Western Europe

Great Britain

"It is not going to be an easy year," Prime Minister Harold Wilson promised the Labour party early in 1968. This prediction was fully vindicated regarding the fortunes of the government, as well as the general well-being of the country. Despite frequent revolts by government supporters in parliament—over income policy, charges for doctors' prescriptions, cuts in social services, the emergency bill to control the entry of Asians from Kenya—the position of the government itself was never seriously imperiled. However, this was not because the government had any successes to its credit. Its record was marked not so much by failure, as by an inability to make its collective will prevail. This was not so serious in the case of Rhodesia, where Wilson, defying the suspicions of leftwing backbenchers, made a bold, if vain, attempt to secure a settlement with Ian Smith, Rhodesia's rebel prime minister. Here, in any case, was the possibility of a settlement; Wilson's proposals for a transition to constitutional rule remained on the table for Smith to take up when he thought the time opportune.

The government's failure was most serious in the economic field. The year began with the hope that the impetus of the November 1967 devaluation would lead to an export-led boom. The devaluation was swiftly followed, in January, by government decisions (involving a total cut of £300 million in 1968-69 spending) to cancel the manufacture of 50 F 111 aircraft, withdraw from the Persian Gulf and the Far East by 1971, and defer to 1973 raising the school-leaving age. In March followed tough budget-bringing tax increases of £923 million, and, in November, a supplementary "budget" designed to raise another £250 million. The only sign of relaxation was a two-stage reduction in bank rate from eight to seven per cent. In March and September world bankers made extensive credits to avert what at times seemed the possibility of a second enforced devaluation.

These policies were adopted to bring about a balance of payments surplus and, indeed, progress was made: by November British exports were some 34 per cent above their average in the third quarter of 1967. But any anticipated benefits were all but nullified by soaring imports which, in the first three quarters of 1968, were £942 million higher than in the same period.
of 1967. It remained to be seen to what extent a new requirement for deposit with the governments of 50 per cent of import costs would succeed in checking imports. In the last quarter of 1968, at least, the current balance of payments appeared to have reached equilibrium. In the meantime, the current deficit in 1968 was estimated at some £470 million, compared with £404 million in 1967. The prospect for 1969 was now estimated at a surplus ranging between £70 and £220 million.

Continued failure to improve the economy undermined the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer Roy Jenkins. The malaise spread to the Labour party, where persistently false assumptions about recovery gave rise to bewilderment and a sense of impotence. The state of industrial relations was also discouraging. The total working days (3,874,000) lost through strikes in the first nine months of the year was greater than in any full year since 1962.

In the country at large, election results reflected disillusion with Labour. In the 11 by-elections during the year, the Conservatives captured five seats from the government, including the Nelson and Colne seat, formerly held by Sydney Silverman. The Tories increased their share of the by-election polls by an average of 12 per cent; that of Labour dropped by 19 per cent. Opinion polls (Gallup and Opinion Research Centre) quite consistently put the Tories in the lead, with a majority of 25 to 27 per cent. Most interesting was the emergence of Celtic nationalism in Scotland and Wales. Though its strength has not been fully tested, especially in Scotland, the Welsh Nationalist party Plaid Cymru took strong second place, with 29 per cent of the votes in the July elections at Caerphilly; Labour lost more than 28 per cent of its vote. All polls indicated a loss of public confidence in the ability of Premier Wilson, personally, and his government, collectively, to manage the national economy. The only solace for Labour was that, despite evidence of a surge towards the Tories, the personal rating of Tory leader Edward Heath actually dropped slightly over the year. Also, commentators agreed that positive enthusiasm for the Conservatives was lacking. This was not surprising, since it reflected the acceptance by both parties of the major objectives of limiting imports and stimulating exports. What was at stake was the means—and here Heath's call for heavier cuts in public expenditure, as opposed to higher taxation, failed to find enthusiastic approval.

It is from this negative approach to both parties that the idea of a coalition emerged, most notably when aired in The Times at the beginning of December. While the idea found no substantial support in political circles, it still was a symptom of disillusion with the parliamentary process itself. The devaluation of the language of politics, through repeated exhortations and promises of better things, brought with it the danger of dramatic but specious panaceas. Though Enoch Powell, a former Conservative cabinet member accused of fanning racial prejudice, so far limited himself to the problems raised by colored immigrants, and though Heath felt obliged to
dismiss him from the Conservative party Shadow Cabinet, he was seen by some as a candidate for a more central political role.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

Every newlywed Jewish couple in Britain, of whatever section of the community, was to receive from the British Friends of Ephrath (the Israel-based society for the encouragement of a higher Jewish birth rate) a pamphlet indicating the seriousness of the Jewish demographic position. The need for Ephrath's warning was made manifest in the results of a survey, conducted by the research unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and published in the June 1968 issue of the *Jewish Journal of Sociology*, Dr. S. J. Prais, honorary consultant to the research unit, recalled that its first report had disclosed a decline in the number of synagogue marriages from an average of 2,876 in 1941–1950 to 1,817 between 1963 and 1966 (AJYB, 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 439). The most recent marriage figures, Dr. Prais added, showed that there were only 78 persons marrying in a synagogue, to every 100 deaths. This compared with a ratio in the general population of England and Wales of 127 marriages to 100 deaths.

The unit's new report reached the general conclusion that "the community as a whole is currently declining in that the intake into the affiliated community (as measured by the number of persons marrying in a synagogue) is insufficient to offset the number dying." The rate of intake was declining at 15 to 20 per cent a decade. The provincial communities were declining more rapidly than the London community. The researchers used the indirect "death-ratio" method, since census returns do not give the religion of British citizens. This method worked back from the figures of Jewish mortality on the assumption that the ratio of deaths to population for Jews was comparable to that for the general population. Adjustments were made for the somewhat lower Jewish mortality rates in other countries.

This method of calculation arrived at an estimated total of 410,000 Jews in Great Britain—280,000 in the London area and 130,000 in the provinces. Estimated totals related to all persons who, no matter how remote their ties with the organized community, "sufficiently identify themselves with the community to be buried (or cremated) under synagogue auspices at the end of their lives."

The decline seemed largest within the Orthodox Anglo-Jewish community, where only 72 persons married for every 100 deaths. Comparable figures for the Reform and Liberal sections were 154 and 123 per 100 deaths. But the latter two accounted for only 10 per cent of Anglo-Jewry (Reform 6 per cent, Liberal 4 per cent), so their growth did not compensate for the deficiency in the Orthodox section. Here, the Sephardim (3 per cent of London Jewry) showed a rise, but this was probably attributable to recent immigration. On the other hand, if there were fewer Jews, a higher proportion had formal synagogal affiliation. Thus the present figure of 61 per cent
synagogue affiliation for London Jewry compares with only 35 per cent in 1933.

**Student Attitudes**

Before and after the Israeli-Arab six-day war, 155 Jewish undergraduates (115 males and 40 females) at the universities of Cambridge, Manchester, London, and Essex were interviewed by Miss Vera West, a sociology research worker at Essex University, for the purpose of determining the different ways in which students felt Jewish and of recording their feelings about Israel before and during the war. The findings were published in the Spring 1968 issue of the *Wiener Library Bulletin*. The students were predominantly middle-class and third-generation British. About 60 per cent did not regard religion as the central part of their Jewishness, though they thought they might continue to observe certain laws.

Persecution, and particularly Nazism, moved the students to attach more importance to their Jewishness than might otherwise have been the case. The Holocaust intensified their Jewish awareness. Some drew from it political implications, committing them to action outside the Jewish group. They felt a responsibility to prevent discrimination, like that suffered by the Jews, against other people. Even before the war, all but 28 of the 155 students were more interested in Israel than in other foreign countries, and 45 were seriously considering *aliyah*. Two groups expressing complete indifference to Israel were “those who consider themselves wholly English,” and those who rejected any national identity. After the outbreak of the war, the study found, most students supported Israel despite earlier differences. Only the left-wingers had divided loyalties “when Israel became identified in their circles with American imperialism.” Over-all, 20 per cent of students dissociated themselves from Jewish life in Israel or the diaspora; 20 per cent upheld traditional Judaism, with the majority oriented towards Israel.

Student political activity centered on protest marches and vigils, in October, in support of Soviet Jewry and, in November, in support of Polish students awaiting trial following demonstrations in March. The latter participated in the international protest day proclaimed by the World Union of Jewish Students.

In July hopes were frustrated for a single intersectarian university chaplaincy, when the Chief Rabbi declared that only the strictly Orthodox could serve as chaplains, and only with his approval. However, on the material side, despite justified complaints by Hillel student counsellor Malcolm Weisman about lavish expenditure on synagogues while student needs were neglected, students were provided with a new Hillel House at Sussex and a new kosher kitchen for the Jewish and Israel Society at Essex. In March demolition also began in London, preparatory to the erection of another Hillel House, combined with a nine-floor B’nai B’rith center.
Education

The year saw notable developments, favorable and unfavorable, at all levels of Jewish education. At university level, a favorable trend prevailed. At Glasgow University, a new lectureship in modern Hebrew was created with funds provided by the Israel government and the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture. S. C. Reif, an outstanding graduate of Jews' College, was appointed to fill this post, beginning January 1969. At the same date, this author was scheduled to take office as the first Bearsted lecturer in Jewish history at the new University of Warwick. Professor S. Stein, head of the Hebrew and Jewish studies department at University College, London, reported in the summer that he expected student attendance in his department at the beginning of the new academic year to be one-third larger than in October 1967. At Oxford, new regulations adopted in September made it possible to take B.A. Honours in biblical, mishnaic, medieval, and modern Hebrew, without the obligatory additional language. Before, students had to choose between mishnaic and modern Hebrew, to be taken with biblical Hebrew and another language (e.g. Aramaic, Syriac, Arabic, and others).

By contrast, the position of Jews' College became more precarious because of the resignation of deputy-principal Rabbi J. Ross and the retirement of Rabbi K. Kahana at the end of the academic year in July. This left the college with only two full-time lecturers, both of them within two years of retirement age. So far the college has not been able to attract a young academic staff, either at home or from abroad. Also, the resignation of the college secretary, Sefton Solomon, could not but weaken its administration.

The departing deputy-principal declared that a complete "revolution" was needed in the structure and policy of Jews' College, to transfer power from the council to the academic staff. But the most damaging criticism of the college was the poor quality of some of the entrants, too many of whom would not have been tolerated in any similar institution. Dr. Ross argued that the right type of student could only be attracted if the concept of the college was broadened beyond that of a professional school for ministers and preachers.

However, Jews' College started the 1968 academic year with 22 new entrants (seven B.A. Honours, seven B.A. General in teaching, four hazanut, two rabbinical diploma and two "occasional" students), bringing the total to 68. The area of study indicated by the new students gave point to the annual report, made in July by the principal Rabbi J. H. Zimmels, that, despite increasing communal demand for ministers, too few graduates of the college were in fact entering the ministry.

A more complex, but basically no less disquieting, situation existed in certain areas of primary and secondary education. Full-time Jewish day schools, especially in London, were reportedly oversubscribed at the beginning of the school year in September. However, an intense controversy arose over the inadequacy of part-time Jewish education. It began as a local
complaint by deputies from South London at the United Synagogue Council against the London Board of Jewish Religious Education, developed into a scathing attack on the Board, and, in February, culminated in the demand for its dissolution. No action was taken. The South London complaint was borne out by a Jewish Chronicle investigation among pupils in the area, who reported unpunctual, inefficient teachers and constant change of curriculum and teaching personnel. There was also disagreement on what should be taught in the synagogue classes. Rabbi Solomon Goldmann, chairman of the Central Council for Jewish Religious Education, argued in April that the Hebrew language should not be taught to younger children attending classes once a week; instead, there should be an effort to instill a love of yidishkayt. The suggestion was rejected as a “counsel of despair” by S. S. Levin, chairman of the London Board, who reiterated the value of Hebrew. In August, Levin was replaced as chairman by Asher Fishman, who announced plans for improving the training of the teachers.

In December, two American experts on Jewish education, Rabbis Simcha Teitelbaum and Joseph Kaminetsky, who were invited by Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits to examine and advise on the Anglo-Jewish educational system, made their views public. They agreed that many of its problems were insurmountable. The only real answer was for Jewish children to attend Jewish day schools. Positively, they stressed the need to improve the position of the teacher, regarding both remuneration and status. In fact, increases of 25 to 30 per cent were made in the salaries of all teachers employed by the London Board.

Of minor note was the decision, in November, to adopt the Israeli (Sephardi) pronunciation in the classes of the London Board; the entry of a small number of girls into the sixth form of Carmel College in September, and the decision by the Mizrachi Federation, in December, to establish a fund for expanding and improving Jewish education in Britain.

