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Domestic Affairs

The year 1970 will certainly be remembered—whatever else history may subsequently add—as “the year of the counter-revolution,” resulting from the unforeseen Conservative victory in the general election of June 18. When Parliament dissolved on May 29, Prime Minister Harold Wilson and the Labour party then had a majority of 65 seats in the Commons, but was much eroded by by-election losses. On June 19 Edward Heath was prime minister, with an over-all majority of 31 seats and an effective majority of 29. The Conservatives had made a net gain of 66 seats and Labour had suffered 60 losses. This overturn was so unexpected that The Guardian headlined its lead article of June 19: “Mr. Heath does a Truman.”

Virtually no commentator or opinion poll had predicted this outcome. The dominant tone of comment was to deplore the low intellectual level of the debate between the two dominant parties. The debate had become an adjunct to television, rather than the reverse, it was said. Be that as it may, less arguable was the equally general comment that no serious issue divided the parties. The two comments were perhaps related. As for the latter comment, it was certainly true that both parties were at one on policy regarding the European Common Market, that they tacitly agreed not to discuss the problem of rapidly rising wages, and that such issues of contention as did exist—the maintenance of a small force east of Suez, agricultural policy, the degree of state intervention in industry, even trade union reform—all failed to arouse the public.

Why did Labour, in the face of all predictions, lose? No consensus of opinion has emerged. Wilson certainly chose the election date fortified by indisputable evidence of recovery in Labour popularity. But his own campaign, with its insistence on attacking the Tories, did not sufficiently exploit this positive factor. Heath, on the other hand, although he also stressed the negative aspect of Labour’s rule, e.g. rising prices, high taxation, and wage inflation, was able to identify actual, not merely possible, evils. The fact is that in the years and months before the election the Labour government had tacitly admitted much in Heath’s arguments. Thus it had accepted working-
class resentment against high direct taxation; reduced commitments in public spending and reimposed health-service charges that it had come in to abolish, and postponed extending compulsory education. When the general election came, the Labour party was thus compromised in a wide range of issues—to say nothing of its retreat in the face of trade union opposition to its policy of limiting the opportunities for unofficial strikes. Even the government's undoubted success in strengthening the balance of overseas payments was susceptible to a last-minute Conservative scare.

No great difference divided the major parties on Middle East policy. But Heath struck an unusual note in his remark that Europe might speak with a united voice on Middle East problems, and that British troops in the Persian Gulf would help maintain a stability in the interests of the Middle East as a whole.

Race played a part in the campaign, but only fleetingly and with an impact impossible to identify and ascertain. The National Front (AJYB, 1967 [Vol. 68], p. 306) polled only 11,449 votes in the ten constituencies it contested. Its percentage of the poll varied from 1.9 per cent (Cardiff South East) to 5.5 per cent (Islington North). Sir Oswald Mosley's Union Movement had no candidates in the election.

At the national level, race became an issue just a fortnight before election day when Wedgwood Benn, then minister of technology, declared: "The flag of racialism which has been hoisted in Wolverhampton is beginning to look like the one which fluttered 25 years ago over Dachau and Belsen." Enoch Powell, Conservative party candidate who was up for reelection (AJYB, 1969 [Vol. 70], pp. 318, 326) made no direct reply; but two of his own speeches, a fortnight later, whether by accident or design, went some way to substantiate Benn's otherwise wild remark. In the first of the two speeches, Powell predicted that the prospective growth of commonwealth immigration and immigrant-descended population "will result in civil strife of appalling dimensions." In the second, he described the "danger from within" which he identified not only with immigration but also with student and mob demonstrations and the civil rights movement in Ulster.

None of this seemed in any way explicitly to involve the Jewish position. Similarly, as far as can be ascertained, the fate of no Jewish candidate of either party was thereby directly affected. Eighty-four Jewish candidates stood for election, 47 Labour, 21 Conservative, 13 Liberal, 2 Communist, 1 Independent. Of these, 40 were elected, thus equalling the 1966 tally. But in 1970 there was a very significant difference in party allegiance. There now were 9 Conservative M.P.'s, as compared with 2 previously, and only 31 Labour M.P.'s, as compared with 38 previously. All the evidence showed that Jewish candidates shared the fate of their party colleagues, with the possible exception of Mrs. Renee Short (Wolverhampton North East) who may have been affected by the backlash from Powell's neighboring constituency and the presence of a National Front candidate who secured 4.6 per cent of the total poll. The only Jew in Heath's new Conservative government
was the 56-year-old Sir Keith Joseph, secretary of state for social services and member of the cabinet.

**Economy**

On the day following the election, *The Financial Times* declared: "Mr. Heath is something of a radical, but it is very doubtful whether the country realises just what that means; and if it had, it might not have elected him." While the second half of this statement remained matter for conjecture, the truth of the first half became more and more apparent throughout the second half of 1970. Indeed, Heath told the Conservative party conference in October that he came into power committed to "a quiet and total revolution." By this he meant a reassertion of British interests abroad; at home, government would withdraw from those areas of life where people could fend for themselves. He would limit public expenditure and reduce taxation. Efficiency would be rewarded, and the inefficient would suffer. He would combine all this with compassion for the minority unable to help itself.

The implementation of this general outlook suffered a serious setback through the sudden death, in July, of the new Chancellor of the Exchequer Ian Macleod. Even so, given Heath's declared intention of "less government," it was not really surprising that not until the end of October did the precise shape of Conservative economic policy become clear. It did so under the aegis of Anthony Barber, who succeeded Macleod. Broadly speaking, cuts were made in government spending for defense, social services, and housing subsidies and spending by nationalized industries. This will make possible cuts of 2.5 new pence in the standard rate of income tax and a reduction of 2.5 per cent in corporation tax, to 42.5 per cent. The over-all effect on the economy was expected to be neutral.

But this by no means applied to the politics of the country. The "mini-budget," it would seem, inaugurated a counterrevolution. Whereas all postwar governments, Labour and Conservative, had hitherto shared much common ground, except in regard to the nationalization of basic industries, this was by no means true of the Heath regime. It did not accept the prevailing attitude that the removal of injustice and inequality was the primary task of a British government in the 20th century. It preferred to follow a path more in keeping with the tradition of *laissez-faire*. It was in this light that labor and trade-union opposition to the government's projected Industrial Relations Bill had to be assessed. This bill, though not markedly different from that adumbrated by the Labour government, has aroused intense hostility.

The condition of a divided nation must also be the framework within which to evaluate the strike movement of 1970. This was by far the worst year ever. A record total of 3,500 stoppages took place, costing nearly ten million working days, more than in any year since the 1926 general strike. The worst affected industries were motor vehicle, electric power (by a "work to rule"), dockers, council workers, and coal miners.
Some 2,250 of the strikes were connected with demands for higher wages. As a result, weekly earnings have been rising twice as fast as prices, which themselves have been rising twice as fast as the average in the past ten years. By autumn, weekly earnings were about 13 per cent above the 1969 level.

On the other hand, this has not brought with it certain of the normal symptoms of an inflationary society: demand has been kept in check, growth remained at an annual rate of about 3 per cent, and the unemployment figures have set fresh postwar records with each passing month. By December 620,000, or 2.7 per cent of the labor force, were unemployed. The explanation of the paradox of inflated earnings coupled with a comparatively stagnant economy probably was psychological: the very fear and expectation of falling money values spurred on inflation.

The change of government may well have contributed to this situation. The collapse of Labour's industrial legislation and the end of Labour's price and income policies certainly released a projected and an actual barrier to wage inflation. Thus the rate of inflation showed a pronounced increase in the second half of the year. Has the tide turned, or has it at least been halted? The electrical workers' slowdown, which caused widespread power cuts, was called off by union leaders in response to a hostile public reaction. Not only did they agree to cooperate in a court of inquiry, but they also agreed to the inclusion of "national interest" in the court's terms of reference. Heath has always condemned the notion of a wage policy, but there was a possibility that the court would define such a policy—pragmatically, if not otherwise. In such an event controversy was likely to move to the Conservatives' Industrial Relations Bill and to terms governing prospective British membership in the European Common Market. The "quiet and total revolution" sought by Heath had still a long way to go.

Relations with Israel

The gradual deterioration in British-Israeli relations during the Labour government's period of office accelerated with the "new era" of British diplomacy heralded by the Conservatives' assumption of power. *Daily Telegraph* Gallup polls in October showed that British sympathy for Israel was at its lowest since the six-day war (33 per cent of the sample of 1,105 adults questioned, as compared with 36 per cent in April 1970 and 59 per cent in June 1967). Conversely, pro-Arab support was at its highest since 1967, though the increase was not significant—8 per cent (4 per cent in both April 1970 and June 1967). Ten per cent thought that Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser's death made Middle East peace less likely, 45 per cent that it was more likely. People who thought that Israel should retain all or most of the territory it had occupied decreased to 19 per cent in October (34 per cent in June 1967). Twenty per cent (12 per cent in June 1967) thought it should withdraw to its original frontiers. However, Israeli Prime Minister
Golda Meir came out on top in a Gallup poll survey which, shortly before Nasser's death, investigated the popularity of the leaders of five Middle East countries involved in the crisis.

Events influencing Britain's declining sympathy included February's Phantom raid by Israel on a factory at Abu Zabal in Egypt which killed 70 civilians and injured about 100, by accident, the Israelis said, and a second raid in April on what Egyptians claimed was a school. Israel's disillusion was exacerbated in May by Britain's vote in favor of a United Nations' Security Council motion condemning Israel's raid against Lebanon as "a premeditated military action" and a violation of the UN Charter. In February a delegation of the Board of Deputies of British Jews (the first time a British prime minister received an official Jewish delegation) conveyed to Harold Wilson "the deep anxiety felt by British Jewry regarding present developments in the Middle East and certain aspects of British policy."

In April the Foreign Office claimed that Britain had put forward within the talks in New York "two important proposals" covering the "two essential commitments: the commitment to withdraw to be made by Israel and the commitment to be made by the Arab states to live in peace with Israel." The Labour government's last months, however, were characterized by a slight shift away from its confidence in Four-Power talks as a means of solving the Middle East problem.

An indication of general Conservative foreign policy was Foreign Secretary Sir Alec Douglas-Home's statement at the October party conference that Britain would not "leave the Communists as undisputed masters of all military activity in an area where vital British interests lie." It was crystallized in his proposals for solving the Middle East crisis at Harrogate later in the month. What was needed, he said, was an equilibrium which both sides would be prepared to accept; the fabric of a settlement that was fair and workable, as well as consistent with the Security Council resolution of November 1967, could easily be produced:

Agreed solutions on all the separate elements would have to be incorporated into a formal and binding agreement which would be endorsed by the United Nations Security Council; but like the resolution of November 1967, must be based on two fundamental principles—the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, and the need for a just and lasting peace in which every state in the area could live in security, i.e., Israeli armed forces must withdraw from the occupied territories, the state of belligerency must be ended, and the right of every state to live in peace within secure and recognised boundaries free from threats or acts of force must be recognised.

I believe that a settlement should establish a definitive agreement on territorial questions. Such an agreement would be the answer both to Israel's fear for her existence and at the same time, to Arab fear of Israeli expansionism. This is why the balance between the provisions for Israeli withdrawal and secure and recognised boundaries is so important. No outsider can prescribe exactly where these boundaries should be. If they are to be recognized, they must first and foremost be agreed by the countries concerned.
Israel's boundary with Egypt, Sir Alec suggested, should be the old one, with special arrangements for the Gaza area to solve "problems that derive from the immense concentration of refugees" there. In a just settlement of the refugee problem as a whole, he continued, Britain could not "support any political programme which would involve the disappearance of the state of Israel," as the resistance organizations now demand. He advocated "a settlement which will attract the agreement of all the peoples of the area, including the Palestinians, and which takes account of their legitimate aspirations."

With Jordan, the "boundaries should be based on the armistice line . . . subject to minor changes which might be agreed between the countries." The same principle, he suggested, would apply to Syria, once it accepted the November 1967 UN resolution. With Lebanon there was no problem; the present border "has never been questioned and should remain." Sir Alec saw little likelihood of a compromise on Jerusalem; but thought some agreement providing freedom of access to and protection of the holy places was essential. Finally, he called for firm guarantees of freedom of navigation in the Straits of Tiran, the Gulf of Aqaba, and the Suez Canal.

At the UN a few days later, British chief delegate Sir Colin Crowe reiterated these proposals, and suggested further the need for a UN presence in the area: the creation of demilitarized zones under UN supervision. In reply to an Israeli statement at the UN that Britain was entering the Middle East negotiations, Britain asserted that its new policy was wholly consistent with UN guidelines for settling the conflict. It did not mean that Britain wanted to "impose" a settlement.

Despite Sir Alec's repeated assurance that his proposals rested entirely on the November 1967 UN resolution and contained no risk for Israel since they envisaged an Israeli withdrawal only as part of an over-all plan in which every element would be agreed on between Israel and the Arabs, his talks with Mrs. Meir ended in deadlock. An end-of-year blow to Israeli-British relations came with Britain's abstention on the UN General Assembly resolution urging Israel to cease "violating the rights of the Arab population" in the occupied territories.

On the other hand, in November, Britain and Israel signed a convention to recognize and enforce judgement in civil matters, other than matrimonial cases or matters involving estate, bankruptcy or the winding up of companies. The treaty was to come into force three months after ratification by both countries.

In July, Aharon Remez was replaced by Michael Comay as Israeli Ambassador to Britain.

In the economic sphere, British imports from Israel between January and August were over £4 million higher and exports £6 million lower than in the comparable 1969 period. Imports for the eight months ending August 31, 1970, were slightly over $80.6 million (about $71.3 million in 1969) and exports over $152.6 million ($166.6 million in 1969). British diamond exports fell to $55.2 million from over $84 million.
For a week in July Israel banned import of all gramophone records produced by the multi-million Electrical and Musical Industries (EMI) in retaliation for the company’s decision not to renew the license under which the Israeli-based Palestine Orient Company had been pressing EMI records for the past six years. The ban was lifted when the company convinced Israeli authorities that the action was taken for commercial reasons, not as a result of the Arab boycott.

In July it was announced that Bank Hapoalim, one of Israel’s largest banks, would open a branch in London in 1971. Israel Aircraft Industries opened a staff recruitment center in Britain to engage scientists, engineers, and other qualified workers.

Press and Broadcasting

The visit to Israel by The Times editor William Rees-Mogg early in 1970 was of dominant Jewish interest. Answering questions at a Guild of Jewish Journalists meeting in March on his paper’s sometimes critical attitude to Israeli policy (specifically an article by Edward Hodgkin entitled “Grim Reports of Repression in Israel-Occupied Lands” in October 1969 (AJYB, 1970 [Vol. 71], p. 398), he said it was the duty of a responsible newspaper to present the views of both sides in a conflict. About the West Bank, Rees-Mogg himself wrote in February:

The outward signs do not suggest that the occupation is particularly oppressive, considering the Fatah situation . . . Senior Israeli officers leave an impression of being sound administrators and of considering, in rather a British way, the welfare of people they know to hate them.

The concluding article in a series of three he wrote for The Times in February dealt with the problem of the Israeli attitude to peace; it was based mainly on an interview with Golda Meir. Mrs. Meir, he wrote, assured him that she would even risk breaking up her coalition government if the Arabs were willing to negotiate and accept Israel’s terms. These terms, he considered, were not so unreasonable if Israel’s right to survive was accepted, and “no-one need doubt Mrs. Meir’s sincerity and willingness to negotiate realistically.”

In August, the Press Council rebuked Lord Arran for abusive and inflammatory language when he wrote in his column in the London Evening News “Go to it Israel and push those Egyptian bastards into the Qattara depression.” The paper later published a letter of protest from the Egyptian embassy, asking for an apology. Lord Arran’s footnote to the letter ran:

At a time when the Swiss air disaster has earned the Arabs the contempt and loathing of what the writer calls the civilised world . . . it ill becomes some UAR functionary to ask for apologies. My advice to the counsellor is to keep his trap very shut and lie low for the time being.
In April a complaint by Christopher Mayhew, M.P., against the London Jewish Chronicle was rejected by the Press Council. Mayhew claimed the Chronicle deleted the last paragraph of a letter to the editor by him, and that this deletion changed the balance of the letter, and exposed him to attack in subsequently published correspondence. The letter was in reply to an article on Mayhew’s advocacy of the Arab cause.

The Jewish Chronicle sported a new format which won praise in an article in Printing World (December) for its “stark, powerful title line in unusually drawn sans serif.” Leading typography and layout authority Allen Hutt said he knew of no weekly paper to compare with the Chronicle in lively approach to design. In March Lionel Gordon was appointed a director of Jewish Chronicle Newspaper Ltd., a subsidiary of Jewish Chronicle Ltd.

Jewish Community

Centenary celebrations of several synagogues (including the United Synagogue itself, when for the first time a reigning monarch attended a Jewish function) were the occasion for Anglo-Jewry to take a long look at its future prospects, as well as its past. Unless, said Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits, the community could find a balance between the traditions of the past and the need for “bold experiments that cast off yokes,” it would be difficult, if not impossible, to meet the gigantic challenges that faced it. As a step in that direction, he stressed the need for the community to accept its rebels. All the major communal organizations between them, the Chief Rabbi said in October, represented only a tiny segment of the community; for example, 90 per cent of the Jewish intelligentsia was left out of the thinking that could lead to its reshaping. The following month, he called for greater student involvement, pointing to the “brain-drain” constituted by lack of academic identification with Jewish life: out of some 2,000 Jewish university dons, only 200 evinced such identification. He would like “to see students break in and take over bodies such as the United Synagogue, to bring winds of change or even storms sweep into the dismal musty chambers and boardrooms of our communal organisations.”

Demography and Communal Data

Concern was also caused by a suggestion that Anglo-Jewry might be shrinking. Although no substantial change was reported in the estimated total of 410,000, vital statistics issued by the statistical and demographic research unit of the Board of Deputies of British Jews showed an annual population decline of about 800 people. The average annual figure of 1,985 male births over the period 1965–1968 comprised 1,821 reported by mohelim and a further 9 per cent estimated to represent Jewish boys circumcised by medical practitioners. Average annual male burials in the same period were 2,400.
Assuming that the female birth/death ratio was similar, total deaths would have exceeded births by 800. However, if only burial figures for the affiliated community (i.e., members of synagogues and Jewish mutual benefit societies) were used (1,600), average births exceeded average deaths by 220. This suggested that “whereas the total community may be declining in size, the section affiliated to a synagogue is now approximately stable.”

The fall in circumcisions performed at the Jewish Bearsted Memorial Hospital, London also gave rise to fears that there would be insufficient cases for those who wished to become mohelim. In July the Initiation Society was told that in 1963 six mohelim were trained; this year they would be lucky if they could train one. A report showed that members of the society performed 97 circumcisions in 1969, as compared with 101 in 1968, while cases at the Bearsted dropped from 49 to 37.

In March the Chief Rabbi issued a statement on experiments involving “test-tube babies.” Jewish law, he said, would “first seek a foolproof safeguard to assure that children are born exclusively within marriage from husband to wife.” It viewed artificial insemination with “compassionate understanding,” providing that fertilization were by the husband and certain safeguards were assured. If by an outside donor, it was “stud farming . . . a debasement of human life, utterly repugnant to Jewish ideals and methods.” In June the Chief Rabbi criticized Israel’s abortion rate, reported at 40,000 a year.

Synagogue marriages rose to 1,922 in 1969, from 1,823 in 1968, according to the Board of Deputies research unit. The most marked proportionate rise (60 per cent) in the period 1966-1969, as compared with 1961-1965, was in the right-wing Orthodox section of the community; its figure for 1969 was almost double the 1961-1965 average. The total number of Orthodox marriages rose by only 3 per cent between the periods 1961-1965 and 1966-1969, Liberal marriages declined by 15 per cent, and figures for the Sephardi and Reform groups remained almost unchanged. On the other hand, a rise of 2 per cent in Jewish marriages between the two periods compared with a rise of 12 per cent in the number of marriages for the general population of England and Wales. On the basis of the estimated Jewish population of 410,000, the rate of synagogue marriages in 1969 was 4.7 per 1,000 of the Jewish population, compared with 8.4 per 1,000 of the general population.

