

Western Europe

Anglo-Jewry Since World War II

A GROWTH IN NATIONAL IMPORTANCE and a decline in number; a heightened self-consciousness and a loss of identity; a deepening of religious fervor and a fragmentation of religious institutions; a proliferation of educational facilities and a widespread indifference to things Jewish—all these paradoxes characterize the postwar evolution of British Jewry.

The immediate postwar period set the scene for all later developments. Wartime evacuation and dispersal initiated a movement away from city centers to the suburbs and beyond. The struggle of the late 1940s to establish and support Israel, often in conflict with the Labour government's policy, foreshadowed the later much closer identification with Israel. The reduced hierarchical structure of postwar Britain, itself in part a product of wartime dislocation, facilitated the entry of Jews into new occupational and social spheres. The wider diffusion of wealth and enhanced living standards gave opportunity to Jewish entrepreneurs in building, entertainment, publishing, the consumer-oriented industries, and the professions. The educational expansion, initiated during the war, likewise created openings for the intellectual and academic on an unprecedented scale. The Anglo-Jewish community of the late 1970s is recognizably the heir to that of the late 1940s—but it is also recognizably different.

Demographic Decline

One outstanding feature is a demographic decline, though it is only since the 1960s, when the Board of Deputies established a statistical and demographic unit—itsself a symptom of unease—that the measure of decline can be ascertained. Whereas members of the community occupy leading positions in many spheres of the arts, sciences, and politics, demographers forecast that, in the foreseeable future, the Jewish population may fall to 225,000, compared with the 410,000 currently estimated. The primary cause is the low birthrate. A survey conducted among Jewish mothers who gave birth in 1971 showed that Jewish families, with an average of 1.72 children per family, were less prolific than the general population, which had an average of 2.16 children. The same survey indicated that Jewish women had a shorter child-bearing period, with only 4.6 per cent of births taking place after ten

years of marriage, compared with 13.3 per cent for the general population.

What is more, not only is the size and fertility of the Jewish family in decline, but fewer Jews are marrying in a synagogue, so that the religious-marriage rate has fallen below the marriage rate for the general population. Until 1939 the two rates were more or less in line, but in 1949 the synagogue rate fell to 7.2 per 1,000, against a general rate of 8.6; by 1965 it was 3.9, compared with 7.8; in the following three years the rate of religious marriages remained more or less constant, whereas the general rate rose considerably. Expressed in numbers, synagogue marriages have fallen, from an annual average of 2,876 in 1941–1950, to 1,588 in 1975. This does not necessarily mean that an increasing number of Jews is marrying outside the synagogue. It may simply be that fewer marriages are taking place. It appears to be the case that the variation in the marriage rate among Jews is greater than among the non-Jewish population. It falls more acutely in time of crisis and rises more sharply in time of recovery. Thus the 1,588 synagogue marriages recorded in 1975, when compared with the 3,768 recorded in 1947, should not be regarded solely as an index of alienation and intermarriage. They may also express feelings about the future of the country and the prospects it can offer.

Intermarriage

However, when all is said and done, intermarriage unmistakably emerges as the greatest single threat to the future of British Jewry. In reaction to this danger, the Chief Rabbi's office in 1973 set up an Intermarriage Anonymous Bureau that operated initially with a panel of seven or eight London rabbis and aimed to deal with parents and young people reluctant to discuss their intermarriage problems with their own ministers. This was none too soon, for attitudes towards marriage out of the faith have undoubtedly changed since the prewar days. A 1972 national opinion poll survey showed that it was widely tolerated by British Jews: 49 per cent of the 214 respondents held that Jews should be allowed to marry out of the faith. Similar findings emerged from a survey of 40 sample Jewish families in the typical London suburb of Wembley in 1974, where a surprisingly large number of young Jewish people (56.5 per cent) said they would be prepared to "marry out," and an even more surprisingly low percentage of their parents (15 per cent) said they would be prepared to take forceful action to prevent them. The effect of this attitude is evident in the latest relevant statistics. Working on the basis of figures relating to Jewish marriages and burials, the research unit of the Board of Deputies stated in 1976 that "the true level of assimilation—out-marriage with persons neither ethnically nor religiously Jewish and whose children could not automatically be married in synagogue—is approximately 20 per cent, i.e. less than one in five."

This rate is not likely to decline, if the views of Britain's Jewish students are any guide. The relatively large Jewish student body, sometimes estimated at as high a figure as 6,000 and very much a postwar phenomenon, is regarded as one of the most vulnerable areas as far as alienation from the community and intermarriage are

concerned. A survey conducted in 1968 found that 56 of a sample of 155 Jewish university students would be willing to marry a non-Jew, and 17 were uncertain. In 1973 Rabbi Cyril Harris, then national Hillel director, wrote in the London *Jewish Chronicle* that one in three of the Jewish student population was likely to marry out of the faith; seven out of eight had no active connection with Jewish life; nine out of ten knew next to nothing about Judaism. Attempts are currently being made to combat this danger, particularly necessary in view of the fact that only very few of the 2,000 or so Jewish academics in Great Britain identify with the community. A student chaplaincy scheme is in existence to appoint university chaplains to minister to the spiritual needs of the Jewish students. Hillel houses, both residential and nonresidential, try to keep the Jewish student within the fold. An interuniversity Jewish federation has been formed in an attempt to keep the Jewish students together in an identifying group.

Divorce and Separation

While marriages are decreasing, another danger recently appeared to be threatening Jewish family life. In October 1976 Rabbi Harris stated that there were more divorces and separations than marriages in his 1,600-member Edgware community of North-West London. The Anglo-Jewish community had, he said, a higher rate of divorce than the general community. This assessment is supported by a 1976 report by the Norwood Foundation to the effect that about 750 families were being assisted in various ways, the vast majority of them victims of either separation or divorce. "There is a general trend in the community towards divorce," said Harold Altman, Norwood's executive director. A Jewish Marriage Advisory Council has been formed to deal with this problem, and seminars on marriage counseling have been introduced into the syllabus for the training of rabbis.

Economic and Social Status

A second characteristic of British Jewry today is its success nationally. Whether this is bound by some inner, esoteric link to the symptoms of disintegration can only remain a matter of speculation. But the fact of success is incontrovertible. It was indeed the main contention of Ernest Krausz's 1972 study, *Ethnic Minorities in Britain*, that the Jewish minority in Britain had risen more rapidly on the economic and social ladders than any other. This he attributed not to any inherent racial superiority, but to a long tradition of literacy and adaptation to urban life, in conjunction with fortuitous external factors. The result has been transformation.

In the last three decades Jewish novelists, playwrights, producers, academics, administrators, politicians, and businessmen have moved to the forefront of the national scene. In parliament, for example, there were 46 Jewish members in 1975, nine at different levels of government; in 1947, there had been only 28. In February 1977 there were, for the first time, four Jewish M.P.s in the cabinet and five in junior

ministerial positions. The ten hereditary peers of 1945 had grown to 11 three decades later, and to 24 life peers—so large a number that the 1976 retirement honours list of former Prime Minister Sir Harold Wilson caused a minor scandal when it conferred life peerages on such persons as his Jewish doctor, Sir Joseph Stone; a Jewish publisher, Sir George Weidenfeld; two Jewish impresarios, Sir Lew Grade and Sir Bernard Delfont; and two Jewish businessmen, Sir Joseph Kagan and Sir Max Rayne. Another index of Jewish achievement is the rise in the number of Jewish Fellows of the Royal Society (from 12 in 1945 to 48 in 1975) and Fellows of the British Academy (from 4 to 21), the latter including the president of the Academy, Professor Sir Isaiah Berlin. In 1973 Sir Isaac Wolfson became the first benefactor to have colleges at both Oxford and Cambridge universities named after him.

These are examples only of the very top of the ladder, the cream on the milk. But the milk itself is of a fairly rich variety, and the occupational profile of British Jewry that has emerged since the war is remarkable for the concentration in nonmanual occupations that it demonstrates. According to a study, 38 per cent of the Jews who died in 1961 fell into "professional" or "intermediate" categories, with the latter including a wide range of self-employed. Research by Professors Julius Gould and Ernest Krausz suggests that in the London areas over 60 per cent of living Jews are in these two top occupational groups. One conclusion they draw from this hypothesis is that the very many celebrated Jews today have emerged from an estimated 270,000 people in these two sectors. The level of achievement is all the more surprising in view of this fact.

A second conclusion points to the rapid ascent generally that the Jews in Britain have made during the last 30 years. They have been more than ready to take advantage of the educational facilities offered by the country, and were considerably helped in this by the rapid expansion of the educational system in the years following the war. Numerous studies show that Jewish representation at the higher quality, more academic state schools was far in excess of the numbers to be anticipated, given the total number of Jews. Likewise, though no reliable statistics of Jewish students attending British universities exist, two independent studies by Raymond Baron and Professor Emanuel de Kadt, based on two very different research methodologies, showed that Jews constituted 2.8 per cent of all students in the mid-1950s—a proportion three times larger than could be expected on the basis of population figures.

An obvious accompaniment to the upward educational movement of the British Jews has been their mass movement into middle-class living. This is shown in the population drift away from the old London centers of Jewish immigrant life to the more prosperous outer suburbs of London. A survey by S.J. Prais, honorary consultant to the statistical and demographic research unit of the Board of Deputies, disclosed a decline in the number of Jews living in North London to 59,000 in 1970, from 85,000 to 100,000 less than 20 years earlier, and in the East End of London to some 39,000, from 125,000 two generations earlier. The movement is confirmed

by the fact that 67 new synagogues were either built or acquired between 1961 and 1971, while synagogues in the old areas of settlement were forced to close because they were "neither financially nor spiritually viable," to quote the description by Alfred Wolf, president of the United Synagogue, of the Stoke Newington Synagogue which closed in 1976.

The same trend is clearly evident from the male membership figures of the Great Synagogue in London's Whitechapel, scheduled for closure in November 1976 under a rationalization scheme for the East London area. Established in 1690, the synagogue had a membership of 610 men in 1939. This figure had fallen to 369 in 1958; to 294 in 1970, and by 1976 the synagogue, with a male membership of 201, showed a financial deficit and was unable to get a Sabbath *minyán*. Jewish hospitals in the old areas show similar decline in numbers of Jewish patients and are currently threatened with closure as uneconomical.

Statistics of youth-club membership in the old London centers are also significant. The Stamford Hill Victoria Club for example, had 600 members in 1957. The membership fell to 400-450 in 1961, and to 180 in 1976. This trend is borne out by the findings of an analysis, largely based on 1971 census returns, by the Board of Deputies research unit, of the Jewish population of the North London Borough of Hackney. It found that although those who could afford to do so had left Hackney on retirement, there remained a "residential but slowly declining population of elderly people," of whom 500 were reaching retirement age each year. Although Hackney, with 28,000 Jews (14 per cent of the total population of the borough), was still one of the most important centers of Jewish settlement in Britain, this Jewish population was "increasingly composed of aged and poorer persons or of the Chasidic sect."

Jewish Education

A natural corollary of Hackney's aging population is the declining attendance at part-time Hebrew classes there: only ten or 11 children on the roll in 1974. A similar trend is apparent in other declining areas: the New Synagogue, Stamford Hill London, with only 55 children, and Golders Green with 35. On the other hand, prospects of growing attendances are noted on the periphery of London, e.g., Hertfordshire and the South-West Essex border.

As in other spheres, however, a countervailing and positive tendency is at work. If part-time Hebrew schooling is in undoubted decline, full-time Hebrew schooling is flourishing. This denotes a dramatic reversal of policy. In 1945 a communal conference, called to prepare a reconstruction program for Jewish education after the disruptive war years, decided that part-time education should remain the basis of the Jewish education system in Britain. Twin institutions were established to enforce this decision: the London Board of Jewish Religious Education to operate in London and the Central Council for Jewish Education to coordinate the provision of religious education in the provinces.

By 1968 dissatisfaction with the part-time system was already being expressed. There was a shortage of qualified teachers; those employed, it was said, were unpunctual and inefficient. Facilities were unsatisfactory. Educational standards were low, suffering from constant changes in curriculum and teaching personnel. In 1969 two American experts on Jewish education, Rabbis Simcha Teitelbaum and Joseph Kaminetsky, were invited by Chief Rabbi Immanuel Jakobovits to advise on the Anglo-Jewish educational system. They agreed that many of its problems were insurmountable; that the only real answer required Jewish children to attend Jewish day schools.

Since then the popularity of the Jewish day-school movement has proceeded apace. Whereas attendance at part-time Hebrew classes has declined (in 1974-75 the number of children attending such classes administered by the London Board had fallen to 6,647, from a peak of nearly 13,000 in 1950), Jewish day schools are unable to meet the demand for places.

At the end of the war, after the wartime destruction and the population shift, there were only 1,000 pupils at seven Jewish day schools. Encouraged by the Butler Education Act of 1944, which introduced the concept of "aided" education, the number of schools in Great Britain and Ireland rose to 57 in 1975 (40 primary and 17 secondary schools). Enrollment shows a progressive upward curve: 4,400 in 1954, 8,900 in 1963, and 12,700 in 1975. The Jewish Free School comprehensive school, which had been bombed during the war, was reconstructed to become one of London's most flourishing Jewish educational establishments. Carmel College, the only Jewish public school in Britain, was opened in 1950. Today, when governmental cuts in expenditure on education is limiting the building of new schools, there is more demand for places at Jewish day schools than are currently available. In September 1976 the North-West London Jewish Day School had 119 applications for 39 places for five-year-olds; Ilford Jewish Primary School accepted 46 first-year pupils from 90 applications; Rosh Pinah School in Edgware took 35 pupils from 79 applicants. As Chief Rabbi Jakobovits stated in May 1976, "Twenty years ago the schools were chasing the children. Now the tables have turned. Something that was once rejected is now desired."

The Chief Rabbi associated himself with the boom in Jewish education when, in 1971, he published a 15-year plan as part of a program called "Let My People Know." This gave rise to a Jewish Educational Trust, which by 1976 had helped to create an extra 1,000 places at existing Jewish schools; several scholarships and travel grants had been awarded, and a sixth-form college for girls as well as two sixth-form developments, both for youths between the ages of about 16 and 18 in their last years at school in existing institutions had been created. A scheme for training state-recognized teachers in Jewish studies at Trent Park College of Further Education in London was collapsing by 1976, but was being replaced by a similar scheme in North London.

Another feature of the postwar boom in Jewish education was the great expansion of interest in Jewish studies at British universities. Existing departments have been

enlarged, as at University College, London; in Cambridge a lectureship in Modern Hebrew was endowed in 1972, and in 1975 a Taylor-Schechter Geniza unit was set up. At the same time, new courses were introduced. At Warwick University in 1968, the Bearsted Readership in Jewish History was established. In Oxford, Jewish studies at university level were encouraged by the opening in 1972 of a Center for Post-Graduate Hebrew Studies. In 1975 the growing numbers of academics engaged in one or another of the branches of Jewish studies formed a British Society for Jewish Studies to promote their common interests and provide a forum for annual conference.