Chief Rabbinate and United Synagogue

As in previous years, though not to the same extent, the Chief Rabbinate was the focus of controversy. On the one side, it is true, both Dr. Jakobovits and Rabbi Louis Jacobs—a few years ago the central figure in a controversy with then Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie—shared the platform at a B’nai B’rith meeting (November). They were in fact photographed, cordially shaking each other by the hand.

On the Liberal and Reform front, dissension has not ceased. It was most marked when, to the sound of charge and countercharge, two separate services were held in May to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the foundation of the State of Israel—one under the auspices of the United Synagogue, the other of the Liberal and Reform movement. Nonetheless, Dr. Jakobovits maintained that he still sought communal harmony, though he had made it clear from the beginning that “they (i.e. the Orthodox and
non-Orthodox) could cooperate only in areas upon which their religious differences did not impinge."

Despite this hope and the Chief Rabbi's reiterated desire for reforms in Jewish education, an enhanced status for the ministry, and for men "with new vision and concepts" to sit on synagogue boards of management (e.g. in February, April, and May), Orthodoxy in fact encountered increasing challenge from the Liberal and Reform groups. In April the two movements agreed to form a Council of Rabbis, whose chairman would be the official spokesman to the community for both organizations. In May the 27th annual conference of the Reform Synagogues of Great Britain (RSGB) voiced its rejection of being regarded as what it termed "second-class citizens" in Anglo-Jewish affairs, and demanded recognition as a forceful section of the community. In September Rabbi S. Brichto, executive director of the Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, made a similar demand, challenging the Chief Rabbi to recognize members of the Liberal and Reform movement not only as Jews, but as religious Jews.

The Chief Rabbi sought to strengthen his position by appointing, in April, a "cabinet" of ministers to help him deal with specific problems within his purview, e.g. students, small communities, education. But the composition of the "cabinet" was attacked by ministers who were not invited to join. Yet this was a more successful venture than the attempt, in February, to reform the structure and policy of the United Synagogue. The report of the investigating committee aroused so much opposition among the principal honorary officers of the movement that it was withdrawn. Its main recommendations were that women could qualify for some of the representative lay offices in the United Synagogue and that the smaller and less affluent congregations be given proper representation on its council. A recommendation of salary increases for ministers and other officers was adopted.

**Philanthropy and Fund Raising**

Except for the United States, Keren Hayesod chairman Israel Goldstein stated, the British Jewish community continued to lead in aid to Israel. Further proof was the record total of £1,375,000 raised at a dinner in December, launching the 1969 Jewish Palestine Appeal (JPA) campaign. Similarly, the 1968 *Kol Nidre* appeal broke all records, well exceeding the 1967 total contributions of £180,000. In the meantime, Michael Sacher, new JPA chairman and its former treasurer, promised a return to the old fund-raising methods of meetings limited to selected people who were able to make large contributions, in preference to the 1967 experimental method of door-to-door canvassing of those who were largely unable to give generously. In April author Wolf Mankowitz inaugurated a press print and publicity committee of JPA, which would not be purely fund-raising, but also would concern itself with "appetizingly presenting the truth" to both Jews and non-Jews.
The Jewish National Fund announced plans in February for a peace forest in memory of the Israeli soldiers killed in the six-day war, to be planted on the hills surrounding Jerusalem.

At home, the League of Jewish Women celebrated its silver jubilee in May. In November it opened the Charles Jordan House in London to provide rehabilitative care for 25 former patients in mental hospitals. The Jews' Temporary Shelter handled almost twice as many relief cases in 1968 as in 1967, largely due to the arrival in Britain of all Adeni Jews, who were forced to leave their country. Thirty-seven of the newcomers were registered at the shelter. Perhaps the most spectacular philanthropic occasion was the Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) dinner held at St. James's Palace in March in the presence of the Duke of Edinburgh. It launched the board's £2 million project for the care of the community's aged and infirm and, though no formal appeal was made at the dinner, pledges of £400,000 were given to the newly formed Friends of the JWB.

**Zionism**

The British Aliyah movement, an organization of people who intended to settle in Israel within three years, was established in November. Louis Pincus, chairman of the Jewish Agency, revealed at the foundation conference that the number of immigrants from Britain rose from 679 in 1967, to 1,161 as of November 1968.

In December the British Mizrachi movement celebrated its golden jubilee.

**Publications**

Non-Jewish demand has been basically responsible for the current upsurge in Anglo-Jewish writing, said Gerda Charles, herself part of the "upsurge," in an address to the Society for the Study of Jewish Theology in April. The non-Jew called the Jewish writer into being because of a desperate need and desire to learn from the Jew, Miss Charles argued. Be that as it may, the year saw the publication of nonfiction rather than fiction. Important non-fiction included the first volume of Series A of the *Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, edited by Leonard Stein and Gedalia Yogev. The volume, the first in a series of possibly 30, was particularly welcomed as a contribution to the knowledge of the young Weizmann.

Personal, too, was the posthumous publication of the historian Isaac Deutscher's *The Non-Jewish Jew and Other Essays*, edited by the author's widow, Tamara Deutscher. Here, the author foreswore his earlier anti-Zionism, but remained involved in a love-hate relationship with Israel. Particularly weak was his analysis of Nazism as "nothing but a self-defense of the capitalist old order against communism." A far more scholarly analysis of fascism was provided in Professor F. L. Carsten's *The Rise of Fascism* (Batsford). Investigation into an earlier age of tragedy brought Chaim Raphael's *The Walls of Jerusalem* (Chatto and Windus), a commentary with
extracts from the Midrash on Lamentations. The present situation in Israel was examined by Charles Douglas-Home, defense correspondent of The Times, in his The Arabs and Israel (Bodley Head). As a solution to the present impasse, Douglas-Home recommended the transformation of the "Greater Israel," created by the six-day war, into a "bi-national" Jewish-Arab state, with Israel renouncing Zionism and conforming to the "pattern" of the "regional community" of the Middle East.

The relationship of Jews and Gentiles found expression in two novels: Mordecai Richler's Cocksure (Weidenfeld & Nicholson) and Emanuel Litsinoff's The Man Next Door (Hodder). Whereas the first was primarily an amusingly obscene tour de force, the second was a serious study of suburban frustration as a component of antisemitism.

The Jewish Chronicle book award for 1968 went to George Steiner for his Language and Silence. It was praised by one of the judges, Philip Hobsbaum, as "a most distinguished contribution to humane letters. What, in fact, especially distinguishes it, is its insistent catechising of the values upon which such letters rest. And one of the best arguments in favor of the continuing life of the humanities is the care and precision with which Dr. Steiner voices his doubts about them."

Shehitah

In December the House of Commons decisively defeated (by a vote of 219 to 69) an attempt by Labour Member of Parliament David Ensor to introduce a bill to enforce the stunning of animals before slaughter, thus contravening shehitah requirements. Ensor enjoyed the support of the Council of Justice to Animals and Humane Slaughter Association, and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA). Though the debate in Parliament was conducted in terms of tolerance and the avoidance of unnecessary suffering, the campaign acquired pronounced antisemitic overtones from an RSPCA pamphlet referring to "people whose practices contravene the moral requirements of a host country." But, following protests from the Board of Deputies, the pamphlet was withdrawn as liable to cause misunderstanding. All sections of the community cooperated in the campaign to defeat Ensor's bill.

British Broadcasting Corporation

The British Broadcasting Corporation was at the center of controversy on at least three occasions. In February it allowed the following remark in a TV drama serial: "You always were a great one for putting things in your wife's name, Bob, just like a Jewboy heading for bankruptcy." Lord Hill, chairman of the BBC board of governors "unhesitatingly" admitted that the remark should not have been broadcast. Also, in connection with an interview with Sir Oswald Mosley of the Union Movement in November, BBC director-general Sir Hugh Greene would not agree, in answer to a Board of
Deputies protest, that the program had not maintained a proper balance. A television interview between David Frost and Baldur von Schirach, in September, in which the former Hitler Youth leader excused his part in the deportation of Austrian Jews and described Hitler as witty and friendly, was condemned as “revolting” by Alex Easterman, director of the international affairs department of the World Jewish Congress. “Anyone with any recollection of the horrors perpetrated by the Nazis must have been revolted by the picture von Schirach presented of himself,” Easterman added.

Politically more significant, perhaps, was the cessation of the BBC Hebrew Service in October, an act condemned by the Board of Deputies as “appeasement towards the Arab extremists and a setback to Anglo-Israel cultural relations.” At first it was explained that the broadcasts, financed by the Foreign Office, were suspended on grounds of disproportionately small “benefit for the expenditure of money,” and that British links with Israel could “be more suitably maintained in other ways,” such as the planned increase of British cultural activity in Israel. However, Lord Hill explained that the decision had been taken on a “general political assessment” of the impact of the service on Israel, and not solely on grounds of cost. BBC regretted, he said, that it was unable to convince the Foreign Office of the value of the service.

Race Relations and Antisemitism

1968 was a year of heightened social awareness in Britain, epitomized in the speeches of Enoch Powell and his call for the repatriation of colored immigrants. The condemnation by the Board of Deputies and the Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen of Powell’s advocacy of a ministry of repatriation testified to a sensitivity concerning the possible repercussions of “Powellism” (November). In June a working committee of experts in the fields of race relations and social work met with communal leaders, under the chairmanship of the Chief Rabbi, to discuss more effective action by the Jewish community to deal with the challenge of racial prejudice and discrimination. Earlier in the year the Board of Deputies was quick to voice its concern about the act limiting the immigration of Asian Kenyans with British passports, which, it feared, might adversely affect the Jews in Kenya by creating, for the first time, “disturbance between persons holding United Kingdom passports.” Anti-Zionist and anti-Israel feeling was found in the ruling Labour Party by two of its members, Maurice Edelman, M.P., and Ian Mikardo, M.P. In July Edelman warned that while at present, the pro-Arab lobby struck only “a very small ooze” in the Left, this must be related to “a wider context of discontent in Britain. Its smears may spread.” Mikardo saw the heart of the Labour movement as pro-Israel but Trotskyist, and maintained that fringe movements had taken an anti-Israel stand (October).

Results of the municipal elections in May showed nothing beyond the marginal influence of racist policies. Jewish candidates fared no better and
no worse than their respective parties. Racist candidates, especially from Mosley's Union and the National Front, made no progress and none was elected. In a parliamentary by-election in the London suburb of Acton, in April, the extremist right-wing candidate of the National Front received five per cent of the votes. No use was made in this campaign of antisemitism, as distinct from an appeal for the repatriation of colored immigrants. The liberal candidate, a Jew, who made an attack on the National Front the center point of his campaign, secured almost twice as many votes as the Front's candidate.

A stronger Race Relations Act became law in October, extending anti-discrimination legislation to housing, employment, insurance, and education. The act made no reference to religion, as the government held that Jews were already covered by the prohibition of discrimination on grounds of color, race, or ethnic or national origins. The provisions called for no criminal penalties, but were to be enforced through conciliation by the Race Relations Board and its committees. If necessary, such efforts were to be followed by proceedings for injunctions or damages in the civil courts. It is interesting to note that henceforth privately-conducted schools would find it much more difficult to limit their acceptance of Jewish pupils.

At least five London synagogues were robbed in 1968. In December Mrs. Francoise Jordan, former wife of Colin Jordan, leader of the National Socialist party, was sentenced to 18 months in jail for conspiring with members of the movement to set fire to synagogues in 1965 (AJYB, 1967 [Vol. 68], p. 306).

The Times and Guardian were attacked and reported to the Press Council for publishing in July a full-page advertisement inserted by an Arab propagandist organization. The advertisement mentioned "reports of the discovery of mass graves, collective shooting of civilians" in the Israel occupied territories. The Press Council exonerated the editors of both journals on the grounds that they satisfied themselves that the statements in the advertisements were made in good faith.

Equally disturbing was the reception given to the publication of Sir Oswald Mosley's My Life. Reviewers generally regretted that a man of talent allowed himself to be diverted into the sterilities of fascism. Even more alarming was acceptance by reviewers of Mosley's denial of antisemitism and advocacy of violence. The Times reviewer in fact found Mosley's defense against the accusation of antisemitism "convincing."

In a June BBC television debate on whether "the Arab case is more powerful than the Israeli," a jury of 30 lawyers gave a three to one verdict in favor of Israel.

**Anglo-Israel-Arab Relations**

The position of Britain in the world, in general, and in the Middle East, in particular, dwindled during the year, diminishing the importance and
interest of its diplomacy. For example, the rejection by Saudi Arabia of Jewish-born Horace Phillips as British ambassador was regretted by Britain, but accepted "in keeping with international practice" (April). With regard to intercession in behalf of Egyptian Jewry, G. O. Roberts, minister of state, foreign and commonwealth office, stated in April that the British government had no official standing in the matter and that any intervention "on behalf of the indigenous Jews in the Arab countries would harm their position by giving the impression that they are to be regarded as Western clients."

