and their crops burned, thousands of trees uprooted, and several synagogues destroyed. Guerilla warfare spread throughout the rural settlements. For a time, all traffic between Tel Aviv, Jaffa and Jerusalem, ceased, and on May 21 all inland and foreign telephone and telegraph wires were cut by Arab terrorists.
The first official statement on the situation, issued by the High Commissioner, minimized the danger of the outbursts and attributed them to over-excitement caused by false rumors. He appealed “to all citizens to do everything in their power to check the circulation of such rumors and give only credence to what are authentic facts.” He also pleaded for assistance to the police in their efforts to preserve order, adding that “the Government will suppress all disorders and take all necessary measures against those disseminating false rumors or encouraging methods of violence.”

But the Arab leaders chose to disregard this warning, and at a meeting in Jerusalem, in May 2, decided not only to continue the strike but to intensify their efforts to bring in hesitating factions, disregarding the advice which Emir Abdullah of Transjordania gave to a delegation of Palestine Arabs which visited him in Amman seeking his support. The depredations and the killings continued and, early in May, a conference of 150 Arab leaders decided to extend the general strike into a campaign of civil disobedience, to begin on May 15, and to involve non-payment of taxes and a rigid anti-Jewish boycott.

The first active step taken by the Government in an attempt to halt the Arab attacks was the introduction, on May 5, of collective punishment of Arabs for anti-Jewish depredations. These were vigorously carried out. The Government also moved military forces into Jaffa and ordered tanks, armored cars, infantry and other reinforcements from Egypt. By the end of May, Palestine witnessed the greatest military concentration since the days of the World War. In a radio address on May 12, High Commissioner Wauchope explained that he had requested these reinforcements in order to deal promptly with the disturbances as they arose and to afford greater protection against arson.

When, late in May, it was reported that Arab police had disobeyed orders to fire on the rioters, the authorities hastened the recruiting of Jewish youths for police duties. Hebrew University students, laborers, and other young men were signed up in scores. A company of 600 Jewish
youths was formed on May 31, in Tel Aviv, prepared to defend outlying Jewish colonies in the event of attack.

Early in June, the Palestine Government obtained the approval of the Jewish Agency for Palestine to declare martial law, although the Agency declared itself opposed to such action "in principle." Martial law was not declared but, on June 13, the Government announced emergency measures, giving the police and soldiery added power to keep order, and providing the extreme penalty of death or life imprisonment for firing on troops and for sabotaging public property. A strict censorship of the press was also proclaimed. The Palestine Government then began scattering leaflets from low-flying airplanes, appealing to the Arabs to halt the general strike and the terrorism, and promising that if the strike were stopped, a Royal Commission would immediately come to Palestine and investigate its problems. On May 15, in a further attempt to induce Arab leaders to call off the strike, High Commissioner Wauchope made three alternative offers at a conference: 1) not to issue the labor immigration schedule before the Arab delegation completed its negotiations with London; 2) in the event that the Arab delegation did not go to London, to have a British Parliamentary Committee come to Palestine to hear the Arab grievances; 3) to establish a joint Arab, British, and Jewish committee to determine the absorptive capacity of the country.

Neither warnings, military measures nor Government attempts at conciliation had any effect on the Arabs. Not only did they turn down the High Commissioner's proposals, but on June 26, the Moslem Supreme Council issued a public statement, signed by Grand Mufti Haj Amin el Husseini, which said in part: "The Moslem Supreme Council has repeatedly declared to the Palestine Government that the Arab people will never consent to a Jewish national home in a holy Moslem country, and similarly that it will not consent to Jewish immigration and transfer of Arab lands to Jews, which impair the Arabs' existence. The Council finds no reason for the Government to continue this policy, which has proven a failure and a hindrance to the Government. Therefore, the Council regards the general strike as the one legal means to demonstrate that
an aggressive policy toward the Arabs will only enrage the people."

On the other hand, the Palestine Manufacturers' Association and the Histadruth, the Jewish general federation of labor, issued a joint appeal on June 21, demanding the prevention of further killings and sabotage by applying the newly-proclaimed Government regulations.

The outbreaks caused great suffering to the Jewish population. More than 9,500 refugees streamed into Tel Aviv from Jaffa and other nearby settlements. Their condition became so acute that a conference of the Tel Aviv Municipal Council, the Jewish National Council and the Jewish Agency for Palestine decided on April 27, to construct 1,000 homes to shelter the refugees. A campaign to raise $125,000 for this purpose was immediately launched.

By the end of June, it was reported that from sixty-four to ninety Arabs, forty-two Jews, and nine British policemen and foreign Christians had been killed. A Government communique, issued June 10, revealed that, aside from violators of the curfew regulations, 1,495 persons had been arrested since the disorders began. These included 1,313 Arabs, of whom 754 were convicted, 226 acquitted, and 333 remained to be tried; and 182 Jews, of whom 104 were acquitted, 17 convicted, and 61 remained to be tried. Palcor (Palestine Correspondence) reported that 50 Arab leaders had been exiled up to June 7.

Losses sustained by the Government in the first eight weeks of the disturbances were estimated, on June 14, at $2,500,000, resulting from Arab refusals to pay taxes, increased military expenditures, decreased income from customs, and sabotage. Damages to Jews were estimated at $7,500,000, from incendiarism in fields and groves, destruction of their property, and paralyzed trade and communications. The cost of the general strike to the Arabs was placed at $5,000,000. On June 23, the Jerusalem correspondent of Reuters News Agency estimated that the Arabs had destroyed 140,000 trees, many of them fruit-bearing, and about 4,000 acres of grain since the disorders began.

That not all Arabs were in sympathy with the general strike was revealed on May 27, when Arab villages in the
vicinity of Mount Tabor in the Galilee district sent delegations to the Jewish settlement of Mesha to apologize for an attack which had been repelled without casualties. The Arabs asked for reconciliation with the Jews and explained that they had been misled by agitators. Similarly, on June 1, the Arab Merchants Association of Jaffa, tired of six weeks of striking, appealed to strike leaders to "stop your dangerous game." This appeal was the result of Jewish merchants' decision on April 26, not to use Jaffa's harbor facilities, and to make use of Haifa harbor until a new harbor was built at Tel Aviv itself. The Government gave permission for the construction of such a harbor, and on May 25, dredging began.

The unrest in Palestine had its international repercussions when it was reported that Nazi, Italian and Communist propagandists were active in stirring resentment between Arabs and Jews. Twenty-nine Communists were arrested for distributing literature urging troops to mutiny, and exiled to Hedera and Rehoboth under protective custody on June 1. The colonies however, refused to accept them and on June 15, they were transferred to a special concentration camp at Sarafend. On May 15, in a public statement, the Italian consul in Jerusalem denied that Italian agents had anything to do with the disorders, although daily broadcasts in Arabic were sent out for a time by the Italian radio station at Bari. Suspicions of Nazi complicity in the disorders increased on May 28, when several German citizens from Tanganyika, speaking fluent Arabic, were arrested in Jaffa on charges of stirring up disturbances there. These suspicions were strengthened when it was discovered that many of the rifles found with Arab rebels at Nablus, Tulkarem and Jaffa were of German make.