These developments seem to have taken place at the expense of Jews' College, the Jewish establishment's own center for higher education. Before the war, it had been the primary institution for the training of Orthodox rabbis in the United Kingdom. In the postwar period, it declined in status, size, and authority. In the face of falling numbers and quality of students as well as financial difficulties, numerous attempts have been made to recast the College's image. The current principal, Canadian Rabbi Dr. Nahum Rabinovitch, envisages a change in its character by transforming it from a training school for the rabbinate into a center for higher Jewish learning and social studies. The new program would provide a much broader base for the College, it was claimed, and produce a well-educated Jew. It would also make the College effective in the training of rabbis, teachers, lecturers, Jewish social and communal workers, executives in Jewish organizations, student counselors, and youth leaders.

Religious Life

The paradox of a declining Jews' College side by side with a boom in the Jewish day school movement and in Jewish studies at the universities is accompanied by a striking paradox in Jewish religious life. In brief, there has been, at the same time, a decline in religious observance and an increase in synagogue membership. In 1933 only 35 per cent of London Jews were affiliated to a synagogue; in 1969 this was true of 61 per cent. Synagogue builders and architects have worked hard to keep pace with the demand. A survey by S.J. Prais, published as *Synagogue Statistics and the Jewish Population of Great Britain 1900-1970*, found that the 410,000 British Jews were served by 375 synagogues providing 72,843 seats for men, and that half of them were built in the postwar period. Of the total, 199 synagogues were in Greater London with its 280,000 Jews, the remainder in the provinces. Prais pointed out that the number of seats in provincial synagogues in relation to the size of the congregation was almost twice as high as in London because of the "declining nature" of many provincial communities, especially the smaller ones, where synagogues were built long ago for much larger Jewish populations.

In fact, the scale of expenditure on building synagogues as compared, let us say, with Jewish day-school construction is a paradox in itself. With demand for day-school places greatly exceeding supply, Prais estimated that net expenditure from

Jewish communal resources on day schools (apart from the contribution from general communal taxation) was below £1 million between 1961 and 1971, whereas the total estimated expenditure on synagogues was £6.5 million. In the ten-year period, 67 new synagogue buildings were erected or acquired to provide a total of 26,000 seats. But only 5,100 new day-school places were made available in the same period; and since half of these replaced older school accommodations, the real increase was only 2,800 places.

But is the demand for synagogues matched by a similar demand for their utilization? The example of Leeds in 1961 is illustrative. In a community of some 5,500 Jewish families, as many as 76.3 per cent were associated with a synagogue. Yet, at the 16 Leeds synagogues, of which only eight had regular daily services, the total number of worshipers was 170 to 180 in the morning, 120 to 130 in the evenings, 230 to 250 on Friday evenings, 800 to 850 on Sabbath mornings, and 7,100 to 7,200 on the High Holy Days. Moreover, the regular worshipers tended to be the older people.

The consumption of kosher meat is another index of failing religious observance. According to the late Dayan Isadore Grunfeld of the *Bet Din*, only 50 per cent of British Jews bought kosher meat in 1975, as compared with 90 per cent before the war. A national opinion poll conducted in 1972 among a sample of 214 Jews found that only 28 per cent never ate nonkosher food, although 67 per cent kept kosher homes. Some 71 per cent would drive on the Sabbath, but 87 per cent observed Yom Kippur, 86 per cent Rosh Ha-shanah, 79 per cent Passover, and 29 per cent other festivals.

The response of the United Synagogue, the umbrella organization embracing a considerable proportion of British Jews, to this decline in observance has been a tightening of attitudes. It was reflected, in 1972 for example, in the introduction of a ruling whereby, for the first time in the history of the United Synagogue, *bar-mitzvah* boys would not be allowed to read any portion of the Law without having passed a written or oral examination. It is indicative of the success of this policy that an inquiry commission set up two years later found that the new regulation had not resulted in an over-all improvement of educational standards or mid-week attendance at Hebrew classes, and it was therefore modified. The reaction of the *Bet Din* to reports that the number of functions supervised by the Kashrut Commission in 1976 had declined 25 per cent since 1973 was similar; it ordered that only kosher wines be served at supervised functions.

This hardening of attitude is partly the result of the change in the character of the community leadership. When the war ended, the Anglo-Jewish religious scene was dominated by two men: Sir Robert Waley Cohen, president of the United Synagogue, and Dr. Joseph Hertz, Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Empire. The atmosphere they generated was one of Progressive Conservatism; their hope was to see the office of the Chief Rabbi as a unifying force within the community. When the Hon. Ewen Montagu resigned as president of the United Synagogue in 1962, the old régime came to an end. While Montagu had been

critical of members of the London *Bet Din*, his successors have given it their wholehearted support. Today, Chief Rabbi Jakobovits and United Synagogue president Alfred Woolf represent an unimpeachable Orthodoxy in the face of an increasingly lax community.

The new-found rigidity of the Orthodox establishment led to one of the major religious controversies of the century, the "Jacobs Affair." Central figure in the drama was Rabbi Dr. Louis Jacobs, an Orthodox minister, who was rabbi first in Manchester and then in the New West End Synagogue in London, and later lectured at Jews' College. However, some of Dr. Jacob's teachings on biblical criticism ran counter to the traditional Orthodox interpretation of the Torah. Consequently, when the post of principal of Jews' College fell vacant in 1961, Dr. Jacobs was not, as he had been previously assured, offered the post. He resigned from the College and sought to return to the New West End Synagogue, but the then Chief Rabbi Dr. (now Sir) Israel Brodie refused to issue the necessary certificate of authorization to preach. Thereupon, Dr. Jacobs's supporters resigned from the New West End Synagogue and set up an independent one in St. John's Wood, London, with Dr. Jacobs as their minister. So successful was this breakaway group that in 1974, ten years after its formation, an affiliated congregation was established in the London suburb of Highgate.

The "Jacobite" congregations are only one of the several minority groupings in Anglo-Jewish religious life. A great degree of religious diversification has taken place, as already evident in the number of postwar synagogue buildings in London: 20 right-wing Orthodox (mostly in the Stamford Hill area), five Sephardi (some for new immigrants), 11 Reform, eight Liberal, 20 United Synagogue (mainly in the outer London area), and nine Federation (some in northwest London and some in outer London).

It would seem that the extremes are gaining strength, so that a degree of polarization is taking place. At one end of the scale, for example, there are the Liberal and Reform movements, which united in 1968 to form a Council of Rabbis, whose chairman is official spokesman to the community for both organizations. Support for this trend has grown considerably since the end of the war. While between 1840 and 1930 only three Reform synagogues opened, in 1976 the Council could boast that some 60 rabbis in 40 congregations belonged to the Reform Synagogues of Great Britain and the United Liberal and Progressive Synagogue, which, it claimed, now served over 20 per cent of synagogue-affiliated Jewry. In 1956 they also opened their own college for the training of rabbis, the Jewish Theological College for Training Reform Rabbis, the first non-Orthodox institution of its kind to be established in Britain. The following year it was renamed Leo Baeck College, which has been administered jointly with the Liberal movement since 1965.

At the other end of the scale is the Union of Orthodox Hebrew Congregations, established in 1927. By 1960 it was said to have 100 synagogues throughout the country, as well as several schools of which the Gateshead and Sunderland *yeshivot* have achieved international reputations.

If extremes have gained strength, the natural consequence must be the weakening of the center, as represented by the United Synagogue and the Federation of Synagogues. In one respect, this is evident in the loss of prestige and authority enjoyed by the institution of the Chief Rabbinate. More tangible and unmistakable evidence of the decline of the center is the distribution of synagogue marriages. Between 1900 and 1940 it had a virtual monopoly of synagogue marriages, but by 1975 its share of such marriages had dropped to 70 per cent. The balance was accounted for by Reform and Liberal (22 per cent), Sephardi (three per cent), right-wing Orthodox (six per cent). Regarding the last group, Chief Rabbi Jakobovits complained in 1976 that its influence on Jewish communal life was not great enough: ". . . there were some 2,000 to 3,000 Yeshiva alumni whose influence in terms of leadership and responsibility was minimal or nonexistent." But it may well be the case that the intensity of commitment displayed by the "right-wingers" more than compensates for their separatism and does in fact give a tone and coloring to the community that their numbers alone would not warrant.

Shared Community Action

Among this organizational diversity and diversification of religious beliefs and practices—or non-beliefs and non-practices—there are some common threads that animate Anglo-Jewry as a community. One of these is the campaign on behalf of Jews in Soviet Russia which, for the past decade, has been fervently supported by nearly every section of the community, from the Chief Rabbinate to the university students. One of the most active groups in this sector is the Women's Campaign for Soviet Jewry (known as the 35s).

This emergence of Jewish women into public life in itself is very much a new factor in the postwar world. Women, in fact, have been clamoring in recent years for a voice in the running of synagogal affairs and their demands are not looked upon unkindly by the Chief Rabbi. A preliminary step in the recognition of women's potential has been the growing prevalence of synagogue *bat-mitzvah* ceremonies for girls of twelve.

A second, most powerful thread is allegiance to the state of Israel. No factor has had a more profound influence on Jewish life in Britain than the creation of the state. It pervades all spheres, and it is tempting to say that it is the rallying cry that brings estranged Jews back into the communal, though perhaps not the religious, fold. At the time of the 1967 six-day war, the community provided the largest group of foreign volunteers for Israel—some 8,000 young people had registered by June 23. Older Jews, whether Orthodox or formerly nonidentifying, poured money into the Joint Palestine Appeal (now renamed the Joint Israel Appeal). The Chief Rabbi called an unprecedented meeting of rabbis of all "denominations" to discuss specific ways in which they could help. Some 20,000 people attended a "Salute to Israel" meeting in London, aimed at a display of solidarity with the Jewish state. Similar phenomena were to be observed during the 1973 Yom Kippur war.

Identification with Israel has also become a theme of Jewish education. Said retiring Jewish Free School headmaster Edward Conway in 1976:

Experience at the Jewish Free School in recent years has shown that when Jewish education is identified with Israel it can create a new and stimulating relevancy to classroom lessons. In this day it is no longer sufficient only to bring Israel into the classroom. The classroom must be temporarily transferred to Israel. In this way, we can expect a positive revolution in Jewish education and a more secure guarantee of Jewish survival in this country.

In point of fact, the Jewish Free School not only takes the classroom to Israel by arranging for its pupils long-term visits to Israeli schools, but also brings Israel into the classroom by the employment of Israeli teachers. This practice pervades the whole field of Jewish education, so that in 1975 over 50 Israeli Jewish-studies teachers were sent by Jewish Agency departments to Britain for limited periods. Similar schemes send British teachers of Jewish studies to Israel for training.

The other side of this particular coin is the identification, so far as concerns the non-Jewish world, of the Jews with Israel and Zionism. This, of course, is further involved in the relationship of Jew and non-Jew. To put it crudely, is antisemitism a factor in this relationship? Apart from the small but growing National Front, antisemitism in any organized form does not exist. Discrimination, in current English parlance, means discrimination against the blacks, and the successive Race Relations Acts passed by the British government since 1965 are primarily designed to combat this manifestation. As against this, the creeping infiltration of Arab influence into the country and the operation of the Arab economic boycott have given Anglo-Jewry new cause for concern. To quote a statement by the Board of Deputies: "With the growing dependence of British firms on trade with Arab countries, it is inevitable that companies will be increasingly reluctant to hire Jews." At another level, it seems that the influence of Arab and Third-World students in purveying the equation Zionism = racism is creating a new rationale for antisemitism among the most recent generation of English students and perhaps in the population at large.

Is it in reaction to this that Anglo-Jewry is, as it were, less anxious to become integrated than in prewar days? What seems to be happening is a transition from would-be English to successful ethnic group that has its own restaurants, schools, religious institutions, journals, benevolent associations, social life, etc., etc. But this, it must be emphasized, is not incompatible with a pervasive form of assimilation. There is a spectrum of Jewishness that ranges from the ethnocentrism of Stamford Hill and Gateshead to the Jewishness by association of the vast majority. The very plurality of contemporary English life encourages a structure of Jewish identity that is based on external criteria alone, e.g., residence, demography, occupation, organizational membership. How substantial such an identification can be, only the future will tell.

LIONEL E. KOCHAN

France

Political Developments

THE YEAR 1976 was marked by the progressive deterioration of the initially shining public image of President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, together with a decline in the prestige of, and public confidence in, the shapers of economic policy. It was not possible to stop inflation and unemployment. Although the situation was not as yet really serious, being less critical than in other European countries like England, the mere indication of stagnation or recession produced discontent and criticism. In recent years of prosperity, the French had grown accustomed to a constantly improving economy and increasing purchasing power. There ensued a sullen political atmosphere, here and there accompanied by perhaps excessive or premature cries of alarm, which were fully exploited by the Left opposition.

Public-opinion polls at the end of the year showed support of the president lower than that of any chief of state since the beginning of the Fifth Republic; only 32 per cent of the citizens said they were satisfied. Other polls asking, "For whom would you vote if the legislative elections took place at this moment?" gave 54 per cent of the votes to the Left opposition.

The year's major event in internal politics was the resignation in August of Prime Minister Jacques Chirac over a disagreement with President Giscard d'Estaing regarding the powers he felt he should have to function effectively as prime minister. He was replaced by Raymond Barre, a change that led to a partial reorganization of the cabinet, with some new members. Thus Louis de Guiringaud succeeded Jean Sauvagnargues as foreign minister. On September 1 Giscard d'Estaing declared: "The change of government does not alter France's foreign policy."

On September 13 Chirac, the undisputed leader of the Gaullists, announced his intention of uniting all those who wanted to "avert from our country the adventure and constraints of collectivism." He called a special meeting of the principal Gaullist group, the UDR (Union of Democrats for the Republic), which took place in Paris on December 5. The UDR changed its name to Rassemblement pour la République (RPR; Rally for the Republic), and Chirac was elected its president. He then gave his energetic support to the presidential majority, though he was in many respects Giscard d'Estaing's antagonist. His situation was somewhat similar to that of Communist leader Georges Marchais in relation to Socialist leader François Mitterrand. But the new and disruptive incursion of Chirac into the political scene was also regarded as the prelude to becoming presidential candidate at the end of Giscard's term.

The second major political occurrence was the accelerated development of the

French Communist party in the direction of "Eurocommunism," with its proclamations of liberal democracy and its more and more pronounced separation from the principles and practices of Moscow and the "socialist world" under its domination.