Preparatory plans for a nonprofit-making marriage bureau to help combat loneliness and intermarriage were complete but finances lacking, it was stated at the annual meeting of the Jewish Marriage Education Council in July. Intermarriage was described as the most agonizing problem of diaspora Jewry today, at a meeting of the Conference of European Rabbis' standing committee in London in March. Pursuing the interminable “Who is a Jew” controversy, Chief Rabbi Jakobovits said: “If we make conversion easy, the last deterrent to intermarriage and assimilation will go.”

A comment by Reverend Raymond Apple of the Hampstead synagogue,
London, that “at least half the Jewish boys whom we see under the chuppa have previously engaged in reasonably regular sexual intercourse,” was strongly condemned as a “stigma upon the character of Anglo-Jewish youth” by Rabbi Maurice Unterman. A slightly smaller proportion of Jewish girls were so inclined, said Reverend Apple, though real promiscuity and wild teenage sex parties were not common. As for drugs, the problem was growing rapidly.

**Jewish Education**

Chief Rabbi Jakobovits pushed ahead with his plans for revitalizing Jewish education with the appointment of an executive officer for education. (AJYB, 1969 [Vol. 70], p. 322). Yaacov Lehmann, a senior official of the Israeli Ministry of Education, arrived in Britain in September to take up the post for a period of two years. His job involved planning new primary and secondary schools in the Greater London area and teacher-training programs, publishing textbooks, and expanding existing schools. He also was to help coordinate activities with existing bodies.

Further attempt at educational reform was the Chief Rabbi’s proposal for a changed bar mitzvah test syllabus. Differences with honorary officers of the United Synagogue finally gave way to “broad agreement” in October on plans to make attendance at Hebrew classes or Jewish day schools compulsory for a number of years before bar mitzvah. The Chief Rabbi described as “hopelessly unfair and inadequate” the present system, which did not make such attendance compulsory and required of candidates only to pass elementary tests in Hebrew reading, translation from Bible and prayer book, religious knowledge, and Biblical history. “We must feel that the public honours given to a bar mitzvah boy by being placed in the centre of a Sabbath service have to be earned by a corresponding fulfilment of the debts owed to the community,” he said. The number of boys who took this bar mitzvah test which qualified them to read maftir and the haftorah dropped to 414 in 1969, from 451 the previous year, according to a December 1970 report of the United Synagogue’s London Board of Jewish Education.

In June, Rabbi Jakobovits indicated that at least two new major Jewish secondary schools and one primary school were planned for London alone during the next few years. The J.F.S. (Jewish Free School) Comprehensive School, on which construction was being completed at a cost of over $2.4 million, was forced to close temporarily in January when 39 of its teachers participated in the National Union of Teachers national strike for higher salaries. The headmaster’s policy of employing only religiously committed and practising Jewish teachers gave rise to controversy in the autumn.

There were also plans to rebuild the 25-year-old Prestwich Jewish Day School; to build a new primary school for the Waltham Forest Synagogue,
London, if the student enrollment could be tripled, and to construct a state Jewish primary school at Gatley, Cheshire. In April, Rosh-Pinah, the Harry and Abe Sherman Primary School, was formally reopened in Edgware, London, and a new Jewish nursery school was opened in Boreham Wood outside London.

For Jewish children at secular schools, a new schools' visitation scheme by rabbis was launched by the education committee of the United Synagogue Council of Ministers and was being run jointly with the Board of Deputies research unit as a pilot scheme in five London areas.

Meanwhile, Carmel College, which became an officially recognized public school in May when headmaster, David Stamler, was elected to the headmasters' conference, was shocked in November by Stamler's resignation because of ill health. In June, Lord Snowdon opened the college's Julius Gottlieb Exhibition Hall designed by Sir Basil Spence. Accommodation for girls was increased in the winter term. At Glasgow University, S. C. Reif, lecturer in modern Hebrew in the department of Hebrew and Semitic Studies, also took on the post of principal of the Glasgow Hebrew College which had about 40 students who were preparing for the school certificate and intermediate examinations for Hebrew teachers of the Central Examining Board in London.

Expressing disappointment at the low enrollment when the Trent Park College new three-year course in Jewish studies began in October with only three students, London Board of Jewish Education director, Isadore Fishman, pointed out that the scheme was launched too late in the year for many students to apply. The picture in the faculty's part-time teachers' training department was more encouraging, with 15 students enrolled. The Gateshead Jewish Teachers' Training College began the academic year in September with 165 students, including 65 new enrollments.

Jews' College

Canadian Rabbi Nachum Rabinovitch's appointment as principal of Jews' College (AJYB, 1970 [Vol. 71], p. 403) was unanimously approved by the College council in February, to take effect in spring 1971. Rabbi Rabinovitch indicated future policy in his statement that "interference by laymen in the running of the college must definitely be excluded" and in his proposal for a consultative academic council, to be composed of the college's staff and students, as well as of academics outside the college. He also suggested as a remedy for the low enrollment the establishment of a junior institution to act as a "feeder school," or the expansion of one of the existing schools to produce students with two or three years' intensive Jewish education behind them. In February Jews' College had a total of 61 students, full and part-time.

Controversial aspects of the principal-elect's plans for Jews' College emerged when he told a Jewish Chronicle reporter in July that "Jews' College
is no longer to be regarded exclusively for people who have chosen the ministry as a vocation.” The college’s job should be to produce totally complete Jews immersed in Jewish learning, who would then devote themselves to the pursuit of the arts and sciences. Courses in the sciences, humanities, and philosophy would be introduced for students also studying Talmud and rabbinics. He also disclosed that the college was planning to drop coeducational courses and establish separate departments for men and women students. Halakhic objections to mixed courses were thought to have influenced this decision. With female students in view, the college established the Israel and Fanny Brodie Hall of Residence for 20 girls.

The need to change the character of ministerial training at Jews’ College was discussed at several meetings of the council. In April Rev. Raymond Apple, stating that the college was “sadly lacking” in encouraging training in practical skills that made a successful minister, and called for a course in “pastoral theology” for rabbinical students and practicing rabbis. In July Haham Dr. S. Gaon suggested that the present-day rabbi was more of a functionary than a spiritual leader, and indicated future spiritual leaders should be men of letters, doctors, lawyers, scientists, professors, and academicians, as well as rabbis.

At the Universities

Interest in university-level Jewish studies continued to grow. A boom was reported at Glasgow with a peak number of 17 Jewish students in the department of Hebrew and Semitic languages. A new lecturer in Israeli studies, Israeli sociologist Ovadia Shapiro, was also appointed in the department of international economic studies. Courses dealing with Israel were also incorporated in the departments of sociology and of Hebrew and Semitic languages, as well as into post-graduate study programs. In July announcement came of the probable establishment of a lectureship in Jewish history at Birmingham University, a project sponsored by the Birmingham Jewish Graduates’ Association and approved by the university’s history department. An appeal to raise funds to support the lectureship for five years was to be launched. At Warwick University where a readership in Jewish history already existed, a Torah scroll was presented to the Jewish chaplain by Ralph Yablon, a businessman and philanthropist.

Facilities for students improved considerably. The Hillel Foundation’s center for Jewish students in London, which came into use in October, had an auditorium for 400 people, a dining hall for 300, a synagogue, library, meeting room, lounge, dormitory, bedrooms and housed the central offices of the Inter-University Jewish Federation. Kosher meals were provided throughout the week, and synagogue services were held on Sabbaths and festivals. A month-long arts festival coinciding with the opening attracted some 4,000 people. In Liverpool, the Morris Datan Hillel House opened in October, and plans were discussed for a new £100,000 Man-
Chester Hillel House to open in 1973. In January, the Norwich Jewish community associated itself with the construction of an interdenominational chaplaincy for the University of East Anglia. In Oxford, a national appeal was launched in March for a new synagogue and facilities for the local community, as well as for Jewish students from all parts of the world studying at Oxford.

Progress with schemes for university chaplains was less notable: in October the first full-time Jewish chaplain at Oxford, Rabbi Sydney Leperer, resigned for personal reasons. The Inter-University Jewish Federation (IUJF) conference in December continued its prolonged efforts to ensure that the appointment of Rabbi Michael Rosin as northern chaplain was placed on a sound financial footing, with the full backing of Anglo-Jewry. A unanimously adopted emergency resolution called on the Chief Rabbi to spare no effort to raise funds for the northern chaplaincy, and urged him to convene a meeting of the chaplaincy board to discuss the implementation of an IUJF memorandum on the board’s restructuring. Only on that basis, it was stated, would the students resume their cooperation with the board.

In response to a questionnaire circulated to Jewish students at Cambridge University, only 3 per cent of the 93 respondents did not admit to any sense of Jewish identity. Considerable interest was expressed in a program dealing with an introduction to Judaism (45 students) and education in Jewish history (67 students).

Chief Rabbi, United Synagogue, and Religious Life

Denial of rumors of Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits’s impending resignation came when he returned from a visit to Australia in December. The rumor was probably based on his remarks in October that, when he took on his “tough assignment,” he was told that he would be in the driver’s seat. “But the car has been stalled. Whatever plans I have had, we haven’t moved forward. I am getting frustrated in the driving seat and I want to get out of it if I can’t move forward.”

Apart from the revised bar mitzvah project (p. 323), the chief rabbi’s plans included a “ministers’ charter” introduced to the councils of the United Synagogue, the district synagogues, and the affiliated synagogues committee in October. It was designed to combat “the gravest crisis in the history of the Anglo-Jewish ministry” and a recruitment problem of catastrophic proportions”: seventeen ministers and all five dayyanim were due to retire within the next five to ten years. The four-point charter, aimed at increasing incentives and encouraging initiative, would give ministers the chance to take part as equals right from the top of the United Synagogue down to every local committee; greater opportunities for wider services and specialization; a ministerial appointments committee; and a revised salary structure bringing them into parity with other professions. The Chief Rabbi also suggested that ministers should be granted sabbatical leave every few
years to exchange pulpits with American colleagues, and that ministers in larger synagogues should be asked to take care of those in peripheral areas. The United Synagogue council of ministers approved the charter with minor changes: In October, the council asked the Chief Rabbi for closer contact on policy between United Synagogue ministers, himself, and lay leaders. The Association of Chazanim (cantors) claimed that it was not consulted on anything and accused Dr. Jakobovits and his office of encouraging an atmosphere of "separatism" between cantors and ministers.

Three changes were made in the Chief Rabbi's "cabinet" in May, at the end of its first two-year period of office: Reverend Leslie Hardman (Hendon) succeeded Rabbi Morris Nemeth (minister in charge of welfare); Reverend Barnett Joseph (Hackney) succeeded Rabbi Solomon Goldman (Christian-Jewish relations); Rabbi Maurice Hool (Kingsbury) succeeded Rabbi Isaac Lerner (ministerial affairs), who retained liaison with the smaller communities. Rabbis Goldman and Nemeth remained in the cabinet for another year without specific responsibilities.

The first in a series of monthly discussions between ministers and scientists under the auspices of the Chief Rabbi's office took place in December, on Jewish laws concerning the saving of human life.

Orthodox and Progressives again held separate Israel Independence Day services, following the Chief Rabbi's announcement that there could be no question of Progressives taking part in the Orthodox service. The attendance of United Synagogue representatives at a thanksgiving service to mark the centenary of the West London Reform Synagogue in October was described by the Chief Rabbi as "a violation of Jewish law." The Council of Reform and Liberal Rabbis in a statement to the Jewish Chronicle contrasted Dr. Jakobovits's views "with his past eloquence on behalf of communal unity."

An amendment to the constitution of the Board of Deputies, giving consultative status to Reform and Liberal religious authorities and groups of congregations outside the jurisdiction of the Chief Rabbi and haham, failed to get the necessary majority. Preliminary support of the amendment by the board's leaders on the grounds that it did not affect the status of the ecclesiastical authorities (the Chief Rabbi and haham) and merely formalized the existing right of consultation was withdrawn after its defeat by a coalition of the ultra-Orthodox, the Federation of Synagogues, and a section of United Synagogue representatives, who maintained that any reference to the religious authorities of the Reform and Liberal would be seen as a seal of approval by the Orthodox. The deadlock and danger of sectarian strife aroused some interest in a suggestion for the complete secularization of the Board by its dissociation from all religious issues and authorities.

Alderman Michael Fidler, M.P., was reelected unopposed as president of the Board of Deputies.

In a June budget report, United Synagogue council treasurer George Gee warned that a number of well-known London synagogues might dis-
appear so that other, stronger synagogues could be built and urgently needed centers developed in the peripheral areas of London. In March the United Synagogue council approved the establishment of a fund to that end.

Work began in December on the new $720,000 Bayswater Synagogue, London (AJYB, 1970 [Vol. 71], p. 404) planned to accommodate 400 men and 250 women. The cost is being met by the Greater London Council as compensation for a synagogue demolished in 1966.

A demand for a greater role for women in synagogue affairs was made at the first biennial meeting of the Association of Synagogue Ladies' Guilds in October. President Mrs. Jakobovits felt they should have a stronger liaison with men in running synagogues, particularly in educational matters, as well as representation on the Kashrus Commission and Shechita Board.

The Federation of Synagogues has not yet appointed a new rav rashi (chief rabbi) to succeed Rabbi Eliezer Kirzner (AJYB, 1970 [Vol. 71], p. 404). (The Federation, a group to the right of the United Synagogue and comprising mainly small congregations in and around London, was founded to meet the special needs of East European immigrants.) In October the Jewish Chronicle reported top-level secret talks between the Federation and Chief Rabbi Jakobovits on the possibility of closer cooperation between it and the United Synagogue, which may have raised the question of whether a new rav rashi would be appointed at all. It is believed that the Chief Rabbi would prefer the Federation to accept his authority and not appoint a separate religious head. Rabbi Pesach Braceiner was appointed a member of the Federation Beth Din. The Chief Rabbi went ahead with plans for a regional Beth Din for the North, which would meet in Manchester, Leeds, and Liverpool whenever necessary.

Shehitah and Kashrut

In January it was announced that five lawyer members of the London Board for Shehita would try to work out a legal definition of "kosher" and how to ensure that legal action was taken against misrepresentation by merchants. In June the board began a campaign against butchers alleged to be misleading the public by displaying kosher signs. A plea to yeshivah principals to encourage students to become shochetim was made: five or six areas were without shochetim and the situation was becoming serious.

In December a new plan to regionalize shehitah was deferred by the National Council of Shechita Boards in London until it had been examined by the Chief Rabbi and haham and until reports had been received from the board secretary and the rosh ha-shohetim, Rabbi A. J. Gardyn. The plan, which involved dividing the country into seven areas, would enable economies in administration and provide a uniform shehitah fee. Increased supplies regionally also would help wholesalers stabilize prices and sell more kosher meat without increasing their overhead. Reducing the number of abbatoirs would mean that they could be run better, and that the volume
of anti-shehitah agitation would also be reduced. The scheme would also help to improve standards of kashrut in a number of small provincial communities.

**Philanthropy and Fund Raising**

British fund raising activity for Israel reached new heights. The Jewish National Fund (JNF) contributed a total of almost $3.6 million in 1970, over 10 per cent more than the previous year, it was announced at the annual conference in November. Five hundred shares in the *Jewish Chronicle*, sent by managing director David Kessler, were among gifts received by the JNF charitable trust. “The JNF and the Jewish Welfare Board thus become virtually the only shareholders who are outside the family circles of those who have hitherto controlled the destinies of the paper,” Kessler said.

The Younger JNF raised a record of over $163,000 in 1970 and had reached its two-year target of $216,000 within 16 months, national chairman, Richard Manning, told the annual convention in November.

A young leadership group was a new development in the Joint Palestine Appeal’s (JPA) 1970 campaign, reflecting efforts to extend links with the generation born since World War II. The opening of the 1971 “Survival” campaign was preceded in October by a visit to Israel by a JPA National Study Mission which, for the first time, joined forces with the American UJA Mission. One of the largest single donations ever received was some $7.2 million presented by Mrs. Ivy Judah of London to JPA and the United Israel Appeal. A record number of synagogues participated in the 1970 Kol Nidre appeal, including several Liberal and Progressive congregations participating for the first time. Final figures for the appeal were expected to exceed $780,000.

In March the Federation of Jewish Relief Organizations commemorated 50 years of material and moral help to Jewish needy throughout the world at a dinner and ball which raised about $19,000.

**In Support of Soviet Jews**

The year has been marked by almost continuous protest against the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union, in reaction to increased Soviet anti-semitism and to appeals from Soviet Jews smuggled into Great Britain. Particular activity came from the Universities Committee for Soviet Jewry which organized demonstrations, marches, and unsuccessful attempts to submit to the Soviet embassy petitions demanding permission for Jews to emigrate to Israel (February and March), and a demonstration outside London’s Marble Arch Synagogue on Simhat Torah. In February the Chief Rabbi described their “sustained struggle to articulate the anguish of Soviet Jewry” as being “in the finest tradition of Judaism’s passionate commitment to
freedom.” A spokesman for the Front for the National Liberation of Soviet Jewry, a splinter group of the Universities Committee which picketed an exhibition marking the centenary of Lenin’s birth in May, said it would be called into action when Soviet methods warranted militant reactions. He claimed that at least 1,000 of the 5,000 to 6,000 students who usually participated in the committee’s peaceful marches were ready for more militant methods.

In August a young Glasgow Jewish Action Group was formed with the main objects of organizing campaigns on behalf of East European Jewry and monitoring and countering pro-Arab activity on university campuses. A Scottish conference on Soviet Jewry was held in Glasgow in May. Daubings by Jewish students on Soviet-owned property in London in June, in protest against the arrest of Jews in the Soviet Union, called forth an expression of regret from the Board of Deputies which did “not approve of unlawful manifestations.”

The Board was not passive. It organized a protest march to coincide with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko’s visit to London in October. A delegation unsuccessfully tried to present to Gromyko a letter expressing British Jewry’s concern at the wave of arrests of Soviet Jews who had applied to emigrate to Israel. In November the Board, which had sent a letter appealing to the President of the Soviet Union, was informed that Prime Minister Heath had raised the plight of Soviet Jewry in talks with Gromyko. Foreign Minister Sir Alec Douglas-Home also expressed British government concern in a letter to the British Section of the World Jewish Congress, stating:

The Government have made plain the fact that they deplore violations of human rights and the denial of religious freedom wherever these occur. These views, which of course apply to the conditions of Soviet Jews, have repeatedly been stated at the United Nations by our representatives, as well as to representatives of the Soviet Government.

In mid-December a sustained campaign against the death sentences passed on the Jewish hijackers in Leningrad involved all sections of the community. It was led by the Board of Deputies and the Universities Committee, which was also active in forming The Leningrad Group. Demonstrations were held and prayers were chanted; the Board appealed to Opposition leader Harold Wilson, United Nations Secretary General U Thant and the Pope, and a telegram was sent requesting the Soviet ambassador to convey to his government Anglo-Jewry’s “distress and plea” on humanitarian grounds for the repeal of the Leningrad sentences. Several members of Parliament protested to the Soviet embassy in London; arrangements were made to table motions in Parliament until after the Christmas recess. Bricks bearing the message “Struggle for Soviet Jewry. These trials are a mockery of justice” were thrown through the windows of the London office of the Russian airline Aeroflot.
Publications and Culture

Knowledge and understanding of the life and work of Chaim Weizmann were enhanced by notable books by two of his associates: The Memoirs of Israel Sieff, co-founder of the British firm of Marks and Spencer, who first met Weizmann in 1913 and was thereafter intimately involved in his Zionist activity, and The Political Diary of C.P. Scott 1911–1928, editor of the Manchester Guardian and close friend and advisor of Weizmann, as well as his intermediary with Lloyd George. Other autobiographical, biographical, and semi-autobiographical publications included The Viceroy's Wife, Lady Reading's letters home from India, collected and edited by Iris Butler; a biography of the gold and diamond millionaire, The Great Barnato, and the autobiographical A Short Walk from the Temple, both by barrister-writer Stanley Jackson; Counting my Steps, Jakov Lind's autobiography; The Youngest Son, autobiographical sketches by Ivor Montagu, and The Middle East in Revolution by Humphrey Trevelyan, an account of his experiences as British diplomat in Cairo, Baghdad and Aden (1955–1967) offering an unusually interesting first-hand picture of the late President Nasser.