The whole question of the disorders in Palestine was discussed in a formal debate in the House of Commons, on June 19. William Ormsby-Gore, newly-appointed successor to Mr. Thomas, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, announced the British Government's determination to carry out its obligations under the Mandate. "His Majesty's government has not been, and will not be, moved by violence and outrage," he declared. "As soon as order is restored, but not before, His Majesty will be advised to
appoint a Royal Commission to visit Palestine to carry out a most full and searching investigation into the causes of unrest and of any grievances which may be brought to their notice by either Arabs or Jews. The sole aim of His Majesty's Government is to obtain an objective and non-partisan report, to enable them to do justice to all sections of the Palestine population.” Reviewing the background of the disorders, Mr. Ormsby-Gore reported the casualties as follows: Moslems: killed, 42; seriously injured, 109; slightly injured, 275. Christians: killed, 4; seriously injured, 24; slightly injured, 54. Jews: killed, 28; seriously injured, 65; slightly injured, 84. The Christian casualties he said, included 1 British constable killed and 3 seriously injured, and 5 British police officers and 19 British constables slightly injured, also 5 British soldiers and 1 army officer and 4 soldiers slightly injured. The remainder of the Christian casualties were Palestinians. Mr. Ormsby-Gore stated that 1,823 Christian and Moslem Arabs had been tried, and 1,206 convicted, while 418 Jews had been tried and 328 convicted; 336 Arabs were acquitted and 281 were awaiting trial, and 24 Jews were acquitted and 76 were awaiting trial. Collective fines were imposed on 20 Arab villages for arson, outrage and physical violence. Some 60 Jewish Communists were put under police supervision in specified places.

Declaring that “half the trouble that has led to these disorders is psychological,” the Colonial Secretary said the Arabs feared Jewish domination, whereas the Jews were afraid that their constructive work would be cut short or terminated and that they would be reduced to “an inferior status of barely tolerated aliens in Palestine, under Arab domination.”

“I honestly believe,” Mr. Ormsby-Gore declared, “that both these fears are baseless, but they must be shown to be baseless. It is the desire of the Government to find a solution, consistent with the fundamental dual obligation, and they regard this obligation equally an obligation of honor. It is my confident belief that we can dissipate these fears, and do justice to both parties, and it is my intention, when the solution is found, to apply that solution with firmness and consistency.”
David Lloyd George, former Prime Minister, declared that the Arab demand was nothing but a demand for the revocation of the Mandate and warned that under another Mandatory Power Arab freedom would be curtailed. He pointed out that the obligations of the Mandate were specific and definite to encourage the establishment of a national home for the Jews in Palestine without detriment to the rights of the Arab population. Recalling the plight of the Allied nations in 1917, he said: "In these circumstances and on the advice which we received, we decided that it was desirable to secure the sympathy and cooperation of that most remarkable community, the Jews throughout the world. And the Jews—I am here to bear testimony to the fact—with all the influence they possess responded nobly to the appeal which was made."

Other speakers, representing all parties, demanded firmness in putting down the disorders and asked for reconciliation between the Arabs and Jews. At the close of the debate, Mr. Ormsby-Gore reiterated the Government's stand, declaring that "there can be no concession to violence, intimidation and threats, and, above all, to the attack which is now being made by lawless elements in Palestine against the fundamentals of British authority."

**IMMIGRATION**

In July 1935, prisoners convicted of having entered Palestine illegally, went on a hunger strike in protest against being treated as common criminals. When the subject was debated in the British House of Commons, an official statement was issued in Jerusalem, declaring that Palestine law does not provide for any special treatment of political prisoners. The hunger strike ended August 2, when it was reported that the prisoners would be released on bail. Other prisoners, arrested for Communist activities, abandoned their hunger strike August 4, after 16 days. The Palestine Government announced that it would not release on bail any further illegal immigrants, unless the Jewish Agency would agree to deduct the number of such immigrants from the succeeding schedule of labor immigration certificates.
During the year there were many arrests of illegal immigrants. Fifty of them, mostly women and children were detained August 15, at the Palestine frontier and put into Haifa jail pending trial. Hunger strikes of such prisoners were frequent, and on November 24, 1935, a total of 150 Jews, without legal permission to remain in Palestine, besieged the offices of the Zionist Executive and demanded regulation of their status. Again, on February 16, 1936, a total of 300 illegal immigrants paid a surprise visit to a meeting of the Vaad Leumi, demanding that steps be taken to legalize their position in the country. When, on March 1, another group of 150 illegal Jewish settlers converged on the offices of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, police were forced to disperse them, arresting five. On March 30, another group of 13 illegal immigrants began a hunger strike at Acre jail. They were reported to have been roughly treated when they had refused forcible feeding.

On April 16, the Jewish Agency for Palestine reported that 61,854 Jewish immigrants had entered Palestine during 1935. It was estimated that this influx, together with the natural population increase, estimated at 6,400, had raised the number of Jews in Palestine to 29.8% of the total population, compared with 18% at the time of the 1931 census. The Jewish population was estimated by the Agency to be 375,000 in December, 1935. On May 18, in the face of the Arab general strike and the disorders throughout Palestine, the Government announced a new labor immigration schedule for the succeeding six months, providing for the issuance of 4,500 immigration certificates to Jews, 500 of which were reserved for possible illegal immigrants. Of the total number, 1,200 certificates were earmarked for the use of German Jewish refugees.

On January 17, Dr. Werner Senator, member of the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, published a plan for the immigration of German Jews to Palestine. Declaring that "of a total of about 430,000 German Jews still remaining in Germany only about half are 'emigrationsfaehig' (adapted for emigration) during the next 10 years," Dr. Senator proposed the transplanting of nearly 150,000 others to Palestine within a period of 10 years. He pointed out that "the execution of a planned program over a number
of years is dependent upon a certain stability of conditions in Palestine as well as in Germany,” and declared that “contributions ‘a fonds perdu,’ credits from semi-public institutions, and private capital must be used jointly.” His plan provided for the immigration into Palestine annually of 1,000 youths, 3,000 relatives of settlers already in Palestine, 2,000 families entering under the capitalist category, and 4,000 laborers.

GERMAN-PALESTINIAN TRADE AGREEMENTS

In September 1935, in reply, it was said, to the anti-Jewish Nuremberg Laws, the Vaad Leumi, the Jewish National Council, withdrew its representatives from the Haavara, the organization carrying out the transfer agreement with Germany. The German Government soon afterward announced far-reaching regulations with the aim of counteracting the Jewish campaign against the agreement. The new regulation provided that Jews residing in Palestine would be able to buy special “Haavara marks” and would be permitted to send them back to Germany to support relatives remaining there, or as donations to German-Jewish institutions. This new measure, sanctioned September 20, was intended to assist German Jews dependent upon help from relatives abroad.

On September 26, the Vaad Leumi issued a statement asserting that its withdrawal from the Haavara had nothing to do with the Nuremberg laws, and announcing that it would reconsider its withdrawal at its next session.

In succeeding months, the transfer agreement with Germany was attacked by many Jewish groups. In Warsaw, the Joint Committee for Combating Jewish Persecution in Germany requested the Zionist Organization in Palestine to terminate the agreement because “trade relations with Nazi Germany are inadmissible from the point of view of Jewish national interests.” The Revisionists in Palestine, began a campaign against the agreement, and held public protest meetings throughout the country.