So far as Anglo-Israel relations were concerned, Prime Minister Levi Eshkol’s meeting with Premier Wilson in January was marred by the Israeli failure to make clear precisely what its peace terms were. On the other hand, Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart made it clear in July that Israel could not be required to withdraw its troops from the occupied territories in advance of agreement to live up to the British-sponsored United Nations resolution of November 22, 1967. Stewart repeatedly affirmed that British efforts were concentrated on giving effect to the Jarring mission, and that an imposed solution was inadmissible. However, at year's end, indications of a more forceful British attitude became apparent, particularly at the time of the Israeli raid on Beirut airport. Thus it was hinted in December that the Jarring mission might have to be abandoned, perhaps for negotiations amongst the great powers. Hence Lord Caradon's statement in the UN Security Council that "we begin to fear that if left to themselves alone, the Israelis and the Arabs will never voluntarily come together." It was to be expected that, while rejecting the French plan for a four-power conference on the Middle East, Britain would encourage the United States and the Soviet Union to impose a settlement, if need be.

Both Anglo-Israel tourism and trade broke new records during the year. The 1968 total of 46,000 British tourists to Israel was 18 per cent higher than in 1967. Trade figures for the first nine months showed £62 million worth of British exports to Israel, compared with only £49 million for the entire year 1967. Israeli exports to Britain increased from £32 million in 1967 to nearly £35 million in 1968, figures which, at the same time, of course showed further disadvantage to Israel's balance of payments. It was also likely that the British import deposit scheme, introduced in November, would adversely affect Israel's exports to Britain.

**Personalia**

Among honors bestowed on British Jews were a knighthood for Rudolf E. Peierls, professor of theoretical physics at Oxford who worked on the atomic bomb, and for Karl Cohen, a former prominent member of the Leeds city council (June); John Diamond, M.P., chief secretary of the treasury, was promoted to the Cabinet, the first Jew to be so honored in Wilson's four-year-old administration (October); Martin Gilbert, a young historian at
Oxford, was appointed the official biographer of Sir Winston Churchill, following the death of Randolph Churchill (November).

Anniversaries included the centenary of the birth of Dr. Adolph Büchler, Jewish historian and principal of Jews' College from 1909 to 1939; the 65th birthday of Josef Fraenkel, author and archivist; the 75th birthday of Professor Hans Liebeschütz, medieval historian and author of a number of works on German-Jewish intellectual history; the 80th birthdays of Hilda Schlesinger, social worker, and of Lord Cohen of Walmer, Anglo-Jewry's leading lay figure, and the 85th birthday of Professor Norman Bentwich.

Among noted British Jews who died in 1968 were: Arthur Newman, communal leader of Irish Jewry, at Dublin in February, at the age of 93; Sir Herbert Benjamin Cohen, lawyer and communal worker, a direct descendant of Levi Barent Cohen, in Kent in April, at the age of 93; Myer Stephany, secretary of Jews' College, 1921–1962, and communal worker, at London in April, at the age of 81; Doris May, for many years secretary to Chaim Weizmann, at London in November, at the age of 69; Bertram Benas, known for a variety of legal, cultural, and communal activities, at Liverpool in December, at the age of 88; the third Earl of Balfour, nephew of the first Earl and supporter of Children and Youth Aliyah, at Edinburgh in December; Bud Flanagan, comedian, in Surrey, at the age of 72; Julius Isserlis, pianist and Chopin authority, in London; Sydney Silverman, outspoken Labour M.P., Zionist and leading member of the World Jewish Congress, at the age of 72.

Losses to rabbinical scholarship included Rabbi Abraham Israel Kon, author of a major Hebrew treatise on the history and the laws and customs of the synagogue (London, May), and Rabbi Eliezer Kahan, principal of the Gateshead Talmudical College (Gateshead, July).

Dr. Lise Meitner, Austrian-born nuclear physicist who first calculated the enormous energy released by splitting the uranium atom, left Nazi Germany in 1938, worked in Stockholm, Sweden for 20 years, and, after retiring in 1958, made England her home, died at Cambridge in October, at the age of 89.

LIONEL KOCHAN
France

For France 1968 was, above all, the year of the revolt of the "enragés" and the battles of the barricades in a climate which gave astounding new vigor to the old mythology of revolution. The consequences of these events were many and grave. They were still having repercussions at the end of the year, in the financial crisis that swept the country in November and December.

The revolutionary movement started in the faculty of letters of Nanterre, a branch of Paris University. It was begun and launched by those disdainfully described by the Communists as "grouplets," small revolutionary organizations of anarchists, Maoists, Castroites, and Trotskyists. The justified demands for reform, the "revolution" in the university, were quickly left behind and engulfed. The point was that the instigators wanted to prove that a Leninist or Bakuninist revolution was entirely possible in a prosperous West European state. All that was needed was to win the workers to the revolutionary cause and wean them away from the pernicious influence of the official Communist movement, which had become reformist if not indeed conservative.

On May 10, after numerous incidents in Paris and in provincial university towns, a veritable riot exploded in the Latin Quarter; automobiles went up in flames and barricades were raised. The police, on its part, responded with much violence.

On May 11 the trade unions called a 24-hour general strike. On May 14 a strike of undefined duration began with the occupation of factories and many offices. Some 11 million workers were involved. On May 20 the parliamentary opposition, Federation of the Left and the Communists, demanded the resignation of the government and new elections. Pierre Mendes-France called the situation revolutionary. On May 22 the national assembly voted on a motion of censure, whose passage would have forced the resignation of the government. It was defeated and the government remained in office.

On May 27, on his return from an official visit to Rumania, President Charles de Gaulle spoke on television. He announced plans to hold a referendum, and stated that he would resign if the majority of the nation repudiated him. He sounded tired and discouraged. New violent demonstrations took place in Paris and the provinces. On May 25 and 26 discussions were held between the trade union leaders, employer representatives, and Premier Georges Pompidou, resulting in an agreement for substantial wage increases. The majority of the strikers rejected this agreement, and the strike
continued. Pressure from the "leftists" forced the Communist party, against its wishes, to politicize the strike and raise the slogan of "people's power." The party's real desire was to save Gaullist power, whose foreign policy suited it. François Mitterrand announced that he was ready to replace de Gaulle.

On May 29 General de Gaulle left for an unknown destination. It was rumored that his resignation was imminent. Le Monde wrote: "The general is returning to his village and his grief." It was learned only later that he visited the French troops stationed in Germany to make certain of the support of that segment of the army. On May 30 he returned to Paris, and in a second broadcast announced the dissolution of parliament and the cancellation of the referendum; there were to be new elections instead. He called on the people to take action against the revolutionary agitation, which he described as a "totalitarian enterprise." This speech was as energetic as the one before had been apathetic and dejected.

The situation seemed to have changed in favor of the authorities. The proselytization of the student "enrages" among the workers in the occupied factories was a failure. The workers sought to take advantage of the situation, but politely showed the door to the revolutionaries from the universities. Only a small number of young workers and marginal or declasse elements of the proletariat made common cause with the students. Work gradually resumed on the basis of new agreements that were much more favorable to the strikers than the one signed earlier and rejected by them.

On June 16 the police cleared the Sorbonne, held by 5,000 students for some five weeks. Some days later it was the turn of the Odeon Theatre which had been transformed into a permanent debating club. The innumerable red and black flags floating over university and school buildings came down. The response to a grand parade of a million anti-Gaullists, ranging from radicals to anarchists, was an equally large procession of Gaullists from the Place de la Concorde to the Étoile.

The first round of the elections, on June 23, showed major Gaullist gains. The Federation of the Left, the Communists, and the Centrists all lost ground. The red scare had worked. This trend became more marked in the second round, on June 30, producing a Gaullist triumph and a debacle for the Left. The Gaullists won 358 out of 485 seats, a gain of 97. The classic Left, including the Communists, paid the price for the "May revolution" which it had not wanted and in which its influence had been nil.

Some weeks later, events in Czechoslovakia moved French foreign policy closer to the Western alliance and even toward a rapprochement with the United States. At a special cabinet meeting, on August 24, President de Gaulle expressed France's urgent wish that the Soviet Union withdraw its troops from Czechoslovakia.

Before the May-June events, France's Middle East diplomacy under Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville had always been oriented
towards Franco-Arab friendship. On February 7 Iraqi President 'Abd al-Raham Arif paid an official visit to France. On April 2 it was the turn of Lybian Prime Minister Abdel Ahmed Baccouche. On September 23 Michel Debré, the new French foreign minister, met with Egyptian Foreign Minister Mahmoud Riad. On September 26, Debré received Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban. A statement followed that there was no fundamental change in France's attitude toward Israel.

On November 2 a serious financial crisis that endangered the French franc hit the country. It was caused by reckless speculation on the capital markets, as well as by the political agitation and economic paralysis in May and June. At the last minute, the cabinet, acting on de Gaulle's decision, cancelled the devaluation of the franc which had already been announced, but without setting the new rate of exchange. Once more President de Gaulle addressed the nation to justify his action and to demand the heavy sacrifices this policy exacted.

Jewish Youth in the May Events

A large part of French Jewish youth, and practically the entire Jewish student body, participated more or less actively in the "May revolution." Aside from its "reasonable" demands for reform and autonomy for the university as well as student participation in the administration and examination boards, the puerile and romantic revolutionary wave, that frequently became one of large-scale violence in the style of the Chinese Red Guards, swept along young Jews just as it did the other French youths, and for the same complex reasons. Several Jews were at the head of the movement: Daniel Cohn-Bendit, who became a veritable revolutionary myth, Pierre Geismar, and the neo-Trotskyist leader Daniel Bensaïd. This aroused among some Jews a naive pride, a satisfaction in seeing Jews "always on the side of progress."

In one of the great revolutionary demonstrations, the students shouted, "We are all German Jews," in answer to the chauvinist and slyly antisemitic campaign waged against Cohn-Bendit by the Communist and rightist press. (Cohn-Bendit, although born in France, was a German citizen.) Jewish students and even Jewish public opinion interpreted this slogan as a significant and heartfelt declaration of solidarity with the Jews, an exaggeration of both its meaning and importance. One of the oddities involved was that among those who thus proclaimed themselves "German Jews" were the Arab nationalist student groups marching in the ranks. Cohn-Bendit's anti-Israeli statements, made as a matter of principle and without too much insistence, created a little uneasiness.

During the sit-in at the Sorbonne the Arabs of al-Fatah had a sector of their own. The young Zionists of Hashomer Hatzair demanded a similar concession, and obtained it from the "committee of occupation," whose membership changed almost daily. Under these conditions a violent confrontation between the young Arab nationalists and Zionists became inevitable
and did in fact occur, although it never degenerated into a pitched battle. A few days before the police cleared the Sorbonne, the "committee of occupation" banned both the Arab and Zionist sectors.

Within the Jewish organizations and institutions, the "struggle" was of a more timid sort. Some elements of the French Jewish scouts and young observant students staged a sort of occupation of the Consistoire (Jewish community) offices. Their demands concerned the management and quality of cuisine at the Foyer Israélite, a kosher student restaurant in the Latin Quarter. At a Sabbath service in the great Rue de la Victoire synagogue in Paris, some young rebels prevented the playing of the organ. In effect this act ironically was tantamount to a "revolutionary" return to Orthodoxy. There was also a public dialogue between members of the Jewish Students' Unions and the leaders of the Fonds Social Juif Unifié (FSJU) on proposed changes in the latter's structure. The specifically Jewish part of the "May revolution" did not involve more than 500 individuals.

The "exalting" experience of the battle of the barricades doubtless turned some young Jews away from thoughts of aliyah to Israel, as well as from a clear-cut Jewish option. The fervor and enthusiasm during Israel's six-day war were succeeded a year later by the exaltation of a revolutionary adventure that to some may have appeared more valid. In the course of a round-table discussion on the "Young Jews of the Revolt," organized by I'Arche (June-July 1968 issue), one participating student, J. C. Rabinowicz, declared:

For me the birth of the movement changed all my attitudes. Before it began, I thought of settling in Israel in a year or two, and I had already contacted professors in Jerusalem. But of late my attitude has changed radically. It used to be difficult to participate in the national life without becoming part of the establishment. Today, for the first time, I am completely involved in the controversies facing France. If the movement succeeds, I see no sense in going to Israel.