Other studies of Middle East affairs included Kenneth Lowe's Suez: The Twice-Fought War, a fiercely partisan, pro-Nasser, anti-Israel and anti-Eden account of the 1956 Suez crisis; Jon Kimche's The Second Arab Awakening, a very personal and controversial analysis of various events in Middle East history from World War I to the present day; Israel and the Arab World by C.H. Dodd and Mary Sales, a collection of documents with a fair and concise introduction and conclusion; George Mikes' The Prophet Motive: Israel Today and Tomorrow, a departure from the author's previous wholly humorous work; Norman Bentwich's Israel: Two Fateful Years 1967–69; Moshe Shamir's My Life with Ishmael, a political essay on how Israel could achieve peace, interspersed with biographical detail; Yigal Allon's The Making of Israel's Army, and Shabtai Teveth's The Cursed Blessing, the story of Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Arab reaction to the situation after the six-day war.

Two works on hasidism were The World of Hassidism by H. Rabinowicz, a sober account of how the Hasidim organized themselves in their communities, and Lithuanian Hassidism by W. Z. Rabinowitz. Also of considerable importance in this category was Orthodoxy in Anglo-Jewry: 1880–1940 by Bernard Homa. The first facsimile of the early 14th-century manuscript in the British Museum, The Golden Haggadah, was published jointly by the Eugrammia Press, London, and the trustees of the British Museum. Rabbi Louis Jacob's controversial We Have Reason to Believe was recommended as “a popular work on Jewish religious thought” in a United Synagogue publication, Your Jewish Bookshelf.

Also notable were Stephen Aris' The Jews in Business, an analysis of their success in the British business world; Richard Grunberger's Hitler's SS, one
of a series of short books on "key groups of men and movements of the past," and *The Jews in Soviet Russia Since 1917*, edited by Lionel Kochan and published by the Oxford University Press for the Institute of Jewish Affairs, which contained contributions by 16 experts from Britain, America, and Israel.

Fiction included *The Rape of Tamar*, by Dan Jacobson, which retold the Biblical story in modern, self-analytic idiom, *The Rock*, by John Masters, a historical novel in which the Jews emerge as the heroes of Gibraltar; Ivan Golč's *Sick Friends*, David Nathan's *Freeloader*, Montague Haltrecht's *The Edgware Road*, and Danny Abse's *O. Jones, O. Jones* about a Welsh medical student in London. Danny Abse also received the *Jewish Chronicle* 1970 Book Award for a retrospective volume of *Selected Poems*.


Leading British personalities, including Sir Laurence Olivier and Lord Goodman, supported the establishment in London of an Anglo-Israel cultural foundation, the most tangible development to have emerged so far from the Anglo-Israel Cultural Convention (*AJYB*, 1970 [Vol. 71], p. 397). The proposed foundation would support cultural activities and institutions in Israel, encourage Israeli artists by granting fellowships and scholarships for further study in Britain, and sponsor tours by British and Israeli artists.

In July the American Jewish Historical Society and the Jewish Historical Society of England held their first joint meeting in London to discuss "Migration and Settlement."

**Zionism and Aliyah**

British Zionist organizations, including WIZO, local branches of Israeli political parties, youth movements, and the Inter-University Jewish Federation, participated in a national membership campaign which opened in October and was to last for six months. Campaign committee chairman Beatrice Barwell said its purpose was to encourage people to express their formal allegiance with the Jewish state at a time of extreme international pressure on Zionism through *aliyah*, monetary contributions, and organizational service. It was now important to broaden the appeal so that it embraced commitment to Israel in the most basic sense. Individuals were asked to enroll directly in the World Zionist Organization. British Zionist leaders estimated that, with luck, the campaign could bring in 4,000 additional Zionist Federation (ZF) members; over 1,000 joined in the first six weeks. The campaign was accompanied by a study of ideology and an educational program on the meaning of Zionism in the 1970's. The Federation's drive was not only for individual membership, but also for affiliation by groups and organizations.
However, applications for affiliation by a branch of Herut, the right-wing Israeli party (officially established in Britain in April) were rejected in June, when the matter was deferred for a year; and again in December, when it provoked the resignation of ZF treasurer Geoffrey Gelberg on the grounds that the rejection flouted “the integrity of the ZF as an umbrella movement.” Herut’s British branch chairman described the decision as “a rejection of the whole concept of the present Zionist membership drive.” Some Zionist sources considered the establishment of the British Herut branch “a serious intrusion on the British scene,” which could easily be exploited by anti-Israeli forces. It was also thought that Herut could destroy the decade-long “peaceful coexistence” of the various Zionist political factions in Britain. Although there were branches of Israeli political parties in Britain, party issues have been raised only occasionally within its Zionist movement.

In May, the chairman of the Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi Federation called on ZF to change its constitution to make possible a unified Zionist movement in Britain. Mizrachi, the only major Zionist body (its membership stood at about 10,000) outside ZF, was prepared to join if ZF would disaffiliate itself from any particular section of the world Zionist movement. ZF was affiliated to the World Confederation of General Zionists; Mizrachi was part of World Mizrachi, another constituent of the same organization.

At the 69th annual conference of the Zionist Federation in April, S. A. Miller was elected chairman. He died tragically three months later. Increased interest and participation by youth were reflected in their gain of five seats on the ZF executive. They reacted strongly to a speech by Jewish Agency aliyah department London head Moshe Shamir decrying the increased British aliyah figures as a microscopic proportion of British Jews. He called on ZF to make aliyah the “absolute priority” among its activities; to aid the British Aliyah Movement (over 50 of its members had settled since it began two years earlier), and to make the study of Hebrew a compulsory part of every Zionist activity. In December Shamir reported that some 2,000 persons emigrated from the United Kingdom to Israel in 1970, 10 per cent more than in 1969. Some 70 per cent were under the age of 30, and 60 per cent went as family units; 10 per cent settled on kibbutzim or moshavim. Immigrants included 65 doctors and nurses, and 86 engineers and technicians.

A Jewish Agency and ZF offer of two-week pilot tours to prospective British immigrants enabled the latter to establish contacts with prospective employers or business concerns and to weigh possibilities for settlement on the spot. A suggestion that recruiting officers should be sent from Israeli industrial and commercial concerns to British universities to select and engage potential graduates was made by Israeli Development Ministry adviser David Caplin. After touring 17 British universities on behalf of the Jewish Agency and ZF, he expressed astonishment at Jewish students’ ignorance of Israeli life. The weekly Jewish Observer and Middle East Review introduced a new regular feature page, “A Practical Guide to Aliyah,” containing information for intending immigrants.
A scheme for working visits to kibbutzim introduced by the Jewish Agency's Hechalutz B'anglia department in London in the summer brought a large response.

**Race Relations and Antisemitism**

In March both Labour Home Secretary James Callaghan and Quintin Hogg, speaking for the opposition party, indicated that a repeal of the 1968 Race Relations Act was not likely. Hogg's statement, understood as a guide to future Conservative government policy, called for an urgent tidying up of the immigration laws, criticized Enoch Powell, and rebutted the call from "some Conservative quarters" for repatriation. The key to improved race relations in Britain, he said, did not lie in attempts "to force social and economic contacts on members of communities to whom it is intrinsically uncongenial but in the development of conditions in which natural social and economic contacts can grow unpoisoned by economic fears and unnatural restrictions."

In February an attempt to repeal a provision of the Race Relations Act on the grounds that it infringed freedom of speech was rejected in the House of Commons (AJYB, 1970 [vol. 71], p. 409). It was argued that a repeal would deprive certain minority groups of protection against deliberate attempts to incite race hatred. The act made illegal much of the foul, offensive racialist slander that used to be written. The first case involving Jews under Section 6 of the act, which makes unlawful the publication of an advertisement indicating an intention to do an act of discrimination, was brought against *The Brighton Evening Argus* in March for publishing a help-wanted ad specifying that the applicant must be "a Jewish person." A Board of Deputies spokesman advised that if the word "Jewish" were used in an advertisement, it must be made unquestionably clear that it only denoted religious affiliation.

The Trades Advisory Council reported in August that open discrimination against Jews in business, the professions, and industry was practically negligible today, with fewer cases reported in 1970 than five or ten years earlier. The Race Relations Act stopped such open discrimination as firms stating outright, "We do not employ Jews." Council general secretary Maurice Orbach, M.P., told the *Jewish Chronicle* that the color problem in Britain had not become a breeding ground for antisemitism, but warned that antisemitism among colored people could grow if racialists sowed the seeds. He also expressed concern about the growing number of Jews who had shown interest in the Powellist movement.

A Board of Deputies report, *Improving Race Relations: A Jewish Contribution*, which said, among other things, that a small number of colored people had been indoctrinated with antisemitism, was to be followed up by meetings between Board members and leaders of Pakistani, Indian, and African communities, and by private talks to discuss the best ways of im-
plementing good race relations between them and the Anglo-Jewish community. The chairman of the Board of Deputies committee on race relations declared: "For the first time, we have deliberately involved ourselves as a community in the affairs of another community." A scheme to teach English to immigrants was begun by some London Reform synagogues.

In March Enoch Powell asked that the government's estimates of future colored population be "drastically revised upwards" in view of official figures showing that nearly 12 per cent of the 405,000 births registered in England and Wales in the second and third quarters of 1969 were to mothers born outside the United Kingdom. Home Secretary Callaghan replied the government still regarded its forecast of a colored population of 2.5 million in 1986 "as a figure of the right order."

Many sectors of the Jewish community, among them the Chief Rabbi and the Council of Reform and Liberal Rabbis in Britain, opposed the projected visit of the South African cricket team to Britain in summer 1970. The Jewish Chronicle, in April, advocated peaceful abstention to demonstrate "our disapproval of apartheid in sport."

A survey by Nicholas Deakin of the effect of the color problem on the Greater London Council elections, published in May, showed that immigrants voted along established class lines and no evidence suggested that immigration or race relations ever became an issue, although six London boroughs had a high proportion of immigrants. Extreme right-wing candidates, who specifically appealed to the anti-immigrant voter, fared disastrously, and there was no indication that anti-government candidates might have benefited from black disillusionment with official immigration policy.

Sir Oswald Mosley's Union Movement unsuccessfully fielded 32 candidates in these elections, each gaining less than 1 per cent of the votes. The movement claimed that it would not foster antisemitism if it ever came to power. Its anti-immigration platform, a spokesman told the Jewish Chronicle, was not used to get votes with the intention of then switching the attack to Jews. It disclaimed racialist tendencies and opposed only immigration of "refugees, coloured, Jewish or other." But the Association of Jewish Ex-servicemen conference warned that the 10,000 votes polled by the Union Movement in the election meant that there were some 10,000 "determined anti-semites." Warnings of the danger of a revival of antisemitism also were heard from Minister of Technology Wedgwood Benn, in June, when he said, "anti-semitism is waiting to be exploited as Mosley exploited it before," and from the Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Heenan, in a November statement that antisemitism "is not finished."

In January, a projected visit to the Oxford University Union by Adolf von Thadden, leader of the extremist right-wing West German National Democratic Party, was cancelled because of pressure from Left-wing elements and Jewish students at the University. A season of Nazi propaganda films, shown by the National Film Theatre in London in February, included the antisemitic The Eternal Jew. No protest was made by the Board of
Deputies on the understanding that the film would only be screened privately and would be put into proper context in an introduction by a historian.

Anglo-Israel-Arab Relations

The Labour government’s June general election defeat somewhat changed the balance of forces in Parliament in relation to the Middle East crisis. For the first time, a small group of Jewish members, including Board of Deputies Chairman Michael Fidler, and an energetic group of new members representing constituencies with sizeable Jewish electorates joined Israel sympathizers on the Conservative benches: a Conservative parliamentary organization for friendship with Israel had been formed in March.

An indication of the pre-election strength of pro-Israel sympathy within the Labour party were the 99 signatures of Labour M.P.’s and peers, members of the parliamentary branch of the Labour Friends of Israel, to a letter urging Prime Minister Harold Wilson in March to change government arms sales policy. (Mr. Wilson replied that Britain’s policy on arms supplies to Israel and the Arab countries, as well as the government’s ban on the sale of Chieftain tanks to the Israelis, remained unchanged.) In the election the Labour Friends of Israel lost about a quarter of its sponsors.

The year saw continued division on the Middle East between the youth groups of the Liberal party and the parliamentary Liberal party, which pledged total commitment to the continuance of the State of Israel. Committed Zionists and other supporters of Israel outnumbered pro-Arabs among the 30 new members elected to the Liberal Party Council, second only to the annual assembly as party policy-making body. The annual party conference in September firmly supported the official motion calling on Britain to work with other governments to secure a peace settlement based on formal recognition of all states in the Middle East, and overwhelmingly rejected a proposal for the creation of a secular Palestine backed by Young Liberals, who also demanded the return of all Palestinians and restitution of all Palestinian Arab rights. Young Liberal pro-Arab tendencies reached their height in April with a national executive decision to affiliate with the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, which supported al-Fatah. The decision was nullified five months later by the National Council of Young Liberals on the constitutional grounds that it contradicted the Young Liberal conference’s decision not to commit the movement to any Arab terrorist group. A non-Jewish member of Barnet county council in London resigned from the Liberal party in protest against the antisemitic sentiments of younger members. A group of young Liberals formed a Friends of Israel Association.

Following meetings between leading British Communists and al-Fatah representatives in May, the Communist party indicated unwillingness to subscribe to Arab terrorist organization aims and refused to join in denying Israel’s right to exist.

The tendency for Jewish Members of Parliament to take a pro-Israeli
line was criticized by Cecil King, former chairman of the International Publishing Company, in April, in a speech mingling praise for the Jewish religious contribution with blame for the solidarity of the Jews with Israel.

Outside parliament, new groups sprang up: In January, the powerful Committee of Concern for Jews in Arab Countries, to secure the release on humanitarian grounds of Jews detained in Arab countries; in June, Progressives for Peace in the Middle East consisting of Jewish peace workers, Socialists, and Communists, both Zionist and non-Zionist, to work within the British Socialist and Peace Movement and support leftists in the Middle East aiming at self-determination for all people; in September, a British Land of Israel Society, and in October, Middle East Peacemakers concerned with prospects of Arab-Israeli cooperation and headed by Jewish Zionist Eric Moonman and Labour M.P. Albert Booth, who formerly was associated with pro-Arab organizations.

In May, 600 demonstrators of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign—a considerably smaller number than in 1969—protested against the establishment of Israel 22 years ago in a march to the American and Israeli embassies. There they were confronted by members of Zionist and Socialist youth movements who demonstrated under the banner of “Arab-Jewish Co-existence in the Middle East.”

Inter-University Jewish Federation chairman Arnold Wagner stated that a small but growing number of Jewish students in Britain had been adopting an anti-Israeli attitude over the past 18 months. However, no more than five per cent were active Arab supporters and belonged to revolutionary and extreme Left-wing groups. An example of their activity was seen in demonstrations in Perth, Scotland, in April. The Labour Zionists Students’ Organisation was formed in February to organize a nationwide campaign to put across Israel’s case and counter Arab propaganda at universities.

The Arab Chronicle, a newspaper dedicated to serve “all the Arab states, the Arab peoples and especially the Palestine Freedom Movement” was published in London, with financial help from the Libyan government.

In January Board of Deputies defense committee chairman Victor Mishcon denied a newspaper report of a Jewish “secret-service” network created by the Board, with “Arab-looking Jews operating within organizations based in Britain designed to undermine Israeli confidence.” A month later, Mishcon reported that threats of attacks on offices had been received, and emphasized the need for precautionary measures. Plans to kidnap wealthy Jews who financed Israel and ransom them to the Arabs emerged during the trial of a British ex-army officer accused of plotting with al-Fatah leaders in Amman to blow up an El Al plane in December 1969. The officer, who had also contemplated sinking a shipload of Chieftain tanks heading for Haifa from Avonmouth, received a ten-year prison sentence. Hand grenades were found in parcels addressed to El Al offices and the Israeli embassy in October.

After the hijackings of passenger planes by Arab terrorists in August and September, Foreign Secretary Douglas-Home informed the diplomatic en-
voys of Iraq, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait that these acts were gravely damaging the Arab cause in world public opinion and asked that they urge their respective governments to use their influence with the terrorists. The British, German, and Swiss ambassadors to Israel gave assurance that no distinction would be allowed between Jew and Gentile in negotiations for the release of hijacked hostages held in Jordan. An Arab girl hijacker held in Britain after an abortive attempt on an El Al aircraft in September was returned with other Palestinian guerrilla prisoners in exchange for the hostages.

**Personalia**

Honors bestowed on British Jews included peerages for John Diamond, chief secretary to the treasury in the Labour government from 1964-70; Emanuel Shinwell, the first Jewish Labour M.P. and later a cabinet minister; Sir Max Leonard Rosenheim, K.B.E., president of the Royal College of Physicians, and Sir Barnett Janner, who retired as a Labour member of parliament at the general election, in May. Edmund Emanuel Dell, Labour minister of state, department of employment and productivity, was appointed a privy counsellor. Knighthoods were bestowed on Frank Milton, chief metropolitan magistrate; Rudy Sternberg, chairman of the British Agricultural Export Council; Charles Abrahams, chairman of the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme; Leslie Lever, former Labour M.P. for Ardwick; Dr. Joseph Stone, for 20 years Prime Minister Wilson’s doctor; businessmen Joseph Kagan and Arnold Weinstock; and Leonard Frederick Behrens CBE. William Frankel, editor of *The Jewish Chronicle*, was made a commander of the Order of the British Empire in the New Year Honours.

Alan Samuel Marre CBE, second permanent undersecretary of state, department of health and social security, who received a knighthood, was appointed parliamentary commissioner for administration as of April 1971. Harold Lever, paymaster general in the Labour government and for two years financial secretary to the treasury, was elected chairman of the all-party Public Accounts Committee.

Other appointments included Professor Hermann Bondi as defense ministry’s chief scientific advisor; Leopold David de Rothschild as a director of the Bank of England; Dr. Basil Bard CBE as managing director of the National Research Development Corporation; Philip Wien, Q.C. and George Bean as High Court judges; Professor Abraham Goldberg to the regius chair of Materia Medica at Glasgow University; Morris Finer Q.C. as vice-chairman of the London School of Economics; Dr. Gerald Gordon, professor in criminal law at Edinburgh University, as dean of the faculty of law; Dr. Claire Palley as Professor of Public Law at Queen’s University, Belfast (the first woman to hold a law chair in the United Kingdom); Dr. Philip Abrams to a new chair of sociology at Durham University.

Sir Bernhard Katz, professor of biophysics at University College, London,
won the Nobel Prize for Medicine; Miss Bernice Rubens won the £5,000 Booker Prize for Fiction for her novel *The Elected Member*, a study of a drug addict and his family, with a strong Jewish background. Nobel Prize winner Professor René Cassin was awarded the first Lionel Cohen award for services to humanity, instituted by the Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues. Dr. M.L. Kellner Pringle, Austrian-born psychologist, won the Henrietta Szold award given annually by the British branch of Children and Youth Aliyah, in recognition of her dedicated work for the mental health of children; and Miriam Kochan won the Betty Miller literary award for her book *Life in Russia under Catherine the Great*.

Among notable British Jews who died in 1970 were: Professor E. Fraenkel, emeritus professor of Latin and Hon. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in Oxford in February at the age of 81; Adolph Brotman, secretary of the Board of Deputies for 34 years, in February, at the age of 73; Dr. Laurence Phillips, founder member and past president of the London Jewish Hospital Medical Society, in London in February; Emanuel Snowman, mayor of Hampstead, London, 1953–55, eminent Zionist and communal worker, in March, at the age of 84; Charles Wolfson, philanthropist and benefactor of Jewish education, in April; Dr. Samuel Miller, scientist and Zionist leader, newly-elected chairman of the British Zionist Federation, in July, at the age of 58; Alderman Morris Phillip Greengross, civic figure, prominent in assisting Jewish-Christian relations, in London in July, at the age of 77; Professor Morris Ginsberg, distinguished sociologist and social philosopher, in August, at the age of 81; Alter Max Hurwitz, recorder of Halifax and prominent member of the Leeds Jewish community, in October, at the age of 71; Ted "Kid" Lewis, Anglo-Jewry's greatest boxer, in London in October, at the age of 76; Rabbi Elia Lapian, outstanding scholar and leading contemporary spokesman of the *mussar* movement; Dr. Gustav Warburg, international affairs expert and distinguished civil servant of Anglo-Jewry, in Strasburg in November, at the age of 70; Clara Klinghoffer, one of the best-known Jewish artists, in London in December.