At the 22nd congress of the French Communist party in February, the theory of the "dictatorship of the proletariat," and thus essentially what is understood as Marxism-Leninism, was explicitly and categorically repudiated. Georges Marchais launched an appeal to Christians, asking their cooperation and offering a defense of Christianity. On October 21 a representative of the French Communist party participated in a Paris meeting for the release of political prisoners in totalitarian countries, including two in the Soviet Union. And finally, in December, when the dissident intellectual Vladimir Bukovsky was released and expelled from the Soviet Union in exchange for the release of Chilean Communist leader Luis Corvalan who was also expelled from his country, the French Communist party organ *l'Humanité* deplored that the Soviet Union could punish political dissidence by expulsion, thus permitting a parallel to be drawn between the socialist USSR and fascist Chile.

In December there was a telecast of *The Confession*, a film describing the brutal treatment of the accused in the 1952 Slánský trials in Prague. In a debate on the film, Jean Kanapa (a Jew), once among the most rabidly Stalinist French Communist leaders and a member of the Central Committee, acknowledged the historical truth of the shameful events depicted in the film. Only shortly before, the French Communists had called that documentary an "anti-Soviet provocation."

The zealous and ostentatious neo-liberalism of the French Communists was obviously not without effect on the competitive aspect of their relations with the Socialists. In view of the approaching election campaigns, they had to reassure the lower middle class so far as possible, to make a bid for the Socialist votes, to avoid arousing fear, to dissipate once and for all the smell of brimstone which had clung to them in a sort of atavistic way since the distant days of the "man with a dagger between his teeth." But that liberation spirit was a two-edged sword. If the Communists made themselves the champions of freedom of opinion, of pluralism; if they repudiated the one-party system and thus showed contempt for Lenin's teaching, what made them different from the Socialists and wherein lay their uniqueness?

These were the questions the voters had to ask themselves when they went to the polls in the partial national elections and local elections in half the cantons of France, on March 7 and 14. Almost everywhere the Communists lost votes to the Socialists, the major beneficiaries of the new advance of the Left. One thus saw a French Communism which, while no longer causing fear, had also lost its capacity to inspire, so that the hope of the French Communist party to become again what it had once been, the leading party in France, had almost no chance of realization.

The question of a European Parliament elected by universal suffrage divided the Left opposition and, to a lesser extent, the government parties. The Communists, who were fierce opponents of that sort of parliamentarianism, came close to some eminent Gaullists like former Prime Minister Michel Debré in their nationalist prejudices. But the Socialists and Left Radicals supported the proposal. Rejecting

assertions that the election of the European Parliament by direct suffrage would violate the French Constitution, the Constitutional Court ruled, on December 30, that there was no incompatibility between such a vote and the provisions of the Constitution. Earlier, in February, German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt had visited Paris to discuss with the president the role of Germany and France in the structure of Europe.

Middle East Policy

At the end of October a Socialist delegation led by François Mitterrand visited Israel. It included, among others, former deputy Michel Rocard, who, as leader of PSU (Parti Socialiste Unifié; United Socialist party), was known for his virulent anti-Zionism. After conversations with some Israeli leaders, the delegation issued a communiqué of rather general character, which was more or less balanced in indications of sympathy for Israel and care not to hurt Arab feelings.

There was no fundamental change in the attitude of the French government in regard to the Middle East, though there appeared to be a slight thawing of relations with Israel. On August 6 Said Kemal, deputy director of the Palestine Liberation Organization political department, met in Paris with Foreign Minister Sauvagnargues and the Secretary-General of the Foreign Ministry Geoffrey de Courcel. He also saw representatives of the French episcopate.

On June 15 Israeli Minister of Health Victor Shemtov came to Paris at the invitation of his French counterpart, Simone Veil. He met with Prime Minister Jacques Chirac. But, on May 4, Israeli President Ephraim Katzir canceled a planned private visit to Paris because he had not received assurance that he would be welcomed in the manner appropriate to a chief of state.

On January 26 the French representative in the UN Security Council supported the resolution advocating the establishment of a Palestinian state. The Comité de Solidarité Française avec Israël (Committee for French Solidarity With Israel), whose members included deputies and senators of the majority party as well as the non-Communist opposition parties, published a statement criticizing that vote. The main Middle East concern of government circles, however, was not with Israel and its adversaries, but with the full-scale civil war in Lebanon. France, the traditional protector of that country, offered to act as mediator. On January 21 Foreign Minister Sauvagnargues undertook an "exploratory mission" to all the parties in the Lebanese conflict. On March 31 the French government issued a solemn appeal for an end to the fighting in Lebanon, declaring its readiness to take the necessary initiatives for a return to a cease-fire. But the action envisaged by the French, including the eventual dispatch of an expeditionary force, was opposed by the majority of Lebanese political groups.

President Giscard d'Estaing's trips abroad included one to the United States at the end of May, during which the question of sending a French detachment to Lebanon was discussed. His visit to Iran, on October 7, resulted in agreement with

the Shah on "the urgency of an over-all settlement in the Middle East" and in large Iranian orders for French industry. On May 27 Giscard d'Estaing received an American Jewish delegation to discuss French-Israeli relations. During an official visit at the beginning of April, President Anwar al-Sadat of Egypt met with President Giscard d'Estaing and Prime Minister Chirac. The visit to Paris of General Ernesto Geisel, president of Brazil, at the end of the month brought protests from the parties of the Left and from Catholic prelates.

President Hafez al-Assad of Syria paid an official visit to Paris in June. He and the French president issued a communiqué of agreement on general principles with regard to the Middle East.

Although the Entebbe affair (see article on Israel) concerned France, since it was a French plane which the terrorists hijacked, it had no direct repercussions in Paris. The Israeli raid aroused the admiration of press and radio commentators, but there was underlying uneasiness, since France was responsible for the security of the passengers whom Israel had saved. In spite of their neo-liberalism, the French Communists had no change of heart in matters connected with Israel: the party's daily *l'Humanité*, on July 17, 1976, severely condemned the Israeli raid as a violation of Uganda's sovereignty.

October 4 and 5 saw a visit by Kamal Jumblatt, leader of the Lebanese left. King Hassan II of Morocco came to France at the end of the month.

On December 28 Foreign Minister Louis de Guiringaud declared in an interview over radio station France Inter that he was "fully in favor of the creation of a Palestinian state." On January 4, 1977, the Israeli Foreign Ministry asked the French Ambassador to Tel Aviv for an explanation of that statement.

An event which took place at the end of 1976 seemed likely to have political repercussions. Prince Jean de Broglie, a former deputy minister in the de Gaulle government and one of the chief negotiators of the Evian agreements on Algerian independence, was assassinated in a Paris street. The arrest of the assassin and those who hired him to kill the prince for very involved reasons having to do with loans was followed by an official account of the murder, released by the police and the ministry of the interior. The account, which was widely challenged, was seen as an attempt to suppress a scandal apt to compromise Giscard d'Estaing's Independent Republican party, of which the victim was a member, and perhaps also an affair of traffic in arms destined for some Arab states.

Terrorism and Antisemitism

During the night of January 12-13, 1976, Molotov cocktails were thrown at an Arab bookstore in the Paris Latin Quarter, the distributor of propaganda materials of the extremist faction of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Responsibility for the attack, which resulted in a fire and large-scale damage, was claimed by a hitherto unknown group, the Front d'Autodéfense Juif (Jewish Self-Defense Front). The police did not find the perpetrators. On January 3, 1977, the proprietor of the same

bookstore, a Jordanian with Mauritanian nationality, was shot dead.

Numerous plastic bombs were planted by autonomist groups in Corsica. On May 11 the Bolivian Ambassador to France was assassinated in Paris; the perpetrators were not found. On May 14 the president and director-general of the *Crédit Lyonnais*, a nationalized bank, was assassinated outside the bank's central office by a young anarchist, who committed suicide on the spot.

There were a number of similar incidents directed against the Jewish community. On May 30, during the great festival "Twelve Hours for Israel," explosives placed on the approaches to the festival site were discovered and removed. This attempted bombing was the work of a young pro-Palestinian Frenchwoman, who had already been imprisoned in Israel for complicity with the terrorists. A rash of attacks occurred in July. Explosives damaged the Paris office of B'nai Brith. There was an attempt to break into the Jewish community center in Marseilles. A time-bomb was defused in the Marseilles synagogue, and, on the same day, the synagogue of Cannes was desecrated. A bomb exploded in front of the office of the LICA (Ligue Internationale Contre l'Antisemitisme—International League against Antisemitism) in Paris, causing damage. Other targets of bombs were, in August, the offices of the Union Juive pour la Résistance et l'Entr'aide (UJRE; Jewish Union for the Resistance and Mutual Aid), a pro-Communist Jewish organization; in November, the offices of the Mouvement contre le Racisme, l'Antisemitisme et pour la Paix (MRAP; Movement against Racism and Antisemitism, and for Peace), a pro-Communist organization competing with LICA, and, at the end of December, the Jewish "progressist" weekly, *Nouvelle Presse*. The majority of these attacks were claimed by the Groupe Joachim Peiper. Peiper was a German Nazi, a war criminal who, after having served his sentence, died in a fire in his house outside a village in Eastern France, most probably set by former members of the resistance movement.

Lucien Rebatet's *Décombres* ("Rubbish"), one of the most malignantly anti-Jewish and best-selling books to appear in Nazi-occupied France, was republished by the avant-garde publisher Jean-Jacques Pauvert. Considered a leftist, even an extreme leftist, Pauvert justified his action as contributing a work of "documentary" interest on the psychology of the Jew-hater. He also referred to the author's literary talent, which unfortunately was indisputable. Rebatet, who had been condemned to death but later pardoned through intervention of such noted writers as François Mauriac, later died of natural causes. Although success of the newly published book was far short of the success of the original war-time edition, of which more than a 100,000 copies had been sold, it found some 12,000 buyers. No one could tell whether these were attracted by its significance as a psychological "document," or by an affinity with its ideology. The attempts of certain Jewish circles to have this republication banned were made without much conviction and found no public response.

Although certain specialists in virulent anti-Israelism, notably Professor Vincent Monteil, vice-president of the Association de Solidarité France-Arabe (Association

for Franco-Arab Solidarity), continued their activities, there was a perceptible decrease in this kind of agitation involving primarily the depoliticization of university youth. Some Jews of the extreme Left, who had previously been ferociously anti-Zionist, adopted a new line. In the January 1977 issue of *l'Arche*, the Maoist Alain Geismar, one of the principal leaders of the May 1968 revolt (AJYB, 1969 [Vol. 70], p.330-31), declared: "No solution of a military type is possible there. Since neither of the belligerents seeks to liberate the other, unconditional support for one of the two parties has no revolutionary effect."

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Communal Activities

The most notable event in Jewish communal life in 1976 was the agreement reached in Jerusalem in July between a delegation of the Fonds Social Juif Unifié (FSJU; United Jewish Philanthropic Funds) and the Jewish Agency, signed in Paris on December 1 by Joseph Almogui, president of the Jewish Agency and the World Zionist Congress Executive, and Guy de Rothschild, FSJU president. It provided for close cooperation between the two organizations in the fields of Jewish education, information about Israel, and *aliyah*. Besides establishing procedures for the next five years, it created a common fund of some 67,500,000 francs, especially for education, of which one-third was to be supplied by the Jewish Agency and two-thirds by FSJU. The contribution of each of these organizations was to come largely from a levy of 8 per cent on its quota of Appel Unifié Juif de France (United Jewish Appeal of France) collections. Of this money, 80 per cent was to be used for the creation of new Jewish schools and the expansion of the capacity of existing Jewish educational institutions, and an additional part for other Jewish educational and cultural programs.

"Twelve Hours for Israel," a rally organized by FSJU to gain new support for Israel, took place on May 30 in the great fair grounds, the Parc des Expositions of the Porte de Versailles, Paris. It was, at the same time, a festival with displays of various Jewish and Israeli products at numerous stands, pop and Jewish music, political debates, autographing of books, and happy relaxation. A hundred thousand people, more than had been expected, came to the fair grounds. The surprisingly great success of this immense festival prompted its organizers to institutionalize it, to designate it an annual May 30 event.

On April 23 the Day of Deportation was commemorated with services, attended also by government representatives, in the great synagogue of the Rue de la Victoire in Paris, as well as in the crypt of the Monument of the Unknown Jewish Martyr.

A very large French delegation attended the Second World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry, held in Brussels in February (AJYB, 1977 [Vol. 77], pp.153-56).

Three leading offices in Jewish organizations changed hands. Alain de Rothschild was named president of the Conseil Représentatif des Juifs de France (CRIF; Representative Council of the Jews of France), succeeding Jean Rosenthal who resigned. Nicole Goldmann succeeded Professor Albert Najman as secretary general of the FSJU, and Jules Brauschvig became president of the Alliance Israélite Universelle after the death of René Cassin.

Signs of crisis showed themselves in Jewish social and, especially, organizational life. The decision of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC) to cut its contribution to the community for 1977 by one million francs, following a decrease in the same amount in 1976, was deplored by community leaders. They pointed out that the 7,000 new Jewish refugees, who had arrived in France since the Yom Kippur war, increased the need for aid.

Religious Life

A Consistoire Central de France (Central Consistory) investigation into synagogue attendance on Yom Kippur showed it to be 100,000 for all regular and improvised places of worship in the Paris area, with an estimated Jewish population of 250,000. Actually, this figure should be higher, since many Yom Kippur services were being held privately, without Consistoire assistance or supervision.

A small but significant example of spontaneous religious initiative was the *minyán* in the Rue Georges Berger, Paris, functioning since the beginning of 1976. Some Jewish residents of the 17th *arrondissement* and vicinity decided, without any official support and with almost no aid from Jewish organizations, to create in their district a place of worship, specially for the Sabbath. The only help they received was that FSJU placed at their disposal a room in one of its buildings in the Rue Georges Berger, which served as an office during the week. The worshipers in no sense constituted a congregation or community. They had neither a rabbi nor a cantor, nor any appointed reader of the Torah. Whoever wished, or was able to do so, could, on his own initiative, perform any of these roles. Another peculiarity of the *minyán* was that it included both Ashkenazim and Sephardim, and the service was a synthesis of the two. This free association of worshipers included some young couples from a nonpracticing Jewish milieu who had gradually become observant. There were also some Israelis who lived in the quarter, which was close to the Jewish Agency offices.

In 1976 a community center was opened in Rilleux-le-Pape, a suburb of Lyons with several hundred Jewish families. FSJU closed the Jewish community center in Lyons. This meant also the disappearance of the only kosher restaurant in a city with 35,000 Jewish inhabitants, of whom a relatively large proportion, including a number of unmarried men, observed kashrut. This action brought violent protests, especially by Jewish students. FSJU argued that this community center was badly run, had a large deficit, and drew fewer and fewer people because it was in a part of the city inhabited or frequented by many Arabs.