Antisemitism

At the beginning of June, in the midst of the strikes and barricades, a rumor spread through Paris Jewish circles that Arabs were preparing to hold anti-Jewish demonstrations on the anniversary of the six-day war. On June 2, the first day of Shavu'ot, a riot broke out in Belleville—a district with 15,000 North African Jewish inhabitants, almost all of Tunisian origin—as a result of a pointless quarrel in a cafe between a Jew and a Moslem. (Practically all Belleville Arab residents, fewer in number than the Jews, were Algerian workers.) The violence was reminiscent of that in the Latin Quarter—automobiles set on fire, torches thrown into stores, Molotov cocktails. The Arabs tried to set fire to the Rue Julien Lacroix synagogue, which was filled with worshippers on the holiday. The response of the young Tunisian Jews was more violent than the attack, and the Arabs were in a bad position before the police arrived. Arab cafés were burned in retaliation for the burnings of
Jewish stores. Many Arabs took flight. On both sides, there were wounded, a good deal of material damage, but no seriously injured. A march of revolutionary students from the Latin Quarter, coming to Belleville to reinforce the Arabs, was stopped en route. The next day the rioting resumed, but with less violence. Meanwhile Tunisian Ambassador Mohammed Masmoudi went to the area with Rabbi Robert Chouchéna of Belleville in an attempt to calm the Jewish and Moslem residents. The Arab nationalist student organizations—even the Algerian the most extremist among them—published communiqués disavowing the “pogrom,” which they attributed to a provocation, and condemning racism.

In August the Amiens synagogue was twice defaced with anti-Jewish and pro-Arab inscriptions. The police investigation produced no results.

**Jewish Community**

The tension and euphoria of the 1967 summer events left some traces in 1968. Interest in what was going on in Israel was more intense among Jews of all circles, many showing such interest for the first time. But, in general, there was a return to normal routine, and the great renewal anticipated and even announced by Jewish leaders did not take place.

**Jewish Education**

In the field of Jewish education, no noticeable progress was discernible since the period before the 1967 war. The number of full-time students in Jewish schools rose to 2,700—slightly less than three per cent of the Jewish students in the country. Perhaps 12,000 Jewish children received a supplementary Jewish education in one-day-a-week religious instruction, evening courses in Hebrew, and the like. The Jewish seminary of France (Rabbinical School in Paris), attended by 40 students preparing for ordination, established tied with the Centre Universitaire d'Études Juives (CUEJ; University Center of Jewish Studies), where the seminary students were required to attend certain courses. On the invitation of the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations of America, Grand Rabbi Henri Schilli, director of the seminary, visited the United States to study the American method of training rabbis.

**Communal Activities**

The United Appeal, established in 1967 to combine the fund-raising campaigns for Israel and for Jewish philanthropic and cultural work in France, raised 30 million francs in 1968, double the amount collected before the June 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

Throughout the country, the new North African Jewish communities managed to consolidate themselves somewhat. In September Grand Rabbi Jacob Kaplan of France inaugurated a new community center at Creil, an
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industrial town sixty miles from Paris which never before had a Jewish community but now had 200 Jewish families. In September, too, Baron Alain de Rothschild, president of the Consistoire, laid the cornerstone of a new synagogue at Creteil, a suburb of Paris.

The French delegation to a conference of representatives of Ashkenazi and Sephardi congregations, held in Jerusalem in January, was the largest from Europe. It was headed by Alain de Rothschild and Jean-Paul Elkann, president of the Paris Consistoire. Others who took part were Grand Rabbi Schilli, and the Orthodox theologian, Rabbi Elie Munk. In the same month a large delegation from the United Appeal visited Israel under the leadership of Jean Rosenthal, Michel Topiol, and Baron Elie de Rothschild, to discuss investments with Israeli political and economic leaders, among them Premier Levi Eshkol, Abba Eban, and Chief of the General Staff, Haim Barlev. They were received by the president Zalman Shazar.

Aliyah

After the six-day war, there was what could be called real French aliyah, in contrast to the rare instances of emigration of French Jews to Israel before that time. Those who left were primarily young Zionists, students outnumbering young workers. There was also a certain amount of family aliyah among North African Jews, including Algerians who were French citizens. President de Gaulle’s famous press conference of November 1967, with its subtly antisemitic implications, somewhat strengthened this trend by helping the hesitant come to a decision.

In the last months of 1968 Israel also attracted some members of the French Jewish élite, and this had unfavorable effects on the cultural level of the community. Among these was the talmudic and cabballistic scholar and philosopher, Leon Askenazi, creator of the Centre d'Orsay and CUEJ (University Center of Jewish Studies). If France had anything which could be described as a Jewish intellectual and spiritual renaissance, it was mainly due to his teaching and immense influence. Professor André Neher, whose literary work and teaching at the University of Strasbourg had been another manifestation of the new vigor of the Jewish spirit in France, also settled in Israel. Others who joined them were the philosopher Eliane Amado Levi-Valensi and Lucien Lazare, secretary of the Strasbourg Jewish community.

Publications

The year 1968 set a record for the number of publications touching directly or indirectly on Jewish affairs. There was an abundance of books of essays and studies, as well as novels; most dealt with Israel or were related to the problem of Israel. It was the novel that brought an element of ideological polemics into the literature. Pro-Israeli books were answered by other, anti-Israel or pro-Arab, some by Jews. To the latter belonged Maxime Rodinson,
author of *Israël et le refus arabe* (“Israel and the Arab Refusal”; Editions du Seuil), whose position was a somewhat qualified one, and Ania Francos, author of *Palestiniens* (Editions Julliard) which was an apologia for the Al-Fatah terrorists. In the same vein and format, the ultra avant-garde publisher, Editions Pauvert, put out a strong and derisive Jewish indictment, *La gauche contre Israël* (“The Left Against Israel”) by Jacques Givet, and a pro-Arab presentation, furiously hostile to Israel, *Contre Israël* (“Against Israel”) by Pierre Demeran. Taking advantage of the great topicality of Jewish questions, the same publisher put out a new edition of Édouard Drumont’s famous *La France Juive* (“Jewish France”), the best-seller of clericalist antisemitism at the end of the 19th century.

Pro-Israel or relatively pro-Israel works included *Pour Israël* (“For Israel”) by Jean Bourdeillette, former French ambassador to Tel Aviv (Editions Seghers); *De Gaulle, Israël, et les Juifs* (“De Gaulle, Israel and the Jews”) by Raymond Aron (Plon), and *Israël, le Royaume et l’Utopie* (“Israel, Kingdom and Utopia”) by Michel Salomon (Castermann). There were also several essays and reports by Jewish authors on the events in Czechoslovakia, such as *l’Ordre règne à Prague* (“Order Reigns in Prague”) by Isabelle Vichniac (Fayard) and *La Révolution étranglée* (“The Strangled Revolution”) by Michel Salomon (Laffont).

In the field of Judaica and Jewish historical studies were the French edition of *Dieu en quête de l’homme* (“God in Search of Man”) by Abraham Heschel (Seuil); *Quatre lectures talmudiques* (“Four Talmudic Lectures”) by Emmanuel Levinas (Editions de Minuit); the third volume of Leon Poliakov’s monumental history of antisemitism, *Histoire de l’antisémitisme: de Voltaire à Wagner* (“History of Anti-Semitism: from Voltaire to Wagner,” Calmann-Levy); *Le Cas Juif* (“The Jewish Case”) by Dominique Aubier (Editions du Mont-Blanc), and *Martin Buber* by Robert Misrahi (Seuil). The Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation published *Vingt ans après Auschwitz* (“Twenty Years After Auschwitz”) an important collection of studies by the best Jewish writers and important Israeli personalities. Novels and plays included Elie Wiesel’s *Zalmen ou la folie de Dieu* (“Zalmen or the Folly of God”) and *Le mendiant de Jérusalem* (“The Beggar of Jerusalem”; Editions du Seuil), which received the 1968 Prix Médicis; Albert Cohen's *Belle du Seigneur* (“The Lord’s Loved One”; Gallimard), which won the Grand Prix of the Académie Française; Arnold Mandel’s *Le cent portes* (“The Hundred Gates”; Flammarion), and Leon Arega’s *Le Débarras* (“Riddance”; Gallimard). A French translation of Henry Roth’s *L’or de la Terre Promise* (“The Gold of the Promised Land”; Grasset) had some repercussions in French literary circles.

**Arts**

The great exposition “Israel Through the Ages” took place in the Petit Palais in Paris from May to September 1968. It was organized on the
initiative of Minister of State for Cultural Affairs André Malraux, with the cooperation of the ministry of foreign affairs and the art administration of the city of Paris. The majority of the works exhibited were on loan from the Israel Museum in Jerusalem, the Hebrew University, the museum of the Grand Rabbinate, and the Tel Aviv Museum of Art. The Louvre and the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris also contributed. The exposition, opened by Malraux, was a great success; tens of thousands of visitors came from all countries of Europe.

**Personalia**

In August Bernard Lecache, president and founder of the International League Against Antisemitism (LICA), died on the Côte d'Azur at the age of 75. Born in Paris of a family of Ukrainian origin, he devoted himself to journalism. He was editor of *Paris-Soir* in 1928 at the time of the trial of Schalom Schwarzbart, the Jewish assassin of the Ukrainian pogromist Simon Petlura. He conducted an investigation in the Ukraine into the massacres of Jewish communities which had taken place at the time of the civil war, and reported on it in a moving book *Quand Israël meurt* ("When Israel Dies"). Since then, he devoted himself to the struggle against antisemitism. As head of LICA, he was deeply involved in the struggle against the anti-Jewish agitation which marked the period before the Second World War. The Vichy regime interned him in the Colomb-Bechar concentration camp in Algeria. He received the medal of the Resistance.

The Nobel Peace Prize for 1968 was awarded to René Cassin, president of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, noted expert on international law, editor of the first draft of the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1948, and member of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. Jacob Kaplan, Grand Rabbi of France was elected a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, receiving the seat formerly held by the celebrated writer Georges Duhamel.

*Arnold Mandel*
As 1968 began, the effects of the breakup of the coalition between the Catholic People's party (KVP) and the Socialist Labor party (PvdA) in 1966 (AJYB 1967 [Vol. 68], p. 461) could still be felt. Socialist members in the KVP demanded for their leader, Piet C. W. M. Bogaers, who had been minister of housing in the old coalition government, an important post in the party leadership. When this did not occur, a number of prominent party members in parliament resigned, and three of them formed the Political Party Radicals (PPR), the twelfth party in the Dutch government. The establishment of the PPR affected the Calvinist Anti-Revolutionary Party (ARP), whose Christian-Socialist members, without leaving their own party, sought to come closer to PPR. The conservative elements in KVP, ARP, and the Christian Historical Union of the government coalition also sought greater unity, and their leaders decided on far-reaching cooperation in the municipal and provincial elections, scheduled for 1970.

The Socialist Labor party took the initiative in an attempt to consolidate the progressive parties. While PPR and the Pacifist Socialist party were ready to discuss such a step, the Democraten '66 (D'66), led by former journalist Hans A. F. M. O. van Mierlo (AJYB 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 461), turned down the proposal. The policies of D'66 which, for the first time in 1967, was represented in the 150-seat lower chamber of parliament with seven seats, had strong popular support. An opinion poll, conducted in November by *De Telegraaf*, in cooperation with Veldkamp Market Research, showed that D'66 would have won 18 seats if elections had been held at that moment. Among others, PvdA would have lost three seats. A split in PvdA was averted despite demands for an uncompromising Socialist position by the extremist New Left, as voiced by Hans Lammers, editor of the weekly *De Groene*.

There was dissension also in the Boerenpartij (Farmer's party), headed by Hendrik Koekoek. It split into three parts: The original party retained only three seats in parliament; the second group, now called Binding Rechts, also had three seats; the remaining one member of parliament, Hubert C. J. M. Kronenburg, formed his own one-man party.

Under Premier Peter S. J. de Jong's leadership, the government succeeded in reducing the number of unemployed to 43,600, or about 1.5 per cent of the working male population in September. Another sign of economic recovery, after years of recession, was seen in 204 mergers of industrial concerns. After the Russian intervention in Czechoslovakia, and October recommendations by the NATO Council in Brussels that Western political and military policies be based on the unpredictability of Soviet behavior, parlia-
ment voted new taxes to raise an extra 225 millions guilders ($66.5 millions) for defense between 1969 and 1971.

In June and July Foreign Minister Joseph M. A. H. Luns held discussions in Cairo and Jerusalem, followed by efforts to bring about negotiations between Israel and the Arab countries. In the traditional "speech from the throne" at the opening of the parliamentary year in September, Queen Juliana expressed her government's support of United Nations efforts to reach a "lasting and just peace in the Middle East." In November Luns told parliament that he made several suggestions to UN Secretary General U Thant to help achieve this end. However, on December 30, the ministry of foreign affairs went on record as disapproving the Israeli action at Beirut airport. A segment of the Dutch people reacted by telegraphing and telephoning expressions of sympathy for Israel to its embassy in The Hague.