On November 18, 1935, Dr. Franz Mayer, acting president of the German Zionist Federation and director of the German Palestine Office, announced changes in the transfer
agreement. Capital sent to Palestine by German Jews would no longer be paid back in cash, he declared, but would be transferred to shares in Palestine enterprises. At the same time, the export of merchandise valued at over 50,000 marks was forbidden. A few days later, the British consulate in Berlin announced several modifications easing the requirements to permit swifter entry. In December, the Vaad Leumi adopted a resolution expressing its agreement with the decision of the Zionist Congress regarding the Haavara and its approval of the transfer agreement; it decided to name a representative to the Haavara Executive Committee.

On January 19, 1936, the Haavara office in Germany made the startling revelation that, since February 7, 1935, not a single deposit had been accepted in Germany by the Haavara office for transference to Palestine. This was explained by the fact that not enough German goods had been sold in Palestine under the transfer agreement to meet the requirements of the Reichsbank for further transactions. Since the agreement had come into force, however, the Haavara had enabled 1,600 Jewish families to take their capital out of Germany. Toward the end of January the Haavara office announced that, within a few months, it would resume accepting new deposits from German Jews for transference to Palestine. But on April 5, while negotiations for modifying the agreement were being carried on between Zionist officials and the Reichsbank, the Reich Devisen (Transfer) Office issued an official communiqué to the effect that the maximum of 50,000 marks which Jews emigrating from Germany to Palestine had been permitted to transfer in the form of German goods, would be reduced “in view of the fact that the Palestine market is now less capable of absorbing German goods.” It was also announced that refugees to Palestine would be permitted to take with them goods and machinery for their own requirements. A few days later, a German Government order placed the operation of the transfer pact between Germany and Palestine entirely in the hands of the Haavara of Tel Aviv. The Reichsbank, it was announced, would no longer transact any business in connection with the agreement, and the German end of the transfer details were taken over by the
Warburg bank of Hamburg and the A. E. Wasserman bank of Berlin. The maximum amount of capital to be withdrawn in the form of merchandise was set at 37,500 marks per person, instead of the 50,000 marks formerly allowed. Further regulations governing the transfer of capital were made public on April 12. They permitted the sending of 200 marks monthly to German Jewish students in Palestine, 500 marks monthly for the support of German Jews residing in Palestine, and the transferring of further capital to German Jews who emigrated to Palestine independently and took from Germany "only comparatively small sums which are insufficient for the establishment of an independent economic existence."

**ITALO-ETHIOPIAN WAR**

The outbreak of hostilities between Italy and Ethiopia aroused fears in Palestine that England and her dominions would be drawn into the war. The country had suffered a war scare for several weeks and both Arabs and Jews had begun to withdraw savings from the banks and to hoard food. A conference of Palestinian bankers, industrialists and economists, on September 21, 1935, laid plans for coordinated measures to protect the Palestine economic situation in the face of threatened disturbance resulting from the Italo-Ethiopian developments. S. Hoofien, director of the Anglo-Palestine Bank, deplored the panic and assured the public that the country's financial system was sound. In October, upon returning to Palestine after an absence of several months, Mayor Dizengoff of Tel-Aviv declared unjustified the state of panic among many Tel-Aviv inhabitants over the Italo-Ethiopian situation, and assured the public that the Government and the Jewish institutions were standing firm and that there was no cause for alarm.

When, toward the middle of October, the British Government proclaimed sanctions against Italy, the Palestine Government was forced to follow suit. The sanctions against Italy resulted in a sharp rise in prices in the Palestine citrus fruit trade.
On November 16, in a letter to the Manchester Guardian, Dr. Judah L. Magnes, president of the Hebrew University, suggested that Palestine be made a perpetually neutral state, exempted from participation in war and from the imposition of sanctions. The proposal was attacked by Colonel Josiah Wedgwood, M. P., and by Lord Melchett, in replies published in the same newspaper.

Fears were also aroused in Jewish circles by alleged Italian propaganda in Palestine. Frequent radio broadcasts in Arabic from the Italian station at Bari caused the British Government to bring the matter to the attention of the Italian Ambassador in London and resulted in the speeding of plans for a broadcasting station in Jerusalem.

The crisis caused by the Italo-Ethiopian situation began to disappear toward the end of October. The institutions which had been chiefly affected by it were small banks with little paid up capital. Confidence and normal conditions returned as the war scare lessened. However, the situation caused the Palestine Government to prepare banking reform legislation, so that such a financial crisis would not occur again. In February 1936, a new Banking Ordinance was issued, appointing an examiner for Palestine banks to prevent any abnormal increase in the number of banks, rather than reduce the number of already existing banks. The measure also gave the Palestine Government a direct and indirect control over banking affairs in the country.

On May 18, in an interview given in Jerusalem, Haile Selassie, fugitive Emperor of Ethiopia, who had stayed in Palestine for several weeks, voiced his thanks to world Jewry "for the special interest Jews have exhibited in the Ethiopian situation."

MEETING OF PERMANENT MANDATES COMMISSION

When, on May 27, 1936, the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations met in Geneva, reports that Italy, which had been linked in London to the Palestine disorders, might not participate proved groundless, since Marquis Alberto Theodoli of Italy, chairman of the commission, presided over the opening session and was reelected chairman for 1936.
In its report to the Commission, the Jewish Agency asked
the British Government to make Palestine immune from
further attacks on the part of Arabs. Reviewing briefly the
beginnings of the disorders, Dr. Chaim Weizmann pointed
out, in a letter accompanying the report:

“This is not for the first time that an attempt has been
made by the use of violence to force the hands of the
Mandatory Government into abandoning the policy of
the Jewish National Home and to deter the Jewish people
from proceeding with its work of settlement in Palestine . . .
The Jewish Agency trusts that the Mandatory Government
. . . . will not be deflected by any threats, strikes or violence
from carrying out its mandatory obligations.” He appealed
for encouragement of Jewish settlement and development,
declaring that “such a policy is urgently called for by the
conditions of dire economic distress and political persecu-
tion to which large sections of the Jewish people in the
Diaspora are now being subjected and that its adoption is
fully justified by the remarkable development of which
Palestine has shown itself capable in recent years as a
result of increased Jewish efforts.”

Dr. Weizmann also recommended a special grant of
immigration certificates based on the increasing employ-
ment needs of the country and the special needs of German
refugees, easing of the regulations governing the admittance
of relatives, increase in opportunities for absorption of
Jewish immigrants, legalization of the status of illegal
immigrants, abandonment of the proposed laws restricting
sale of land by Arabs, revision of land laws to halt fictitious
claims, revision of tariff, increased government support for
the Jewish health service, and increase of Jewish employes
in public works to one third of the total.

During the closed sessions of the Commission, Attorney
General Harry Herbert Trusted, representing Palestine,
reported on the Palestine situation. He voiced regret that
the unrest there had not subsided, declared that establish-
ment of order was considered by the Government of utmost
importance, and reported that the British and Palestinian
sections of the Palestine police had been strengthened and
the military garrison substantially increased to deal with
the situation, and that restrictive measures against agitators and strike leaders had also been taken.