In Rouen, in Normandy, archaeological excavations brought to light the ruins of a medieval synagogue. Professor Bernard Blumenkranz, a leading specialist in the ancient history of the Jews of France, eagerly studied the discovery to determine the exact period of the structure. Before the expulsion of the Jews from France in 1394, Normandy, of which Rouen was the capital, had been a brilliant center of talmudic scholarship.

Youth

There was a crisis or, more precisely, a continuation of the crisis in the Union des Étudiants Juifs de France (UEJF; Jewish Students' Union of France) (AJYB, 1976 [Vol. 76], p.308). The group's harmful experiments with excessive politicization and later depoliticization—a general phenomenon in the university—produced indifference, exhaustion, and skepticism about the reason for the very existence of a union of Jewish students. This uneasiness was particularly noticeable in the Paris section of UEJF, whose activities had greatly diminished, if not entirely ceased. The provincial sections were more successful in resisting deterioration.

There was a slight revival in the teaching of Hebrew as a living language at the French universities, with some increase in the number of students attending such courses, but with more non-Jews than Jews taking part. There were teaching chairs in modern Hebrew at two branches of the Paris Academy and at the universities of Lille, Toulouse, and Lyons. The majority of these chairs were filled by Israelis.

The problem of examinations scheduled by school and university authorities on the Sabbath arose when the new school year began. For years, the Consistoire has tried to have such examinations rescheduled, but so far has only succeeded in changing the date of the baccalaureate examinations, which were to take place on the Sabbath. Other examinations, whether in technical schools or institutions of higher learning, and fellowship examinations in particular, continued to be scheduled for the Sabbath. This obviously worked to the detriment of observant Jewish candidates, of whom there now were many more at the university than in the past.

Another source of worry was the fear that Jewish all-day schools—the high schools in Paris, Strasbourg, and Marseilles—would suffer as a result of the total nationalization of French public education, which was expected in the event of a left-wing coalition government after the 1978 legislative elections. Such a measure would completely abolish current government subsidies to so-called “free,” that is confessional, education. Since the Socialists had not yet reached a final decision on the terms of the proposed nationalization, the Jewish organizations wanted to be kept informed and reassured, in view of the relatively large Jewish vote in centers of Jewish population like the Paris region. While the leaders of the government parties (Gaullists, Independent Republicans, and Centrists) have received Jewish delegations, the leaders of the Left coalition parties failed to do so in 1976.

Cultural Events

The 17th colloquium of French-speaking Jewish intellectuals took place at the end of November. The subject discussed by the many participants of diverse interests was "The Model of the West." For the first time since this annual event began, one of its participants was a Moslem, Mohammed Arkoun, an Algerian professor and Islamic scholar.

An important symposium on the present situation of various religions took place at the end of May at the Abbey of Hautvilliers in Champagne. There were Catholic, Protestant, and Greek Orthodox participants, Moslems from North Africa and the Middle East, and two Jews—Professor Jean Halperin and this writer. Although the discussion at times became political when it focused on Israel and the Middle East, there was no clash between the Moslem and Jewish participants. The former showed much courtesy to those "on the other side" and a good understanding of the emotional involvement of the Jews in their relation to Israel.

In a discussion on "The Jews and France," presented on French television in December, Professor Emmanuel Lévinas gave a solid and interesting general account of Judaism. But the level of the discussion was considerably lowered by the introduction of childish and vulgarly anti-Zionist, even anti-Jewish, polemics by one of the participants, Michel Rachline. Noted for his hostility to Israel and religious Judaism, Rachline was chosen by the television programmers, despite his questionable competence and nonexistent erudition, simply because he was about to publish *Un Juif libre* ("A Free Jew"), a book aimed against religious Jews and Israel.

Jean-Paul Sartre was awarded an honorary doctorate in philosophy by the University of Jerusalem. The ceremony took place on November 7 at the Embassy of Israel in Paris, since the noted writer and philosopher was almost completely blind and could not travel to Israel. On this occasion Sartre expressed his attachment to, and even affection for, Israel and admitted that a certain form of anti-Zionism was equivalent to antisemitism.

Christian-Jewish Relations

Various not specifically Jewish groups were concerned with Jews and Judaism, notably movements fighting antisemitism and, on another level, Judeo-Christian friendship organizations working for a spiritual rapprochement between Jews and Christians.

The Ligue Internationale contre l'Antisemitisme (LICA; International League against Antisemitism) was international in name only, having practically no existence outside France, and here primarily in Paris and the large provincial cities. It was founded in the 1920s and long given dynamic leadership by the Jewish journalist Bernard Lecache, whose work was now continued by attorney Pierre Bloch. The majority of its approximately 10,000 members were Jews. Its purpose was to fight

not only "classic" antisemitism, but also current anti-Zionism slanted toward antisemitism, and to defend the State of Israel. LICA's monthly organ *Le Droit de Vivre* (The Right to Live), a high-level magazine of excellent appearance, had a circulation of 15,000.

The Mouvement contre le Racisme, l'Antisemitisme et pour la Paix (MRAP; Movement against Racism and Antisemitism, and for Peace) was founded by pro-Communist elements to drain the antiracist current into so-called "progressist"—pro-Soviet—channels. Its attitude has often been equivocal and its antiracism one-sided, never raising questions about antisemitism in the Soviet Union and its satellites. Of late this has changed a little as a result of the new orientation of the French Communist party. MRAP was headed by Pierre Paraf, an eclectic individual from a Zionist milieu with which he has maintained some contacts. Although MRAP carried on a good deal of agitation, it was less influential than LICA. Its monthly *Droit et Liberté* (Justice and Liberty) had a circulation of some 5,000.

The Judeo-Christian friendship organizations, small groups functioning in the various districts of Paris and in the provincial cities, sought to establish spiritual contact between Jews and Christians. Their principal activities were lectures on various theological and historicoreligious subjects. For some years the discussions had often been a little uneven, since the Jewish participants, who were more concerned with sociopolitical questions were not well-grounded in theology, while the Christians talked mainly about theology. More recently, this difference has almost disappeared.

The Judeo-Christian friendship organizations published bulletins as well as two periodical, *Sens* (Reason) and *La Fraternité d'Abraham* (The Brotherhood of Abraham). The groups were influential largely in the Paris area and the south of France, and less so in the east, in spite—or perhaps because—of the traditionalist character of the Alsace Jewish community. They had several thousand members, many of them drawn from the teaching profession, with no real strength among the workers and peasants. The majority of Christian members are Catholics.

Publications

In 1976 there was an abundance of new books dealing with Judaism or touching on it, not to mention the oversupply of works on the Middle East. Two books of memoirs, written by women, dealt with the same period. In *Poursuite de vent* ("Pursuit of the Wind"; Orban), Claire Goll, the widow of the Alsatian Jewish poet and writer Yvan Goll, recounts her experiences since World War I, when she was living in Switzerland among pacifists and revolutionaries, and close to Tristan Tzara, the founder of dadaism. Her many anecdotes tell about writers and artists, such as Rainer Maria Rilke, James Joyce, Henry Miller, Louis Aragon, and Marc Chagall. The book is a highly interesting look back at the entire world, but one imbued with a great pessimism about humanity generally, and about the "great men" with whom she had contact, often close, very close.

In *La Fin et le commencement* ("The End and the Beginning"; Grasset), Clara Malraux, who was the first wife of André Malraux and a Jewess of German origin, primarily recalls her often strained relations with her husband, but also the time of the Popular Front, the Spanish Civil War, the Nazi occupation of France, and the resistance.

Jean Blot's novel *Les Cosmopolites* ("The Cosmopolitans"; Gallimard) is an interesting chronicle whose characters are Russian Jews and functionaries of the UN. The Jewishness of Blot's heroes is discreetly drawn, like a transparency. One could also regard as a novel Carlo Coccioli's *Mémoires du Roi David* ("Memoirs of King David"; Table Ronde). It "reproduces" in highly poetic contemporary language, the dramatic life of King David, as it is described in the Book of Kings. Coccioli, by birth an Italian Catholic and a convert to Judaism, tells of spiritual adventure in another book, *Le tourment de Dieu* ("The Anguish of God"; Éditions Fayard). Éditions du Seuil published *Locataires*, the French translation of Bernard Malamud's *The Tenants*.

Éditions Seghers published *Le Racisme* ("Racism") by the historian León Poliakov, a short summary of his previous works on racism. A new edition of *Difficile Liberté* ("Difficult Liberty"; Albin Michel), by Professor Emmanuel Lévinas, is a sequel to the writings of that French Jewish philosopher, primarily on his perception of Judaism, couched in language expressing as much emotion as intellect. Nahum Goldmann's memoirs, collected by Léon Abramowicz, were published under the title, *Le paradoxe juif* ("The Jewish Paradox"; Stock). Containing a strong element of polemics and reflecting a sense of humor, they speak of the eventful life of that Jewish leader from a personal perspective, giving it historic dimension.

General Moshe Dayan's *Histoire de ma vie* ("Story of My Life"; Éditions Fayard), though a mediocre literary product, illuminates some little-known details of the six-day and Yom Kippur wars. Samuel Katz's *Israël face au mythe de la Palestine* ("Israel Confronts the Myth of Palestine"; Albatros) presents the views of the right wing in Israeli politics. Deviating to some extent from the officially formulated theses, it is a lucid and rigorous essay on the attitude of the Arabs of the Middle East toward Israel and the Jews. André Chouraqui, a French poet and journalist now living in Jerusalem, continued to publish his books through French firms. He was about to conclude his "deconceptualized" and "de-Hellenized" translation of the Hebrew Bible with *Les quatre annonces* ("The Four Announcements"; Desclée-de Brouwer), a version of the New Testament conceived in the same terms. It has been widely discussed in Catholic and Protestant publications, but treated with a bit of reticence or uneasiness by the Jewish press.

Michel Rachline, a journalist of Jewish origin and the son of a well-known LICA activist, was the author of *Un Juif libre* ("A Free Jew"; Guy Authier), a polemical book, often puerile and showing a total ignorance of Judaism, which virulently attacks Zionism, Israel, and Judaism. The book's sensational and disparaging content aroused attention and earned its author a rather undeserved reputation as a nonconformist.

Although Henri Chemouilli's contemporary history of the Jews of Algeria, *Une diaspora méconnue* ("An Unacknowledged Diaspora"), could not find a publisher and was produced at the author's own expense, it deserves attention because it is the first serious attempt, since the end of the Algerian war, by an Algerian Jew to explain the tragedy of the Algerian Jewish community. It strongly attacks the European Jews, whose dogmatism and intellectual frivolity moved them to support the Front de Libération Nationale (FLN; National Liberation Front) and to advise the Algerian Jews to rally behind the cause of an independent Algeria. Chemouilli shows that such a course was totally impossible and that the advisers had no understanding of the situation of Algerian Jewry. Unfortunately, this positive aspect of his contribution is marred by irascible attacks on the Ashkenazim, more particularly on the Yiddish-speaking and Left-oriented Jews. It is a mixture of keen analysis and emotional prejudice.

The Grand Prix National des Lettres was awarded in December to Armand Lunel, author of some very beautiful novels depicting the history of the Jews and life in his native Comtat Venaissin, or Papal States, who recently published *Histoire des Juifs de Provence et des États du Pape* ("History of the Jews of Provence and the Papal States"; Albin Michel). The award of this prestigious prize to the old Provençal Jewish writer led to the republication of his complete works.

Personalia

René Cassin, international jurist, diplomat; winner of the 1968 Nobel Peace Prize; member of the Conseil Constitutionnel, the French equivalent of the Supreme Court (1960–71); president of the highest administrative court in France (1945–60); delegate to the UN (1946–51); leading participant in the UN Commission of Human Rights and in formulating Declaration of Human Rights, and later president of the European Court of Human Rights; a founding member of UNESCO; president of the Alliance Israélite Universelle for 30 years, during which he revitalized its schools in the Middle East and dealt with refugee problems and the security and status of Jewish minority groups, died in Paris on February 20, at the age of 88.

The writer Emmanuel Berl, who as editor of the weekly *Marianne* played an important role in the literary and political history of France before World War II and who, in the final period of his life, took a great interest in Judaism, studied the Kabbalah, and wrote a small book in defense of Israel, died in Paris on September 21, at the age of 84.

ARNOLD MANDEL

The Netherlands

Domestic Politics

DURING THE LAST TWO YEARS, the Netherlands have been governed by the progressive-confessional cabinet under Minister President J. M. den Uyl of the Labor party. In office since 1972, the government has been explicitly committed to a wide-ranging and difficult to implement program of social and economic reform, including greater codetermination in industry, sharing of excess profit, and further distribution of national income. Inflation, recession, and unemployment have become serious problems. Rising government expenditures and the growing costs of welfare programs have forced the government to restrict spending to one per cent of the national income per annum.

Disagreements on atomic energy, the sale of atomic-reactor parts to the Republic of South Africa, the removal of criminal penalties for abortion, the adoption of the F 16 fighter-bomber, and many other issues have sharply divided the cabinet. Despite dissension and several crises, it survived until March 22, 1977, when it was brought down as a result of a disagreement between the Labor party and the newly emerging confessional bloc. The immediate issue was legislation prohibiting land speculation. The three confessional parties merged to form the Christian Democratic Appeal before the new elections, held on May 25, 1977. In the election for the 150-seat parliament, Labor won 33.8 per cent of the vote (53 seats, an increase of ten since 1972); the Christian Democratic Appeal, 31.9 per cent (49 seats, an increase of one); the Liberals, 18 per cent (28 seats, an increase of six). The smaller parties generally lost ground.

Perhaps the best known general issue in Dutch domestic politics was the development of the Lockheed scandal and the allegation, made public in early 1976, that Prince Bernhard accepted bribes. The government decided to establish an investigative commission which, in mid-August 1976, reported that it did not find sufficient evidence to prosecute the Prince. Nevertheless, he was so gravely compromised that he had to resign from all public offices, including that of inspector general of the Armed Forces. This solution was widely accepted, and the issue rapidly vanished from the political scene.

Note: The author wishes to thank Dr. Steven B. Wolinetz, assistant professor of political science, Memorial University, Newfoundland, and I.L. Palache of Amsterdam for their kind assistance.