War Crimes

The first part of a twenty-volume summary of Nazi war crimes was published jointly by a number of Dutch concerns in an edition of 650 copies. It was compiled by a Dutch couple, Mr. and Mrs. C. F. Ruter; several members of the Supreme Court were on the editorial board. The work included 1,200 proceedings against German war criminals, between May 1945 and January 1966.

The Catholic Church

The Dutch Roman Catholic Church, known for its progressive policies, continued to be in constant turmoil. The Church's position was stated in a pronouncement (October) by the Haarlem diocese pastoral council, which said in part: "The demands made of priests by the encyclical Humanae Vitae—loyal obedience to the church's teachings—are the same as those made by Pravda of the press, radio, and television in Czechoslovakia." In light of the fierce repudiation of this encyclical, the Dutch diocese declared that it must be looked upon as an authoritative pronouncement, not as infallible. To what extent that authority was being undermined was evidenced by an invitation from Piet Wesseling, the priest of the village of Spijkenisse, to Democrats '66 leader van Mierlo to explain his party's goals from the pulpit on a Sunday.

One hundred and fifteen priests left the church in 1968, most of them to get married. In the Haarlem diocese, 70 priests urged the bishops to let married priests continue their work. A test case regarding Jos Vrijberg, a 36-year-old student priest who became engaged and announced his intention to marry, and, at the same time, asked his bishop if he would be permitted to continue working as a priest, was awaiting decision in 1969. In October the Vatican's feeling about all this became clear, when Monsignor J. Bluysen, Bishop of Den Bosch, was refused admission to a meeting of the Liturgical Council, of which he was a member. The chief reason for being excluded
was that, in November 1967, he permitted the church wedding of a priest, who had resigned from his diocese without first having received the required dispensation from Rome.

Almost all Catholic leaders flocked to the support of Dr. Edward C. F. A. Schillebeeckx, professor of theology at the Catholic University of Nijmegen and theological advisor to the Dutch diocese, when it became known that proceedings would be initiated against him on suspicion of heresy. In general, the proceedings were interpreted as a rebuke for Cardinal Bernardus J. Alfrink. The Congregation of the Faith based its actions against Schillebeeckx on the progressive doctrines he preached at American universities on a lecture tour in the fall of 1967. Catholic professors, students, and orders protested against the inquiry. When the Dutch Church made its distress and concern known in Rome, a denial of the proceedings were issued. As the most important Catholic theologian in Holland, Professor Schillebeeckx could have escaped the inquiry if he had responded to a request from the papal nuncio in The Hague that he speak favorably of the encyclical Humanae Vitae.

Toward the end of the year, the Dutch Church received another rebuke from Rome when, on November 29, a commission of Cardinals, set up by order of Pope Paul VI to study the liberal Dutch catechism of 1966, asked that ten disputed points be modified to reflect Roman Catholic orthodoxy. The changes demanded involved the liberal nonliteral interpretations of such matters as original sin, the virgin birth of Jesus, the nature of the crucifixion, and others. At a conference in December, the bishops decided to waive further discussion of the new catechism out of respect for the Pope. The Dutch bishops agreed to introduce the desired modification in consultation with the Holy See. They were to be published in a special edition.

JEWISH COMMUNITY


Jewish life in Holland had gradually shrunk. The only remaining bond between Dutch Jews was Israel, with which they strongly identified, particularly because most of them had either family or friends there. Anti-Zionism was unknown. Since 1945 some 6,000 left Holland to settle in Israel.

In January 1941, the number of Jews registered with the Dutch Jewish communities had been 140,245. During the Nazi occupation, between 110,000 and 120,000 were deported in 98 transports. In the first years after the Holocaust, the Netherlands had some 27,500 Jews: It was known that 5,450 returned from concentration camps; 2,000 came back from abroad, i.e. Switzerland, England, and the United States; 10,000 had been hidden in the country by non-Jews, and 10,000 were partners in mixed marriages, and therefore escaped deportation.
A change had also occurred in the ethnic composition of the Jewish population. While, before 1940, the proportion of Central and East European Jews in the Netherlands had been 15 per cent, it was much higher after the war, probably because these Jews had had much more experience with pogroms, and tried to save themselves while there was still time. The structure of the Dutch Jewish community reflected these changes.

Ten years ago, one could still speak of a Jewish life in several cities, but now this was true only of Amsterdam, the seat of all Jewish organizations and institutions. Amsterdam with about half of the country's Jews, had the largest Jewish community. The Nederlands Israelietisch Hoofdsynagoge of Amsterdam had 10,200 members, the Liberaal Joodse Gemeente 2,000, and the Portugees Israelietische Gemeente 800. A number of Jews in Amsterdam were not registered with any of the communities.

Jewish life consisted mainly of festivities and meetings of the Youth Aliyah, Wizo (Hadassah) and Keren Yaldenu. In all of Holland, some 780 men attended Sabbath services in the synagogue. The rate of assimilation was constantly accelerating. The number of children receiving a Jewish education was slowly dwindling. Of the approximately 2,000 Jewish school-age children in Amsterdam, only 500 received any kind of Jewish education. Rabbi E. Berlinger was the spiritual head of the 10,000 Jews who lived outside of Amsterdam, The Hague, and Rotterdam, cities with their own chief rabbi. His congregants were organized in 40 kehillot, where 185 children received a Jewish education. Only a small percentage of boys celebrated their bar mitzvahs. Each year about 50 newborn children were registered as Jewish. More Jews were cremated or buried in unconsecrated cemeteries, than were buried in Jewish cemeteries. Only half of all Jews who married had religious ceremonies. Some of the intermarried couples became members of one of the four liberal congregations, which attracted young people because of the dynamism of Dr. Jacob Soetendorp, rabbi of the Amsterdam Liberal community.

Dutch Jews suffered from an ever growing shortage of functionaries, and many of their communal offices were staffed by non-Jews. It was not at all rare for one person to hold ten or more organizational posts. Only ten of Rabbi Berlinger's congregations had their own Hebrew teacher. Thirty of the communities had only one synagogue each, and only in 17 of these were regular Sabbath services held. It was almost impossible to find volunteer workers for Jewish programs, a situation that developed partly from the constant criticism to which such programs were subjected, and partly from the disinterest of the young people. A generation gap existed between young Jews and their elders because a link in the chain of generations had been torn away. By the end of World War II, Nazi persecution had all but wiped out the 15-30 age group, so that, at present, those who now would have been 40 to 55 years old, barely existed. The average membership age in many organizations was about 65.
Yet, it was they who rebuilt Jewish life after 1945. They did so with the courage born of despair, because there seemed to be no future for Jews. This feeling became so strong that a serious controversy arose over the decision of the Rotterdam community in the early 1950s to build a new synagogue. Such a project was considered a waste of money, money that would be better spent for Israel. However, the synagogue was dedicated in 1954, and, since then, synagogues were built in many communities with government aid. Earlier, the Dutch regime was prepared to subsidize only the reconstruction or rebuilding of synagogues. Synagogues also were sold in many communities; they were converted into garages, baths, churches, warehouses.

After the war, efforts to revitalize the Netherlands’ Jewish organizations and institutions were so successful that their number once again reached the pre-war level. But real Jewish life did not return. Of great importance was the founding of the Central Education Commission, a group of itinerant teachers who brought Jewish education to children in remote areas. It now had seven teachers who gave instruction to 95 children. The congregations of the Nederlands Israelietisch Kerkgenootschap, the Ashkenazi community, gradually shrank from 150, in 1940, to the present 45, but their total membership dropped from 25,000 in 1946 to 16,600. The number of Ashkenazi rabbis was reduced from 11 to 4. The Sephardi Portugees Israelietisch Kerkgenootschap liquidated its community in The Hague, while the Verbond van Liberaal-Religieuze Joden slowly increased its membership and communities. Also of importance was the establishment after the war of the Stichting Joods Maatschappelijk Werk as the all-encompassing body for the many social welfare agencies.

Now, once again, much of the organizational apparatus has become too large, not because there were not enough Jews in Holland, but because an ever increasing number was turning away from the Jewish community. A most glaring example of this situation was the last election, in 1965, of the Amsterdam Nederlands Israelietisch Hoofdsynagoge governing council (30 seats). Only 4,000 of the nearly 10,000 registered members were eligible to vote; 6,000 had in no way indicated that they even considered themselves members. But even of the 4,000 eligibles, only 1,600 took the trouble to go to the poll. Or to put it another way: 8,400 Jews, or 84 per cent of those registered as such, appeared to be uninterested in how the Jewish community was run. Since then, the situation has not improved.

Demography

In 1968 the Jewish population of the Netherlands was approximately 30,000 in a total population of 12,776,000. The estimate was based on the “Demographic Analysis of the Jews in the Netherlands After the Second World War,” a study conducted by the Joods Maatschappelijk Werk (Jewish Social Work Foundation) in 1954, and published in 1960. Actually, this
figure should be increased by several thousand on the assumption that a large number probably did not admit to being Jewish. According to the last census of May 31, 1960, only 14,503 Dutchmen admitted to being Jewish, i.e. fewer than the number of Jews living in Amsterdam. It is estimated that there were some 15,000 Jews in the capital; 2,000 in The Hague, and 1,000 in Rotterdam. The actual membership of the country's 45 Jewish communities, after going down for years, rose to 16,450 in 1968, an increase of 200 over 1967. About 200 Jews emigrated to Israel in 1968. There was no immigration.

Israel and Zionism

January accounting reports indicated that contributions to the nationwide "Three-Hours-Wages-for-Israel" campaign (AJYB, 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 464), set up shortly after the six-day war under the direction of former Minister of Economic Affairs, Jacob E. Andriessen, were considerably less than expected. With the aid of the general, Protestant, and Roman Catholic labor unions, only 2.5 million guilders ($700,000) was received, instead of the projected 100 million. Still, money raised by United Israel Appeal increased the total for 1967 to 17 million guilders, as compared with 1 million guilders in 1966 and 4 million in 1968. Former minister of agriculture, Barend W. Biesheuvel, leader of the Protestant Anti-Revolutionary party in parliament, started the ball rolling for a new Israel campaign—this time the Israel Bond Drive—under the motto "Help Israel build further."

The twentieth anniversary of Israel's independence, on May 3, was celebrated on a large scale. A Committee for the Celebration of Twenty Years of Israel was formed by the Nederlandse Zionisten Bond (Netherlands Zionist Organization), in cooperation with Jewish youth groups, the Nederlands Israelietisch Kerkgenootschap (Dutch-Jewish community), the Portugese Israelietisch Kerkgenootschap (Portuguese-Jewish community) and the Verbond van Liberaal-religieuze joden in Nederland (the League of Liberal-Religious Jews in the Netherlands). The celebration began with a memorial service for the six million Jewish victims of Nazism, and Israeli soldiers killed in action which was organized by the Jewish youth groups. It was held at the former Dutch Theatre in Amsterdam, where most of the 100,000 Dutch Jews had been held before their deportation to death camps. A special service was held in the Portuguese Jewish synagogue, and a special celebration took place at the Tuschinski Theatre, where a film on Israel's twenty-year existence was shown. There were festivities in almost all large Jewish communities, such as Leiden, Haarlem, Arnhem, Eindhoven, and The Hague.

Non-Jews joined in celebrating Israel's anniversary. The newspapers Het Parool and the Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant came out with special issues devoted to Israel, and, on May 1, one of the two Dutch radio broadcasting systems arranged for a whole evening's program. An Israel week was held in Rotterdam, under the auspices of the Genootschap Nederland-Israel (Nether-
land-Israel Friendship League). Several museums organized exhibits on Israel, and the Jewish community prepared an exposition depicting 350 years of Jewish life in Rotterdam; Israeli products were for sale in the shops. Mayor Abba Khoeshi of Haifa visited the city, the Israel Chamber Orchestra gave performances, and special church services were held.

Similar events occurred in other cities. Nijmegen had an Israeli exhibit, and Groningen an Israeli shopping week. Former mayor Jan Tuin of Groningen directed a collection among the city's residents for a statue in memory of its Jews who were killed by the Nazis.

The topic chosen by the National Press Club in 1967 for its yearly contest for the best articles in the Dutch press was "The Israeli-Arab War of 1967." In May prizes were awarded at an open meeting to Henk L. Leffelaar of the *Groot Provinciale Dagbladpers* and Jan Kuypers of the *Eindhovens Dagblad*.