Because Mr. Trusted refused to discuss the Palestine disturbances any further, his replies to questions on the proposed Legislative Council, Arab-Jewish relations, police and military questions, and other Palestine problems, were generally considered unsatisfactory, the Commission called a closed meeting June 2, without the accredited representative of Great Britain, to consider the procedure which was to be followed with regard to the Palestine Report. The majority opinion held that if the Mandatory Power would not give further information concerning the situation in Palestine, there was no sense in proceeding with the examination of Mr. Trusted's report. The Commission, therefore, proposed that the Mandatory Power be asked whether it was prepared to give further information or to submit a proper report at a later date. The next day the Commission decided to proceed with the examination of Great Britain's Palestine report for 1935, "in view of the impossibility of foreseeing at this stage when the desired information would be furnished."

On June 10, the British Government made public in London its report to the League of Nations on its administration of Palestine during 1935. The report ascribed the Palestine disorders in part to the contagion of the Italo-Ethiopian War and the Egyptian unrest and to Arab discontent arising from Jewish immigration and the sale of land to Jews. Although public security was well maintained, the report stated, the latter part of the year had not been free of tension and Arab discontent. This condition was constantly manifested, it declared, by vehement speeches and strongly worded articles in the press which reached their climax following the death of Sheikh Iz-ed-din, who was slain by police in a battle with brigands. The announcement of the legislative council plans of the Government, according to the report, exercised a tranquilizing effect. The report revealed that 61,854 Jewish immigrants entered Palestine in 1935, of whom 6,309 were capitalists bringing with them a minimum of $5,000 each. A total of 1,557 persons were found to have entered the country illegally,
of whom 565 were sentenced and recommended for deportation. Of the total illegal immigrants, 1,079 were deported, 245 of them being Jews. Jewish immigrants, the report declared, continued to gravitate mostly to the towns, but there was a slight movement at the year’s end to the settlements. “The prosperity enjoyed by the Jewish community in 1934,” the report stated, “was sustained during 1935 and manifested itself in a widening of activities until, towards the year-end, the uncertainty communicated by the international situation led to a general restriction and contraction of investment, building and industry.”

COMMUNAL ACTIVITIES

Hebrew University.—On July 2, 1935, the student body of the Hebrew University went on strike in an effort to enforce its demand for the addition of an agricultural school to the University. Continued reports that Dr. Judah L. Magnes had submitted his resignation as Chancellor of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem to the Board of Governors were officially denied in Lucerne, August 27, by Zalman Schocken, honorary treasurer of the University. Several days later, Dr. Magnes threatened to resign if additional funds to meet the institution’s requirements were not raised. In his report to the Governing Body of the University on September 10, Dr. Magnes declared that the Board of Governors had approved the agreement with the Hadassah Women’s Zionist Organization for the joint establishment of a Medical Centre. The Executive also affirmed the project of the English Zionist Federation to establish a Chair of English as a Moses Montefiore Memorial. The Board of Governors elected Dr. Chaim Weizmann chairman and the administration of the University was reorganized. The post of Chancellor was abolished, and Dr. Magnes agreed to serve as President of the University. Academic self-government was furthered by the institution of the offices of Rector, elected by the Senate, to act as academic head of the University, and of Deans elected by the various Faculties. In November, Dr. Weizmann announced the establishment of the Faculties of Mathematics, Natural Sciences and Chemical Physics.
Chief Rabbinate.—The death in Jerusalem on September 1, of Rabbi Abraham Isaac Ha-Kohen Kook, Chief Rabbi of Palestine and one of the most widely loved and respected figures in the Jewish world, plunged all Palestine into mourning. The Mizrachi Organization of Poland also proclaimed a day of mourning, and memorial services were held at the Zionist Congress in Lucerne. Rabbi Kook's death left open the post of Chief Rabbi of Palestine. In October, the Vaad Leumi announced that, in accordance with official regulations, an election to fill the vacancy would be held. In January, the Assembly of local Rabbis, meeting in Jerusalem independently of the Jewish institutions, elected Rabbi Zvi Pesach Frank to succeed Rabbi Kook. The Jewish institutions, however, announced that they would not recognize Rabbi Frank as Chief Rabbi. Meanwhile, the Gerrer Chasidim invited Rabbi Zemba to come to Palestine to be their Rabbi.

Labor Organizations.—In August 1935, workers belonging to the Labor Federation, Histadruth Haovdim, and the Hapoel Hamizrachi, the Orthodox labor group, clashed as a result of a labor dispute. The conflict was settled within a few days, and the two organizations agreed to cooperate in the future. On April 30, however, the orthodox Jewish labor organization broke off relations with the Histadruth Haovdim, charging that the latter was monopolizing employment. Similar labor disputes arose in September between the Histadruth and National Labor Federation (Revisionist).

On February 11, 1936, at the 33rd conference of the Palestine Labor Federation (Histadruth Haovdim), in Tel Aviv, it was reported that there were 3,000 unemployed in the cities and 1,200 unemployed in the colonies, although 8,000 new workers had obtained employment during 1935.

Jewish Medical Congress.—In August 1935, at the world conference of Jewish doctors held in Lucerne to discuss Jewish health conditions in various countries, plans were laid for the convocation of a World Jewish Medical Congress in Tel Aviv. On April 23, 1936, 300 physicians from all over the world gathered in Tel Aviv. The Congress adopted a resolution to establish a Jewish International Medical Organization, and discussed a proposal to establish a Medical Faculty at the Hebrew University.
In March, Moshe Smilansky, president of the Jewish Farmers' Association, issued a plea for intensive cultivation of Jewish land in Palestine. He pointed out that out of a total of 1,500,000 dunams of land owned by Jews apart from town property, 1,000,000 dunams are fit for intensive cultivation, although only 150,000 dunams are actually under such cultivation. He urged the introduction of a cooperative program to further the work.

On April 1, an appeal for contributions to a fund of $500,000, to aid the Jews in Poland, was made public in Tel Aviv at a meeting of the Olei Polania, organization of Polish Jews in Palestine.

MISCELLANEOUS EVENTS

On July 8, 1935, the Palestine government approved the loan of $650,000 from a London bank by the Vaad Leumi, the Jewish National Council of Palestine, to be used for erecting new Jewish school buildings.

Jewish State Party.—In the same month, the government refused to register the Jewish State Party unless it eliminated from its statutes the words "Jewish majority" and "within the historic boundaries of Palestine." After the passage was reworded the government agreed to register the party.

Japanese Dumping.—Palestine suffered in 1935 from Japanese dumping of silk and other goods. While Japan bought little from Palestine, she was able to sell goods at extremely low prices. This policy resulted in the failure, in July 1935, of an important Palestine silk firm, which had invested $400,000 in its business.

It was pointed out that, according to Article 18 of the Mandate, Palestine was not allowed to differentiate between members of the League of Nations in tariff matters. However, since Japan had withdrawn from the League, certain circles proposed drastic action against further dumping.

A delegation of Palestinian industrialists visited Sir Arthur Wauchope, High Commissioner, to ask protection against dumping from Japan, Czechoslovakia and other countries. They warned that many Palestinian industries
would be forced to close down unless they were protected. Mr. Johnson, Treasurer of the Palestine Government, ordered an inquiry into the causes for the shutting down of the Sacks Silk Mills.

On October 24, in a debate in the House of Parliament, Sir Wilfred Sugden questioned the Government concerning the dumping of goods which endangered the existence of many budding industries in Palestine, and was told that this activity could not be stopped owing to the Anglo-Japanese commercial treaty. In the same month, Nobumi Ito, Japanese representative at Geneva, declared to the Mandates Commission that, although no longer a member of the League of Nations, Japan insists on equal privileges in the Mandated territories, particularly in Palestine and Syria.