Relations With Israel

GOVERNMENT POLICY

The policies of the Dutch government, which generally reflect the views of the constituents, have also begun to show attitudes which, though friendly and understanding, were fundamentally different from the cordial support of earlier days.¹ There has now been a new reluctance to display publicly pro-Israel sentiments and a growing tendency toward a more "evenhanded" attitude on the Middle East conflict, which in effect meant being more receptive to the point of view of the Arabs and their grievances. True, the government has expressed positive support for Israel, as in the Dutch vote against the UN resolution equating Zionism with racism (November 10, 1975), and, locally, formal refusal to provide baptismal certificates for Dutchmen wishing to work or travel in Arab countries. In July 1976, too, the cautious and discreet reaction of Foreign Minister Max van der Stoel to the Entebbe rescue operation was challenged in the Second Chamber of the Dutch Parliament as being insufficiently positive and even "stingy." However, at the International Women's Year Conference, held in Mexico City in July 1975, the Netherlands delegation voted in favor of the Declaration of Mexico calling for the elimination of colonialism, Zionism, and apartheid (AJYB, 1977 [Vol. 77], p. 115). Sharp criticism was also expressed concerning the visit to Israel of South African Prime Minister John Vorster (April 1976). The Netherlands reportedly advised Israel that the visit would complicate the efforts of friends abroad to persuade the world that there was no connection between Zionism and racism.

There has also been a definite shift in official attitude on the Palestinian question, seen particularly in a tendency to depart from the principles of UN Resolutions 242 and 338. Official statements, at the end of 1976, were explicitly pro-Palestinian in formulation. For example, the permanent representative at the UN, now J. Kaufmann, speaking for the nine countries of the European Economic Community (EEC) in full assembly, on November 18, 1976, cited a statement by van der Stoel stressing that "in the establishment of a just and durable peace, account must be taken of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians." EEC, he added, took the position that in the search for peace in the Middle East, "our countries wish to clarify that the exercise of the Palestinian people of effective expression of its national identity may involve a territorial basis in the framework of a negotiated settlement. The exercise of this right should be compatible with the rights of all the states in the region, Israel included, to live in peace within secure and recognized borders."

At the 31st meeting of the UN Special Political Committee, on December 2, 1976, Dutch representative L. Quarles van Ufford, again speaking on behalf of the states of EEC, stated that changing the physical and demographic character of the

¹For background and documentation of this change in policy, see especially Avner Yaniv, "Dutch Middle East Policy since 1973," *Wiener Library Bulletin*, Nos. 41-42, 1977, pp. 47-57.

occupied territories and, in particular, the policy of establishing settlements could, in their view, only prejudice the prospects for peace and were contrary to the obligations imposed by international law. In his address of December 9 at the United Nations, he stated that while the EEC members had strongly supported resolutions 242 and 338, these had not taken into account the political dimension of the Palestinian question, and must be amended to include a statement of the lawful rights of the Palestinians, particularly an effective expression of national identity and, as reported by Kaufmann earlier, its implications for a future settlement. These expressions, as explained by a spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in The Hague, "are perhaps formally actually new, but it is really an ordinary amplification" (*Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad*, December 3, 1976, p. 1).

The various pronouncements caused disquiet in the local Jewish community, and subsequently its leaders, J. Z. Baruch of the Sephardi community, I. Zadoks of the Ashkenazi community, M. Goudekot of the Amsterdam and R. A. Levisson of the The Hague Reform communities, and J. Meijers of the Zionist Federation of the Netherlands requested a meeting with Prime Minister den Uyl. At the meeting, which took place on January 12, 1977, with the foreign minister also in attendance, each side expressed its views, and the matter was left fundamentally unchanged.

On February 20, 1977, den Uyl arrived in Israel for the convention of Israel's Labor party, the first visit of a Dutch chief of state in office and leader of the Dutch Socialists. On that occasion he declared: "Our commitment to Israel is as firm as a rock, but the time has come when the Palestinian people are entitled to some form of territorial expression of their national aspirations." Earlier, at the end of January, however, the Labor party adopted as one of its platform planks support of a Palestinian state—exceeding the official position, which referred only to the desirability of a territorial basis as an expression of Palestinian aspirations.

During this period the Netherlands and Israel reached a cultural accord, for which Israel had been pressing as early as September 1974. When on a visit to Jerusalem in April 1975 Foreign Minister van der Stoel and Israeli Foreign Minister Yigal Allon agreed to formulate a cultural treaty, it was reported that the initiative had come from Israel and that the Dutch government did not see much purpose in putting the existing good cultural relations into treaty form. (At dinner, on April 6, 1975, Allon thanked his colleague for the manner in which the Netherlands was protecting Israel's interests in the Soviet Union since 1967.) Later, in November of that year, on the occasion of an official visit by Allon to the Netherlands, he and van der Stoel signed a cultural accord, effective in May 1977.

DUTCH PUBLIC OPINION

On January 15, 1977, Association Parlementaire pour la Coopération Euro-Arabe, composed of parliamentarians of seven European countries—Belgium, England, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Ireland, Italy, and the Netherlands—addressed an appeal to President-elect Jimmy Carter, in the form of a

19-page document, issued in Paris. Clumsy and replete with gross falsification, it called on him to adopt an explicitly pro-Arab (and anti-Israel) foreign policy. When it became known in the Netherlands in late January and early February that five Dutch parliamentarians had signed this appeal, a storm broke out in the local press and the Second Chamber of the Dutch parliament.

Before 1967 the attitudes of many Dutch toward Israel were frequently influenced by the experience of the Nazi occupation. They had lived together with the Jews, had seen them disappear, and missed them. Moreover, in the light of the Holocaust, they often regarded the creation of the state of Israel as an obvious necessity. For the religious, particularly among Protestants, today's Israel had theological importance, since its establishment confirmed biblical prophecies. What Israelis did—namely, putting an impoverished country on the map—was of interest to the people. It reminded many of Holland's own struggle for independence against Catholic Spain. There were also areas of common interest, such as agriculture, veterinary medicine, and the dairy industry.

After 1967 a generation "that did not know Joseph" came of age. Indeed, young adults have never known a world in which there was no Israel. The founding of Israel was not considered a marvel, and Israel came to be viewed as an ordinary country. Thus, public opinion would have tended, in any case, toward a more detached stance. The generation that emerged in the late 1960s and 1970s may be characterized by its search for humanity, which rejected the puritan morals of the bourgeois system considered to be established solely for the benefit of the possessing classes, at the expense of those who could not meet its standards. Seeing the world as a dualistic scheme of oppressors versus oppressed, some youth have extended their sympathy to all manner of underdogs and outcasts. Reflecting deep inner frustration, many turned to forms of escape in exotic religions and experimentation with drugs.² A good number of this group gradually attained important positions in the press, and particularly in television, on which they have imposed their perspective on the treatment of the Middle East conflict.

After Israel's 1967 victory, the Arabs were increasingly portrayed as the new underdogs, and Israel as their oppressor, a foreign element in the Middle East and a pawn of America. Similarly, in this scheme of social and international relationships, the terrorist and his violence occasionally could have a respected, if not idealized, place. Noteworthy was the reaction of the Socialist VARA broadcasting corporation to the Entebbe rescue operation (see article on Israel), which castigated Israel in onesided and scathing terms. This evoked a wave of strong protests from listeners, and subsequently resulted in a public expression of regret. Radio Nederland, the country's shortwave radio service, in its Dutch-language broadcast on July 5, self-righteously contended that there was no moral difference between the terrorists' use of violence and the Israeli intervention to rescue the threatened hostages:

²Interview with Professor H. J. Heering, Leiden, October 17, 1974.

. The ratio between the liberated and the dead people is 3 to 1. Ethics is no arithmetic problem. You cannot say that one human life is worth the freedom of three people. The Israeli rescue operation is thus no humanitarian action. . . . In the final analysis, the [Israeli] decision was based on two considerations: on the one hand, confidence in the combat readiness of the Israeli élite troops; on the other, the need to inflict on the international army of kidnappers a serious defeat. It had nothing to do with humanitarian considerations, and even less with international law. Israel answered the guerilla with the tactics of the guerilla.

The application of a double standard is obvious from a comparison of that statement with Radio Nederland's commentary on June 11, 1977, supporting the Dutch government's own use of force in ending the double sieges carried out by South Moluccans in Northern Holland:

The decision of the Dutch government, after three weeks of unbearable tension, to end the sieges by employing "controlled violence" can only be greeted with approval. In the government's plan of action, which involved persistent attempts at ending the hostage actions by negotiation and persuasion, a violent solution was always considered; but it had been difficult to determine when the moment would come when there was no other way. The government eventually used the only criterion acceptable under the circumstances: the physical and mental state of the hostages.

Examples of biased and unfair reporting by Dutch correspondents in Israel were cited with documentation by Eliahu Salpeter in an article in *Haaretz* of December 1, 1976.

While large groups of the population have supported Israel, and will always continue to do so, opponents have grouped around the Palestina Comité (estimated membership, 150), which enjoyed much sympathy in the press. A sharp debate took place in February 1977 when this group's request to the government for a subsidy of 35,000 guilders was turned down. The government let it be known that the decision was taken partly in consideration of objections from the local Jewish community. Public accusations of "surrender" followed.

Anti-Israel circles have produced a number of Dutch terrorists. Notable were the arrest and conviction in the fall of 1974 of two Leiden students in Israel, who were sentenced by the military court of Ramallah to 30 months imprisonment for having aided al-Fatah. On the eve of Rosh Ha-shanah, September 28, 1976, 23-year-old Ludwina Janssen of Breda was arrested at Ben Gurion airport. Member of the Rode Hulp (Red Help), a group linked to the Baader-Meinhof organization in Germany, she allegedly belonged to George Habash's Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. With other members of her terrorist group, Janssen was planning a hijacking and an attack on Ben Gurion airport. In March 1977 the Tel Aviv district court sentenced her to seven years imprisonment for aiding a terrorist organization.

A significant and related development has been the tendency among Left Socialists to refuse to believe the Soviet Union to be potentially aggressive. This new concept of the role of the Soviet Union has affected attitudes towards NATO, casting doubt on the need for the defensive non-Communist alliance. Results have included

reduction of military budgets and the length of military service. And in this scheme, the importance of Israel, once seen as potential protector of Europe's eastern flank in the Mediterranean, has diminished.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Demography

The Jewish population in the Netherlands remained at about 30,000, out of a total of 13.6 million which was 39.5 per cent Roman Catholic; 30 per cent Protestant, and 8 per cent others, with 22.5 per cent nonaffiliated. The Jews represented 0.22 per cent of the general population. The Nederlands Israëlietisch Kerkgenootschap, the roof organization of the Ashkenazi communities, had about 14,000 members, the Verbond van Liberaal-Religieuze Joden in Nederland, the Progressive or Reform community, nearly 2,000, and the Portugees Israëlietisch Kerkgenootschap, the Sephardi community, some 1,100 (reflecting a slight increase in recent years). Jews have been living in all parts of the Netherlands. The most recent figures of the Ashkenazi community, whose rabbinate is Orthodox, showed 8,500 members in Amsterdam, 2,200 in The Hague, 700 in Rotterdam, and the rest scattered throughout the country. A trend has been noted of Jews moving to the suburbs and towns surrounding Amsterdam. The Reform community reported about 600 families in Amsterdam (1,200–1,300 persons), 200 families in Arnhem, and a small nucleus in Twente.

Although authoritative data on occupations were not available, some may be identified as traditional Dutch-Jewish: textiles, jewelry, cattle trading, medicine, law, and careers for which advanced academic preparation is frequently required. A major new profession is the brokerage of industrial and pharmaceutical chemicals.

The Jewish population has been gradually aging, still suffering from the loss of child-bearing age groups as a result of the Holocaust and subject to processes of demographic decline, such as a low birth rate (except in extremely Orthodox families), assimilation, and intermarriage. Converts to Judaism were estimated at 15 per year. To the extent that these demographic conditions had an identifiable influence on the quality of Jewish life, three basic tendencies may be observed: 1) the social and communal manifestations of an aging population, 2) a shortage of qualified Jewish personnel, and 3) the participation of non-Jews in Jewish life which, though largely passive, has been beneficial.

Besides the local Jewish population, some 1,000 to 5,000 Israelis have been living in the Netherlands, including businessmen working independently or officially representing Israeli firms; restaurateurs; students (about 150) of varying commitment to their studies; drifters; the spouses of Dutch men and women (with many non-Jewish partners), and criminals. (In August 1976 an armed Israeli gang robbed

an Amsterdam jewelry store, taking articles valued at some \$121,500.) Another distinct group has been identified: young women, frequently professionals (e.g., laboratory technicians), who come to the Netherlands to escape parental and social pressure to get married. Tending to identify more with the Christian population than with Dutch Jews, the Israelis had minimal contact with the established Jewish community. But if one day they chose to associate, they could be of considerable influence in such a small community.

In 1976 it was reported that 160 persons emigrated to Israel, and interest in *aliyah* remained steady. A new, and particularly Dutch, category of emigrants were the non-Jewish spouses of Israelis, who had met their partners during visits or while working as volunteers on kibbutzim in Israel. Frequently, such couples chose to live on kibbutzim.

Community Affairs

Unlike many Jewish communities in Western Europe, the three Dutch Jewish communities were not formally organized in a roof organization. They worked together on an institutionalized basis in such areas as social work, and frequently consulted on matters of common interest to the three communities, particularly efforts on behalf of Russian Jewry (under the active leadership of Rabbi A. Soetendorp of the Reform community of The Hague). As a matter of policy, the Ashkenazi community refrained from ceremonial contacts with the Reform community, but while there have been manifestations of polarization, particularly in the demonstrative refusal of the Orthodox rabbi of The Hague, M. Fink, to attend the dedication of the Reform synagogue in this city, there has been a clear tendency toward friendlier relations.

Amsterdam was the only city with a rabbinical court, comprised of Rabbis M. Just, chairman, H. Rodrigues-Pereira, and A. Ralbag. To the extent that certain questions coming before such a body reflected social developments in the community they deserve to be recounted. The rabbinical court reported that, in conformity with the world trend, there has been a rise in the number of Jewish divorces. It also provided services to the Jewish communities of Scandinavia, where it has noted a similar trend. Although precise statistics were not available, it has been noted that most divorces in Dutch Jewish circles occurred among young couples from nonob-servant backgrounds.

In a unique manifestation of the Israel-Diaspora relationship, the rabbinical court has come into almost daily contact with Israeli men living in Amsterdam. Among them were many who left their wives and came to the Netherlands to seek new opportunity. In the event of actual abandonment, the Chief Rabbinate of Israel asks the Netherlands Rabbinate to search for the man and, if he is found, to persuade him to give a writ of religious divorce. If he agrees, it is often because he wishes to enter into a new marriage, frequently with a non-Jewish partner. The rabbinical court thus faces the dilemma of wanting to help the abandoned Israeli wife by

granting the divorce, so that she will not become an *'agunah* (a woman whose husband has disappeared and cannot be proved dead, and who therefore cannot, according to Jewish law, marry again); but in doing so, it generally helps an Israeli Jew marry a non-Jew. Also, because of the nearly complete separation of church and state in the Netherlands, there hardly is a way to compel a man to provide support for his former wife and family, and frequently the terms of separation must be concluded on the man's terms.