In July, at the opening of the Rotterdam Park which was built with money donated by the people of the city, Alderman Frederique J. Krop was cheered for his activities in behalf of Israel. Krop, a member of the Calvinist Anti-Revolutionary Party, was chairman of the Rotterdam branch of the Genootschap Nederland-Israel. He was honored at Yad Washem in Jerusalem for his aid to the country's Jews during the Nazi occupation. At the Israel Embassy in The Hague, six other Dutchmen received special citations from Yad Washem.

Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban twice came to the Netherlands for discussions with government leaders. In March he explained Israel's position at an open meeting. The purpose of his second visit was to address a conference of Israeli ambassadors in Western Europe, meeting in Holland from June 26 to 29. It was chaired by Gideon Rafael, the director-general of the Israeli ministry of foreign affairs. On the occasion, Eban invited Dutch Foreign Minister Joseph M. A. H. Luns, to visit Israel. In December Rafael returned to Holland for a meeting with Luns.

In the meantime, the entire Israeli diplomatic staff in the Netherlands was changed. Former Israel Ambassador to Mexico Simeon Arad succeeded Ambassador Daniel Lewin at The Hague. The economic attaché, Dr. Jaacov Cohen was replaced by Shragai Tsur, who moved his department from The Hague to Amsterdam. Chargé d'affaires Shmuel Yaari was appointed Consul General in Amsterdam.

At the time of his appointment, Yaari had to deal with the problem of Dutch attitudes toward Israel (AJYB 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 464). This situation brought about the resignation of the executive of the Nederlandse Zionisten Bond, a 2,000 member organization, under the chairmanship of Y. S. van der Hal (AJYB 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 466). The executive sought re-election at the Bond's annual meeting in April; but criticism, particularly from the younger members about its failure to help change the anti-Israel sentiment in the country, was so strong that it decided to resign as a body. It was unable to find candidates to stand election for a new executive.
The Zionist paper *De Joodse Wachter* (AJYB 1968, [Vol. 69], p. 466) ceased to exist as a separate publication. It now appeared every fortnight, on one page, with its own heading, in the *Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad*. The page was edited and financed by the Zionist Federation. The first issue of a new publication, the *Israel Bulletin*, financed by the Israeli Embassy and containing information about Israel, was distributed at the Federation's annual meeting; it was to appear irregularly.

Israeli public relations was much improved in 1968. At the beginning of November a 40-minute television program, part of the *Achter Het Nieuws* (*Behind the News*) broadcast, gave a very favorable picture of Israel and the occupied Arab territories. An earlier television program, in August, sought to stimulate tourism to Israel. Some 13,000 Dutch vacationed in Israel in 1968, as compared with 9,000 the year before. The newspaper *Trouw* organized a collection among its readers that brought in 45,000 guilders for Nes Ammim, a Kibbutz in Israel where Christians from Holland, Germany, and Switzerland attempted "actually to participate in the building of the Jewish state."

Israel's Sephardi Chief Rabbi Yitzhak Nissim and his son Meir Benayahu visited Holland. The shofar was blown in the chief rabbi's honor when he attended the Portuguese synagogue in Amsterdam. Benayahu discussed with the Judaica and Hebraica expert Max H. Gans, the founding of an institute in Israel for the history of Dutch Jews, a joint venture of Dutch settlers in Israel and the Netherland Jewish community.

**Religious Activities**

The Academy for Judaism, a joint project of Ezrath Hinnukh Chabad (the education department of the Lubavitcher Rebbe) and the Ashkenazi Jewish community in Amsterdam, and the Beth Ami community center was opened in Amsterdam in November. It was to offer three-semester courses in Jewish mysticism, ethics, and philosophy, with Professor Cyril Domb of London, Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits of Great Britain, Professor Henri M. Baruk of the Sorbonne in Paris, and Chief Rabbi Hillel Medalie of Antwerp as guest lecturers.

Followers of the Lubavitcher Rebbe visited Jewish families in smaller communities and, in an effort to stimulate a feeling for Judaism, urged the men to put on *t'filin*. This campaign attracted some attention in the Dutch press.

In observance of the first anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem, on May 26, synagogues held special services at the request of the Board of the Chief Rabbis in the Netherlands. It was decided that, in the prayer for the welfare of the State of Israel, the words *reshit simhat g'ulatenu* (the beginning of the joy of our deliverance) would be included from now on. When the Amsterdam rabbis refused to recite the words, Amsterdam Chief Rabbi Aron Schuster declared that the cantors could say the prayer. References to

In January, Rabbi Barend Drukarch was installed in the Portuguese Synagogue as spiritual leader of the Sephardi community, the first Ashkenazi to hold such a post in modern times (AJYB 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 465). He visited Rabbi Solomon Gaon the haham of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews of Great Britain and arranged for a cultural exchange between the Sephardim of the two countries. As a result, 20 young Sephardim from England visited at the end of December.

Rabbi Yehuda Ashkenazi became the spiritual leader of the Liberal Jewish community in Arnhem. Awraham Soetendorp was installed, September 15, as rabbi of The Hague Liberal community by his father Rabbi Jacov Soetendorp of the Amsterdam Liberal Jewish community. He was ordained, in 1967, at the Leo Baeck College in London, and spent a year at the Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion at Cincinnati and New York. These new liberal rabbis made possible the establishment of the first Liberal rabbinical court since the Second World War, doing away with having to call in rabbis from abroad to decide questions of religion.

In December nearly all members of the Orthodox Jewish community in Venlo, which never had enough worshipers for a minyan, agreed to found a Liberal group, the fourth in the Netherlands. Het Verbond van Liberaal-Religieuze Joden (League of Liberal Jews) appointed a 25-year-old Semitics student, Awraham W. Rosenberg, cantor and teacher for the 35 members of the new community.

Christian-Jewish Relations

A controversy arose in January, when it became known that Mayor Ivo Samkalden and the city council of Amsterdam decided to use one of the two synagogues in the old Jewish section, which had been sold to the city in 1954, as a school of drama. The Grote synagogue, built in 1671, and the Nieuwe synagogue, completed in 1730, had become too large for the community. However, it had been agreed that they would put it to "worthy use," and a drama school was not considered "worthy" in Jewish circles. No final decision was reached by year's end.

A meeting, cosponsored by the Nederlands Zionistische Studentenorganisatie (Dutch Zionist Student Organization), and two non-Jewish student groups, was held in May in the auditorium of the Amsterdam municipal university to demonstrate solidarity with the Soviet Jews.

When, in October, 30 of the 125 tombstones at the Jewish cemetery of Oude Pekela were destroyed by vandals, money for their restoration was collected among the citizens of the town, which no longer had any Jews.

Rabbi Yehuda Ashkenazi of the Arnhem Liberal community, former director of the Leerhuis, an interfaith center for the study of Judaic and Christian biblical traditions (AJYB 1967 [Vol. 68], p. 329), accepted ap-
pointments to give introductory courses on the Talmud at the Catholic theological high schools of Amsterdam and Utrecht.

Shortly before Rosh Ha-shanah, on September 21, Holland’s largest weekly, *Elsevier’s Weekblad*, came out with a cover story on “The Jews in Amsterdam,” based on interviews with 11 prominent Jews on the future of the Netherland Jewish community. The impetus for the article was Dr. Sylvain Wijnberg’s study, *The Jews in Amsterdam* (*AJYB* 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 463).

Chief Rabbi Elieser Berlinger of the Nederlands Israelietisch Kerkgenootschap (Dutch-Jewish Community), Chief Rabbi Salomon Rodrigues Pereira of the Portuguees Israelitisch Kerkgenootschap (Portuguese-Jewish Community) and Rabbi Jacob Soetendorp of the Verbond van Liberaal-Religieuze Joden were invited to attend on Saturday, December 28, the baptism of the second son of Princess Beatrix and Prince Claus in the Domkerk at Utrecht. He was given the name Johan Friso Berhard Christian David. According to Prince Claus, the boy was called David because “My wife has great admiration for the biblical figure of King David.”

**Communal Activities**

In February the Netherlands Jewish homes for the aged made places available for Jewish refugees from the Arab countries, at the request of the Standing Conference of European Jewish Community Services. The Dutch government was not prepared to accept these refugees under its social legislation, and the Jewish Social Work Foundation was allowed to bring in no more than fifty Jewish refugees. The ministry of justice was to pass on each case separately; responsibility for all rested with the Jewish community. Under the regulations, only one family from Morocco was admitted.

The governing boards of the Nederlands Israelietisch Kerkgenootschap, the Portuguees Israelitisch Kerkgenootschap and the Verbond voor Liberaal-religieuze joden, sent a joint telegram to UN Secretary General U Thant, expressing their distress over the continued persecution and oppression of the Jews in the Arab countries and asking for action.

The Joods Maatschappelijk Werk, the umbrella organization of 77 Jewish agencies, celebrated its 20th anniversary in October. On that occasion, Chairman Edward Spier said that the Dutch government “gave no significant attention either to the Indonesian or the Jewish victims of the war.” The most substantial aid came from the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and the Central British Fund. Joost Glaser was chosen to succeed Dr. Gerhard Taussig as director of the Joods Maatschappelijk Werk in 1969.

Two new wings of the Sinai Centrum were officially opened, one for the care of retarded children and the other for 30 senile old people. The governing board of the Joods Maatschappelijk Werk, and the two Amsterdam Jewish homes for the aged, Beth Shalom and Beth Menuha, jointly decided to build a large Jewish home for the aged. Another home was to be opened in Rotterdam.
Intercession by the Joods Maatschappelijk Werk, the Auschwitz Committee, and, especially, the poet Ed Hoornik who mobilized the press, radio, and television, moved the government to make special provisions for psychologically and physically handicapped Dutch war victims, who had been persecuted by the Nazis for reasons of race, religion, or ideology. While particular consideration was being given to disabled resistance fighters, none had been given to the other victims, most of them Jews. Although the latter were still at a disadvantage, their maximum weekly allotment was increased from 120 to 194 guilders ($54), under the existing social welfare system.

Personalia

Chief Rabbi Aron Schuster of Amsterdam was named Knight of the Dutch Lion, a high Dutch honor; Dr. Max Goudeket, president of the Verbond van Liberaal-Religieuze Joden in Nederland, was named Officer of Orange-Nassau. Professor L. Kukenheim became rector magnificus of the University of Leyden; he resigned from the chairmanships of the Leyden Jewish community but remained director of Keren Jaldenee Nederland. Professor August D. Belinfante was named rector magnificus of the University of Amsterdam.

Caroline Eitje, former history teacher at the 40-year-old Jewish Lyceum Maimonides and a writer of several books on Jewish education, died on February 15, at the age of 84. Nathan Keizer, former executive board member of the Dutch Ashkenazi Jewish community in Amsterdam and honorary secretary of the Joods Maatschappelijk Werk, who was chiefly responsible for rebuilding the Dutch Jewish community after World War II, died in San Francisco on May 10, at the age of 68. Benzion Moskovits, cantor of the Lekstraat synagogue in Amsterdam, died on September 18, at the age of 61. Louis P. Polak, who established and maintained the document files on the Nazi persecution of Dutch Jews at the Jewish Historical Museum in Amsterdam, died in December at the age of 62.

Maurits Kopuit
At the beginning of 1968, as the parliamentary elections of May drew near, the Center-Left coalition government of Christian Democrats (DC), Republicans (PRI), and the Unified Socialist Party (PSU) adopted several important laws. After a bitter struggle of the majority against opposition from the right, the bill authorizing the establishment of regions, which sought to decentralize political-administrative power in the country, was finally approved (AJYB, 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 467). Other important laws instituted hospital and public administration reforms, and established a state nursery school.

However, the government was unable to secure passage of its university reform bill. Student dissatisfaction, often shared by professors, over the antiquated university system, lack of personal or other contact between professors and students, and the student organizations’ almost total lack of influence in university affairs continued. The resultant student demonstrations at most Italian universities were suppressed, sometimes harshly, with the aid of the police. As in other European countries, some of the protests challenged the nation’s system as a whole and, at the same time, condemned various political groups, such as the Communist party (PCI), for trying to exploit these demonstrations for their own purposes.

The controversy arising from the illegal compilation by the secret service of files on political personalities, which had nothing to do with the security of the state, came to an end. When the scandal broke in 1967 (AJYB, 1968 [Vol. 69], pp. 467–68), the most compromising files had disappeared. The radical weekly L’Espresso connected this incident with what it called an attempted coup in 1964. General Giovanni De Lorenzo, former secret service chief whom L’Espresso accused of having organized the coup, brought suit against the newspaper. The trial ended at the beginning of 1968 with an unexpected verdict. Although the prosecutor had asked for the acquittal of the two Espresso reporters who wrote the story and the indictment of De Lorenzo, the judges found them guilty.