In December 1935, twenty-five trees were planted in the King George V Jubilee Forest, celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the reign of the King. A cypress tree, given by the King himself, was also planted.

In April, laborers digging on the site of the ancient city of Jericho unearthed synagogue mosaics more than 1,400 years old. The mosaics were inscribed in the Maccabean style, which was taken as evidence that the Jews must have remained in Jericho long after Joshua's death, contrary to theories that the Jews had deserted the city at that time. Further excavations uncovered a shrine dating back 5,000 years on the site of ancient Jericho. The excavators, directed by Professor John Garstang, also unearthed numerous relics of the neolithic age.

In February 1936, it was announced in New York that Arturo Toscanini, world-famous orchestra conductor, had accepted an invitation to conduct the opening concert of the Palestine Symphony Orchestra on October 24, 1936.

On March 31, 1936, the radio station of the Palestine Broadcasting Service was inaugurated in Jerusalem by High Commissioner Wauchope, who stressed the great benefits which Palestine farmers would derive from the service. The first program consisted of a broadcast of a military band, some Arab instrumental music, and Hebrew poetry and songs. Within four days, however, the station
created hard feelings between Jews and Arabs when the manager of the Arab section of the station was reported to have resigned because of the use of the Hebrew phrase, "Eretz Israel" (Land of Israel), by Hebrew announcers. The phrase was ruled off the air, and its initials, "Aleph Yud" (A.I.), were used in its place. This action aroused a storm of protest in the Hebrew press, and caused the Vaad Leumi to make representations to High Commissioner Wauchope. On April 10, Israel Amicam, a former official of the Government Posts and Telegraph Department, filed suit to force lifting of the ban, basing his case on photostatic copies of proclamations of the late King George V, published by the Palestine Government, addressed to the Jewish community, in which "Eretz Israel" was used repeatedly. On April 12, the Government ordered that only the phrase, "Jerusalem calling," should be used in broadcasts over the station. Meanwhile, it was disclosed that the inauguration of the new station had so spurred sales of radio sets that the Government was forced to issue 12,000 new permits to owners of sets.

On April 30, 1936, the Levant Fair opened in Tel Aviv in the presence of 12,000 persons, and lasted till June 6. Designed as an international trade and industries exhibition, the Fair was forced to open with only Palestine products on display, all foreign exhibitors having been obliged to postpone their showing until the arrival of merchandise from Jaffa, where it was tied up as a result of the Arab general strike. The Fair was opened by High Commissioner Wauchope, who voiced his regrets at the disturbances but expressed confidence that they would not interfere with the normal economic development of the country. Colonial Secretary J. H. Thomas participated in the opening ceremonies by broadcasting a brief greeting from London. On May 6, the foreign pavilions of the Levant Fair opened for the first time. More than 300,000 persons visited the Fair during the 36 days it was in progress.

On May 6, it was estimated that $500,000 had been withdrawn within a few days from the Polska Kasa Opieki, semi-official Polish bank, as a result of Poland's new currency laws forbidding export of gold or foreign exchange. The press reported that Palestine Jews had suffered a loss
of approximately $600,000 because of the reduced exchange rates. The restriction on export of foreign exchange made it impossible for Polish Jews in Palestine to meet their real estate and other obligations.

Other Countries

Afghanistan.—In August 1935, the Afghan Consul in Bombay denied reports that anti-Jewish discrimination existed in Afghanistan. The Jewish press, however, reported anti-Jewish outbreaks in Kabul, the capital, and declared that Afghan Jewry lives in constant terror. It was later reported that the Afghan Government had deported all the Jews of Kabul to a remote village in the interior. In February, insisting that Jews were not persecuted there, the Afghan consul in Bombay refused to issue visas for a Jewish deputation to visit Afghanistan to investigate the condition of Jews in that country.

Australia.—In January 1936, the Jewish citizens of New South Wales presented an address to Sir Isaac Isaacs, retiring as Governor-General of Australia, expressing “humble and warm appreciation of your [his] unceasing devoted and successful efforts to enhance the prestige of the Commonwealth of Australia in the sisterhood of Nations comprising the British Empire.” In acknowledging the message, Sir Isaac said that he accepted it in the spirit in which it was offered, “that is, in recognition and grateful appreciation of the fact that in Australia, as throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations, religious belief creates no distinction whatever with regard to the duties and rights of citizenship or the opportunities of public service.” During March, at the instigation of a lawyer recently returned from Germany, an attempt was made in Perth, Western Australia, to form a branch of the Nazi Party. The organization announced its opposition to Jews, Catholics and Freemasons.

India.—In April 1936, derogatory utterances about India attributed to Chancellor Hitler evoked a movement for the boycotting of the Olympic Games and of German goods. Nationalist papers printed sharp attacks on Hitler, and, in
a newspaper article, K. F. Nariman, Mayor of Bombay, condemned him and expressed sympathy for the German Jews. A meeting of the National Students League adopted a resolution calling for a boycott of the Games, and the Bombay Chronicle declared that such action “will no doubt serve as an eloquent and dignified expression of the resentment caused in India” by Hitler’s attitude.

Luxembourg.—In March 1936, a demand for prohibition of shehitah in the Duchy of Luxembourg, voiced in the Chamber by a Socialist deputy, was categorically rejected by the Government; Premier Bech, a member of the Catholic Party, declared that such a prohibition would be contrary to the spirit of religious tolerance.

In the preceding month, representatives of eleven nations took part in the International Congress of the League for Human Rights, in Luxembourg. The gathering adopted resolutions appealing to the conscience of the world to condemn anti-Jewish persecutions in Germany and in Poland, and to fight against such medieval methods, and demanding that the Governments not only offer an asylum for German political refugees but also grant them the right to work.

Manchukuo.—Late in June 1935, six White Russians went on trial in Harbin, on the charge of having kidnapped and murdered the son of Simon Kasper, a local French-Jewish diamond dealer. On July 1, 1935, the proceedings were postponed. The accused endeavored to give the trial a political character, alleging that they wanted to avenge Russia for the misrule to which it has been subjected by Jews in high Soviet circles.

In October, Harbin Jews were outraged by the raid of police authorities who, at the supposed instigation of “White Russians,” entered a synagogue “in search of arms and of banned literature.” The Manchukuo Government was severely criticized for permitting such a step. The local Jewish press reported that anti-Jewish terrorism was widespread in the district, several Jews having been kidnapped, and an anti-Jewish boycott instituted. During Yom Kippur the Manchukuoan police searched the homes of prominent Jewish public men and philanthropists in Harbin. These
and similar anti-Jewish activities were believed to be inspired by White Russians, in reprisal for a protest campaign by Shanghai Jews against their Jew-baiting activities in Manchukuo. During April, anti-Jewish agitators carried out a brutal program of kidnappings and arrests in order to extort large sums of money from local Jewish businessmen. In May, the Mukden Jewish community was horrified to learn that Sender Koletz, a 60-year-old Jewish photographer, had been arrested by White Guards as a Soviet spy and had been tortured to death during efforts to extract a confession from him. The official news agency reported that he had "committed suicide" by taking poison while in prison.