The question of women's rights also reached the Amsterdam rabbinical court when the Amsterdam community requested an opinion on whether women could serve on its board. In January 1973 the court ruled against this, but one of the rabbis stated that its members were unhappy with the decision; that if Amsterdam had permitted women to hold such positions without requesting an opinion, the court would not have interfered. Women now served on the boards of Orthodox communities in the countryside.

Religious Observance

On March 29, 1976, representatives of the Ashkenazi community administration, the rabbinate, and the nine Amsterdam synagogues named a commission to study how religious services could be made more attractive to the wider Jewish public. According to Rabbi M. Just, no more than 40 per cent of Amsterdam Jews attended services during the High Holy Days. Two months later, at an open meeting of the commission, Rabbi Just stressed the basic importance of Jewish education and announced that the prayer for the state of Israel would be recited with the Sephardi pronunciation. The audience made a number of requests, and to the extent that they reflected some shared feelings in the community, they are worthy of mention: a warmer reception in the synagogues, briefer sermons, more community singing, the introduction of a choir, a fairer distribution of honors, an explanation of the *sidra*, less discrimination against women, and the introduction of the Sephardi pronunciation (*Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad*, June 4, 1976, p.3).

Within the Ashkenazi community, a subject of bitter controversy has been the question of creating the post of chief rabbi for the Netherlands to head the present chief rabbinate of Amsterdam, Utrecht, The Hague, and Rotterdam. The lay trustees of the Ashkenazi community, serving on its Central Commission, considered it necessary to have a religious spokesman who would represent the largest Jewish community in the country. The rabbinate opposed it. The problem was resolved with the departure of Rabbi M. Fink of The Hague, who had been candidate for the post. During this period, a *kollel* was formed for the encouragement of Talmud study. Mention should also be made of the influence of the Lubavitch (*Habad*) movement. Some Dutchmen have studied at Lubavitch *yeshivot* and returned to the Netherlands (Amstelveen and Amersfoort), where their activist approach has been successful in appealing to youth and attracting Jews back to the community.

In a sudden decision, the ministry of agriculture declared that, as of January 1, 1975, kosher slaughter for export purposes would be forbidden on "humanitarian" grounds, to prevent cruelty to animals. Kosher slaughter would be allowed only for local needs. The Permanent Commission, the administrative body of the Ashkenazi community, sharply challenged the decision, as well as the implied assertion that kosher slaughter was more cruel than other methods. The protest was successful, and Minister of Agriculture Van der Stee, meeting with a member of the Commission, announced that the new ruling was canceled. Particular attention should be drawn to a full-page article on *kashrut* and its practice in the Netherlands by Adriaan van Dis, "Kosjere Regels en Rabbinale Zegels," (Kosher Rules and Rabbinical Seals), which appeared in the culture section of the most respected Netherlands newspaper, the *Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant-Handelsblad* of August 22, 1975. The author held to ridicule the association of the concept of spirituality with observance of dietary laws. The question must be asked if the traditional Christian abhorrence of Jewish ritual law and Torah Law as such might not be at the root of these attitudes, so that articles of this kind propagate antisemitic ideas in their most fundamental sense.³

Reform Judaism

Recent years were a period of tranquil development for the Reform community. With its era of rapid expansion past, the "revolutionary" zeal of this group has somewhat waned, since those who were interested in it were already within the fold. As part of its policy, the Reform community was seeking to extend its influence within and beyond the Jewish community. This desire was reflected, for example, in a request for a Reform army chaplain (October 1974). Rabbis Soetendorp and D. Lillienthal of Amsterdam have been serving these congregations; a student rabbi residing in London has been ministering to the Arnhem congregation once a month. The Reform community of the Netherlands is affiliated with the World Union for Progressive Judaism and thus automatically with the World Zionist Organization.

The high point of the movement was the dedication of its synagogue in The Hague, on September 3, 1976, in the presence of Queen Juliana. The event was telecast and received wide press coverage. The beautiful building, the 250-year-old former synagogue of the Hague Sephardi community, had originally been built at a cost of 6,000 guilders (some \$2,500, at today's rate of exchange). As of August 1976 the restoration has cost some 1.5 million guilders (\$600,000), paid by the Dutch government, The Hague municipality, and the voluntary donations of many non-Jews who participated in the Werkcomité tot Herstel van de Vroegere Portugees Israëlietisch Synagoge (Work Committee for the Restoration of the former Sephardi Synagogue). The royal family, including the Queen, Prince Bernhard, Princess Beatrix, and Prince Claus, made a personal donation to this fund.

³Cf. theses 23 and 25 in David Flusser, "Jewish Christian Relations Past and Present: Theses on the Emergence of Christianity from Judaism," *Immanuel*, Summer 1975, p. 78.

Sephardi Community

The Sephardi community consisted mainly of the local Amsterdam group, new immigrants from Morocco and Iraq, as well as a few Israelis. Suffering from attrition of membership, which extended into the postwar era, this community did not view its continuity as certain. Looking to the future, the trustees adopted a by-law on January 29, 1976, stating that if the community must be dissolved or accept a merger, written approval of the Chief Rabbinate of Israel would be required. The purpose of this measure was to prevent members of a liquidated congregation from pocketing the proceeds (as occurred after the Second World War in some Ashkenazi congregations), or the reversion of the synagogue building to another religious community (as was the case with the Reform community of The Hague).

The Sephardi community has been engaged in the restoration of its famous Ouderkerk cemetery, dating from 1614, under the sponsorship of a foundation which included the community's trustees and the mayor of Ouderkerk. While the cemetery remained the property of the Sephardi community of Amsterdam, its maintenance costs were paid by a foundation, subsidized by the government, the Province of North Holland, and the community of Ouderkerk. Ten to 15 men were employed to raise sunken grave stones, and an extensive card index has been prepared, showing the location of graves. The cemetery remained in use.

The high point for the Sephardi community was the memorial service held on the 300th anniversary of its famous Esnoga (synagogue) in Amsterdam on August 22, 1975. The ceremony was attended by Princess Beatrix, Minister of Justice A. van Agt, Ambassador of Israel H. Bar-On, Chief Rabbi Ovadia Yossef, and Haham Dr. S. Gaon of the World Sephardic Federation. A special commemorative stamp was issued in honor of the event. Princess Beatrix also opened the restored 17th-century Pinto House, which had belonged to a leading Sephardi family. As part of this commemoration, an evening of Sephardi liturgical music was arranged, with guest cantors from New York, London, Bordeaux, and Gibraltar.

Another commemoration, somewhat related to the Sephardi community, was the 300th anniversary of the death of Baruch Spinoza on February 21, 1677, in The Hague. Exhibitions and ceremonies were held in Amsterdam and The Hague, but not under the auspices of the Sephardi community, which, however, lent the original ban of Spinoza to the exhibition held at Spinoza House in The Hague. When asked about the present attitude of the community toward Spinoza, its president, Dr. J. Z. Baruch replied:

Spinoza was banned by the *parnassim* (lay trustees) and not by the rabbis. At that time, Jews had been in the Netherlands only fifty years. Spinoza's concepts were represented as anti-Christian, and it was feared that the entire community would have to suffer the consequences. The ban was an administrative act, a political act of policy, not addressed to his philosophical concepts. . . . Judaism offers great intellectual freedom in these matters. Spinoza had the opportunity to appeal, but he did not. Ben Gurion wanted us to lift the ban, but we did not consider ourselves wiser than those who pronounced it to protect the community. It was decreed

mainly for the benefit of the non-Jewish world which, then as now, was not so tolerant.⁴

On another level, the Sephardi community took the initiative in an issue of international importance. After the death of Generalissimo Francisco Franco (November 19, 1975), members of the Sephardi community met with the Spanish ambassador who arranged an appointment with the Spanish foreign minister on a visit to The Hague. On that occasion, they requested that Spain recognize the state of Israel. Subsequently, a meeting of the World Sephardic Federation was held in Madrid where, on February 22, 1976, delegates expressed the same wish to the new King of Spain, Juan Carlos.

Jewish Education

The educational system of the Jewish community offered a course of study from nursery school through high school. The schools, which were being relocated and concentrated in the modern suburb of Buitenveldert-Amsterdam where many young families lived, had some 450 pupils. The Ashkenazi community also maintained five religious instructors who traveled to the countryside to give lessons. A new nursery school-kindergarten in The Hague enrolled 40 children. The Jewish school only accepted children from halakhically Jewish families; 70 per cent of these came from nonreligious homes. The chairman of the board of Joods Bijzonder Onderwijs (Special Jewish Education), R. Goudsmit, estimated the intermarriage rate for those who had not attended Jewish schools was 45 per cent; it was appreciably less for those who had received a Jewish education.

The Jewish content of the schools' curriculum has been the subject of a recent controversy. All Jewish schools were subsidized by the government, and for all denominations the hours devoted to religious education were limited by law. It has been debated whether, and to what extent, additional religious education should be given after school hours. A growing nucleus of Orthodox parents and some having rather strong Jewish identification favored such measures; they were opposed by others, many of whom were descendants of Socialist and areligious families of long standing, particularly laborers and diamond and textile workers. Many have had their education disrupted by the war. They had little or no positive Jewish background and wanted to give their children more, but not too much. Formerly, they probably would have sent their children to non-Jewish schools. Many such parents were embarrassed by their children's questions concerning Jewish life, which they were unable to answer. There have been tensions between the groups, who did not mix socially, and this new middle-class group was highly sensitive to the somewhat socially closed life style of the more religious circles.

Polarization developed, and a group of observant parents, who wanted more Jewish instruction, established an independent, strictly Orthodox breakaway school

⁴Interview with Dr. J. Z. Baruch, Amsterdam, February 7, 1977.

and a *heder*. This school offered religious instruction in Yiddish (something new in Dutch-Jewish life, since its use was first discouraged by governmental regulations dating from the Napoleonic Empire), given by a *melamed* who had been commuting weekly from Antwerp to Amsterdam. The *heder* received sympathetic and understanding treatment from the ministry of education, which granted subsidies, even though it had less than the required number of pupils. While its founding received favorable coverage in the general press, the *Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad*, organ of the Jewish community, attacked it viciously. The transfer of students to the *heder* has meant a decrease in government subsidy (based on enrollment), constituting a loss both in funds and prestige to the community's educational system. This was particularly serious because of the present financial crisis. It was reported that the Jewish educational system has been operating with an annual deficit of some \$175,000 to \$200,000.

Israel-Centered Cultural Activities

Through the Jewish Agency's Division of Education and Culture, Hebrew and Israeli culture was spread in the Netherlands. Its local representative was Aryeh Chen and its major activity providing instruction in modern conversational Hebrew. Enrollment in these courses has been increasing. Only some 40 per cent of the students were Jews, and the participation of non-Jews was necessary to assemble classes. Among the latter were those interested in learning to read the Hebrew Bible as well as the frequent visitors and volunteers to Israel who wished to learn Hebrew or perfect their knowledge of it. The program had 14 teachers and offered ten months of instruction, once a week (36 lessons of an hour and a half) for about \$80, which was considered reasonable. Complementing its program of formal instruction, the Jewish Agency conducted *Yemei Ivrit* (Days of Spoken Hebrew), gathering students from all over the country to discuss themes chosen in advance, such as Independence Day, Israeli poetry, or Masada. The Jewish Agency has also organized general open gatherings for easy conversational as well as advanced Hebrew. The latter, known as the *Moadon Ivri* (Hebrew Club), has been particularly successful in attracting Dutch Jews and non-Jews, and local Israelis.

One of the most successful aspects of the Netherlands-Israel relationship has been the work of the Kibbutz Volunteers Desk. The kibbutz representative in Amsterdam, J. Snir, has been arranging for about 750 young Dutchmen (age 22-25) per year to go to Israel. There were also two travel agencies which arranged group tours. Snir estimated that, in all, more than 2,000 volunteers, some 10 per cent of them Jews, have been going to Israel per year. Although many of them went to Israel for the first time, a certain number were repeat volunteers. This group was interested in kibbutz life, offering a new and different experience at little cost. Many volunteers were from the provinces, particularly agricultural areas; 75 per cent were not students. Among the women were many nurses who requested placement in Israeli hospitals. A small number of this group found spouses in Israel.

Fund Raising

Until 1967, the Keren Ha-yesod, known in the Netherlands as Collective Israël Actie (CIA), directed its appeal to the local Jews exclusively. In the opinion of I. L. Palache, its director for the last 25 years, this effort did not succeed as well as hoped because many Jews gave far less than they could. Until 1967 CIA did not approach non-Jews, but when the six-day war broke out, many of them wanted to contribute, and have continued to do so annually. These contributions generally involve smaller sums, but a larger number of givers. Since 1965 Mr. Palache has concentrated on wills and bequests, which yielded increasingly large donations.

The outstanding accomplishment of CIA last year was its special Entebbe appeal. On the day after the liberation of the hostages, Professor L. de Jong, director of the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation, made a brief, eloquent public appeal suggesting to those who admired Israel's action to send a contribution to CIA. A single advertisement appeared in the newspapers, but no drive took place. Within four weeks CIA received some 22,000 donations, 90-95 per cent of them from non-Jews. The yield was 1,000,000 guilders. In view of local patterns of philanthropic giving, the appeal was an extraordinary success.

Jewish Social Work

Social services have been available through Joods Maatschappelijk Werk (JMW), a consolidated organization established shortly after the liberation to serve the three religious communities. The type of services provided reflected local conditions and community needs. Since the Netherlands is a welfare state, those receiving aid did not generally suffer from material deprivations, but rather from spiritual and psychological needs. The two main activities of the agency therefore were helping persons suffering from delayed effects of the war (e.g., crises of Jewish identity and accepting their suffering) and caring for the elderly.

In response to the special needs of war victims, legislation came into effect on January 1, 1973 (AJYB, 1973 [Vol. 74], pp. 412-13), which made it possible for persons who had been persecuted because of their race, belief, or world view (among whom were Jews, Jehovah's Witnesses, political opponents of the Nazis in the Netherlands, and whites in Indonesia), to claim an allowance from the state. (Legislation adopted in 1947 provided special allowances for resistance fighters who suffered from disabilities as a result of the occupation and its consequences.) The director-general of the ministry of culture, recreation, and social work declared in February 1975 that, as of July 1, this law would apply also to victims who were no longer Dutch nationals.