A blow to scholarship was the death of Cecil Roth, Anglo-Jewry's major historian, reader in post-biblical studies at Oxford from 1939 to 1964, in Jerusalem in June, at the age of 71. His many publications did much both to make the wider public aware of the Jewish factor in European history and to awaken in many Jews an interest in their own past.

LIONEL AND MIRIAM KOCHAN
France

Middle East Policy

The year 1970 began with disputes in the government over responsibility for the "vedette" affair in December 1969, the escape from Cherbourg to Israel of five gunboats, already paid for but embargoed by the French government (AJYB, 1970 [Vol. 71], p. 418) in connection with which two French generals were suspended.

During the visit of President George Pompidou to the United States in late February and early March, Jews in several large American cities organized hostile demonstrations against France's Middle East policy. On March 9 the French government called for a meeting of the Big Four to decide on a joint policy which, in its view, was the only way to deal with the crisis in the area. At the same time, it expressed distrust of all other attempts at solution.

When, at a press conference in July, a reporter asked if there was a possibility for a change in France's attitude toward Israel, Pompidou's irritated and brutal reply was: "Monsieur, there is no subscriber at the number you are calling." In short, he likened the repeated posing of this question to the obstinacy of a caller who goes on insisting on being connected with a wrong telephone number.

In December Minister of Foreign Affairs Maurice Schumann received Asher Ben-Natan, the new Israeli ambassador to Paris.

The French government's decision to sell 50 Mirage jets to Libya, with 30 more Mirages and about 20 training planes to be delivered over the next four years, provoked many public protests and demonstrations by militant Jews and other pro-Israeli French citizens.

In September, when tensions between the Palestinian guerrillas and the Jordanian army exploded into armed conflict, Paris warned against outside intervention. King Hussein made a brief stop in Paris in December. At the funeral of Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser, France was represented by Council of State President Jacques Chaban-Delmas.

In the meantime, France was having troubles of its own in the Middle East: In the middle of June Algeria suspended negotiations on the demand for a 50 per cent increase in its share of revenue from oil produced by French companies. At year's end this question had not yet been settled.

Also in June, France signed an agreement of economic cooperation with Spain, whose Minister of Foreign Affairs had made an official visit to Paris some four months before. At about the same time, Rumanian President Nicolae Ceausescu, on a state visit to France, discussed with Pompidou concerns over the Indochina and Middle East situations.
President Pompidou paid an official visit to Moscow where, on October 13, he signed a protocol stipulating that France and the Soviet Union would take concerted action "on all points and situations creating a threat to peace." Shortly thereafter, on October 22, President Tito visited Paris.

**Domestic Affairs**

June was an exciting month in domestic politics. After a spectacular legislative election campaign, anti-Gaullist Jacques Servan-Schreiber, publisher of the weekly *L'Express* and a promoter of a "new look" for his aging Radical Socialist Party, won the seat in the Chamber of Deputies of the Gaullist vice-major of Nancy, who had resigned. In September, however, after an equally colorful campaign for the Bordeaux seat against Council of State President Chaban-Delmas, he suffered a crushing defeat. (Servan-Schreiber had not expected to win; he merely wished to weaken the government majority by drawing away some of his opponent's supporters. Chaban-Delmas, on the other hand, promised that, if elected, he would turn over his seat to someone else in his own party."

In general, Gaullists did well in the 1970 election campaigns, perhaps as a result of a crippling railroad strike in Western France in the spring, and a dramatic upsurge in university unrest. On April 30, the Parliament passed an "anti-casseur" (anti-wrecker) law making Leftist demonstrators criminally liable for any property damage they caused.

Among the most interesting and publicized political events of the year was the Communist Party's expulsion in May of the philosopher Roger Garaudy, one of its most distinguished intellectual leaders and a former member of its Central Committee, mainly for his categorical condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. An early demonstration of Garaudy's new independence was a visit to Israel.

The sudden death of General Charles de Gaulle on November 9 evoked a tremendous, nationwide emotional reaction. Though, in keeping with his wishes, no official representatives attended the funeral at Colombey-les-Deux-Eglises on November 12; a day of national mourning was declared. Thus, 80 chiefs of state, among them Israel President Zalman Shazar and former Premier David Ben-Gurion, attended the ceremonies at the Cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris. The French Jewish community paid homage to de Gaulle's memory in a solemn service at the Great Synagogue of Paris, and Chief Rabbi Jacob Kaplan sent to the widow the respectful condolences of his community.

**Pro-Jewish Action**

The overriding political events at year's end were the trials in Leningrad and Burgos. The French government petitioned Moscow for clemency for the convicted Jews, and a large, highly diverse number of famous Frenchmen—from Jean-Paul Sartre on the extreme Left to François Cardinal Marty,
Archbishop of Paris—voiced their protest. The noisiest Jewish demonstration against the trial and harsh sentences was a march by students. With very rare exceptions, the French press, daily and weekly, severely criticized the Soviet government's refusal to permit Jews to emigrate. Surprisingly, the official Communist daily, *l'Humanité*, editorialized against the Leningrad death sentences, and the party itself intervened in Moscow. Except for Arab political emigrés to France, who remained silent, most of the normally anti-Zionist groups had the moral elegance—or the political astuteness—to join the chorus of censure of the Russians' denial of justice to the accused Jews.

The general impression was that the French government's initiatives in the Leningrad case were designed to balance a pro-Arab policy in the Middle East with a demonstration of good will to Jews elsewhere. Some time before, in July, the French press had featured accounts of the discreet, effective pressures exercised by the Quai d'Orsay, through its embassy in Cairo, to authorize the departure from Egypt of a small number of Jews, along with their possessions.

**The Left and Anti-Israel Agitation**

Early in 1970 Leftist anti-Zionist and pro-Palestinian agitation began to overshadow campaigns and demonstrations in behalf of North Vietnam. With the same anti-American emphasis, "pro-Palestinian" and support for al Fatah and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine became the general consensus on the Left. Many groups and committees were disseminating propaganda that identified Zionism not only with capitalism and imperialism, but with Nazism. Some famous artists and intellectuals participated in these campaigns, for example, the writer Jean Genet who made a personal visit to Arab guerrilla camps in Jordan, and film producer Jean-Luc Godard, not to mention such quasi-professional activists in the French-Arab solidarity group as former member of the cabinet Louis Terrenoire and Georges Montaron, director of the Left-wing Catholic weekly *Témoignage Chrétien*. Support of the Palestinian Arabs was widespread also among Left-wing Gaullists, especially in Gaullist youth groups.

*Témoignage Chrétien* and a number of French personalities like the famous Abbé Pierre, the apostle of the "homeless" after World War II, participated in an International Christian Conference on Palestine, held in Beirut in May. The meeting provided the occasion for a vast deployment of anti-Israel slogans, embellished by specious theological postulates based on a new kind of biblical exegesis which denies Jews any right to the land of Israel.

The anti-Israel psychosis raged most violently among students, particularly in the high schools. Attempts to extend it to the working class were not successful despite the support of the Communist party and its obedient labor federation, the C.G.T. (Confédération Générale du Travail).

Israel had few defenders on the Left. One was the ultra-Leftist Christian
There was a certain feebleness in the response of Jews to this propaganda; real, straightforward discussion with their opponents was rare. The Arabs in France usually refused to enter into discussion with the "Zionists," leaving Israel's defenders within the New Left in a very difficult position, and forcing them to make many concessions. Certainly, it is not easy for a believer in a broad philosophical system like Marxism-Leninism to reject its specific application to the Jewish question or the Middle East crisis.

Here and there fears were expressed about the influence of this ideological-emotional pro-Palestine complex on Jewish students in high schools and universities. In fact, some Jews were among the theoreticians and supporters of the "Palestinian Revolution," the most renowned of them the Semitic scholar, Professor Maxime Rodinson. One of the most impassioned partisans of al-Fatah was an Orthodox Jew with rabbinic training. On the whole, however, the masses of young Jews have maintained their pro-Israel position. In the high schools, Jewish students displayed Zionist newspapers and books on stands they set up directly opposite those showing pro-Arab material. Fights and near-riots usually ensued.

Toward the end of 1970, agitation for the Palestinian commandos was clearly declining. The September confrontation with the Jordanian army exposed their weakness as well as their lack of unity and of support from the Arab masses. The guerrillas' political credit was seriously depreciated.

Antisemitism

The Leftist anti-Zionist campaign in the universities was joined by some students on the extreme right. Most notable among them was Oeuvre Française (French Deed), a group led by the fascist agitator Pierre Sidos, which conducted a campaign against "international pan-Zionism," a term replacing the more traditional "international Jewry." One of Sidos's propaganda themes was that the genocide in Biafra was an invention of the Rothschild press; his posters said, "When you hear talk of genocide, learn to be suspicious."

In January Maoists armed with iron bars attacked students who were distributing leaflets in the Paris Latin Quarter. On a university cafeteria bulletin board were posted the most anti-Jewish passages in Karl Marx's The Jewish Question. And in Aix-en-Provence, antisemitic graffiti appeared on a wall of the university.

The city of Amiens in the North of France witnessed a revival, though on a smaller scale, of the 1969 "rumor of Orleans" (AJYB, 1970 [Vol.71], pp. 419-420), which accused Jewish shopkeepers of kidnapping young Christian women for purposes of white slavery. Judeo-Christian friendship groups, the Union of Jewish Students and the Amiens newspapers voiced their indignation at this libelous gossip; on the other hand, according to a
report in the *Tribune Juive* of April 3, a local Catholic priest stated that “there is always some basis of truth in these stories: some women have, in fact, been kidnapped.”

On June 15, in the Paris Belleville quarter, Tunisian Jews and Arabs (Algerian workers) faced each other in street fighting, as they had shortly before the anniversary of the six-day war. The police soon restored order, but some property was damaged and a few people were slightly injured during the brief mêlée.

In the same month, distribution of an anti-Zionist, anti-Jewish pamphlet at the Soviet exposition at the Porte de Versailles provoked a strong protest by the French Union of East European Jews (L’Union française des Juifs originaires de l’Europe de l’Est).

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

*Community Affairs*

The annual convention of the Fonds Social Juif Unifié (FSJU; United Jewish Social Service Fund), chaired by Guy de Rothschild, was held in Paris on November 10, the day after de Gaulle’s death. The meeting paid unreserved homage to the general, whom it extolled as a great historic figure, the leader and driving force of the French resistance against Hitlerism.

The many studies and reports presented to this assembly demonstrated that social service and relief to refugees remained the primary concern of the French Jewish community. Since 1956 there has been a virtually uninterrupted flow of refugees into France; 70 per cent of the beneficiaries of FSJU aid were not yet French citizens and were completely dependent on the Jewish community. Of 65,000 elderly Jews, FSJU provided aid to 6,000, of whom 52 per cent were Moroccan and Tunisian immigrants. There was also a need to raise their allowance for food, which has remained at three francs per person per day since 1955.

A new FSJU project, “Judaïsme—Point 70” (Judaism for the 70’s), was designed to broaden the base of Jewish institutional life and to introduce more democratic procedures. The immediate goal was to stimulate large-scale “constructive thinking” about the French Jewish community: what it wanted to accomplish and what it could really do. Lists of 150,000 people were being used to organize a general Jewish congress; responsibility for preparations was assigned to FSJU’s 15-member executive committee and 100-member board of directors.

The convention heard a report on cultural problems delivered by Richard Marienstras, a young Jewish intellectual and university faculty member. Speaking for himself, not for FSJU, he developed the thesis that a Jewish *diaspora* culture that was neither centered on Israel nor dependent on Zionism for its vitality, was perfectly possible, even desirable. His appeal for a
certain “distance,” or remoteness, in regard to Israel was met with vigorous, often noisy, criticism from the floor.

The community celebrated the 75th birthday of France’s Chief Rabbi Jacob Kaplan, the only Jewish member of the Institut de France and recipient of an honorary degree from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. In honor of this occasion, a Jacob Kaplan Chair in Jewish Thought was established at Bar-Ilan University in Ramat-Gan.

L’Association des Juifs d’Origine Algérienne (Association of Jews of Algerian Origin) celebrated the centenary of the 1870 Crémieux Decree which granted French citizenship to the Algerian Jews.

A FSJU leader in the Midi, Samuel Castro, was named executive secretary of Conseil Européen des Services Communautaires Juifs (European Council of Jewish Community Services), whose offices were recently transferred from Geneva to Paris. The Council was founded in 1960 to coordinate social services and cultural activities on the continent. It did a great deal to help restore Jewish institutions in Florence which had been badly damaged by the flood.

The Conseil Représentatif des Israélites de France (CRIF; Representative Council of French Jews), whose functions and membership duplicated those of the coordinating committee formed after the six-day war (AJYB, 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 450), was reorganized. CRIF head Vidal Modiano, who resigned because of illness, was replaced by Professor Ady Steg, a surgeon and one of the leaders of the Jewish Student Union after the liberation of France in 1944. Professor Steg, an Orthodox Jew with a hasidic background, had performed surgery on President de Gaulle.

Zionism and Aliyah

Following its general pattern, aliyah from France in 1970 remained a predominantly elitist movement of students and intellectuals. Several prominent Jews, including some rabbis, emigrated to Israel, notably Georges Weil, former vice-president of the Strasbourg Jewish community, and Claude Hemmendinger, secretary-general of the editorial board of Tribune Juive. Among the approximately 6,000 settlers from France was a great-granddaughter of Captain Dreyfus.

A recruitment campaign by the French Zionist Federation increased its membership to 10,000 at the end of the year.

The Jewish Student Front, a Zionist dissident group in the Jewish Student Union, gained influence. Front militants were in the vanguard of demonstrations of solidarity with Soviet Jews: hunger strikes at the Memorial to Jewish Martyrs in Paris and at the Great Synagogue in Marseilles, in November, and, at the end of December, a brief sit-in at the Paris offices of Intourist, the Soviet travel agency. A number of non-Jewish members of the Communist party demonstratively joined the young Jews in the Marseilles protests.

Amitiés France-Israel (Association for French-Israeli Friendship; AJYB,
1970 [Vol. 71], p. 417) lost its prestigious leader, General Pierre Koenig, who died on December 22. He was a staunch friend and defender of Israel. According to present plans, Amitiés will be run by a committee of its members.

**Education and Culture**

There was little change in the state of Jewish education. Some 3,000 full-time students were attending Jewish elementary and high schools (not including ORT training schools). At the beginning of the school year in October, hundreds of applicants to the Maimonides and Yavneh lyceés in Paris, as well as to the Akiva school in Strasbourg, had to be turned away because they were filled to capacity. When former students of Jewish educational institutions met in October, it was determined that a relatively large percentage of graduates had left for Israel.

Throughout the school year, members of Centre Universitaire d'Études Juives (University Center of Jewish Studies) offered courses in Talmud, Midrash, biblical exegesis, modern Hebrew, and Yiddish language and literature to 600 students at the University of Paris. The unequal levels of the students' Jewish background posed one of the great difficulties of the program.

At the end of October, the French section of the World Jewish Congress conducted its 11th colloquium of French-speaking Jewish intellectuals, this time on the subject of "Israeli Youth."

A retrospective exhibit at the Grand Palais in Paris, which lasted through the summer, paid "Hommage à Chagall" (Homage to Chagall). The great Massada fortress exhibition reviewing the history of its siege and tragic fate was featured at the Paris Museum of Modern Art from July to the end of September.

A French-Israeli agreement signed in Jerusalem in March provided for an enlarged program for the exchange of scientific researchers and scholarship grants. It also recommended the creation of new chairs in the French and Hebrew at Israeli and French universities, respectively.

**Books**

Among the important 1970 literary events was the publication of Claude Vigée's *La lune d'hiver* ("Winter Moon"; Flammarion), a collection of memoirs and reflections by a former professor at Brandeis University. In a very beautiful, poetic style, he recalled his youth in Alsace, the development of his Jewish consciousness, and the deepening of his Jewish being. Among the books of Jewish interest were Elie Wiesel's *Entre deux soleils* ("Between Two Suns"; Seuil), a group of texts and dialogues on the problematic aspects of Jewishness, and André Neher's *L'Exil et la parole* ("Exile and the World"; Seuil), a brilliant and profound reformulation of the mystery of Judaism and its mission. Roger Ikor, a devotee of assimilation, wrote *Lettre ouverte aux*
*juifs de France* ("Open Letter to the Jews of France"; Albin Michel), characterized mainly by naïveté and the 19th-century anachronistic spirit.

Among the important historical and political works that appeared in French translation were: Abba Eban's *Mon Peuple* ("My People"; Buchet-Chastel) and Volume II of Solomon Grayzel's *Histoire des Juifs* ("History of the Jews; Service technique pour l'éducation"). In this category, books by French authors were: *Bloc-Notes d'un contre-révolutionnaire* ("Notebook of a Counterrevolutionary"; Gallimard) by Piotr Rawicz, recalling the 1968 May days; *Quand Jérusalem brûlait* ("While Jerusalem Burned"; Laffont) by Gérard Israël and Jacques Lebar, a chronicle of events in 70 C.E.; *Méditerranée, nouvel empire soviétique* ("The Mediterranean: New Soviet Empire"; Laffont) by Michel Salomon; *Parti-pris pour Israël* ("Prejudice for Israel"; Laffont), a completely pro-Israel presentation and opposed to France's current Middle East Policy, by the Gaullist deputy Jacques Mercier; *La gauche, Israël et les Juifs* ("The Left, Israel and the Jews"; La Table Ronde de Combat) by Jacques Hermone; *La puissance et la sagesse* ("Power and Wisdom"; Gallimard), by Georges Friedmann; *La loi du retour* ("The Law of Return"; Laffont), an evocation of the "Exodus" incident by Jacques Derog; *Moi, juif palestinien* ("I, a Palestinian Jew"), by Claude Ranel, a French Jew living in Jerusalem, thoroughly ultra-left in tone but directed against the *fedayeen* and their supporters among Western intellectuals; its thesis: Zionism and Jewish national conscience—and they alone in the Middle East—are essentially and radically revolutionary.

There was a great deal of discussion, not always favorable, of Philip Roth's *Complexe de Portnoy* ("Portnoy's Complaint"; Gallimard).

**Personalia**

General Pierre Koenig, a key figure in the defeat of Rommel by the Allies in World War II, for many years president of the Association for French-Israeli Friendship and militant advocate of an alliance between the two countries, died at Neuilly sur Seine on September 2, at the age of 72.

Joseph Bloch, Chief Rabbi of Haguenau, Alsace, died on September 8, at the age of 95. A graduate of the famous Hildesheimer Seminary in Berlin, he was a great Jewish scholar whose many scholarly and popular works enriched the literary heritage of French Jewry. He was recognized as a specialist on the Jewish calendar, and for many years his calendars had been used in all Jewish communities of Western Europe. He was a modest man who refused many important positions so that he could remain spiritual leader of his small, ancient community. Students traveled great distances to seek his advice on many difficult problems they encountered in the study of Judaism.

Arnold Mandel
The Netherlands

Foreign Policy

Since the end of World War II, the major foreign policy problems of the Netherlands have been related to its overseas colonial empire. Thus, in January 1969, the Dutch were shocked when Dr. J. G. Hueting, physician and psychologist, revealed in a televised interview that Dutch troops had committed war crimes in Indonesia (then the Dutch East Indies) in 1947 and 1948. William Drees, premier at the time, countered that he had been aware of only two cases of military misbehavior during his administration. Parliament asked for an investigation which found that there had been 150 such incidents. A motion by Socialist leader Joop M. den Uijl for a parliamentary committee to take a closer look at specific occurrences was defeated on the ground that the statute of limitations and an amnesty made prosecution impossible.

At the request of the governor of the Netherlands Antilles, the Dutch Ministerial Council decided in May to send 300 naval men to Curacao to strengthen the Dutch detachment already there. The request came when some 5,000 striking oil company employees rioted in Willemstad. Leftist and Antillian groups in the Netherlands, especially, deplored the Dutch military involvement. Speaking for the government, Vice-Premier and Minister for West Indian Affairs Johannes A. Bakker said that, according to statute, Holland was committed to furnish military upon request by its commonwealth countries. The lower chamber of parliament rejected a motion by the Democrats '66 and the Socialist party that the statute be amended to bar all future dispatch of military forces.