Turkey.—In January 1936, the Jewish community of Istanbul was disturbed by continued reports in the foreign press to the effect that Jewish schools would be forced by the government to close down. H. Reisner, vice-president of the Jewish Community, denied this report and revealed that the Turkish Government had, in fact, granted to the schools a special relief fund of 10,000 Turkish pounds, of which Jewish educational institutions received a part. On June 20, Michon Ventura, professor of Roman law at the University of Istanbul, was appointed chief rabbi of Turkey, succeeding the late Haim Bidjarano.

INTERNATIONAL MATTERS

Following is an account of important events which could not be treated in connection with any one country.

Zionist Congress.—The nineteenth (biennial) World Zionist Congress was held at Lucerne, Switzerland, August 20 to September 3, 1935.

Before the opening of the Congress, a representative of the German Zionist Federation arrived in Lucerne to attempt to prevent the gathering from discussing persecution of Jews in Germany. The representative declared that the German delegation would be forced to leave in a body if such a discussion arose. Dr. Stephen S. Wise, of New York
City, announced that he would fight any attempt to suppress anti-Nazi discussion and that he and other delegates would walk out if the question did not arise. The validity of the American elections for the Congress was questioned in a petition submitted to the Congress Court by the Jewish State Party, which charged "improper conduct of the elections at the polling stations" and accused the Labor Zionists of selling shekolin to anyone, Zionist or non-Zionist, promising to vote for the Labor ticket. The objection was overruled by the Congress Court, which, however, invalidated more than 600 votes cast in the Chicago district.

At the Conference of Labor delegates, David ben-Gurion, Palestine Labor leader, proposed a plan for re-organization of national Zionist organizations, providing for Zionist organizations in each country, consisting of all Zionist groups, with their administrative bodies composed of representatives, in the same proportion as the various factions are represented at the World Congress. The Laborites offered two seats in the next Executive to the Mizrachi organization in order to lay a basis for a coalition Executive.

The Congress was formally opened by Dr. Nahum Sokolow, president of the World Zionist Organization, who reviewed the progress of Zionism during the preceding two years. He pleaded for understanding with the Arabs, for freer immigration and for colonization of Transjordania, and called for unity in Israel.

A message from Malcolm McDonald, British Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, declaring that the government is determined to carry out its dual obligation, as to both Jews and Arabs, was received coldly by the delegates. Greetings were also received from David Lloyd George and from the British Parliamentary Committee for Palestine, signed by Colonel Josiah Wedgwood, Lord Hartington and Barnett Janner.

High Commissioner James G. McDonald was accorded an ovation when, on behalf of the Government body of the High Commission for Refugees from Germany, he expressed deep appreciation of the activities of the Zionist Organization and of other bodies in the Jewish Agency, in facilitating the immigration of refugees to Palestine.
David ben-Gurion criticized the British Government for its Palestine immigration policy. Professor Selig Brodetsky, member of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, delivered a violent attack on the Revisionists for attempting to split the Zionist movement.

Reporting as chairman of the Central Bureau for the Settlement of German Jews, Dr. Weizmann declared that Palestine's absorption of 25,000 German-Jewish immigrants since March 1933, was proof that Palestine will stand the test as the Jewish national home. Praising the enterprise and energy of the immigrants, he said that the problem of the German refugees remained unsolved, and that his Bureau was overwhelmed with requests to grant refugee certificates. Dr. Arthur Ruppin, director of the Bureau's Palestine office, emphasized that its guiding principle has been to settle the refugees on the land as well as in manual occupations and in industry.

The General Zionist Group B. fraction began a movement to suppress discussion of the Jewish situation in Germany and to prevent anti-Nazi speeches at the Congress. Meanwhile, M. M. Ussishkin, president of the Jewish National Fund, demanded the raising of a £1,000,000 fund within two years for the redemption of land in Palestine, and the Congress unanimously decided to establish a colony in Palestine in honor of Miss Henrietta Szold, founder of the Hadassah, American Women's Zionist Organization.

On August 22, the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Palestine published its report. It described the preceding two years as a period of unprecedented increase in Jewish immigration into Palestine and "of an equally unprecedented struggle with the Government on the immigration issue"; and drew attention to the fact that the Government's estimates of the absorptive capacity in Palestine fell far short of those of the Jewish Agency, but "that the official estimates of the country's capacity to absorb immigrant labor have been steadily increasing, both absolutely and in relation to the estimates of the Jewish Agency, and that in spite of the increasing deductions the net schedule figures have also risen." Regarding the proposed legislative council for Palestine, the report declared that representatives of the Jewish Agency had "expressed the fundamental and categorical
opposition of the Jewish Agency to the proposed constitutional reform." The report also disclosed that the number of Palestinian workers had increased from an estimated 40,000 in the summer of 1933, to 64,000 in May 1935. "The Labor Department made great efforts to place the newly-arrived Chalutzim in agricultural work, but despite its efforts and those of the Histadruth, it was impossible to satisfy the demands for agricultural laborers. There was, on the other hand, a steady increase in numbers of Arabs employed in Jewish groves."

The Federation of Jewish Societies of France, representing 80,000 Jews, sent a message to the Congress protesting against the continuation of the German-Palestinian transfer agreement; the Jewish Ex-Servicemen's Association of France, the League for Combating Anti-Semitism, and the Poale Zion, Left-wing Zionist Organization, also joined the protest.

Unity in Zionist ranks was furthered by an agreement reached at the Congress between the regular Zionists and the Mizrachi, Orthodox Zionists. The latter agreed to modify their demand for sanctions against violators of the religious requirements of the Sabbath in Palestine, and declared their readiness to join the presidium as well as all Committees of the Congress. Accordingly, Rabbi Meier Berlin, Mizrachi leader, took his place as Mizrachi member of the presidium. In the general debate, Berl Locker, head of the Organization Department of the Zionist Executive, also invited the Revisionists to resume contact with the Zionist Organization.

In the name of the American delegation, Morris Rothenberg, president of the Zionist Organization of America, presented a five-point program, and demanded that an economic commission be established to coordinate private and national economic enterprises in Palestine.

Outright condemnation of German persecution of Jews was voiced by Rabbi Wise, and the formal attitude of the Congress was made clear by Dr. Weizmann's announcement that the gathering would adjourn for a half-day as a sign of mourning over the anti-Jewish events in Germany. Dr. Weizmann called for a renewed effort for the upbuilding of Palestine as the only dignified reply to the Nazi persecution.
A special committee, with Rabbi Wise as chairman, was created by the Congress to study the question of the transfer agreement with Germany.

The report of the American Economic Committee for Palestine was submitted to the Congress by Israel B. Brodie, president. It outlined a program of acceleration of the absorptive capacity of Palestine, particularly in relation to the industrial development of the country, and proposed the establishment of an industrial bank and the adoption of "an enlightened and flexible tariff policy suited to Palestine needs."

The proposal of Israel M. Sieff, London economist, that a national loan of £5,000,000 be floated for the development of Palestine, was referred to the Budget Committee, which appointed a sub-committee of experts to report on this plan as well as on Mr. Brodie's proposal.