In the May general elections, the Christian Democrats slightly increased their strength, obtaining 39 per cent of the vote; the Communist party gained, with almost 27 per cent of the vote; the small Republican party doubled its strength, with 2 per cent; the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, which had broken away from the Socialists in 1963 and, in these elections, for the first time demonstrated its appeal to the voters, maintained its position, with 4 per cent of the vote. Setbacks were suffered by the Unified Socialist party as a result of the split with the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, and by the parties of the right.
Several Jews ran for office. Roberto Ascarelli, Aldo Sonnino, and Vittorio Luria, all members of the Rome Jewish community council, were candidates of the Socialist, Republican, and Liberal parties respectively; Guido Jarach, president of the Milan Jewish community, was a Liberal party candidate. None of these was elected. Other Jews, who were not active in the Jewish community, were elected on the Communist party, the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, the Socialist, and the Liberal parties tickets.

In view of the unpromising election results, the Unified Socialist party decided to defer participation in the new government until after its congress in October. Thus, the experiment of the Center-Left coalition was, at least temporarily interrupted, and Christian Democrat Senator Giovanni Leone was asked to form an interim government. With the support of his party, he received a narrow majority; the Unified Socialist party and the Republicans abstained. The program of the Leone government, temporary as it was, seemed to follow that of the preceding Moro government precisely because a new Center-Left coalition was in view. One of its noteworthy acts was its mediation, through Minister of Foreign Affairs Giuseppe Medici, in the incident of the El Al Boeing 707 plane, which was hijacked by Palestinian guerrillas and taken to Algiers.

In October the Unified Socialist party called a national congress, the first since the fusion of the Italian Socialist party (PSI) and the Italian Social Democratic party (PSDI), to produce political stability for the party. (On that occasion, the party took on its old name Italian Socialist party, which had been changed in 1967, and added the words "Section of the Socialist International.") After six days of dramatic debate and negotiations, no significant reconciliation was reached among the party's five factions. These ranged from the radicals, who were opposed to another coalition government with the Christian Democrats, to the more or less conciliatory elements, headed by Francesco De Martino, secretary of the former Italian Socialist party, Mario Tanassi, former Secretary of the Italian Social Democratic Party, and others.

After the congress, the country was thrown into turmoil by massive series of student demonstrations and workers' strikes, partly politically motivated and partly resulting from labor disputes, that paralyzed the life of Rome, Milan, and other big cities. In the face of these grave disorders, the Leone government resigned on November 19 to help hasten the formation of a new Center-Left coalition.

After a few weeks of difficult consultations, premier-designate Mariano Rumor, Secretary of the Christian Democrats, succeeded in forming his first government in mid-December. In the new Center-Left government the secular parties appeared to be stronger than in the preceding one. De Martino became deputy premier; Socialist party president and former vice-premier, Pietro Nenni, became foreign minister. The ministry of budget, one of the three economic ministries, went to the Socialist Luigi Preti and, another, the ministry of finance, to the Republican Oronzo Reale.
During the year Italy was hard hit by two national catastrophes. In January violent earthquakes destroyed many villages in Sicily, killing several hundred persons, injuring and making homeless thousands of others. Many families left the region permanently for the mainland or abroad. Instances of administrative failure during and after the earthquake caused despair among the victims, who had to camp for many cold nights in the open or in improvised tents. They sent delegations to Rome to demonstrate in front of parliament against the slowness of government aid.

In November, exactly two years after the flood in Florence, rainstorms struck northwestern Italy. Rivers overflowed, inundating the country. This time, too, the victims were counted in the hundreds and damage was enormous.

**Vatican and Catholic Church**

New regulations concerning the Curia, in effect the government of the Vatican State, went into effect March 1. Among the most important was the principle that all offices were temporary and automatically terminated upon the death of the Pope. Also, the rule that prelates hand in "voluntary resignations" upon reaching the age of 75 began to be applied. Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith and the avowed leader of the conservatives in the Vatican, was among those who relinquished their offices. The over-all effect of the innovations was the wider participation of non-Italian prelates in the temporal government of the Catholic Church.

Addressing 150 Catholic priests, Protestant ministers, rabbis, and Orthodox prelates, who participated in a Congress of Biblical Studies at the end of April, Pope Paul VI emphasized that the Old Testament was shared by the Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant faiths. Therefore, he said, "They can study and honor these sacred books together; in fact, they can even pray from the same texts."

The dialogue, recently proposed by the Catholic Church, had a religious as well as a political aspect, if the Pope's words of September were being interpreted correctly. He explicitly invited Catholics to enter into dialogue even with nonbelievers. Possibly carrying the interpretation too far, some people read political implications into the statement. They took it as encouragement for a meeting of the two big Italian parties, the conservative Christian Democrats and the Communists. In any event, the outcome of the elections and the fact that former Foreign Minister Amintore Fanfani, a Christian Democrat who sought the presidency of the Republic, became president of the Senate gave rise to some uneasy talk in secular democratic circles about a forthcoming "repubblica conciliare" (a Church-supported coalition between the Christian Democrats and Communists).

On July 29 Pope Paul issued the encyclical "Humanae Vitae" upholding the church ban on all artificial means of contraception. The core of the
declaration was the Pope's reaffirmation of the doctrine proclaimed almost four decades ago by Pope Pius XI that "each and every marriage act must remain open to the transmission of life." It was a rejection of the recommendation for liberalization by a majority of Pope Paul's own study commission of clerics and laymen in 1966, and ran counter to strong pressures for change within and outside the Church. The Pope himself, as Msgr. Ferninando Lambruschini, the moral theologian of the Lateran University, expressed it, expected that the declaration "will perhaps not be easily received by all." And, indeed, it evoked protests among Catholics and non-Catholics everywhere.

Disappointment with the Pope's confirmation of the ban was expressed at several levels of Italian public opinion. Newspapers and lay groups, both Left and Center, emphasized the anachronism of the papal decision, in view of the compelling problems of Catholics all over the world in confronting and overcoming the specters of hunger and malnutrition, and the need to improve the quality of life. Naturally, not many official Catholic voices were raised in opposition, but general malaise was deeply felt among the lower clergy in their more direct contact with people who, in good Catholic conscience, wished to safeguard their rights to social betterment and to satisfactory marriage. Several times, also, the impatience of the lower clergy with the directives of conservatives in the Catholic Church hierarchy on political and liturgical-ritual practices exploded with real acts of defiance in small rural and local urban parishes (for example, the acrimonious dispute between Enzo Mazzi, priest of the Isolotto working-class quarter of Florence and the city's Archbishop, Ermenegildo Cardinal Florit; also the consternation in the education system over Lettera ad una professoressa ["Letter to a Woman Professor"], which attacked church and state schools and their teachers for their inability to cope with the problems of the children of the poor and for the inadequacy of teaching methods in general).

Augustin Cardinal Bea, who had been entrusted with drafting the declaration on the Jews and Judaism and bringing it before Vatican Council II (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], pp. 99–136), died in Rome on November 16, at the age of 87.

**Jewish Community**

The number of Jews registered with the communities in Italy—30,644, according to a 1965–1966 community study (AJYB, 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 471)—remained unchanged. About 42 per cent lived in Rome, 28 per cent in Milan, 22 per cent in the middle-sized communities (Turin, Florence, Trieste, Venice, Genoa, Leghorn, each with a population of 600 to 1,800), and 8 per cent in the 15 smaller communities of 15 to 450 persons, each.
Immigration and Emigration

About one-third of the 3,000 Libyan refugees, who arrived in the wake of the six-day war, left for Israel; others were expected to leave later, either for Israel or other overseas countries. A number apparently intended to rebuild their lives in Italy, particularly in Rome. This injection of new, vital forces promised to be beneficial for Jewish life as a whole, though their concentration in the Rome community, the largest of all, could in no way help revive the other, moribund communities.

The problem of integrating the Jews from abroad was of particular importance for the future of the Jewish community. Two researchers, this writer and Sergio Della Pergola, who did work in the field in 1965, undertook a new study of persons who had been leaders in the Italian Jewish youth movement between 1948 and 1968. The composition of this group, now ranging in age from 20 (the present leaders) to 55 years (the first postwar leaders) was important for a picture of current tendencies, such as identification with Judaism, activities within the Jewish community, political and cultural interests, and social background. The first results seemed to indicate, among other things, that Jewish immigrants to Italy did not adjust to the new community sufficiently to permit them to assume responsibilities in keeping, or even approaching, their increasing numerical strength.

Aliyah from Italy, as from many other Western countries, was increasing; but, in absolute numbers, it remained necessarily small and rather selective. According to Jewish Agency statistics, 114 persons migrated from Italy to Israel in 1967; the number was at least doubled in 1968.

Communal Affairs

The outstanding event of the year was the Special Congress of Delegates from the Italian Jewish communities. Originally set for ten months earlier, the congress was convened to consider revising the law governing the Jewish communities. This law, conceived in 1930–1931 and reflecting the political climate of the time, sought to establish rather rigid compulsory controls. It established a decidedly hierarchical community structure, with the executive in control of the legislative organs. Also, some of the provisions governing the internal life of the communities were contrary to the democratic spirit and institutions that followed the Second World War. To cite a few examples: Only tax-paying male heads of families had the right to vote, and only male taxpayers having a certain educational level and practicing "normal religious conduct" could be elected to office. Delegates to the congress were chosen by the community councils, not by all members of the community.

The spirit of the law also was incompatible with the Italian Constitution, which provided in Article 8, that "religious faiths other than the Catholic are entitled to organize in accordance with their own statutes" and that "their relations with the state are governed by laws, based on an understanding with their respective representatives." But the law of 1930–1931 was a compulsory
and unilateral one, even though such Jewish personalities as jurist Mario Falco helped write it, and controversy over it had been going on in the Jewish community for many years. Yet, it enabled the community to impose taxes on its members without constitutional sanction, and thus secure its income. In 1962, after much pressure especially from young community members, a study commission was appointed. It completed its work only now, after consulting with several experts on constitutional law.

The congress rejected the minority position that the question be solved constitutionally (a rather problematical approach because it would have required a very long procedure in parliament). The congress also rejected a more moderate report which, without questioning the law as such, wanted more democratic application of the law; greater influence for the rabbis in the communities; the establishment of a more progressive system of taxation, and, above all, predominance by the congress over the executive. Delegates to the congress were to be elected by all members of the community. In the end, the congress only made recommendations, among them that all adult members of the community, including women, have the right to vote and to be elected; that some of the powers of the executive committees be transferred to community councils; that the rights of minorities be safeguarded in elections. In essence, the congress wanted to make as few changes as possible, and to make them internally in order to forestall the possibility of invalidation by the state government.

On April 25, the anniversary of the liberation from the Nazis, the Federazione Giovanile Ebraica d'Italia (FGEI, Federation of Italian Jewish Youth) organized a demonstration outside the Polish Embassy against anti-semitism in Poland. Several hundred persons, many of them Jews, took part in the protest.

On October 8, the 30th anniversary of the promulgation of the racial laws in Italy, the Union of Italian Jewish Communities organized a very successful commemorative meeting, "Lest It Be Forgotten." In one of the best known theatres in Rome, Professor Giuseppe Branca, judge of the constitutional court, and the historian Renzo De Felice author of the basic work Storia degli ebrei italiani sotto il fascismo ("History of the Italian Jews under Fascism") spoke of the political situation and motivation that had led to the adoption of the shameful laws.

On October 16, the 25th anniversary of the deportation of more than 2,000 Jews from Rome, Italy's President Giuseppe Saragat assured a delegation from the Unione delle Comunità and 23 Jewish communities of his personal sympathy.

Israeli Ambassador to the United States Yitzhak Rabin visited the Jewish community when he stopped at Rome on his way to Washington. Sephardi Chief Rabbi Itzhak Nissim of Israel visited some of the small Italian communities, among them Pisa and Siena.
Ambassador Ehud Avriel, who became head of the Jewish Agency executive, was succeeded by Amiel E. Najar.

**Cultural Activities**

In their totality, Jewish cultural activities in Italy remained inadequate and scanty. However, there was a recent radical change in the interpretation of Jewish culture by the leadership of the Rome Jewish community, as expressed in the establishment of the Portico d'Ottavia literary prize named after the famous street in Rome's ghetto. A jury of distinguished personalities, headed by the poet Diego Valeri, was selected to make recommendations for the award. After examining many works submitted, it gave the first prize to Giorgio Voghera for his *Quaderno d'Israele* ("Israel Notebook"). The book dealt with Voghera's experiences in a community of pioneers who helped build modern Israeli society through manual labor. The committee also awarded gold medals to Guido Ceronetti for his translation of the Psalms, and to Giorgio Romano, an Italian-born Israeli journalist, for his biography of David Ben-Gurion.