Domestic Affairs

In April 1969 students at the small Roman Catholic Tilburg university occupied the school's buildings to underscore their demand for a voice in university affairs. They were promised some participation, and the occupation ended. Students at other universities later took similar action, with the same result. At the University of Amsterdam students, who occupied the administration center in May, were removed by the police. In parliament, the Pacifist Socialist (PSP) and the Communist (CPN) parties backed the students' methods; the other parties expressed understanding for their demands. Between June 12 and 27, 1969, fines or prison sentences were given to 538 student protesters. During the first few days of the trials, student violence occurred in Amsterdam streets in protest against presiding
Judge G. H. Nomes who, shortly before, had sentenced a Communist youth accused of insulting the royal family to three months in jail and loss of voting right for five years.

The country's artists demonstrated their demand for greater participation in government policy on the arts by occupying an exhibit room in the Rijksmuseum. Minister of Culture Margarete A. M. Klompé (KVP) promised them closer cooperation.

Economy

In 1970 Holland's main problem was to check inflationary forces. Leo de Block resigned as minister economic affairs in January because the government, under pressure from parliament, agreed to approve a collective workers' agreement for higher wages. De Block opposed the agreement on the ground that it would set a precedent and, since demands far exceeded what Holland could bear financially and economically, would aggravate the inflation. He was succeeded by Roelf J. Nelissen (KVP). The government imposed a wage freeze, and, on December 12, the labor unions called a one-hour general strike in protest.

Elections

In contrast to earlier elections, in which some 95 per cent of the voters went to the polls, only 68.9 per cent voted in March. This decline followed parliament's revocation of a 1917 law that had made voting mandatory. In the state councils elections Democrats '66, whose support came mainly from the youth, showed the largest gain: 7.69 per cent of the vote, compared to 4.47 per cent in 1967. The conservative Liberal party (Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie; VVD) from which the Democrats '66 split off on the left, gained 2 per cent. At the other end of the political spectrum, the Netherlands Communist party also gained, but only 0.8 per cent. The Farmers' party (Boerenpartij; BP), a secular party of extreme right-wing orientation which was formed in 1967 and later split into three groups, polled 6 per cent fewer votes than in 1967. The Pacifist Socialist party (PSP) lost 1.31 per cent of its 1967 report.

The largest opposition party, the Labor party (Partij van de Arbeid; PvdA), would have lost 11 seats if the election had been for the lower chamber of parliament. Without a doubt, the New Left now had greater influence on the nomination of candidates.

Some members of PvdA set up the Democratic Appeal within the party as a counterpart to the PvdA—New Left. Followers of Democratic Appeal established a new party, the Democratic Socialist '70 party (DS '70) in April, and left the PvdA. Locally, a few deputies left the PvdA because they no longer agreed with its "turning to the Left and radicalization" of the party, they affiliated with DS '70. In May 1970 DS '70 was seated in parliament
as the 15th party, when Frans J. Goedhart and Willem J. Schuitemaker left PvdA to join it. This occurred after the defeat of a PvdA-supported motion condemning the American invasion of Cambodia. In July another PvdA member went over to DS '70, thus giving the new party three seats.

In the June municipal council elections, DS '70 polled 2.3 per cent of the vote in the 12 municipalities where its candidates ran for office. The voting in this election was even lighter than in the state council elections, with only a 66.6 per cent turnout. Most noteworthy in the election was the strong attraction of the Kabouter (pixy) party, an anarchist group that grew out of the Provos, and whose leading spirit Roel van Duyn had been in the Provo movement (the Provos—short for provocateurs—who first appeared in 1965 sought to provoke the establishment with Yippie-like platforms. The group disbanded in 1969 because it feared it had become institutionalized.) However, after the election the Kabouters proved to be considerably less significant than the Provos before them.

War Crimes

COLLABORATION WITH NAZIS

The first of a ten-volume work, The Netherlands in the Second World War, appeared in February 1969 under the title Overture. Professor Lou de Jong, its author and director of the National Institute of War Documentation in Amsterdam, had been commissioned by the government in 1955 to research and describe this period. The Dutch press gave special attention to his detailed account of the government's return of Jewish refugees to Germany in 1938 and 1939, when then Justice Minister Carel M. F. J. Goseling ruled that they must be considered "undesirable persons" who should be sent back. De Jong also quoted from an article on Hitler's Mein Kampf, written in 1932 by Jan A. Nederbragt, who later was to become Holland's first ambassador to Israel, which said that, while antisemitism was unacceptable, "where pure human judgment of Jews is concerned, I must say that I strongly agree with Hitler."

In December 1970 Minister of Social Affairs Bouke Roolvink set up a work group to study the effects of experiences in concentration camps on the survivors.

In the July 1969 issue of the semi-annual Studio Rosenthaliana, a periodical for Jewish research and history in Holland, Yosef Michman, head of the cultural division of the Israel Ministry of Education and Culture, wrote that the Jews would not have been better off if the Jewish Council had refused to cooperate actively with the occupation government. In fact, he said, they actually would have been treated much more harshly. What was to be regretted, he said, was that the council did not cooperate with the Dutch underground.
WEINREB CASE

The press also gave wide coverage to the three-volume memoirs *Collaboration and Resistance, 1940–1945: An Attempt to Kill a Myth*, by Friedrich Weinreb, edited by the journalist Renate Rubinstein and published in 1969–1970. In October 1948 a Dutch court had sentenced Friedrich Weinreb to six years’ imprisonment for having betrayed underground workers and Jews to the Germans between 1940 and 1945. The memoirs ended with an analysis of the judgment by Aad Nuis, a poet and columnist and defender of Weinreb, who concluded that the court had not understood the nature of persecution of the Jews.

The question was whether Weinreb was a traitor, as the court ruled in 1948 and with which many Jews agreed, or whether he was a hero who had saved hundreds of lives in 1940–45, as he himself related and to which many non-Jews attested. Some of Weinreb’s defenders started a movement to rehabilitate him. The publication of his memoirs was the first step in this effort, the formal establishment of a committee, another.


*Het Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad*, the only Jewish weekly in Holland, thought Weinreb’s memoirs only opened up old wounds and took a stand against him, as did many in the Jewish community. Non-Jews, in particular, came to his defense. Under pressure from those opposing Weinreb, a television showing of a film, “Weinreb and His Fellow Man,” scheduled for February 20, 1970, was postponed a few weeks. In March 1970 the Dutch daily *De Tijd* published a special issue containing reprints of all articles it had printed for and against Weinreb.

A poll on the Weinreb affair, published by the firm “Inter/View” in January 1970, showed that about 50 per cent of the Dutch respondents, 18 years of age and older, knew something about it. Forty per cent were either certain, or thought it plausible, that Weinreb had been innocently condemned. The young, particularly, were for reopening the Weinreb case. The Dutch Ministry of Education and Science later commissioned the National Institute for War Documentation to report on Weinreb’s activities during the Nazi occupation, as well as to investigate whether information on the persecution of Jews, received since the trial, could put a different light on Weinreb’s activities.

CONVICTED WAR CRIMINALS

The release of the three Nazi war criminals still held at Breda in the Netherlands has been sought repeatedly in recent years. Two such requests
were denied in 1967 (AJYB, 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 462) because of the strong opposition of the majority of Dutch and Jewish groups. Franz Fischer had been found guilty of the deportation of 13,000 Jews from The Hague, Ferdinand aus der Funten of the deportation of over 70,000 Jews from Amsterdam, and Joseph J. Kotalla, of crimes committed as commandant of the Amersfoort concentration camp in Holland. The original death sentences were commuted on appeal to life imprisonment.

The three Jewish communities—Orthodox Ashkenazi, Orthodox Sephardi, and Liberal—had sent Justice Minister Carel H. F. Polak a joint letter protesting proposed legislation that would conditionally free the prisoners after 20 years. The Dutch Auschwitz Committee, the organization of concentration camp survivors, supported the protest in an open letter addressed to the justice minister, members of parliament, and the public. Chief Rabbi Levi Vorst of Rotterdam, Chief Rabbi Elieser Berlinger of Utrecht, and Rabbi Jacob Soetendorp of the Amsterdam Liberal community joined the protest in television broadcasts and newspaper articles. On September 30, 1969, Polak announced that he would not introduce such legislation. Ten months later he declared that 69 Dutchmen and foreigners suspected of war crimes were still being sought.

The plan of former fascists to convene in Donderen near the German border in November 1970 was given up under pressure of public opinion. At the same time, it was announced that the Jan Hartman Foundation had been established in August 1969 for the purpose of “advancing the good life of persons, their wives and children, whose deeds and/or behavior in the Second World War were subject to investigation.” Its chairman, Henk Knigge, had been sentenced in 1948 to 14 years’ imprisonment for betraying a Dutch Jew to a German.

Memory of Nazi Occupation

On November 24, 1969, during a state visit to Holland, West German President Gustav Heinemann visited the memorial in the inner court of the Dutch Theater in Amsterdam, the central gathering point for Jews who had been deported to Westerbork concentration camp in transit to death camps in Poland. Heinemann, accompanied by Queen Juliana, Prince Bernhard, Amsterdam Mayor Ivo Samkalden, Rabbi Soetendorp, Rabbi David Bromman of the Nederlands Israelietische Hoofdsynagoge, and Rabbi Barend Drukarch of the Portuguese-Jewish Community of Amsterdam placed a wreath at the foot of the monument in honor of the 100,000 Dutch Jews murdered by the Nazis. Zionist Federation chairman Marius Tels called Heinemann’s visit to the monument “horrible.”

In an open letter dated December 1969, the professional staff of the Jewish Social Work Foundation (Stichting Joods Maatschappelijk Werk) protested the failure to help Jewish war victims. It called measures forced from the government in 1968 by radio, television, and press campaigns insufficient
and shameful. In May 1970 Socialist deputy Jan Voogd introduced a motion on the floor of parliament, asking the government to set up a pension plan for needy Jewish war victims, such as the one already in force for former resistance fighters and Nazi hostages. Though the government had advised against the motion, it was adopted by a vote of 64 to 52. Social Affairs Minister Jan van de Poel announced in December that the administration was not prepared to act on the motion. Instead, existing aid measures were extended. Minimum and maximum monthly payments to invalid Jewish war victims were raised to $170.00 and $470.00, respectively. Only those with annual incomes not exceeding $7,000 were eligible. For the first time, Dutch Jews living outside Holland could apply for this aid.

On the eve of the 25th anniversary of liberation of Holland from Nazi occupation, much attention was given to the Jews. Jewish Life in the Frisian Capital 1920–1945: was published in 1970, and its author, Sam de Jong, was introduced to Queen Juliana. In May a national commemorative service for the murdered Dutch Jews was held in Amsterdam. Chief Rabbi Aaron Schuster delivered a sermon on the text “I am the man who has seen suffering.” A Jewish choir from Antwerp came especially to perform during the service. The Nieuwe Apeldoornse Courant published a detailed story of the war period by the Chief Rabbi’s daughter, who had settled in Israel. Other newspapers carried stories about Ha-shalshelet (The Chain), the illegal Jewish newspaper during the German occupation. Secret synagogue services were also discussed in Holland’s largest weekly, Elsevier’s Weekblad.

On the memorial day, May 4, Queen Juliana and Prince Bernhard went to the site of Westerbork concentration camp where the Jewish graphic artist Ralph Prins of The Hague, a former prisoner of this camp, presented them with a monument he created for the occasion. Also, in May, the Jewish Historical Museum in Amsterdam had an exhibition of art that had been banned by the Nazis as “degenerate.”

The entire Dutch press reprinted an interview with Prince Claus, husband of Crown Princess Beatrix, which first appeared in the Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad on August 7, 1970. Concerning the opposition of the Jews to his marriage, he said, “My wife and I completely understood the diffidence of the Jewish leaders at the time of the marriage, on March 10, 1966. After my discussion with them, I did not expect them to change their decision not to attend the marriage ceremony” (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 333). The Prince continued that it would give him “the greatest pleasure” to go to Israel, “a country for which I have strong sympathy.” He added that he, as a German, felt a sense of collective, but not personal, responsibility for what had happened between 1933 and 1945.

Restitution

In January 1970 the Dutch Jewelry Foundation Committee announced that they had a test case pending in Berlin. They had requested the West
German Ministry of Finance to pay compensation to the heirs of the 100,000 slain Dutch Jews for the precious jewels plundered by the Germans.

**Relations with Israel**

The Dutch people continued to show support of Israel. One day in February 1969, there appeared in the press a small advertisement with the Israeli flag, suggesting that the people watch television that evening. The advertisement was placed by Jan W. van der Hoeven, son of Queen Juliana's secretary and pastor of the Holy Sepulchre Church in Jerusalem, who was married to an Arab. Van der Hoeven, himself, appeared on the broadcast and made an impassioned plea to the Dutch not to let Israel down. He asked that, as a demonstration of support, viewers clip the advertisement from the papers, write in their name and address, and send it to him. Some 10,000 persons responded. The pastor also toured the Netherlands for several weeks to encourage non-Jews to help prevent Israel's isolation.

An opinion poll conducted in December 1969 showed that only 1 per cent of the Dutch population felt that their government should support the Arab countries; 34 per cent thought it should support Israel, 43 per cent that it remain neutral, and 22 per cent had no opinion.

Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban visited Holland in February 1970. He conferred with Dutch Foreign Minister Joseph M. A. H. Luns and was received by Queen Juliana. About a month later, Luns visited Jordan, Lebanon, and Egypt, where he said he was acting as "messenger" for Abba Eban. Upon his return home, Luns gave a report to Eban and, at a press conference, expressed pessimism about chances for peace in the Middle East.

Also pessimistic was Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba who, on a visit to Holland in April 1970, said that no peace was to be expected in the Middle East as long as Israel, "out of the arrogance resulting from the gains of conquest," refused to consider the Arab position. This view was supported by President Tito of Yugoslavia who, on his visit to Holland in October 1970, said he was convinced that Israel had let her best chances go by. In a few years, he added, the Arabs would be so strong in manpower and materiel that nothing could deter them.

Before returning to Israel from Amsterdam in March 1970, Consul General Shmuel Yaari gave press interviews, in which he said that sympathy for Israel was still widespread in the Netherlands. "In New Left circles," he said, "there also are a sufficient number of people who understand Israel. The loudest criers against Israel do not automatically have the largest following." Yaari was succeeded by Miss T. Nir. In May the general consulate in Amsterdam was closed for financial reasons and attached to the embassy in The Hague. The first secretary of the embassy, Yaacov Yannai, returned to Israel in September.

Dutch aid to Jews during the German occupation again was given rec-
ognition in May 1970, when Israel Ambassador Shimshon Arad awarded 22 medals and certificates from the Yad Vashem in Jerusalem, as he had done in 1969.

A 14-member Dutch parliamentary mission representing 8 of the 12 political parties in government, visited Israel in July. Dutch Minister for Development Aid Bernard J. Udink attended several conferences in Israel in August. From these it was learned that Holland and Israel would undertake a joint public-health project in the African countries, with Holland supplying the medical equipment for a clinic and Israel the medical staff.

In an audience with Queen Juliana in August, Israel Ambassador Shimshon Arad presented her with an especially designed Jewish National Fund certificate for the establishment of the Queen Wilhelmina Forest near Nazareth, on the occasion of the anniversary of the late queen's 90th birthday. The forest was to mark the 25th anniversary of the Netherlands' liberation from Nazi occupation.

In September Queen Juliana received a WIZO (Women's International Zionist Organization) delegation on the occasion of the organization's 50th anniversary. WIZO president Mrs. Raya Ragkon presented to the Queen a Hebrew-English Bible with a ruby-encrusted silver cover. On the occasion of the anniversary, the premiere of The Rainbow, a musical for children, took place in The Hague.

In November the Netherlands Ambassador to Israel Baron Oswald F. B. van Schoonheten was succeeded by Gijsbert J. Jongejans, until then ambassador to Czechoslovakia.

**Arab and Pro-Arab Activities**

Special security measures were taken in August 1969 at the Israeli embassy in The Hague and the consulate in Amsterdam, when the police was warned that the offices would be raided by Arabs. These measures were later extended to include the El Al and Israel Tourist Information offices in Amsterdam. An attack on the embassy in September misfired. More than two months later, the juvenile court sentenced a 16-year-old suspect from Amman, Tayser Ali el Attar, to three months in reform school, which included pre-trial time served. On appeal, a higher court upheld the sentence in December, when el Attar was released and sent to Tripoli.

A radio broadcast by G. B. J. Hilterman on "The World Situation" (October 12, 1969), in which he called the Roman Catholic daily De Volkskrant "anti-semitic or, at any rate, anti-Israel" because of its one-sided reporting on Israel, created a sensational controversy. For many Dutch it was a signal to start a discussion in the press, on radio, and television on whether being anti-Israel was the same as being antisemitic. The Volkskrant sued Hilterman for libel, and on November 7 the president of the Amsterdam court ruled against the paper. He found that the Volkskrant had shown such a lack of objectivity in its Middle East reporting that it could justly be called
antisemitic or, at any rate, anti-Israel. In his opinion, "The situation of the Jews and their collective fate in the world depends so much on, and is connected with, Israel's existence and survival that an anti-Israel stand can therefore be considered anti-semitic."

In an appeal to a higher court on January 8, 1970, the Volkskrant was exonerated. Hilterman was asked to state in his next radio commentary that, in the court's view, an examination of the paper's reporting did not justify the accusation of antisemitism. Several days later, the Volkskrant filed a complaint with the Council of Journalism, which heard both parties in November. The council ruled at the beginning of 1971 that Hilterman had not damaged the paper's reputation and therefore dismissed the Volkskrant's complaint.

The five Jewish members of the Rivierenbuurt local council in Amsterdam resigned in August 1969 in protest against its chairman, Father Jan A. W. van Eupen, who had been a spokesman for a delegation of the Palestine Committee on its trip through the Arab countries. Van Eupen had refused an earlier invitation to visit Israel. The membership and Rabbi David Brodman of the Hoofdsynagoge and Rabbi Jacob Soetendorp of the Liberal-Jewish Community issued the following joint statement: "The danger to the state of Israel touches the entire Jewish people, our own family members. The continued existence of Israel is a matter of life and death to us." A week later Father van Eupen declared "It is not true that I am on the side of the Arab terrorists and see murder as the highest ideal in the Middle East."

In response to an appeal by Syria that Arab countries mobilize in retaliation for the "One Hundred Days for Israel" campaign (p. 362), Amsterdam Mayor Samkalden stated in January 1970: "The Syrian step against a peaceful campaign should make everyone realize how Israel's needs have grown. May the brave land find many friends in these hundred days."

In March Bernard von Tijn resigned from the Pacifist Socialist party because its publication, The Radical, carried articles questioning Israel's right to exist. Van Tijn, a long-time board member of the Netherland Zionist Federation, represented the party in the Amsterdam council from 1966 to 1968.

Rabbi Soetendorp refused to continue a radio lecture series in May 1969 because the network's commentator Wouter Gortzak, reporting on an Arab attack on a bus of Israeli schoolchildren, expressed understanding for the attack but no word of pity for the victims.

In May 1970 the United Student Organization of Amsterdam held a Middle East Congress, with Maxime Rodinson, the noted professor of Arabic at the Sorbonne in Paris; the anti-Zionist Jewish writer Nathan Weinstock of Brussels, and representatives of El Fatah and other Arabs as speakers. Amsterdam Mayor Samkalden, who also was curator of Amsterdam University, refused to put university premises at the disposal of the congress because the Israeli viewpoint was not represented. The Congress was not a success.
Anne Frank House

The director of the Anne Frank House, S. H. Radius, resigned in April 1969 when its board of directors failed to go along with his suggestion that it be used as an international center to educate young people about war, race discrimination, and certain political movements. The board felt that its aim should be the propagation of Anne Frank's ideas because, as board member Rabbi Soetendorp expressed it, "Emphasis on the past may prevent the killing of Jews in the future."