The rabbis of all the religious communities have found that the extensive pastoral care required by the survivors of the Holocaust has made increasing demands on their time. Rabbi Soetendorp therefore asked that provision be made, within the framework of this legislation, for increased pastoral work which had become

necessary. In response, the government provided a pastoral social worker for each community, to be attached to JMW on an experimental basis. (In view of the almost complete separation of church and state, this solution makes it possible to fulfill the Jewish community's particular need.) In conformity with governmental regulations, JMW prepared dossiers advising on eligibility for financial stipends and provided referrals to psychotherapists and institutions as necessary. In cooperation with non-Jewish organizations carrying out similar work JMW advises the state secretary of public health and environmental protection on the care of war victims in its broadest sense.

The elderly constituted the largest sector of the Jewish population, and JMW's special social workers aided those living at home as well as residents of the seven Jewish homes for the aged. It organized social and cultural activities for the elderly in special clubs run by professionals with the aid of volunteers in Amsterdam, The Hague, and Rotterdam.

JMW extended aid to delinquents, both juvenile and adult. The majority of those needing these services were not members of the local community, but Israelis. Pastoral workers visit Israelis interned in houses of detention and prisons throughout the country.

The general shortage of Jewish manpower has affected Jewish social work, as other fields, although in recent years there has been an increase in applicants. Non-Jewish social workers, who have been filling the gap, had much to learn about Jewish life, and JMW organized several well attended sessions to explain customs and ritual. This group was reported to be highly committed to its work.

Holocaust Remembered

Painful memories of the wartime experience have evoked bitter debates and sad recollections of the occupation and its consequences. The collective trauma of the postwar years was reawakened with renewed attempts by parliamentarians and church groups to end the imprisonment of three Nazi war criminals, popularly known as the "Three from Breda" (location of the prison), who had played a central role in the deportation of Dutch Jews to the death camps. The question of their release was heatedly debated in 1972 (AJYB, 1973 [Vol. 74], pp. 417-18). New arguments were presented in early 1975 by Prof. G. E. Langemeijer, special advisor to the cabinet and former attorney general of the Supreme Court, in an article in the *Nederlands Juristenblad* of February 1, 1975, calling for their release. These efforts failed, and in an open letter to Langemeijer, which appeared in the February 15 issue of the publication, Prof. I. Kisch, an eminent Jewish jurist, delivered a forceful challenge to the principle of granting pardon to those who had aided and participated in mass murder, particularly in view of the devastating effect their release would have on the survivors.

The Dutch Council of Churches, in which 14 denominations were united, actively continued to lobby for the release of the three war criminals, reportedly on the

request of German church groups. Giving the Jewish community extremely short notice, the Council, on March 16, 1976, launched an appeal for such action. The three Jewish communities published a joint statement of opposition, describing the suffering the release would cause Holocaust survivors. The efforts of the church groups failed.

Commenting on this affair, Rabbi Soetendorp stated that the intentional decision of the Council of Churches not to consult the Jewish community on a sensitive issue for Dutch society as a whole had "turned back the clock of dialogue." In an interview which appeared in the *Rotterdamsch Nieuwsblad* of July 29, 1976, Soetendorp explained:

A dialogue cannot only comprise the studying of each others' religious texts . . . but also means discussing the daily problems with which the Jewish people and Israel struggle, and with which humanity is still afflicted.

Another incident, the Menten affair, has brought before the public the issue of Dutch collaboration with the Nazis and the workings of the postwar denazification courts.⁵ According to reports, more than 100,000 Dutchmen, accused of having collaborated with the enemy, were interned after the liberation of the Netherlands. Under the concerted pressure of the churches attempting to obtain for them on "humanitarian" grounds reduced sentences or amnesty, many of them were indiscriminately pardoned.

The affair began in Spring 1976, when P. N. Menten put up for auction some pieces of his art collection. Subsequently, in June 1976, Haviv Kana'an published an article in *Haaretz*, accusing Menten of having murdered members of his family in Podhorodze, Poland, where he had allegedly served in the *S. S. Einsatz-Kommando*. Menten, who had been a businessman of considerable means in Lemberg in the 1920s and 1930s, had had social and business relations with Kana'an's uncle, Isaac Pistiner, but these turned sour and ended in a prewar lawsuit which Pistiner won. Menten, member of the *SS* with the Nazi occupation troops in eastern Galicia, allegedly seized the opportunity to settle his personal score. He was also accused of murdering 600–800 persons in nearby Urice. In 1943 Menten returned to the Netherlands with railroad cars full of plunder, particularly art treasures, and entertained high-ranking officers of the Nazi occupation forces.

After the war Menten was tried for collaborationist activity and given a three-year sentence, most of which he managed to evade. In the late 1940s Kana'an attempted to bring Menten's activities in Poland before the Dutch courts, but was rebuffed (and sworn depositions from Israel and Poland were ignored). The public controversy was touched off by Kana'an's report, which appeared in the conservative weekly *Accent*, edited by H. Knoop, a Dutch Jewish journalist. Knoop constantly kept the issue before the public. It was the *Haaretz* correspondent Henriëtte Boas who

⁵See Henriëtte Boas, "The Menten Affair," *Jerusalem Post* (international edition), December 28, 1976, p. 13.

informed Kana'an of the auction of Menten's collection and also brought Knoop into the picture.

The ministry of justice decided to have Menten arrested, but, obviously tipped off about the impending arrest, he fled in November. With the cooperation of the German publication *Stern*, Knoop later succeeded in locating Menten in the small town of Uster, outside Zurich, and in his presence, Menten was arrested by Swiss and Dutch police agents (December 6, 1976) and subsequently brought to the Netherlands. Early in 1977 a Dutch delegation was sent to Poland and the Soviet Union to gather evidence, and upon its report of sufficient evidence to initiate legal action, Menten was now being tried.

At the beginning of October 1976 the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation released a report by J. van der Leeuw and D. Giltay Veth on the activities of Fredrik Weinreb, convicted in the late 1940s for betraying fugitive Jews to the Gestapo and extorting money from others whom he assured he could help flee (AJYB, 1948-49 [Vol. 50], pp. 57-59). In the late 1960s Weinreb published a trilogy, *Collaboratie en Verzet* ("Collaboration and Resistance"), defending his behavior and presenting his views in such a convincing manner that he succeeded in winning a number of enthusiastic advocates in the press and in intellectual circles. His case became a *cause célèbre*, and the minister of justice commissioned an official investigation into the affair. With the publication of the findings, it became obvious that Weinreb's role in betraying his fellow Jews was far graver than was known at the time of the trial. Weinreb now lives in Switzerland.

Another Dutchman put on trial for war crimes committed in World War II was Hans Loyen, a volunteer and former SS corporal sentenced on December 14, 1976, by a court in Roermond to life imprisonment for war crimes and crimes against humanity. He was found guilty of the sadistic and savage murder in 1942-1943 of hundreds of Polish Jews in the concentration camp of Kislievitsky, near Minsk.

Cultural Events

On October 14, 1974, Abel Herzberg received the P.C. Hoofd Prize, the highest national distinction for writers in the Dutch language. On January 30, 1975, the Jewish Historical Museum was officially reopened. On July 20, 1975, a conference under the sponsorship of the Dutch and Israel governments was held in Jerusalem to mark the 300th anniversary of the inauguration of the Sephardi synagogue in Amsterdam and the 700th anniversary of the founding of the city. In honor of the event, the Institute for the Study of Dutch Jewry in Jerusalem published a volume on the history of the Dutch Jewish community: Joseph Michman, ed., *Mehkarim al Toldoth Yahaduth Holland* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1975).

Under the sponsorship of the Juda Palache Institute of the University of Amsterdam, a symposium on "Contemporary Judaism: Ideals and Realization" was held on December 1, 1975, in The Hague. On December 16 the Netherlands Opera Foundation gave the world premiere of the Opera, *Der Kaiser von Atlantis*,

composed by the Czech Jew Viktor Ullmann (1898–1944) during his internment in Theresienstadt.

M. H. Gans, antique dealer, former editor of the *Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad*, community leader, and well known for his history of Dutch Jewry, was named Clevringa Professor at Leiden University for the academic year 1976–1977.

On February 7, 1976, the NCRV television network ran a 70-minute color film, *Op Zoek Naar Joods Amsterdam* ("In Search of Jewish Amsterdam"), a report by its producer Philo Bregstein, whose father was Jewish, of his personal search for the prewar Jewish past of Amsterdam.

Publications

The Ashkenazi community reprinted several works in Dutch on Jewish religion and tradition, for which there has been continuous demand, notably, the 1895 Pentateuch with Rashi commentary, translated and edited by Rabbi A. S. Onderwijzer and the Mishnah with Dutch translation. Because of a favorable review of the Onderwijzer reedition in the Protestant daily *Trouw* (March 2, 1977), there were many requests for the work, and the five-volume set went into a second printing. About half of the purchasers were non-Jews, without whose interest it would not have been possible to meet publishing costs.

Professor L. de Jong published volumes V, VI, and VII of his *Koninkrijk der Nederlanden in de Tweede Wereld Oorlog* ("The Kingdom of the Netherlands in the Second World War"; Nijhoff Staatsuitgeverij, The Hague, 1974–1976), the official history of the Netherlands during World War II. These volumes give extensive coverage to the persecution of the Jews. In late January 1977 it was announced that parts of this series would be issued in paperback, according to subject. A second publication of fundamental importance, originating from the Netherlands State Institute for War Documentation, was the dissertation of Dr. N.K.C.A. in 't Veld, *De SS in Nederland: Documenten uit SS-Archieven, 1935–1945* ("The SS in the Netherlands: Documents from the SS Archives, 1935–1945"; Nijhoff, The Hague, 1976), based on an imposing collection of documents edited by the author and showing the long-term political plans the Nazis had for the Netherlands.

The Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana announced the acquisition of a 13th-century Ashkenazi *mahzor*, written by Kalonymos ben Jehudah of Esslingen. The *Studia Rosenthaliana*, journal for Jewish literature and history in the Netherlands, began its 11th year of publication. Of related interest are two bibliographies published by L. Fuks, former curator of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana, and R.G. Fuks-Mansfeld, *Hebrew and Judaic Manuscripts in Amsterdam Public Collections*, Vol. I: *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana, University Library of Amsterdam*, Vol. II: *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Ets Haim/ Livraria Montezinos, Sephardic Community of Amsterdam* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975).

Other recently published or forthcoming books and articles relating to Dutch Jewry and of Jewish interest were: R. H. Fuchs, ed., *Steps Towards Rembrandt:*

Collected Articles by A. van de Waal, tr. by P. Wardle and A. Griffith (Royal Academy, North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam-London, 1974); L. A. Vega, *Het Beth Haim van Ouderkerk* ("The Sephardi Cemetery of Ouderkerk"; Van Gorcum, Assen, 1975); Ludy Giebels, *De Zionistische Beweging in Nederland, 1899–1941* ("The Zionist Movement in the Netherlands, 1899–1941"; Van Gorcum, Assen, 1975); Central Bureau of Statistics, *Onderzoek naar de Sterfte onder Overlevenden uit Concentratiekampen, 1945–1968* ("Investigation of the Causes of Death Among the Survivors of Concentration Camps, 1945–1968"; The Hague, 1976); A. M. van der Woel, *Inventaris van de Archieven van de Nederlands Israëlietisch Gemeente te Rotterdam, 1737–1971* ("Inventory of the Archive of the Ashkenazi Community of Rotterdam, 1737–1971"; Municipal Archive Service, Rotterdam, 1976); S. Laansma, *De Joodse Gemeente te Zutphen* ("The Jewish Community of Zutphen"; De Walberg Pers, Zutphen, 1977); M. H. Gans, *De Oude Amsterdamse Jodenhoek nu* ("The Old Amsterdam Jewish Quarter Today"; Ten Have, Baarn, 1975). Good news is the forthcoming English edition of M. H. Gans's illustrated history of prewar Dutch Jewry: *Memorbook: History of Dutch Jewry from the Renaissance to 1940 With 1100 Illustrations*, tr. by A. Pomerans (Bosch & Keunig, Baarn, 1977).

Among the important articles on Dutch Jewry were two by J. S. Fishman: "Jewish War Orphans in the Netherlands: The Guardianship Issue, 1944–1950," *Wiener Library Bulletin*, Vol. 27, 1973/1974 and "The Jewish Community in the Post-War Netherlands, 1944–1975," *Midstream*, January 1976. Others of Dr. Fishman's writings soon to appear were: "The Anneke Beekman Affair and the Dutch News Media," in *Jewish Social Studies*; "The Ecumenical Challenge of Jewish Survival: Pastor Kalma and Post-War Dutch Society, 1946," in *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*; and, "The Reconstruction of the Dutch Jewish Community and its Implications for the Writing of Contemporary Jewish History," in *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, Vol. XLV.

To the extent that the Netherlands has been a meeting place for ecumenical thinkers, it falls within our interest. While it is impossible to provide a complete survey on the subject, two publications should be noted. The first is a letter dated July 1974 from Professor R. J. Z. Werblowsky of the Hebrew University to the members of the conservative Catholic Pax Christi peace movement, explaining that he refused their invitation to participate in a dialogue with Arab-Christian clergymen because the latter had passed over the Ma'alot massacre in silence. He also noted the "structural" antisemitism of systems whose implications contain the destruction of Israel. The second publication, "Theses on the Emergence of Christianity from Judaism" (*Immanuel*, Summer 1975), was prepared by Professor David Flusser of the Hebrew University for a seminar of Dutch and Belgian theologians, held in Jerusalem in January 1975. Their publication in Dutch translation evoked lively discussion.

Publications of related interest appearing in the Netherlands are: J. N. Sevenster, *The Roots of Pagan Anti-Semitism in the Ancient World* (Brill, Leiden, 1975);

S. Safrai and M. Stern, eds., *The Jewish People in the First Century*, Vol. II of *Compendia Rerum Iudiacarum ad Novum Testamentum* (Van Gorcum, Assen, 1976), and C. Schoneveld, *The Bible in Israeli Education* (Van Gorcum, Assen, 1976).

Personalia

In January 1975 J. Sanders was appointed secretary of the Board of Ashkenazi Communities, and in August A. Rodrigues Pereira became secretary of the Amsterdam Sephardi community. In June J. Glazer, director of Joods Maatschappelijk Werk, retired at age 60.

In February 1976 Dr. J. Meijers was elected president of the Netherlands Zionist Federation. In September Miss Judith Belinfante was appointed director of the Jewish Historical Museum in Amsterdam. In November Rabbi M. Just was installed as Chief Rabbi of Amsterdam.

In August 1975 Dr. J. Z. Baruch, president of the Sephardi community of Amsterdam and former member of the Lower House of the Dutch Parliament (1971–1973), was named Officer of the Order of Orange Nassau.

On November 3, 1975, an Iraqi press service reported that the 40-year-old Lex Aronson had been hanged, having been condemned for carrying out espionage for Israel.

Gerhard Taussig, former director of the Dutch Jewish Welfare Board, immigration director for American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, member of the Dutch Advisory Committee of the Claims Conference, died in Amsterdam on April 20, 1975, at the age of 71.