The Congress adopted resolutions appealing to public opinion throughout the world to assist Jews in rebuilding a national home in Palestine; emphasizing the Jewish desire to live in peace and harmony with the Arabs; appealing to Great Britain "to generously fulfill its obligations under the Balfour Declaration, by initiating an active and systematic policy of furthering the development of the Jewish National Home on a scale and on a basis which the position of the Jews in the world demands and which the development of Palestine, given free scope for Jewish efforts and active assistance on the part of the Government, can make possible"; and protesting against the proposed Legislative Council because it relegates the Jews of Palestine "to the position of a minority."

At the closing session on September 3, Dr. Weizmann was elected President; Dr. Nahum Sokolow, honorary president; and M. M. Ussishkin president of the Actions Committee. The new Zionist Executive was composed of David ben-Gurion, Moshe Shertok, Eliezer Kaplan, Laborites; Isaac Gruenbaum, Professor Selig Brodetsky, Group A. General Zionists; Dr. Rottenstreich, Group B. General Zionists; and Rabbi Fishman, Mizrachi. The plan put forward by David ben-Gurion for reorganization of the Zionist Organization on a territorial basis was adopted by the Congress. Other resolutions adopted included a demand for expulsion from
the Zionist Organization of those refusing to employ Jewish labor in Palestine; for a free hand for the Jewish Agency in distributing immigration certificates; for negotiations with the Soviet Government for larger emigration of Russian Zionists; for the assignment of 55% of the certificates to chalutzim and one-third of the remainder to artisans; that colonization of middle-class Jews be increased; that the Government protect Palestine industries against foreign dumping; etc.

Over the objections of the German delegates, a strongly-worded resolution condemning Nazi Germany for its persecution of the Jews was adopted. Another resolution favored the convocation of a World Jewish Congress for the defense of Jewish political rights and of the economic existence of the Jewish people. The transfer agreement with Germany was upheld despite strong opposition.

On August 13, a world conference of Jewish National Fund representatives and workers opened in Lucerne. M. M. Ussishkin, chairman of the Board of Directors, complained that the Jews owned only six and one-half percent of the land in Palestine, despite the fact that the Jewish population is more than twenty-six percent of the total. A resolution was adopted expressing grave concern at the dangerous development of land speculation in Palestine, calling upon all Jewish institutions in Palestine and abroad to combat the peril, and asking the Zionist Congress to create a central body for the control of land concessions. A new agreement between the Jewish National Fund and the Keren Hayesod (Palestine Foundation Fund) for the coordination of fund-raising campaigns also was adopted.

The Jewish Agency.—The fourth (biennial) session of the Council of the Jewish Agency for Palestine opened in Lucerne following the Zionist Congress. Reporting on behalf of the Executive, Dr. Arthur Ruppin declared that continued prosperity and economic progress in Palestine are assured despite frequent assertions that the country was headed for an economic crisis, and that its "boom" was about to end. "A temporary setback in the progress of the work is to be expected," he said, "since no country can hope to escape such natural consequences. But this setback, when it does
come, will not affect Palestine deeply for two important reasons. The first of these is the readiness of the Government of Palestine to expend half of its £6,000,000 surplus on a programme of public works, if and when the situation warrants such an expenditure. The second is the continuous stream of capital of Jews outside Palestine which is flowing into the country."

The Council issued an appeal to the Jewish world to raise a million pounds within two years to finance the colonization of 2,000 workers' families in Palestine. An agreement was reached between Zionist and non-Zionist members, giving three seats on the Executive to non-Zionists instead of the two they previously held. Speakers at the gathering urged support of the Agency's work in Palestine and criticized the Mandatory Power for restricting the immigration of Jewish labor. On November 11, David ben-Gurion was appointed president of the Executive, sharing the political work of the Jewish Agency with Moshe Shertok. Other appointments were Eliezer Kaplan, treasurer; Isaac Gruenbaum, head of the Labor Department; and Dr. Werner Senator, head of the Immigration Department. In November, the Jewish Agency submitted to the League of Nations a plan to take 200,000 Jews out of Germany within six years and settle them in Palestine.

On November 28, at a conference of Jewish relief organizations in Geneva held under the auspices of the Jewish Agency, the proposed establishment of a liquidation bank to help German Jews transfer their capital to other countries, under a German-Jewish agreement similar to the Palestine transfer agreement, was opposed by a majority of representatives who decided not to present the plan to the League of Nations Committee of Experts studying the refugee situation.

On September 11, the First International Conference of the Youth-Aliyah Committees, held in Amsterdam, discussed the problems of training and preparing German-Jewish youths for life under the conditions now prevailing.

New Zionist Organization.—In September 1935, the New Zionist Organization (Revisionists) reported the following returns in the voting for its first constituent congress:
Poland 298,532; Eastern Galicia, 97,000; West Galicia, 40,000; Palestine, 27,000; Czechoslovakia, 38,000; Lithuania, 22,000; North America, 20,000. On September 8, the first Congress of the New Zionist Organization opened in Vienna. Vladimir Jabotinsky, president, submitted a ten-year plan to settle 1,500,000 Jews on both sides of the Jordan; announced that a bank with a capital of $500,000 would be established by the Revisionists to further the development of Palestine; attacked the Palestine Government for its immigration, land reserve, and Transjordan policies; and assailed the proposed Legislative Council as unwise and dangerous. Mr. Jabotinsky repudiated the accusation that he and his organization were Fascist in tendency. Outlining the constitution of the new organization, Dr. Oscar Rabinowitch asserted that “the New Zionist Organization is no Jewish Party, it is Jewry itself.” He declared that all Jews were automatically members of the New Zionist Organization, without distinction of class or private views and that therefore the Organization represented world Jewry. Dr. Rabinowitch declared that, considering itself the representative body of world Jewry, the New Zionist Organization would demand recognition by Great Britain and by the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations as the Jewish Agency for Palestine, as well as the eventual granting of a seat in the League of Nations. Over the objection of Jacob de Haas, American delegate, who declared that American Jews were opposed to militaristic activities, the Congress appointed a special committee on the Jewish Legion. The motion was defended on the ground that it had nothing to do with militarism, but was only a matter of affording adequate protection to Jewish peace.

On September 11, the Congress adopted a constitution. It proclaimed the aims of the organization to be: “First, the creation of a Jewish majority on both sides of the Jordan; secondly, the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine on the basis of reason and justice and in the spirit of the Torah; thirdly, the repatriation to Palestine of all the Jews who wish to be repatriated there; fourthly, the liquidation of the Diaspora.” The constitution provides for the establishment of a Parliament, to be known as the Zionist National Assembly, to be convoked once every three
years. The Congress adopted a resolution condemning the German-Palestinian transfer agreement and calling upon all Jews to denounce and terminate it. During the debate on the resolution, B. Y. Jacobi of London accused the Haavara (transfer agency) of giving back to the German Jews only 39% of the entire amount of goods imported from Germany, and asserted that several Jewish organizations were receiving large benefits through the agreement.

The Congress elected Vladimir Jabotinsky as president of the organization, and set up an Executive Committee with headquarters in London. Among the resolutions adopted were those demanding a more equitable interpretation of the Balfour Declaration by the British Government, opposing the proposed Legislative Council, calling for the establishment of a Jewish State, and condemning labor disputes in Palestine.

In November, the first plenary meeting of the Executive of the New Zionist Organization, held in Paris, decided to proceed with the creation of national federations of the New Zionist Organization in different countries, to launch a national loan, and to prepare details of the proposed immigration plan. On March 17, 1936, Vladimir Jabotinsky, president of the New Zionist Organization, announced in London that the first world convention of the organization would take place in August 1936. This convention, he said, would pave the way for formation of a National Assembly, to be elected once every three years by all Jews, irrespective of ideological differences.