The new director of the House, I. J. van Houte, evidently disagreed with the board. In December the premises were used by the Palestine Committee for a discussion of antisemitism in Israel. The announced participants were five members of the Palestine Committee and the Anne Frank Foundation chairman, Henri van Praag, who spoke for Israel. Upon complaint by Rabbi Soetendorp that the Israeli position was not adequately represented, he and Martin Boertien, a professor of Hebrew, were added to the panel. On that occasion, van Houte made it clear that the Anne Frank House was a youth center having nothing to do with Judaism and that it therefore could be used also for anti-Israel events. Earlier, in April, at a 50th anniversary meeting of the Society for Jewish Science in the Netherlands, historian Jacob Presser expressed the view that a cult had developed around the figure of Anne Frank which was akin to the veneration of Roman Catholic saints.

In September van Houte announced that the Anne Frank House could no longer cope with the 170,000 annual visitors. The need to enlarge the structure moved Henk van Stipriaan, in April 1970, to make an appeal for contributions on his radio program "From the Heart." It brought in $20,000, and in October the house was temporarily closed for remodeling.

Christian-Jewish Relations

According to a March 1969 announcement, a 12-part project was begun under the joint editorship of Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic theologians: the Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, a handbook of the Jewish sources of the New Testament. Among the project participants were Professors S. Safari, M. Stern, and David Flusser of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem; R. le Déaut, professor of Bible exegesis at the Papal Bible Institute in Rome; and Rabbis Samuel Sandmel and Marc Tanenbaum of the United States. In December 1970 the undertaking appeared to be in financial difficulty, and subsidies were promised by the Vatican Secretariat for Christian-Jewish Relations and the World Council of Churches.

The Dutch Reformed Church, the largest Protestant group in Holland, said in a report to its general synod that "in the name of God, the special ties between the Jewish people and Palestine still remain in force." The report, which was to be studied more closely, also declared that "the foundation
and survival of Israel as a state must be considered in the same light as God's preservation of the Jewish people in its true character." Some ministers protested the lofty position accorded Israel in the report. A new version, which was accepted by the Reform synod in June 1970, by a vote of 39 to 10, said: "We expect more of the people of Israel than of any other people. Whoever is put in a special position must also behave in a special way." The statement that "Christians who now deny Israel's right to exist and who oppose it are indirectly opposing God" disappeared from the report.

The pastoral council of the Roman Catholic Church, held in April 1970, also dealt with the Jews. Its report spoke of "rejecting antisemitism and acknowledging that the [New Testament] Gospels have their origin in Jewish ideas and faith," and "the failure of the churches and individual Christians [to act] during World War II, partly because of the legacy of antisemitism throughout the ages." Some professors of the Roman Catholic university of Nijmegen disagreed with the use of the term "Jewish people" because it had become a political term for "a people which makes political demands based on religion."

JEWS COMMUNITY

Some of the findings of a demographic study commissioned by the Jewish Social Work Foundation (Joods Maatschappelijk Werk) were revealed in December 1969: As of January 1, 1966, Holland had 29,675 Jews, of whom some 14,200 were men and 14,500 women. Twenty-six per cent were under 20 years old, and 48.4 per cent over 45. Of the 15,262 married Jews, 5,804 had non-Jewish spouses. One-third of the children who were raised as Jews had non-Jewish fathers. The full report was to be published at a later date.

Communal Activities

At its meeting, on June 23, 1970, the Nederlands Israelietisch Kerkenootschap, the representative body of the 45 Ashkenazi-Orthodox Jewish communities, elected a new governing board. Izak Zadoks, head of the Jewish community of The Hague, became chairman. He succeeded Izak Dasberg, who resigned at the age of 70 after having been in office for 16 years.

In its December 1970 issue, Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad published an unsigned article it had received, calling for a Dutch branch of the Jewish Defense League, "because we Jews must defend ourselves everywhere and always." Despite the negative reaction from the Jewish community, the paper's editor-in-chief Hans Knoop supported the idea. But he withdrew his support when Jewish protests poured in from all sides.

Knoop's appointment, in May 1969, as editor-in-chief of the paper had caused a stir, also in the Dutch press. He had been reporter for the Amster-
dam daily De Telegraaf, which now was pro-Jewish and pro-Israel but had a strongly antisemitic past. It had been banned in the first years after World War II because of collaboration with the Germans. Therefore, when Knoop joined the Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad some contributors withdrew their support. He resigned at the end of 1970, before a successor was found, and returned to De Telegraaf.

In November 1970 the three Jewish communities sent a note protesting against the definition of "Jew" in the just published ninth edition of the large Dutch dictionary Van Dale to its publisher. The entry included such synonyms as usurer, swindler, and deceiver. The note stated that the dictionary's editor Dr. G. Kruijskamp failed to change the definition despite similar requests regarding earlier editions. At the same time, Hans Boekdrukker, a Jewish wholesale paper distributor in Voorburg, sued the publisher because he felt that the definition injured his reputation. At the trial, the publisher promised that in forthcoming editions all negative descriptive terms would be provided with a note saying "These are expressions employed by antisemities." In December the court ruled in favor of the publisher because the new edition was not sufficiently changed or reworked to differentiate it from the one before. In the view of the presiding judge, a dictionary entry can hardly be considered an insult, since it reproduces only what already exists in the language of the people. Even before the trial, the Dutch press called the Jewish communities' and Boekdrukker's complaints unjustified. Comparisons were frequently drawn with the definition of "Dutch" in dictionaries used in English-speaking countries.

Religious Activities

After a stormy campaign, the election for the 30-member council of the Amsterdam Ashkenazi Nederlands Israeliische Hoofdsynagoge, the largest community in Holland, was held in March 1969. Only 1,381 of the 3,741 eligible members voted. Kehillah Jaäcov, the organization of the East European Jews, elected three representatives to the board, the Kadima (Progressive) party, five; Comité 5729, the party of the young Orthodox Jews, seven, and the Zionist Achduth Yisrael party (Unity for Israel), 15. Also in March a fifth Liberal community was founded in Rotterdam. It was temporarily under the jurisdiction of the Liberal-Jewish community of The Hague, of which Rabbi Awraham Soetendorp was spiritual leader.

In May 1969 information became available that a total of 55 religious wedding ceremonies had been performed in the three Dutch Jewish communities in 1967.

In a personal letter to the members of the Nederlands Israeliische Hoofdsynagoge, written on the eve of Rosh Ha-shanah 1969, Chief Rabbi Aaron Schuster stated that, spiritually, Dutch Jewry "was in a deplorable condition. Many Jewish children are prey to the strong influence of the surroundings. Our culture, religion, and history no longer speak to them. 
Indifference and assimilation are the result.” The Chief Rabbi called for greater awareness.

The last kosher restaurant in Amsterdam closed in September 1970.

In May 1969 the Netherlands Chief Rabbinate asked all synagogues, to include in three services each week a special prayer and Psalm for Israel. In December prayers were offered “for Jews living in lands where they suffer persecution.”

Menachem Fink, an Argentine-born resident of Israel, was named Chief Rabbi of The Hague in October 1970, to succeed Chief Rabbi Salomon Beëri who retired a month later. Daniel Kahn, born in New York and a resident of Denmark since 1946, was named Chief Rabbi of Rotterdam in December; Chief Rabbi Levi Vorst was to retire in March 1971.

In May 1969 a new synagogue was consecrated in Amstelveen, a suburb of Amsterdam. The 250 Jewish families living there had worshipped in a temporary wooden synagogue. However, the congregants were dissatisfied with the new structure because its L-shaped auditorium required the use of a mirror to give the women’s section a view of the Holy Ark, and in October 1970 they asked that a new building be constructed. On Rosh Ha-shanah 1970 the first service was held in the new Jewish center in Buitenveldert, just outside Amsterdam, where some 2,500 Jews lived. The building, a church and a large auditorium, erected in 1967, was bought and remodeled by the Hoofdsynagoge because the neighborhood synagogue had become too small. The old Beth Ami community center was to be moved to the new building.

In February 1970 a division of the Academy of Judaism was established in Nijmegen. The Academy was opened in 1968 in Amsterdam by the education department of the Lubavitcher Movement in cooperation with the Hoofdsynagoge (AJYB, 1969 [Vol. 70], p. 345).

In May 1969 the governing body of the European Board of the World Union for Progressive Judaism met for a three-day conference at the Progressive Jewish Center of the Amsterdam Liberal-Jewish community. The conference resolved to establish a committee to study how Jewish attitudes toward sex and contraception could be adapted to modern ideas. The July 1970 conference of the World Union for Progressive Judaism in Amsterdam, discussing “Crisis in Belief,” aroused great interest. Representatives of the Orthodox-Jewish communities, among them one rabbi, also attended the opening session. The Dutch press gave it thorough coverage. Before the meeting opened, its host, Rabbi Jacob Soetendorp of the Liberal-Jewish community, was interviewed, and most newspapers cited his remark, “One thing is certain. God does not lose.” Jacob E. Shankman, who resigned as president of the World Union, was succeeded by Rabbi Bernard Bamberger of New York.
Reaction to Arab and Soviet Treatment of Jews


In February 1969 a large demonstration was held, protesting the execution of 16 persons in Iraq, among them nine Jews, accused of having spied for Israel. The Zionist Federation organized the demonstration in which thousands participated. The speakers were Chief Rabbi Elieser Berlinger of Utrecht, Rabbi Jacob Soetendorp; the jurist Abel Herzberg, former chairman of the Federation; the political commentator Henk Neuman, and Federation chairman, Professor Marius Tels. Memorial services for the victims, held in the courtyard of the Amsterdam Dutch Theatre in August, drew hundreds of people. Rabbi Soetendorp and Chief Rabbi Schuster officiated. In September 1969 the Dutch government stated in the United Nations and in meetings with the International Red Cross that they found the situation of the Jews in some Arab countries untenable.

Holland was particularly well informed about the situation of the Jews in Poland and the Soviet Union because it represented Israel in these countries when they broke diplomatic relations with Israel in June 1967. Thus, Foreign Minister Luns informed parliament in April 1969 that the government had protested to Poland several times about its treatment of Jews.

Jewish youths sat at a Seder table in front of the Soviet trade mission building in Amsterdam in April 1970, distributing pamphlets that appealed for concern for the Soviet Jews and offering matzoh, "the bread of misery." A large meeting protesting anti-Jewish discrimination was held on April 19 in the Amsterdam Portuguese-Jewish Synagogue. Speakers were Sir Barnet Janner, M.P., the Soviet expert Emmanuel Litvinoff of London, and Simon Wiesenthal of the Documentation Center of the Association of Jewish Victims of Nazism in Vienna. At the end of the meeting, a torchlight procession led by Liberal and Orthodox rabbis moved through Amsterdam to the monument in the courtyard of the Dutch Theatre. On September 20 a plane trailing the banner "Liberate the Soviet Jews" was flown over Amsterdam. A year of continuous protests closed with one condemning the Leningrad trial judgments (p. 407). Fifteen hundred people gathered at the Amsterdam mercantile exchange; former Socialist Premier William Drees was one of several speakers.

Israel and Zionism

At a meeting of the Netherlands Zionist Federation (Nederlandse Zionisten Bond) on January 12, 1969, a presidium consisting of Professor Marius
Tels, Sal Cohen, and Piet F. de Jong was named to succeed outgoing chairman Dr. J. S. van der Hal. The membership sent a telegram to the French Ambassador in The Hague, informing Paris of the “feelings of distress at the most recent measures [embargo on the export of arms to Israel] which operated against Israel.” The three Jewish communities also sent a telegram of protest. Several days later, the Federation presidium addressed themselves to the Jews of Holland: “So long as the arms embargo lasts, so long as the attitude of the French head of state remains unchanged, we suggest that the Jews of Holland seriously consider boycotting French goods.”

The 1969 United Israel Appeal brought 9,390 contributions totaling $280,000, compared with $1,120,000 in 1968. Non-Jewish organizations were criticized for their apparent unwillingness to support Israel to the same extent as in 1967 and 1968; the Jews were blamed for not being sufficiently convinced of Israel’s financial needs.

“One Hundred Days for Israel,” an Israel Bond campaign opened in January 1970 by Amsterdam’s Mayor Ivo Samkalden, was more successful. The rabbis of the three Jewish communities declared in a joint statement that “the State of Israel has become the foundation of the future of the Jewish people, and a symbol of faith for all humanity.” Ha-kehilla, the monthly publication of Amsterdam’s Hoofdsynagoge, published a special campaign issue that was mailed to all Dutch Jews. Over $800,000 was pledged. The unusually generous response moved State of Israel Bonds to hold a European conference in Amsterdam in March.

At its general meeting in March 1970, the Netherlands Zionist Federation decided to publish De Joodse Wachter again as an independent periodical. For a time it had been a section of the Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad. The Federation’s annual report took the Weekblad to task for its coverage of non-Jewish criticism of Israel. It asked the Zionist members of the paper’s editorial board to organize a staff that would express the Zionist viewpoint. Discussing the rising criticism in Holland of Israeli policies, the Federation’s board stated that “the provincialism of Dutch Jews” coupled with “their strong love for Israel” explained their “surprise and dismay over increased non-Jewish criticism.” However, the board expressed its conviction that “a large majority of non-Jews in Holland saw the reasonableness of the Israeli position.” Its reaction to the hostile tone of the non-Zionist Jewish press was stronger.

Through the initiative of the Netherlands-Israel Society a new periodical dealing with Israel (Israel-Midden Oosten) was launched in December 1970. It received a poor press on both appearance and content.

At the invitation of the Amsterdam section of the Chaim and Vera Weizmann Lodge and The Hague Hollandia Lodge of B’nai B’rith, 22 Israeli boys and girls visited Holland. They came from the border kibbutzim Kfar Ruppin and Moaz Chajiem.
Culture and Publications

Early in 1969 the Gemeentemuseum in The Hague had a large exhibition of Jewish art objects lent by the Jewish Museum of Prague.

In December 1969 The World Federation of Bergen-Belsen Survivors awarded a prize to Dr. Jacob Presser for his study of Jewish persecution under the Nazis, Ondergang (“The Destruction of the Dutch Jews”; AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 335). Dr. Presser described his experiences at length in the television documentary “About Things That Last,” which was dedicated to him. It had two showings, in May and October 1970.

Another documentary, “Who Are These People?”, telecast in April 1970, clearly indicated that the Dutch Jewish community was disappearing.


Van Joodsche Natien tot Joodsche Nederlanders (“From Jewish Nation to Jewish Dutchmen”) the dissertation submitted in 1969 by Cor Reynders, a non-Jewish Ph.D. candidate in sociology, received special attention because it dealt with the history of the Dutch Jews between 1600 and 1942, from the ghetto to assimilation.

A book Weerklank van Anne Frank (“A Tribute to Anne Frank”), edited by Anna G. Steenmeijer, in collaboration with Otto Frank and Henri van Praag, chairman of the Anne Frank Foundation, appeared in May 1970; it contained thus far unpublished photos and stories by the young girl.

Volume I, containing Genesis and Exodus, of the planned two-volume Hebrew-Dutch edition of the Pentateuch appeared in September 1970. The translation from the Hebrew, the first of its kind undertaken in 70 years, was prepared by Dr. Izak Dasberg under the supervision of Chief Rabbi Aaron Schuster.

Personalia

The following honors were bestowed by Queen Juliana: In 1969 Professor Salomon Dresden, chairman of the Dutch division of the International Friends of the Hebrew University, received the High Order of Knight of the Dutch Lion; Mrs. J. E. van der Heijden-Lob, honorary secretary of Joods Maatschappelijk Werk, and artist Ro Mogendorff were named Knights of the Order of Orange-Nassau.

In 1970 David Simons, professor of constitutional law and member of the central commission of the Nederlands Israelietisch Kerkgenootschap, was named Commander of Orange-Nassau; David Heymans and Izak Zadoks, members of the Kerkgenootschap’s permanent commission, were
named Officers of the Order of Orange-Nassau; Salomon Vega, secretary of the Portuguese-Jewish community in Amsterdam, was named Knight of the Order of Orange-Nassau; Amsterdam Mayor Ivo Samkalden received the Golden Medal of Jerusalem; Hyman Beem received from Prince Bernhard, for his many publications in Yiddish, the Silver Carnation of the Prince Bernhard Fund; Mrs. H. A. Polak received the Silver Carnation for being a patron of Dutch art and supplying scholarships for Dutch youths to study at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Martin von Creveld, member of the Joods Maatschappelijk Werk board of directors, for many years chairman of the council of the Nederlands Israelietische Hoofdsynagoge, member of the permanent commission on public affairs of the Nederlands Israelietische Kerkgenootschap, died in Amsterdam on January 7, 1969, at the age of 80. Chief Rabbi Salomon Rodrigues Pereira of the Portuguese-Jewish Synagogue in Amsterdam, the first Jewish chaplain of the Dutch army who was with the Dutch Irene-brigade in 1944, consultant to David Ben-Gurion on the question “Who is a Jew?”, former chairman of the Society for Jewish Science, died in Amsterdam on October 10, 1969, at the age of 81. Cantor Hartog Ereira of the Liberal-Jewish community of Amsterdam died in Amsterdam on October 21, 1969, at the age of 49. Artist Ro Mogendorff died in Laren on October 27, 1969, at the age of 62. Professor Jonas Andries van Praag, chairman of the Society for Jewish Science, died in Amsterdam on October 31, 1969, at the age of 74. Professor Salomon Kleerekoper, for many years chairman of the Nederlandse Zionisten Bond who had helped reestablish the Nederlandse Israelietische Hoofdsynagoge in Amsterdam after World War II, died in Amsterdam on January 16, 1970, at the age of 76. Several years before his death he had left Jewish organizational life because of what he called “the declining niveau of Jewish Holland.” Jacob Presser, historian, author of Ondergang, died in Amsterdam on April 30, 1970, at the age of 70. Herman J. Mansfeld, active in Jewish social work and chairman of the Jewish Mental Health Foundation (Joods Geestelijke Volksgezondheid), died in Amsterdam on July 13, 1970, at the age of 83.

MAURITS KOPUIT
Italy

The Domestic Scene

POLITICS

THE INSTABILITY of the political situation at home, which continued in 1970, was reflected in two long, severe government crises. It is true, the four-party Center-Left coalition which has ruled the country for seven years was revived in August, but only because there was no other possibility. Emilio Colombo, a Christian Democrat and since 1963 Italy's minister of the treasury, succeeded Mariano Rumor as premier.

Internal tension was nurtured by Francesco De Martino's Socialists (PSI) and the left wing of the Christian Democratic party (Democrazia Cristiana; DC). The purpose was to oust the Social Democrats (Partito Socialista Democratico Italiano; PSDI) and Republicans (Partito Republicano Italiano; PRI) from the coalition as the first step toward bringing the Communists (Partito Communista Italiano; PCI) into the government. Socialist party founder Pietro Nenni warned that such a maneuver would leave PCI and DC, the stronger partners in such a coalition, in full control of the government.

(For years the DC and PCI, particularly the former, had been suspected of aiming at the establishment of an authoritarian state in which they would share the power through a clerico-Communist, or "black-red," coalition, especially since Popes John XXIII and Paul VI and the great majority of the Ecumenical Council showed certain tendencies of coming closer to the Communist world. The secular democratic parties dubbed this hypothetical state, with apparent sarcasm, Repubblica Conciliare, or Conciliar Republic.)

When the alarmed Social Democrats again threatened to withdraw from the government, which would have meant a new election, DC Secretary Arnaldo Forlani emphatically stated, in December, that his party would consider no change in alignment. If necessary, he said, DC would undertake to rule the country as a minority government with whatever support it could muster from other parties. This guarantee was taken seriously, and year's end brought some improvement in the political situation—a "limited optimism."

PCI continued its offensive to be seated in the government. Its slogan was that without it order and reform were impossible. PCI pronouncements left little to be desired regarding their democratic convictions, but they convinced only those who wanted to be convinced.

The regional elections of June 7 were decisive, for gains by the Center-Left, though moderate, were expected to strengthen the government because it
received a clear mandate for a moderate reform policy. While the Christian Democratic party lost almost 1 per cent of the vote (37.9, compared to 38.8 in 1968), the other coalition partners showed gains: The Socialists and Social Democrats combined polled 17.4 per cent, as compared to 14.8 in 1968, and the Republicans received 2.9 per cent, as compared to 1.8 in 1968. Altogether, the coalition gained 2.8 per cent, from 55.4 in 1968 to 58.2 in 1970. The Left opposition (PCI and the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity; PSIUP) lost 1.3 per cent of the vote, the neo-fascists gained 0.9 per cent.