There was also increasing activity at the Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea (Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation) which, despite its precarious financial situation, not only operated as a source of documentary evidence in the indictment of former Nazis, but also continued to collect books and historical material about the Jews of Italy.

The Federazione Sionistica Italiana (Italian Zionist Federation) continued to organize lecture series and to distribute publications. The various youth centers affiliated with the Federation of Italian Jewish Youth (FGEI), and other groups, such as the Weizmann Circle in Rome, conducted local programs. The Italian Zionist Federation and the Jewish youth centers organized several Hebrew language courses. Official cultural activities were carried on sporadically in some communities.

**Jewish Youth**

As a result of the general situation in the Jewish community as a whole, Italian Jewish youth went through one of its most critical periods since 22 years.

FGEI remained the most important Italian Jewish youth organization, and the only one seeking to unite under one roof young Italian Jews of all tendencies—students, workers, Zionists, non-Zionists, leftists, conservatives—with the single exception of potential fascist elements. However, of late, the Federation has been losing some of its following, a phenomenon reflecting not only the demographic crisis of the community whose crop of young people decreased every year, but also the polarization of ideological positions, following political events.

Thus, after the congress of December 1967, a faction of the Milan Jewish youth center members accused the congress and the newly elected council of
"anti-Zionism" and "anti-Judaism," and of playing the game of Israel's enemies. This despite the fact that the majority of its delegates approved a resolution strongly reaffirming their solidarity with the State of Israel, recognizing its right to self-defense, and calling only for the elimination of the causes of the Arab-provoked war and its consequences, "which are foreign to a scrupulously defined policy for the defense of national integrity and security." These unfounded accusations moved this group to break away from FGEI and form their own autonomous group. Actually, it was not the first time some of Milan's young people created splinter groups, but these used to be short-lived, and politically "not involved," or tended "to the right" in Jewish affairs.

The new group also reflected changes in the community resulting from the influx of many Jews from abroad who could not be fully integrated. They often failed to understand the mentality of the native Jews, many of whom had fought for liberation from Fascism and were close to the progressive movement. In fact, a good many of those who broke away from the community organizations and, incidentally, seemed to have had supporters among the Milan communal leaders, were not of Italian origin.

In any case, the trauma of the six-day war and the prolonged crisis with no solution in sight, obviously sharpened internal conflicts. The unusually large number of youths going to Israel in 1968, mainly for study, certainly was connected with this situation. For example, there were some 40 Italian students at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, as compared to five in 1967; to these must be added a number attending other Israeli universities.

FGEI held its usual two conferences, one on problems of Zionism and the State of Israel, the other on the Jews in Italy during the last hundred years. The Federation also arranged Israeli tours for youths wishing to attend Jewish Agency and work camps during the summer, and conducted its own summer camp.

The 21st congress of FGEI, in December, had an unexpected outcome. After extensive and inconclusive debate on new directives for action, which took into consideration the need to face the state of uncertainty and crisis after the six-day war, the Federation failed to elect a new council; it asked the outgoing council to stay in office until the meeting of a special congress in the spring 1969.

The other youth movements, Hashomer Hatzair and Bnei Akiva, also organized their customary activities during the summer and winter. Participation was generally satisfactory. Young people who left Libya for Italy in the wake of the Israeli-Arab war formed their own organization. They were rather active, especially in Rome.

**Arab-Israeli Conflict**

The views of the Italian Jews and non-Jews on the aftermath of the June 1967 war had become rigid. Except for those dedicated to an anti-Zionism
marked by the prejudices of the Italian Communist party and the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, the Jews fell into three groups, each with many shades of opinion. The “para-Israeli” faction went all out for Israel, supporting and justifying automatically and uncritically any action or declarations by Israel and its representatives. The so-called “Jews of the Left,” though not Zionist-oriented, more or less identified with Israel; but they felt that, when necessary, it was their function to use criticism as an irritant to move Israeli leaders to action. In view of the dearth of up-to-date objective information on the Middle East—the Italian press lacked either the ability or the willingness to give such information—the first group ran the risk of adopting intransigent, uncritical, and therefore unconstructive positions; and the second was prone to exploitation by anti-Zionist political forces, PCI and PSIUP, or by the antisemitic parties of the right. The third group, certainly the largest, proved its support of Israel by generous contributions to Keren Kayyemet le-Yisrael and Keren Ha-yesod. On the whole, the six-day war led to a radicalization of attitudes towards Israel, accentuating contradictions and the crisis in the Italian Jewish community.

Italian public opinion on Israel, essentially a reflection of the positions of the various political groups as presented in the press, changed noticeably since June 1967. Yet the attitudes of the parties themselves changed only slightly. The position of the Communists and of the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity remained negative; that of the Socialists and Republicans friendly, but with growing reservations; that of the Liberal party close to the Socialist position, though for different reasons, and that of the Christian Democrats divided. The parties of the extreme right, though leaning toward antisemitism, were pro-Israel because of their strongly anti-Communist and therefore anti-Arab stance.

**Jewish Education**

During the 1967–1968 school year, 2,231 students attended Jewish schools: 1,399 in the five-year elementary schools in Rome, Milan, Florènce, Turin, Bologna, Genoa, Leghorn and Trieste; 603 in the three-year lower high schools in Milan, Florence, Turin, and Rome; and 229 in the five-year liceo (senior high school) in Milan. In all these cities, and in Venice, altogether 497 children went to kindergarten. Fourteen of the 23 Jewish communities had no Jewish schools. The Talmud Torah enrollment was 137.

The Collegio Rabbinico Italiano in Rome, which is supported by the Unione delle Comunità, had 17 students, the Margulies rabbinical school in Turin, 6, and Almagià women teachers’ seminary had 30. ORT vocational schools operating in Rome, Milan, Genoa, and Leghorn had a total enrollment of 1,075 students, all but 173 were Jews.

The slight increase in the number of students in the Jewish community schools (close to 300 since 1966–1967) was partly due to the arrival of refugee children from Libya after the six-day war. Jewish youth centers,
the Zionist Federation, and sections of the Italian WIZO organized Hebrew language courses in various cities.

Publications

Two new Italian Jewish publications joined the considerable number already in existence. But there still has been no centralized effort to create a democratically oriented and very widely circulated, high-level Jewish publication, that could serve as forum for the entire small Jewish community.

The political-cultural newspaper with the largest circulation (7,300), the FGEI monthly Ha-Tikvah, carried a wide variety of articles on current events, a series of articles on Jewish culture, and reports from Israel. La Rassegna Mensile di Israel, a cultural periodical supported by the Unione and edited by Professor J. Colombo, received government support in recognition of its cultural value. However, its circulation was below 1,000 copies. Israel, a privately published weekly with a circulation of about 2,000, sought to keep alive the bonds between the small and dying communities. Shalom, a new monthly replacing the now defunct official organ of the Rome Jewish community La Voce, tried to cover current events and cultural subjects. Its contributors were quite well known; part of its editorial staff had worked with youth publications and FGEI. Shalom's circulation extended to communities other than Rome. Karnenu, the illustrated periodical of the Keren Kayyemeth le-Yisrael, and La Fiamma, L'Eco dell'Educazione Ebraica, organ of the Hebrew teachers, also continued publication.

Two journals launched in 1968 had political overtones; I Quaderni del Medio Oriente ("Notebooks of the Middle East"), the organ of the group of Jews of the Left, and Atzma'ut ("Independence") the magazine of the Milan FGEI splinter group. The first sought to "furnish objective documents on the Arab-Israeli conflict and to facilitate a meeting of leftist Arabs and Israelis." Except for its opposition to FGEI and a certain nationalist tendency, the aims of the latter were not as yet clear.

The Union of Jewish Communities continued to make possible the publication of books. It financed the production of Discorsi sulla Torà ("Speeches on the Torah") by Riccardo Pacifici, the heroic rabbi of Genoa who had been deported and killed by the Nazis, which was edited by his family. Rosh Ha-shanà e Kippur by Augusto Segre was edited by the Unione. Lo shabbath: guida alla comprensione ed all'osservanza del Sabato ("The Sabbath: a Guide to the Understanding and Observation of the Sabbath") was published in a translation by Roberto Bonfil, former assistant rabbi of Milan who had emigrated to Israel.

A number of books on Jewish subjects were published by non-Jewish firms. Among important works translated into Italian were: Auschwitz by Leon Poliakov (Veutro; translation by B. Foà); Il Ghetto ("The Ghetto") by Louis Wirth (Comunità; translation by N. Morra); L'orchestra rossa: Il Servizio segreto sovietico nell'ultima guerra ("The Red Orchestra: The
Soviet Secret Service during the Last War”) by G. Perrault (Bompiani; translation by A. Dell’Orto), dealing with Jews working for the Soviet Union in Nazi occupied Europe; *Il mulino di Levin* (“Levin’s Mill”) by J. Bobrowski (Garzanti; translation by T. Villari); *L’uomo di Kiev* (“The Fixer”) by Bernard Malamud (Einaudi; translation by I. Ombroni); *La soluzione finale* (“The Incomparable Crime”) by Roger Manvell and Heinrich Fraenkel (Longanesi), and *Uno psicologo nei lager* (“A Psychologist in Concentration Camps”) by V. Frankel (Ares). Works by Italian authors were *I deportati italiani nei campi di sterminio* (“The Italian Deportees in Extermination Camps”) by V. Morelli (Artigianelli); *Impero fascista, africani ed ebrei* (“Fascist Empire, Africans, and Jews”) by Luigi Preti (Mursia); *L’inizio della stampa a Trento e il Beato Simone* (“The Beginning of the Press at Trent and Simon the Blessed”) by L. Donati (Bronzetti); and *Angelo Levi-Bianchini e la sua opera nel Levante* (“Angelo Levi-Bianchini and His Work in the Levant”) by Sergio Minerbi (Fondazione S. Mayer), and *I salmi* (“Psalms,” translated by Guido Ceronetti). In December the Mondadori publishing house issued the *Bibbia Concordata*—the Old Testament revised by Catholic, Protestant, Waldensian, and Jewish scholars—in a de luxe and in an inexpensive edition.


**Antisemitism**

Only a few small neofascist groups existed in Italy. As already stated, their waning importance and influence showed in the elections in which the rightist movements, such as the Movimento Sociale Italiano (a neofascist party which, though more or less tied to Italian neo-Nazi groups, preferred
to keep their activities formally distinct from them), lost votes and seats in parliament.

In Viareggio, Pisa, Trino, and elsewhere, Jewish cemeteries were desecrated, and, for the most part, authorities moved quickly to find the hooligans who defaced tombstones with swastikas and antisemitic slogans.

The small virulently antisemitic newspaper *La Rivolta del Popolo*, again created a stir (AJYB, 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 475) with an article, published on the eve of the elections in May. It put blame for every evil deed against outstanding persons—also for the assassination of President John F. Kennedy—on the Free Masons, a sect "which was set up by the Jews and is but a most obedient instrument for the achievement of Israel's criminal objectives." The sheet subsequently claimed that its electoral list received 10 per cent of the vote in Abruzzo, a region of central Italy.

From time to time, many newspapers and weeklies printed letters expressing hostility toward Jews. In their replies, editors usually strongly criticized these letters; on occasion they were ambiguous.

A court decision, in July, upholding the right of Mussolini's widow to a pension on the ground that she was the heir of a former head of government, was received with disgust and surprise. Although the government was opposed to the ruling, the likelihood was that the Italian taxpayers would pay to well-to-do Rachele Mussolini $500 a month, plus arrears.

**Personalia**

A number of eminent Jews died in 1968, among them Professor Isacco-Ernesto Gallico, a member of the Mantua Jewish Community Council and well-known philosopher, at the age of 78; composer Mario Castalnuovo Tedesco, in the United States, at the age of 73; Commendatore Felice Bassani, president of the Ferrara Jewish community, at the age of 87; Bruno Pincherle of Trieste, former resistance fighter and Jewish community council member; Benevenuto Terracini, professor of literature at Turin university and Jewish community council member, at the age of 82; Dr. Giorgio Forti, former president of DELASEM, the World War II Italian Jewish refugee aid agency; Aldo Servadio, one of the founders of Zionism in Italy; Mario Nizza, professor of gynecology and obstetrics, president of the Medical Association of Israel in Turin; Commendatore Jacob Sacerdote, president of the Naples Jewish community, at the age of 56; Vittorio Coen, president of the Verona Jewish community, at the age of 76; Giuseppe Ottolenghi, former member of the Unione council, former president of the Milan Jewish community, leader in World War II refugee relief, at the age of 71.

**Franco Sabatello**