**Hicem.**—In March, 1936, the Executive Committee of the HICEM (Hias-Ica-Emigration Association), meeting in Paris, approved a resolution to convene, in July, a general Jewish emigration conference, to be attended by representatives of all the committees affiliated with the HICEM in countries of emigration, transit and immigration, of the organizations providing assistance to refugees from Germany in different countries, and of certain organizations concerned in Jewish emigration which have worked in close contact with the HICEM. Edouard Oungre, Director of HICEM reported that the organization had helped more
than 3,000 refugees to emigrate from Germany during 1935, making a total of 13,667, from May 1933 to February 1936.

High Commission for Refugees.—On July 17, 1935, a public session of the Governing Body of the High Commission for Refugees Coming from Germany took place in London, presided over by Viscount Cecil of Chelwood. High Commissioner McDonald declared that the meeting must “consider a basis for the definite liquidation at the end of this year of the High Commission for Refugees from Germany and the transfer of its responsibility to a new organization directly responsible to the League of Nations.” He declared that the work of the Commission was two-thirds done. He stated that some 36,000 refugees had been settled overseas, 18,000 had been repatriated in Central and Eastern Europe, and from 5,000 to 10,000 had been established elsewhere. He estimated that, out of a total of 80,000 refugees since January 1933, approximately 15,000 were still unplaced.

“The plight of thousands of these is now grave,” he declared. “They and others must soon become desperate unless the present tendency to deny to unsettled refugees opportunities to work is reversed . . . I see no prospect that this task can be carried forward to completion except under the direction of an organization created by the League of Nations as an integral part of the League system, and empowered to act on behalf of all the categories of refugees—Russians, Armenians, Assyrians, and others as well as Germans.”

Mr. McDonald also reported that immigration to South American countries is at present restricted to agriculturists; referred to Palestine as “the chief country of refuge for the Jewish exiles from Germany”; praised the work of private organizations in Europe and America, and reported that “since April 1933, a sum approaching two million pounds has been collected and distributed on behalf of the refugees.” To this total, American Jews had contributed $3,000,000, British Jews $2,500,000, and the rest came from the Jews of France, Holland, Denmark and elsewhere.

The High Commissioner stated flatly that “it is . . . impossible . . . to recommend in any case any persons who had left Germany to return,” and reported that there had
been no further dealing with the German Government with regard to economic questions of refugees, such as that of remittances of incomes from Germany to the refugees.

The subject of the resignation of Mr. McDonald, is treated at length in the United States section of this Review.

League of Nations and Refugee Questions.—In July, 1935, the urgent need for dealing comprehensively with the refugee problem was expressed in a memorandum circulated by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations to the Assembly, Council and members. The memorandum was submitted by the Norwegian Government, which asked that the question of international assistance to refugees be placed on the agenda of the approaching sixteenth Assembly of the League. The Norwegian Government supported High Commissioner McDonald's plea for the establishment of a central organization at Geneva to carry out for all refugees the functions exercised by the Nansen Office for certain groups. Denmark, Finland and Sweden supported the Norwegian Government's proposal.

On September 13, after debating the Norwegian Government's plan, the Sixth Committee of the Assembly of the League of Nations decided to appoint a sub-committee composed of representatives of fifteen states to study the question and report on it at a later date. On September 1, the Sixth Committee adopted a resolution of its sub-committee, practically rejecting the proposal of the Norwegian Government, confirming previous plans for the liquidation of the Nansen office, and leaving to the League Council the question of the refugees, under the supervision of the High Commission for Refugees from Germany. The Council, in turn, appointed a Commission of five experts to study the problem. On September 24, the League Assembly adopted the report of the Sixth Committee.

The Assembly decided to ask the Council to appoint a small committee of experts to "collect all useful evidence, particularly that of the Inter-Governmental Advisory Commission for Refugees."

Appearing before this committee, Major T. F. Johnson, secretary-general of the Nansen Office, disclosed that the Nansen Office was engaged in assisting Jewish refugees
from the Saar to settle in Brazil and Paraguay. A special commissioner had been sent to South American countries for this purpose, and about 8,000 refugees from the Saar, Jewish and non-Jewish, had been furnished with Nansen passports. At hearings conducted by the Committee, representatives of central Jewish organizations demanded the establishment of a special agency for dealing with German refugees.

On December 8, the Committee of Experts completed its report on the refugee problem, and made public its recommendations. The Committee unanimously recommended the appointment of a person to carry on the work of the High Commission for Refugees from Germany, to convocate an intergovernmental conference to draw up a unified legal code for refugees, and to work out a program for the increased emigration of German refugees into such countries as Palestine, South America and elsewhere. The Committee made two alternative proposals for the solution of the refugee problem. One of these, adopted by four votes to one, recommended the appointment of an eminent personality as president of the Nansen Office, which would include a special organization dealing with German refugees; after the liquidation of this office at the end of 1938, the special organization for German refugees would become an autonomous League body. The alternative proposal recommended, in case the first proposal were rejected, the creation of an autonomous international organization under League auspices, for the protection of German refugees. In an minority report Signor de Michelis, Italian member of the Committee, recommended that the protection of the refugees be entrusted to private organizations. In February 1936, Michael Hansen, of Norway, was appointed president of the Governing Body of the Nansen International Office for Refugees.

On February 18, announcement was made of the appointment of Major-General Sir Neill Malcolm as League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees from Germany, to succeed James G. McDonald. Sir Neill declared he would not be concerned with the charitable aspects of the work, which are handled by private organizations, but only with "the political and legal side after people have become refugees."
Sir Neill stated that he would not carry on with the work of settling and assisting refugees from Germany, which was being conducted provisionally by Professor Norman Bentwich. On March 19, Joseph A. C. Avenol, secretary-general of the League of Nations, sent out invitations to member States of the League as well as to the Governments of the United States and Brazil, to take part in an Inter-Governmental Conference to be held at Geneva on July 2, which was to decide the legal status of refugees from Germany.

On February 23, the Juridical-Political Commission of the International Union of League of Nations Societies met. Prior to the meeting, the Dutch League of Nations Society adopted a resolution demanding that the Union ask either for annulment of the Nuremburg laws, or for the grant to German Jews of the status of a national minority. On the Dutch group's initiative, the Commission adopted a resolution to be proposed at the annual conference of the International Union at Glasgow on May 31. The resolution declared that the German legislation concerning "non-Aryans," their treatment, and, in general, Germany's policy in the sphere of religion and freedom of thought "violate the generally accepted principles of justice" and cause serious difficulties to other states; and that these policies will make difficult "the resumption of Germany's international cooperation with the rest of the world"; and recommending "the next meeting of the League of Nations should find an opportunity for examining these different measures, an examination which is demanded by the present position of the Jews." The German League of Nations Society announced its withdrawal from the Union because of this stand, and was dissolved by the Nazi authorities.

On June 4, the plenary session at Glasgow of the International Union of League of Nations Societies unanimously adopted the Dutch resolution, and also a resolution asking the British Government to facilitate immigration of Jewish refugees to Palestine "to the utmost extent consistent with the Mandate."