The hope was that decentralization of the country by the establishment of largely autonomous regions, as provided in the Constitution, would bring an improvement in the presently inadequate and dated administration of the state. On the other hand, three regions (of a total 20) were now governed by popular-front coalitions; in several others similar tendencies were discernible. All this resulted in new tensions in Rome. Thus far, the regional system brought only grotesque-tragic popular uprisings, as in Reggio Calabria and Pescara, each demanding recognition as the sole capital of their region, a situation reminiscent of the wars of the cities in medieval Italy.

In December, after a five-year struggle by its backers, a coalition of lay parties cutting through the government and the opposition, parliament adopted the first civilian divorce law in Italy's history (AJYB, 1968 [Vol. 69], p. 468). It provided for the dissolution of civil marriages, without distinction of the religion of the spouses, as well as for the "cessation of the civil effects," consequent to the registration of a Catholic religious marriage, under the following conditions: 1) if there has been a legal separation for at least five years (in some cases six or seven years), or if the spouse was a foreign citizen who obtained a dissolution abroad, or remarried; 2) if the spouse committed a grave criminal deed that resulted in a prison term of over 15 years or was aimed "against the family" (such as inducement to prostitution, incest, etc); 3) if the marriage had not been consummated. Jews were, of course, equally affected by the law. For whereas the rabbinical court could grant a divorce, remarriage remained impossible until the enactment of the divorce law. For this reason, the rabbinical court had granted very few divorces in the past.

The Vatican's reaction to the law remained completely negative, at times aggressively so. Before the passage of the law, while discussions were going on in parliament, high Vatican dignitaries and the Pope himself publicly expressed disapproval. This particularly because consideration was being given to granting Italian courts the authority to cancel the civil effects of Catholic marriages, an offense against the Concordat, which explicitly guaranteed those effects. Since the Concordat was anchored in the Italian constitution, an appeal to the constitutional court on this point was likely. Official talks between the government and the Holy See remained fruitless.

Another threat to the new law was the Catholic coalition of the right which planned to collect a minimum of 500,000 signatures requesting a referendum on the law. The Vatican refrained from openly participating in the discussion
on the referendum. But the Italian Bishop's Conference stated that it was
the duty and the right of every Catholic to fight the law with all legal means.
The supporters of the law, on their part, threatened to initiate a referendum
to denounce the Concordat. The century-old tradition of deep anticlericalism
in Italy could indeed kindle a divisive struggle reminiscent of Bismarck's
*Kulturkampf*.

Party maneuvers in preparation for the 1971 presidential elections at the
end of Guiseppe Saragat's term of office began early and brought more
political confusion. The fronts criss-crossed the coalition and the individual
parties, and public life already was poisoned by the accusations the opposing
parties hurled at each other. The candidates and their groups vied for the
support of the Communists, who were bound to become much stronger as a
result. The strange thing about all the excitement was that the president's
office was only representative.

Another development in 1970 was the bid for power of the three labor
unions, the Confederazione Generale Italiana Lavoratori (CGIL; with a Com-
munist, Socialist and Social Proletarian membership), the Confederazione
Italiana Sindacati Liberi (CISL; Christian Democrat and Liberal), and the
Unione Italiana Lavoratori (UIL; Social Democrat, Socialist, and Republi-
can). All three wished to exploit gains won for the workers and in the govern-
ment during the autumn 1969 strikes. The unions left further wage demands
to their locals and to wild-cat strikes. Constantly threatening a general strike,
they now concentrated on far-reaching demands for reforms in education,
housing, the industrial development of the South, transportation, and national
medical services. They also tried to intervene in negotiations with foreign
states (Switzerland) regarding international agreements on labor conditions
and residence permit regulations for Italian migrant workers, and made an
effort to drag European trade unions back into the class-struggle stage in
which the Italian workers still found themselves. As the end of 1970 ap-
proached, there was some moderation on the part of the unions, apparently
because the workers refused to understand, and did not always want to sup-
port, the high aspirations of their labor leaders.

Among the neo-fascists and their lateral organizations was a growing ten-
dency toward provocation and assault. The Leftist extra-parliamentary opposi-
tion splintered into innumerable groups, some of which, however, have gained
constituents. Unrest continued at the universities and even in the high schools,
but the intensity of the anger had subsided.

**THE ECONOMY**

Italy's economy suffered from the insecurity of business, caused by constant
strikes and soaring wage demands, as well as by psychological factors. At
the same time there was a drop in investments, which the government could
make up only in part and which posed a threat to Italy's ability to compete in
the world market. Flight of capital, though diminishing around mid-year,
made extensive foreign credit necessary. So far, currency and price levels were well defended, a situation to which the Colombo government’s legislation for stimulating the economy contributed. Some of the planned reforms, such as housing and the industrialization of the South, touched upon the economy. As 1970 drew to a close, there was concern about the construction sector and the textile industry.

**Foreign Policy**

Confusion at home affected Italy’s foreign policy, directed by Aldo Moro. The noisy opposition was watched constantly. The government’s strong advocacy of the movement for an integrated Europe was motivated in good part by the expectation that internal dangers could be warded off more easily within a larger, politically and economically much more stable, sphere.

Tension in the Mediterranean was among the most immediate concerns. Italy tried to dissuade the United States from intervening in Jordan during the September crisis. At the same time, it sought to persuade the NATO partners to make the convening of the European security conference (strongly urged by Russia) contingent on a détente in the Mediterranean.

The Italian government unconditionally recognized Red China and broke relations with Formosa, but then helped keep Peking out of the United Nations for at least another year.

Italy suffered a severe defeat when, in July, Libyan Colonel Muammar Qaddafi, leader of the ruling Revolutionary Command Council who ousted King Idris in the September 1969 coup d'état, ordered the expulsion of the 25,000 Italian settlers in Libya and the expropriation of their property. The return of the settlers to Italy was more than just a socio-economic burden for a country still struggling with unemployment. It also brought the humiliation of having to accept discreet French and British intervention in Tripoli, which eased at least the most intolerable features of the expulsions. By October, 12,770 persons had been expelled. Several thousand more left voluntarily. Confiscated property totaled $25 million.

Foreign Minister Aldo Moro’s implied reassertion of Italy’s claim to a part of the Istrian peninsula off Trieste moved Yugoslav President Tito in December to cancel his planned visit to Italy. Moro’s action can be explained only by the hankering after the opposition—this time on the right. By year’s end, however, there already was talk of an amicable resolution of the incident.

**MIDDLE EAST**

Italy’s official position on the Middle East conflict was one of even-handedness. Underneath, no doubt, was solidarity with Israel: cognizance of a common civilization and a common conception of a free democracy in a constitutional state. Each of the four government parties, as well as the
Liberals in the opposition, sent delegations to Israel and continued to show full understanding of that country's basic demands for secure borders and a stable peace.

Regarding stated aims generally, admissible Italian interests paralleled those of Israel: the opening of the Suez Canal, peace that could lead also to the economic development of existing resources in the region, détente in the Mediterranean. But this did not necessarily mean that the interests of both were always completely identical regarding phases, methods, and conditions. One differential—on which action was more or less discreet and unobtrusive—was Italy's crude-oil interests. Finally, some consideration had to be given in Middle East policy, too, to the parliamentary opposition on the Left, which even exceeded Moscow in its support of the Arab position.

All these contradictions could be seen in the vacillating position of the Italian delegation to the United Nations on the General Assembly resolutions and its later tortured, unconvincing explanation of its voting.

The delegation abstained from voting on the November 4 General Assembly resolution on the three months' extension of the cease-fire in the Middle East, which was opposed by Israel, thus giving the Afro-Asian states a bigger majority. This followed a bitter fight in Italy. *Il Popolo* later explained that Italy could not possibly have taken a stand different from that of all the other Mediterranean countries of Europe. The second vote was on the December 8 Assembly resolution asserting the right of self-determination of the Palestinians. The delegation voted for it in the commission and against it in the plenary session. The explanation was that the paragraph indeed constituted interference in Israel's internal affairs since the Palestinians coveted its territories. Then why the support in the commission?

The publications of the political parties in the coalition mirrored the official and unofficial government attitudes, described above, in all their shadings: Markedly defending Israel were the Social-Democratic *Umanità* and the Republican *Voce della Repubblica*. The Milano paper *Il Giorno* reflected the pro-Arab views of the Ente Nazionale Indrocarburi (ENI; National Board for Hydrocarbons), a state-owned institution identified with Italian crude-oil interests and linked with left-wing groups in DC and with the Socialists. The Italian independent press wrote mostly in favor of Israel. The position of the Communist press was self-evident. The radio and television networks were state-owned, and policies were left to the more or less disguised partisanship of their commentators.

This was the situation at the time of the official visit by Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban in mid-June. He established close contact with many important persons, and doubtless succeeded in widening the circle of pro-Israel sympathizers. At any rate, his visit called forth not even the smallest pro-Arab demonstration or excess. On the other hand, President Richard M. Nixon's visits, in February 1969 and September 1970, were marked by violent demonstrations and riots in Rome and many other cities, which were anti-American and in large part anti-Israel and pro-Arab.
The Vatican

DIFFERENCES WITHIN CHURCH

The rift with the Dutch clergy continued to be the most manifest expression of the internal tensions of the Catholic Church. The year began with the Dutch Pastoral Council’s January 6 recommendation that the Church rescind the celibacy rules and the Vatican’s resolute reactions to it (Jean Cardinal Danielou’s article in the Osservatore Romano of January 31; the Pope’s Sunday address in St. Peter’s of February 1, and his February 3 letter to Vatican Secretary of State Jean Cardinal Villot that no compromise was possible on this issue, except in borderline cases). The meeting of Cardinal Villot and Bernard Jan Cardinal Alfrink in February in Paris was said not to have produced positive results. However, when it became known that the Episcopal Synod convoked for fall 1971 would deal with “priesthood” it was generally admitted in Rome that the Synod would unavoidably have to deal also with the problem of celibacy, a subject the Pope had so far reserved for his personal authority.

Toward the end of 1970, the much commented upon Guidelines for Dialogue with Atheists was published by the Vatican Secretariat for Non-believers. It contained instructions which would make priests more familiar with the methods of atheism and with “Marxism in every form, including Maoism.” The document was considered a further “approach to the Left.”

Pope Paul went on a ten-day journey (November 25-December 5), the longest he ever took, to Asia, the Central and South Pacific, and Australia. Knowledgeable observers did not consider it very successful because his attempts at closer relations with Red China, culminating in his message of “unity and love to Chinese everywhere,” antagonized the local high clergy almost everywhere he went and in Australia even a good part of the faithful. The fact that Australian youth, as well as the poor in Manila and elsewhere, acclaimed him only contributed to straining relations between the Pope and the majority of the bishops. Whether this was the reason why he watered down the so carefully prepared address in Hong Kong, or whether he did so at the suggestion of the British authorities, remained a secret.

While in the world of the Catholic Church the contrast between the “progressives” and “conservatives” became more rigid, in both the purely religious and political-social spheres, the Pope’s attitude on the former tended more toward conservatism and on the latter more toward the progressive.

In December the Pope issued a motu proprio barring cardinals who were over 80 years of age from participating in future conclaves. The reaction of some to whom this applied, i.e., Tisserant and Ottaviani, was surprisingly sharp.
Relations between the Catholic Church and the Jews showed sporadic progress in 1970. In March a group of 90 Catholic priests, headed by Corrado Cardinal Ursi of Naples and six bishops from various parts of Italy, toured Israel at the invitation of the Israeli government. They visited the Yad Vashem, the Jerusalem Museum, the religious Kibbutz Lavi and its synagogue; they ate fish at Ein Gev, the border settlement on Lake Tiberias—an act with New Testament implications; they planted trees in the Balfour Forest, and returned home full of enthusiasm.

In May Jan Cardinal Willebrands, the late Augustin Cardinal Bea's successor as president of the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, inaugurated the new headquarters of the International Service for Jewish-Christian Documentation (SIDIC) in Rome. Operated by the Congregation of Our Lady of Zion, SIDIC was formerly housed in its convent. Chief Rabbi Elio Toaff of Rome attended the ceremony. Cardinal Willebrands compared SIDIC's function with that of his secretariat's Office for Catholic-Jewish Relations, i.e., training persons in methods of promoting dialogue with the Jews in the spirit of the Vatican Council II declaration. SIDIC was well equipped to do the job. Its library was growing quickly, and it planned to arrange conferences related to its activities, a useful service to Christian and Jewish researchers, students, and journalists, as well as to the general public.

Successful interfaith meetings were held at Camaldoli in Tuscany and at St. Gregory's in Rome, with the active participation of Augusto Segre, head of the cultural and educational department of the Unione delle Comunità Israelitiche Italiane (Union of Italian Jewish Communities).

Christian-Jewish relations reached a high point in December when Vatican officials met for four days with an International Jewish Committee on Interreligious Consultations in the offices of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity. It was reported that they had "discussed from the religious viewpoint concrete plans and procedures to improve relations between the two communities throughout the world and to strengthen their cooperation in the fields of common concern." The meeting ended with an agreement to join forces in fighting racism, antisemitism, and all forms of discrimination. Among the members of the committee were Professor Zvi Werblowsky, chairman of the Israeli Council for Interreligious Cooperation, Jerusalem; Gerhard Riegner, secretary-general of the World Jewish Congress; Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, head of the interreligious affairs department of the American Jewish Committee, and Rabbi Henry Siegman, vice president of the Synagogue Council of America. Taking part on the Roman Catholic side were Cardinal Willebrands, who opened the meeting; Rev. Cornelius A. Rijk, a Dutch priest in charge of the new Vatican Office for Catholic Jewish Relations; prelates from the Vatican Departments for the Doctrine of Faith, Catholic Education,
and the Oriental Churches, and a scholar of the Pontifical Bible Institute. Another participant was the American-born secretary of the Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace, the Very Rev. Joseph Gremillion.

One obstacle to better understanding was the persistence of the cult of the “Little Saint and Martyr” Domenichino in a small church near Viareggio. The cult grew up around a ritual murder accusation which originated in Saragossa, Spain. An annual carnival in honor of the saint and the distribution of a booklet telling the “gruesome truth” which, the people were told, “can be trusted since it is based on a Spanish text,” were arranged by the priest of the little church to promote tourism. Several Jewish community leaders who regularly showed up at the event to check whether the booklet was still being distributed found this to be so as late as December 1970.

The Pope appealed to the Soviet government to spare the lives of two Soviet Jews convicted in Leningrad of planning to hijack a Soviet airliner (p. 407). On Christmas Day, several hundred Jews carrying posters and distributing leaflets demonstrated in St. Peter’s Square during the Pope’s sermon. Subsequently, the Vatican daily, Osservatore Romano, in a comment that was unusual for such an occurrence, lauded the demonstrators for their “composure and dignity.”

The Vatican made a point of appearing impartial toward the Middle East conflict. It reproached, and voiced disapproval of, both Israel and the Arab states in a more even-handed manner than in the past. While Abba Eban was in Rome, Monsignor Agostino Casaroli, Vatican secretary of public affairs, paid him a courtesy visit, reciprocating Eban’s visit to the Pope in October 1969.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

*Relations with Israel*

For the Jews of Italy Abba Eban’s visit, the first official one by a member of the Israeli government, was without a doubt the most important occurrence of the year. They interpreted it, and rightly so, as a new phase in Italian relations with Israel. And by a process of identification, probably generated by an inner need, they looked upon the visit as a new confirmation of their own rights and dignity not only as Italian citizens but also as Jews. It strengthened their recognition of what the existence, independence, and achievements of Israel meant for their collective and individual status in Italian society. They did not miss the significance of the initial welcome extended to Eban in Rome’s city hall, some 400 yards and 19 centuries removed from the Arch of Titus at the far end of the Via Sacra, the triumphal road.

Of course, Abba Eban’s four-day visit offered an opportunity for close contacts not only with Italian leaders, but also with the members of the Jewish community. The Israel foreign minister addressed enthusiastic crowds
in the Rome Synagogue and in the huge Castello Sforzesco hall at Milan. He met the small remnant of Jews in Ravenna and Ferrara when he commemorated the first battle of the Jewish Brigade in its cemetery at nearby Piangipane. He met Jews influential in public life, and their friends, at well-attended receptions given by Italo-Israeli organizations in Rome and Milan.

However, the Italian visit also left a strong impression on Eban. He admitted that he was carried away, "electrified," by the tremendous, profound enthusiasm of the Italian Jews, by their ties to, and solidarity with, Israel which had now become the true content of their Jewishness.

**Communal Activities**

Italian society's growing acceptance of the Jews, in large measure the consequence of both the Vatican Council II’s Declaration on the Jews and Israel's achievements, was underscored at the opening session of the eighth Congresso dei Delegati delle Comunità Ebraiche Italiane (Congress of the Delegates of Jewish Italian Communities) held in the capitol building in Rome in May. The Congress was addressed by Italy’s Interior Minister Franco Restivo; high civilian and military officials attended, and messages were received from Italy’s president and premier.

The working sessions of the congress dealt with many real and serious problems facing Italian Jews, and not, as so often in the past, with subtle, sterile discussions of how Italian law affected the Jewish communities. The assembled delegates and rabbis from Italy’s 22 Jewish communities agreed that emphasis on Jewish culture seemed at the moment the best way to fight for the survival of the small community threatened both by a rising Leftist anti-semitism masked as anti-Zionism and by creeping assimilation.

The Unione’s new board, which reelected Judge Sergio Piperno-Beer as chairman for another term, committed itself to an intensive program: to provide “itinerant” rabbis and communal officials for the most threatened smaller communities; to take inventory of the religious, artistic, cultural, and historical patrimony of Italian Jewry, to preserve it, and make it accessible to all; to insist on more numerous and better quality television and radio programs on Jewish subjects; to limit the two existing rabbinical schools, in Rome and Turin, to students seeking ordination; to establish, as soon as possible, a university-level Institute of Higher Jewish Studies where the graduates of the two rabbinical schools and of similar institutions abroad could continue their studies and where courses in Judaism and Jewish culture would be offered to other students too; to request state schools to set aside time for Jewish religious instruction; to intensify the promotion of the Unione-supported high-level Jewish monthly, *Rassegna mensile di Israel*; to promote Jewish education, especially among the young, in local communities; to give stronger financial and moral support to the Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea (CDEC; Jewish Documentation Center) at Milan.

CDEC, founded in 1955 for the purpose of recording the fate of Italy’s
Jews under fascism and Nazism, acquired in 1970 some 3,000 new books for its library, and for its archives a microfilm of the crucial 1934-1943 activities of the pre-war DELASEM (Delagazione Assistenza Emigranti), and a transcript of the Osnabrueck trial of Nazi war criminals (AJYB, 1970 [Vol. 71], pp. 369-370). Good progress was made in the preparation of a subject catalogue, and the collection of documentary evidence for forthcoming trials of Nazi war criminals in Germany continued. The center also participated in the Milan “Exhibit of Deportation.” CDEC was sought out by many, mostly non-Jewish, researchers, students, and staff members of the Italian TV and radio networks, for guidance in their work and source materials. However, financial problems constantly plagued the center as its activities expanded.

On the occasion of the centennial celebration, “Rome: Capital of Italy,” the Rome Jewish community issued a patriotic proclamation. At a round-table discussion of the Associazione Italo-Israeliana representatives of all democratic political parties stressed Italian Jewry's ties with, and active participation in, the risorgimento and the resistance movement during World War II. They also likened the rebirth of the Jewish state to that of the Italian republic.

**International Conferences and Offices**

At the beginning of December, the Conference of European Rabbis and a meeting of synagogue leaders of Europe took place in Ostia, a suburb of Rome. It will be remembered that Rome was supposed to have been the site of the conference of the rabbis, originally scheduled for 1967. At the time, Israel’s Sephardi Chief Rabbi Yitzhak Nissim protested the choice of what he called the “Zion of Catholicism” as the place for a rabbinical conference. Some rabbis refused to attend, and the meeting was cancelled, officially because of the crisis preceding the six-day war. The problem was resolved later by compromising on Ostia as the site. This choice was particularly meaningful, since a thriving Jewish community had existed in this Roman port of antiquity even before the destruction of the Temple. On December 9 the assembled rabbis said the afternoon prayers in the ruins of the ancient Ostia synagogue.

There was good reason for the Italian rabbinate’s insistence that the conference be held in Rome. As Chief Rabbi Toaff explained at a social gathering arranged for the conferees by the Rome Jewish community, Italian Jewry would gain valuable hints and new strength from this and similar meetings. It was in dire need of such collaboration, ideas, and new experiences which, aside from Israel, it could gain only by constantly working with the large British and French Jewish communities.

The conferences, whose delegates included Chief Rabbi Nissim’s deputy, Chief Rabbi Ovadia Yoseph of Tel Aviv, his entourage, and guests from abroad, dealt in the main with the religious basis of aliyah, the question of conversion to Judaism, and youth problems.
In August some 200 delegates from the European B’nai B’rith lodges met in Florence under the chairmanship of Georges Bloch. The opening session was attended by city officials; Israel Ambassador to Rome Amiel Najar; Jochanan Meroz, director of the European department of the Israel Foreign Ministry, and embassy counsel Nissim Yosha. The four-day conferences dealt with growing Soviet antisemitism, the situation of the Jews in the Arab countries, and anti-Israel propaganda in Europe, especially in Germany where 6,000 Arab students attended universities and in France where $1.5 million were being spent annually for such propaganda.

The United HIAS Service World Conference also took place in Rome, May 13-15.

The European headquarters of Keren Ha-yesod was established in Rome in November. (The Brussels office was for Northern Europe only.) Histadrut, the Israel National Labor Federation, opened a Rome office for France and Italy, headed by Elieser Halevy who was familiar with the Italian scene and, for years, has been nurturing contacts with European labor unions.

The tendency to move international organizations or activities to Rome also was expected to help forge ties between Italian Jewry and a larger, stronger sphere.

Youth Activities

The normal reaction to creeping antisemitism and the many overt anti-Israel manifestations in Italy bolstered the inner strength of the Jews. Youth reacted to animosity with more intensive involvement in youth organizations of all shades. This became particularly apparent in Rome and Milan during Abba Eban's visit and during Israeli artistic and cultural events in Italy, but also on less happy occasions as, for example, the demonstrations in support of Soviet Jewry.

The Federazione Giovanile Ebraica d'Italia (FGEI; Jewish Youth Federation of Italy) which, at the end of 1969, had been threatened with dissolution because of internal differences (AJYB, 1970 [Vol. 71], p. 437), also profited from this general attitude. True, lack of interest forced it to abandon the plan of becoming a real federation of Jewish youth groups. But the Federation carried out that part of its program which it described as service to the Jewish community.

It held two well-attended seminar-like youth conferences in Venice in May and in Rimini in November; organized a summer camp with seminars in Vanese (Trient) in July-August, and a winter camp in Sestola (Modena province) in December. The Federation also continued to publish its monthly Ha-Tikvá fairly regularly. Of unquestionable success were protests in Rome against Soviet anti-Jewish policy as, for instance, in April in Milan and on the Piazza Navona in Rome where signatures were collected for a petition to the Soviet embassy, and, on November 11, in front of the Rome synagogue
where a hunger strike took place on the occasion of Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko’s visit.

An FGEI delegate participated in the eighth Congress of the Delegates of Jewish Italian Communities held in May, and the Federation sent a delegation to the World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS) held at Arad, Israel, in August. The Zionist program elaborated by the WUJS, the so-called “Arad Program” including “definitions” of Socialism, was reproduced verbatim as the Federation’s Zionist program at the annual FGEI congress in December. Nevertheless, the FGEI congress decided to participate in the 1971 Zionist Congress in Jerusalem, though this implied adherence to the “Jerusalem Program.” The explanation given for this apparent contradiction was that FGEI intended to fight for the Arad Program at the Zionist Congress.

The Federation meeting also enthusiastically decided to participate in the “young lay leaders” associations of European Jewish communities. Such foreign contacts were very important for the miniscule group of Italian Jewish youths who, in recent years, strayed into the ideologies of Italian youth. The result was that many of them had become estranged from the Jewish community since those political activities certainly required no connection with a Jewish organization.

FGEI’s difficulty was that its own local groups were losing members. Although it called itself a federation, it represented nationally only a small group of young, gifted, interested intellectuals who were able to carry on a relatively rich program. It was to their credit that they, themselves, were dissatisfied with this program.

The rest of the youth organization were either under the influence of Israeli groups and their respective “sh’likhim,” (Hashomer Hatzair, Bene Akiva), or assumed a generally Jewish and, in practice, almost apolitical character (Kadimah). The last organization was a rallying point for the Libyan and a number of Polish refugees. In administrative matters, the youth organizations cooperated satisfactorily.

The number of young Italian Jews who settled in Israel in 1970 or went there for longer periods of time, either as students or in some other way, was estimated at 500. This was a significant number that was expected to increase. Among those who settled in Israel in 1970 were Rabbi Aldo Luzatto of Genoa and his wife Giovanna, the latter a past president of the Zionist Federation of Italy. An organization of Italian settlers was established in Israel.

Between Sickle and Swastika

When, in February 1970, swastikas and neo-fascist banners appeared at the universities of Rome and Milan, while in Bologna the Maoist-oriented Movimento Studentesco (Student Movement) incited Arab students to attack Jewish and Israeli students, the important independent Milan weekly
Il Mondo (March 12, 1970), under the headline “Antisemitism United Them,” wrote the following:

... For a long time there has been an absurd point of contact between fascist and Communist propaganda on the “Judeo-plutocratic-Anglo-American” exploitation of poor Mediterranean nations... [which] started as anti-imperialism and anti-Zionism, and degenerated into antisemitism.

Other papers wrote in a similar vein.

The reaction of the press had its effect. In the months that followed there were only sporadic incidents of a similar kind: swastika daubing on the Siena synagogue, cheers for “Nasser, the exterminator of Jews” and for “fascist Italy” alternating with “Long live the Red First of May and Red Palestine; death to the Jews!” Similarly, on November 12, the main gate of the Pisa synagogue was smeared with a symbol equating the Star of David to the swastika, with “Lotta Continua” (the fight continues), the slogan of the extreme Left, below it. The group denied responsibility.

Unfortunately, there were in the extreme Left a number of Jews who, in an effort to prove their “objectivity,” became veritable janissaries of the movement. The PCI organ l’Unità published open letters from Jewish party members urging “progressive Jews” to withdraw as members of the Jewish communities. A true Communist (and, as such, an atheist) who surely could feel no solidarity with aggressive Israel, they argued, also had no reason to be a member of the religious community in the diaspora. Shalom printed these letters side by side with letters of very similar content from the fascist period, which had appeared in 1934 in the assimilationist Jewish newspaper La Nostra Bandiera (“Our Flag”)—indeed, the saddest fascist-Communist point of contact of the year!

Equally harmful was the attitude of those Jews who did not permit themselves to become completely subservient to Leftist propaganda but who, in an effort to prove their “progressiveness” and to escape the accusation of being fascists, showed only weak, conditional, and blunted opposition to it. During the weeks of the trials of Leningrad Jews and of the Basques at Burgos, they attempted to make clear that they were in no way against the Soviet Union, but only demanded the “correction of errors” (a stand very close to that of PCI). At the same time, they branded the death sentences imposed on the Basques as the inevitable consequence of the “system” in Spain, a historically correct conclusion which, however, they failed to reach regarding the Leningrad trials.

These Jews also showed a tendency to differentiate between anti-Zionism and antisemitism, thus playing into the hands of their adversaries.

This stand lent importance to La sinistra e la questione ebraica (“The Left and the Jewish Question”; La Nuova Italia, 1970), a book written by the Jewish Communist Luciano Ascoli, one of the few among the Jewish and, obviously, the Italian Communists, who were critical of the official PCI position on the Arab-Jewish conflict. (Senator Umberto Terracini was another.) Wrote
Ascoli: “Anti-Zionism is but a modern variant of the ancient passion... antisemitism, which today is more vigorous than ever.” The uncompromising rejection of all objective analysis, he continued, was characteristic of the irrationality of antisemitism, as evidenced by the nature of Communist criticism of Israel and its terminology (“racist,” “theocratic,” “imperialistic”) which was so similar to that of the fascists. In other words, Ascoli was in agreement with the views of *Il Mondo*.

The Communist party leadership took no action against Ascoli; the party’s paper criticized the book only in vague terms, but its weekly for intellectual readers, *Rinascita*, attacked it very strongly, as did the PSIUP’s publication, *Mondo Nuovo*. The party obviously preferred to exploit the book as evidence that Communism permitted the free expression of opinion. But the Ascoli case proved the exact opposite. A party member never would have turned to the general public if he had not encountered in the party a certain typical irrationality, prejudice, and “deaf ears.”

In the course of the year, the PCI’s position on the Middle East stiffened, as foreshadowed earlier at the 1968 and 1969 Mediterranean conferences (*AJYB*, 1970 [Vol. 71], p. 438). Since the State of Israel was a reality, the Communists had to admit its right of existence, on the basis of “Socialist principle” alone. But since PCI tried to make every effort to surpass even Soviet Russia in its pro-Arab stance, it would have to become friendlier with the *fedayeen*—and they wanted to destroy Israel. Fortunately, PCI found a way out of this dilemma: since the freedom fighters, as they were called by PCI, wanted a “free, democratic, secular state in Palestine” where Moslems, Jews, and Christians could live together as equals, their position was a fully “Socialist-revolutionary” one. The Israelis, on the other hand, “do not want to grant the Arabs equality.” Discord and the “question of conscience” were quickly solved by advocating that the Palestinian Arabs get the whole of Palestine. Some of the party leaders carried their honesty even further: Giancarlo Pajetta declared, one century after Moses Hess, “The Jews are under no obligation to be a nation!”

The importance of the ideological front against Communist assaults became quite clear in 1970. The political future of the already mentioned sector of “progressive” Italian Jews was at stake. This was especially true of young Jews who were drawn to the Left but who, sooner or later, would be rejected by it because they were Jews. To meet this eventuality, it was important to create for these youths a rallying point within the Jewish community, in short to counteract Communist propaganda where it was most powerful and dangerous—within the “Jewish Left.”

While Eban spoke in Milan, the Paris correspondent of the Israel radio, Kol Yisrael, interviewed a young Italian Jewess. She complained about the animosity of the (Leftist) circle in which she moved. “Give us arguments to convince others,” she said. “I, myself, am already convinced.”

In recognition of this situation, *La Sinistra per Israel* (The Left for Israel) was established in Milan where the Unione Democratica Amici d’Israeli
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(UDAI; Democratic Union of the Friends of Israel) already existed. The program of the new group, published in the March 1970 issue of Shalom, said in part:

We are militants and Leftist sympathizers, and we dissent from the positions taken by a large sector of the Left on the Middle East problem. . . . We deplore that that Left never seriously considered taking any initiative for a peaceful and equitable solution . . . and that, on the contrary, it adhered to a systematic boycott of Israel . . . thus supporting the theses of those denying it the right to exist.

As part of the same effort, the Jewish press and lecturers, some of whom had come from Israel for this very purpose, emphasized the social and Socialist content of Zionism since its inception; the assured position of influence of democratic Socialism in a liberal, pluralistic Israel, and the role of the kibbutz in Israeli life. The ignorance of many Jews—and non-Jews—on the subject justified this educational endeavor which, hopefully, would itself avoid bias. But in this task, the tiny Italian Jewish community, lacking the necessary human resources, experience, and material to counteract the experienced, giant PCI propaganda machine, needed help from the large communities abroad.

By and large, the Arab students in Italy, whose number was increasing constantly, showed greater moderation than their Italian protectors. One of the reasons could have been that, as aliens, they feared police action. At any rate, the "vast demonstrations" announced for months by the Committee for Solidarity with the Palestinian Nation to mark the anniversary of the "victory of Karameh" in March finally turned out to be but a few meetings.

Some 50 Arab students, accompanied by Italian fellow students, appeared at a meeting of the local Comitato Pro Israele in Pisa. A lively discussion took place, and the Arabs asked to be heard—the first such request ever made on an occasion of this kind. They said nothing new, just made the usual accusations. What was new was that a discussion took place, which continued in the street after the meeting had ended.

In Lucca, the only provincial capital in Tuscany where the Communists were not in the majority, the Associazione Cattolica Lavoratori Italiani (ACLI; Catholic Associations of Italian Workers) acting, in a sense, as stand-in for the Communists, signed the proclamations of the Palestinian committee. In recent years, ACLI has become strongly Left-oriented; but it continued, though with difficulty, to maintain a connection with the Italian episcopate which furnished it with "priestly assistants."

On the other side of the traditional Jewish two- or multi-front war was the Movimento Sociale Italiano (MSI), the neo-fascist party. Officially, it did not deal at all with the Jewish question. Was this proof that MSI had severed all ties with the smoldering, though embanked, pre-1938 fascist anti-Semitism and with the outspoken anti-Semitism of the racial laws? Or did this great silence mean that, on this and other matters, MSI was keeping different, and even diametrically opposed, paths open in accordance with the dictates of
the fascist view of power and politics? Each of these possibilities may apply, perhaps both.

As for the party's display of friendship and admiration for Israel, especially its military achievements, it "is worth as much as the enmity of the Communists," as Shalom (March 1970) put it. The reason for this pro-Israel attitude, the monthly continued, was that the Arabs opted for Soviet Russia. The nostalgic fascists had not abandoned the old dream of returning to North Africa as Mussolini's "nation of navigators," and would have been only too ready to take over for the Russians there, with all attendant privileges and duties.

It need not be emphasized that an alliance of Italian Jewry with MSI was out of the question. Proof of this, if required, was the Rome Jewish community's refusal of neo-fascist youth's offer, in November 1969, to give it "physical protection." The attitude of the community was determined not only by the traumatic experience of October 16, 1943, when Rome's Jews were rounded up for deportation to Auschwitz, but also by the natural solidarity which, despite all internal strife, still held together the Italian resistance parties and groups, from liberals to Communists.

Therefore the two-front fight against antisemitism had to continue. And there was always more awareness that it really wasn't a question of two fronts, but of one and the same foe—the foe of freedom in general, and of Jewry in particular.

Among rightist antisemitic publications was a new edition of Vermillon's viciously antisemitic book, Il cappio degli Ebrei sul collo dell'Umanità ("A Jewish Noose Around Humanity's Neck") with the subtitle Le forze occulte che manovrano il mondo ("The Secret Powers That Steer the World"). The sensation was created not by its title or subtitle, nor by its content, but by an introductory note which said that, in 1957, the book had received an award from the Presidency of the Council of Ministers in Italy; that, furthermore, Libri e Reviste, a publication of this authority's Information and Copyright Service, had boasted the book had gotten very good reviews. The Union of Jewish Communities protested, and a search was begun to determine the authenticity of this claim. There has been no word about the result of the research, nor of an injunction against the book.

The publisher Longanesi abandoned his plan to publish a new edition of Mein Kampf. However, in a letter informing the Union of Jewish Communities of this decision, he angrily said that both the San Marino and the new Pegaso editions were being sold without difficulty. Though the Pegaso edition reproduced photographs from concentration camps under the caption "Where This Leads To," as well as commentaries written in the same spirit of enlightenment, the Jewish community's reaction to it was negative.

Art and Culture

For works with Jewish content the Italian Jews depended largely on Israeli artists whose exhibits were always received with much interest and often
enthusiasm. The constant, if currently one-way, cultural relationship could in time have an activating and stimulating effect. Thus, the Haifa municipal theater presented at the Venice Biennale *Zakhut Bedihuta dekiddushim* ("The Comedy of Wedlock") by Yehuda Sommo Portaleone (Leone de' Sommi), written in Hebrew in the 16th century at the court of the Duke of Mantua. Most of Portaleone's writings had been lost, but his *Quattro dialoghi sulla rappresentanza scenica* ("Four Dialogues on the Theater") was published by Polifelo in 1970. As a result, it was decided, in fall 1970, to establish a Jewish theater group named "Leone de' Sommi."

The Tel Aviv Habimah theater, the Haifa Dalia Atlas orchestra, the Bat-Dor dance company of Tel Aviv, and other Israeli ballet companies visited Italy with good success.

The Italian Jewish producer Alexander Fersen staged a new production of the *Golem*, which was acclaimed also by non-Jewish theatergoers. In his presentation, Fersen referred to current Jewish problems.

Vittorio De Sica's film *Il giardino dei Finzi-Contini* ("The Garden of the Finzi-Contini") was noteworthy, apart from its artistic value, because it helped Italian audiences get a better understanding of the essence of Jewishness. Luigi Magni's film, *Nell'anno del Signore* ("In the Year of the Lord"), which received an award from the municipality of Rome on the occasion of its centenary as the capital city, may have had a similar impact. It was the first meaningful account of the tribulations experienced by the Jews of the Rome ghetto as recently as 1825. A film short from Israel was shown at the Venice film Biennale.

In the Biennale's Israel pavilion, created by the Danish architect Fredrick Fogh, the works of Aliyah Shavit (self-animated plastic objects), Ruth Zarfati (bronze sculptures), and Michael Argov (collages) were exhibited. It was one of the best-attended pavilions, and the artists received invitations to exhibit in many other cities.

In the 27th international artistic ceramics competition at Faenza, for centuries the center of this type of art, Edith Ady of Kibbutz Ner Yitzhak in Israel received an award from the Ravenna province.

**Publications**

In Jewish journalism an attempt was being made to bring the privately published weekly *Israel*, the Rome community's monthly *Shalom*, and the *Bolletino della Comunità di Milano* under a central administration. Keren Ha-yesod launched the publication of the periodical *Realtà Israeliana*.

Among 1970 publications were an Italian edition of Uri Avneri's *Israele senza Sionismo* ("Israel Without Zionism"); a collection of articles, published by *La Rassegna mensile di Israel* under the title *Scritti in memoria di Attilio Milano* ("Writings in Memory of Attilio Milano"), and another collection of articles by various authors, *Conflitti e sviluppi nel Mediterraneo* ("Conflicts and Developments in the Mediterranean"), published by *Il Mulino* for the
Instituto di Affari Internazionali. Among the many works dealing with Jewish subjects and Israel were: Marcello Curti, *Ogni casa è la mia casa* ("Every House Is My House"), the story of a recent Russian Jewish settler in Israel; Carlo Cocciolo, *Documento 127* ("Document 127"), the account of a conversion to Judaism; Clara Kopciowski, *Shalom*, which described the friendship between an Arab and a Jewish boy. A valuable artistic book was Henryk and Ard Geller's collection of photographs, entitled *Roma Judaica* ("Roman Judaica"), with text by Ruth Liana Geller. Arie Eliav's *Between Hammer and Sickle* appeared in Italian translation by Raoul Elia, titled *Tra il Martello e la Falce*. It was a great success also in non-Jewish circles. Another translation was Isaac Bashevis Singer's *Zlateh, la capra ed altre storie* ("Zlateh the Goat and Other Stories").

Two entries on the Jews in the *Enciclopedia delle Religioni*, of which the first two volumes appeared in 1970, deserve mention for the authors' historical-scientific approach and for their rich bibliographies. They were: "Antisemitismo" by Alfonso di Nola, Alessandro Dall'Oglio, and Augusto Segre, and "Ebrei, Religione degli" (Religion of the Jews) by Alfonso di Nola.

**Personalia**

Lidia Ascarelli Soria, fund raiser for the Italian Welfare Agencies and philanthropist, died in Rome on January 22, at the age of 91. Claudio Salmoni, an engineer and former member in the resistance movement of Yugoslavia, since 1965 vice secretary of the Republican party of Italy and mayor of Ancona, died in Milan March 21, at the age of 51. Giorgio Zevi, a leader of the Jewish community of Rome and president of the Union of Jewish Communities from 1954–56, a founder and life trustee of the Rome Jewish maternity hospital, died in Rome on August 4, at the age of 81. Ermanno Friedenthal, since 1945 Chief Rabbi of Milan, died in Milan on September 26, at the age of 89. Leonardo Ascoli, a known and respected journalist and active in Jewish community affairs, died in Turin on November 29, at the age of 54. Elisa Rosselli Benaim, author of children's books and talented artist, died in Florence on December 15, at the age of 97.

*Julio Dresner*