Karel Edersheim, prominent Dutch and Zionist leader, died in Amsterdam in June 1976, at the age of 82. Rabbi Jacob Soetendorp, the leading Reform rabbi who had given great impetus to the spread of Reform Judaism in the Netherlands during the postwar years, died in Gotenburg, Sweden, on July 28, at the age of 62. S. Mendes Coutinho, sexton of the Sephardi community of Amsterdam, who throughout World War II had regular *minyanim* in his home, helped in the baking and distribution of *matzot* in 1944 and 1945, and even provided ritual burials for Jews who had died in hiding, died on October 14, at the age of 68. Dr. R. Gerstenfeld, former leader of the Union of Eastern European Jews, died on October 29, at the age of 77.

JOEL S. FISHMAN

Luxembourg

IN RECENT YEARS the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has become a political and financial center of world importance. It is the seat of the European Parliament and thus one of the capitals of the European Economic Community. Because of its favorable economic legislation, social and economic stability, and central location, many financial institutions have opened offices or have representatives in the country. It is estimated that more than 80 banks and 2,000 holding companies are registered. The enhanced position of the Grand Duchy has uplifted its cultural life (for example, it was now able to attract international theater groups) and thus widened its horizons.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

The legal status of the local Jewish community derives from Napoleonic legislation, implemented by an imperial decree of 1808. It should also be remembered that the Concordat and Napoleonic legislation in religious matters remained in force in the Eastern provinces of France, namely Alsace-Lorraine, which were under German sovereignty when legislation separating Church and State was passed in France (1906). The Jewish community of Luxembourg is closely bound through ties of geography and tradition with the Alsace-Lorraine communities of Metz, Nancy, Colmar, and Strasbourg. In Luxembourg, Judaism is officially recognized as a state religion, and its rabbi, Dr. E. Bulz, and secretary are officials paid by the state. The community has traditionally been a German-speaking group, although Rabbi Bulz, its first French-speaking rabbi, is a graduate of the Rabbinical Seminary of Paris and member of the French rabbinate. At official Jewish functions, Rabbi Bulz addresses the congregation alternatively in German and French (the official languages of the Grand Duchy).

Demography

Pending the findings of a new census now in progress, no exact Jewish population figures were available. The latest estimate was 1,000 in a largely Catholic general population of 360,000. Close to 865 Jews lived in Luxembourg city; 110 in nearby Esch-sur-Alzette; eight in Ettelbruck; five in Diekirch, and 12 in Mondorff. The

Note: The author wishes to thank Dr. E.E. Eppler of the Institute of Jewish Affairs, London, for her kind assistance.

Luxembourg community had 280 registered members. The community was aging, and the number of deaths exceeded the number of births. For the last 18 years, Rabbi Bulz has officiated at 56 Jewish marriages. In the same period, some 24 mixed marriages took place. Divorces were practically unknown: of the 56 Jewish marriages, one was dissolved. In recent years, a small influx of families from abroad has taken place: some Sephardi families from Egypt and Tunisia, one from the Congo, and six from Israel; four were the families of EEC officials.

There has been little *aliyah*, but two students from Luxembourg were studying at the Hebrew University.

Jews engaged mainly in business, most of them in the retail trade in clothing, fashion, and household goods. A small factory with some 30 employees produced metal furniture. Israeli families owned a dry cleaning chain and a store selling chocolates. There were three physicians, two lawyers, and a bank president. Most of the Jews lived comfortably, with little extreme wealth or poverty.

Community Activities

The administrative body representing the interests of the Jewish community was the Consistory of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. The Consistory, of which the rabbi was a member by law, had 11 members, two of whom participated in an advisory capacity. Some years ago, its statutes were amended to allow women to participate and to foster their interest in communal affairs. The community proclaimed 1976–1977 the “Year of the Community,” with the objective of encouraging more members to attend religious services and join in activities. Plans for the year included the remodeling of parts of the synagogue building and enlarging rooms for educational and social activities. The Consistory issued a monthly bulletin announcing religious, cultural, and social events.

The Luxembourg community cared for its needy members through Esra, an organization which has been in existence for over 50 years. Most recipients did not require sustained aid, and Esra extended its support to Jews from abroad, who may have been passing through and in need of some assistance.

Religion

The Community’s attractive synagogue, located on the Avenue de Monterey, was built with state funds and inaugurated in June 1953 to replace the original building destroyed by the Germans in 1943. The Sabbath evening services were being conducted by young people in a small chapel, and Sabbath morning services in the main synagogue. The ritual is comparable to that of the American Conservative movement: the congregation participates in the prayers and there is an organ, but men and women sit separately. While the organ has been falling into disuse in France, in Luxembourg, which had a strong prewar Reform tradition, it has been maintained. The prayer book, printed in France, is based on the traditional Rödelsheim *siddur*. (A new postwar tradition has been the communal Passover seder.) In

Esch-sur-Alzette, *minyanim* were held on the Sabbath and holidays.

The Luxembourg community had kosher meat; its cantor was also a *sho'het*. Meat was distributed through a local food store having a kosher meat department. It was sold by a Jewish clerk, whom the community has made available to the store. Matters such as divorce or conversion, which require the intervention of a rabbinical court, were referred to the *Bet Din* of Paris.

Jewish Education

Jewish education consisted of supplementary lessons, given on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons, some two to three hours per week. Almost all children attended until *bar-mitzvah* age, with participation sharply falling off thereafter, so that hardly any students continued beyond the ages of 15 or 16. The cause of this particular problem, which has also been identified in France, has been attributed to the increasing demands of the secular schools on students of that age group. Rabbi Bulz has been giving adult Hebrew courses for beginners and intermediate and advanced students. Another Hebrew course was given under the sponsorship of the local Zionist movement. Once a week the cantor of the Luxembourg community gave religious instruction to the 12 children at Esch-sur-Alzette.

Social Life

Social activities were arranged around two groups, youths and adults. The young people, between the ages of 20 and 25, were organized in the Union de Jeunes Gens Israélites de Luxembourg, which arranged dances and other social events. They also participated in international gatherings on a regional basis under the auspices of the Intercom (intercommunity) organization of Strasbourg, which arranged gatherings in the Communautés de l'Est, such as Metz, Nancy, and Strasbourg, and in Luxembourg. Young men and women who met at these encounters frequently married each other. The great social event for the entire community (and for the neighboring regions of Belgium and Lorraine) has been the annual WIZO (Hadassah) and Keren Kayyemet ball, held after Simhat Torah for the last 25 years. At this event, some \$3,000 were usually raised for each of the two organizations. Other social and philanthropic groups, largely Israel-oriented, included Keren Ha-yesod (the equivalent of the United Jewish Appeal), ORT, B'nai B'rith, and Israel Bonds.

Interfaith Activities

Relations with the non-Jewish population of Luxembourg have been cordial. In 1966 the Interfaith Association was founded by Catholics, Protestants, and Jews to promote better understanding and closer links between the faiths. The organization arranged regular lectures and discussions.

Spain

Political Affairs

WITH THE DEATH of Generalissimo Francisco Franco on November 20, 1975, after a five-week illness and more than 34 years of indisputed rule, Spain gingerly entered a new era. The country reverted to a monarchy with Don Juan Carlos de Borbon as King, in accordance with the provisions of two 1972 succession laws. The year 1976 was to be one of careful political jockeying in which the young, 38-year-old king moved away from entrenched Franco institutions, such as the Council of the Realm, the Falange, hard-line civil war veterans movements, and corporate structures, and toward a more democratic and representative constitutional monarchy. It was a transition marked by trial and error; demonstrations and political violence from both extreme right and extreme left, often strong police reaction, with quite a few casualties. The King's government finally amnestied substantial numbers of political prisoners and exiles, including even well-known Communists; made some concessions to vigorous demands for greater regional autonomy of Basques and Catalans; came to a partial Concordat revision with the Vatican; replaced a vice-premier, a top army general thought to lean too much toward the hard-line right for a more moderate military man, and, in October 1976, even brought to trial policemen (who had enjoyed special immunity under Franco) suspected of mistreating and torturing those under arrest.

The last premier appointed under Franco, Carlos Arias Navarro, was replaced in July 1976. In a surprise move the King chose as head of government a personal friend and political unknown, Adolfo Suarez, over prominent political lights such as Foreign Minister José Areilza or Interior Minister Manuel Fraga Iribarne, who had expected the call. In November Suarez persuaded the parliament, the Cortes—once a rubber stamp for Franco, but in this instance a potential block to reform—to adopt measures making possible constitutional change and Spain's first free elections in more than 40 years, scheduled for June 1977. Thanks to new-found greater freedom (for all that the government retained the right to ban any organization at any time) literally dozens of political parties suddenly came into being. Among the most important were the Popular Alliance, formed by Fraga and five other former ministers; the Spanish Workers Socialist party, headed by Felipe Gonzales; the Communists, headed by Santiago Carrillo, who fitted in and out of Spain for months before receiving "official" permission to return, and the Christian Democrats of Joaquin Ruiz-Giminez. Most consequential of all, it was expected, would be the group headed by Suarez, the Democratic Center Alliance.

Economic Situation

Making the political transition period still more difficult was the fact that Spain was in economic trouble after years of striking advance. The country's growth rate had dropped to a sluggish 2 per cent; inflation rocked to over 20 per cent in 1976; unemployment rose to 6 per cent, and the Spanish payments deficit was huge. The government, however, was loathe to attack economic issues at a time when it had its hands full with political ones. Spaniards, remembering their civil war only too well to wish to go through any drastic changes of the kind that followed the fall of the Caetano government in neighboring Portugal a couple of years before, wanted to contain the situation to prevent bloodshed. The King's personal ties with the army, too, were an essential factor in keeping that institution outside the political struggle, although old-time Francoists sought to enlist support among sympathizers in the military and the police.

Foreign Policy

In foreign affairs, a main Spanish objective was to get full membership in the European Economic Community (EEC). Negotiations to this end (cut off by EEC in protest against the execution by Franco in September 1975 of five political activists who had killed a policeman) were resumed in November 1975. Spain moved its troops out of the Spanish Sahara, taken over by Morocco and Mauritania in November. A new five-year agreement on maintenance of United States bases in Spain was approved in summer 1976. Despite some early moves by Juan Carlos and Queen Sofia that seemed to indicate a more favorable stance toward Israel, both the King and Suarez in fact were to make statements early in 1977 clearly showing that Spain would continue its earlier policy of seeking closer ties with Arab states and of nonrecognition of Israel.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

The number of Jews in Spain was estimated at about 11,000 and continued to grow little by little, as Jews still dribbled in from Morocco and from troubled Latin American countries. The latter, often, did not make contact with the communities. Eleven organized Jewish communities were registered with the Ministry of Justice. Madrid and Barcelona had about 3,000 Jews each, and the rest were to be found in Malaga, Alicante, Seville, Valencia, the Majorcan capital of Palma, Las Palmas and Tenerife on the Canary Islands, and the Spanish North African enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla. Several attempts have been made to create a liaison body among the separate communities, the most recent after a meeting in Torremolinas in January 1976, at which a Spanish affiliate of the World Sephardi Association was formed. But this, like the earlier initiatives, foundered, and there was no national

Jewish body. The differences between the Madrid Jewish community council, headed by Philippe Halioua after elections in April 1973, and former council president Max Mazin, heading the defense agency Asociación Hebrea de España, became particularly exacerbated in February 1974, but later subsided. In March 1976 Halioua was reelected council president; its vice-presidents were Moises Benbunan and Bertram Shader, an American. Continuing as head of the Barcelona community was David Ventura.

Condolences sent by the Madrid Jewish community on the occasion of Franco's death spoke of his relations with Jews, particularly of his government's rescue of several thousands in Balkan countries and elsewhere during World War II by granting them Spanish nationality on the grounds of Sephardi origin. (The same kind of protection, incidentally, was given several dozen Jews thrown into Egyptian prison after the 1967 Israel-Arab conflict.)

A Jewish delegation was among those received by Juan Carlos at his accession ceremonies, a small but telling symbol of the gradual process in the postwar period of granting Jews in Spain more extensive official recognition. Jewish communities, it must be remembered, only had their status affirmed under the religious liberty law of June 1967, previously having operated as private civil companies without official standing (AJYB, 1973 [Vol. 74], pp. 425-27). Jewish leadership was hoping the Juan Carlos regime would make it possible to normalize further the existing communal status and rights. In meetings with such government officials as Interior Minister Fraga Iribarne and Undersecretary of Justice Marcelino Cabanes early in 1976, Jewish delegations asked that existing legislation on religious liberty be amended to assure the full equality of all sects and the normalization of community property. The problem was how to shift property owned by the Jewish communities in their former private capacities to communal control without heavy transfer-tax loss. There were fruitful discussions, too, on granting citizenship to some 400 Jewish families. (The 1924 law giving citizenship to Sephardi had been abrogated years before.) With the agreement of the various ministries involved, it became possible, on an individual basis, to acquire citizenship after a two-year residence instead of the formerly required ten-year period.

Relations With Government

The King and Queen showed readiness for contact with Jewish organizations, both at home and abroad. In January 1976 the King received a delegation consisting of leaders of the World Sephardi Federation, Nissim Gaon and Haham Solomon Gaon, and heads of the Madrid, Barcelona, and other communities. Queen Sofia, who had been participating in a seminar on Judaism given by Rabbi Baruch Garzon, came to a Friday night service in the Madrid synagogue in May, the first time a Spanish monarch had attended a non-Catholic religious service. She failed, however, to make a speech on religious liberty, which was to have been her first public address. In June, on a visit to the United States, the royal couple met with a

delegation of the American Jewish Committee headed by Arthur Goldberg, in the course of which democratization and religious liberty in Spain and the possibility of the resumption of diplomatic relations with Israel were discussed. In October the monarch gave an unpublicized audience to Izhak Navon, head of the Keneset Security and Foreign Affairs Commission. This seemed to point to a more favorable atmosphere for things Jewish and to raise hopes for a more positive attitude toward Israel. In December 1976, however, matters took a sharp turn for the worse.

For several years the Madrid Jewish council had been working and planning for a new community school, Ibn Gabirol II, for which the cornerstone was to be laid on December 6. To coincide with this ceremony, the World Jewish Congress (WJC) scheduled holding the meeting of its European Executive in Madrid, the first such international Jewish gathering in Spain. Whether it was because of international publicity given the meeting, or because of Arab concern that the choice of Madrid as the meeting place was an augury of further improvement in Israeli-Spanish relations, the arrangement stirred Arab wrath. The ambassadors of several Arab countries to Madrid warned the Spanish Foreign Ministry that Spanish official representation at the gathering would be considered an unfriendly act, and asked that the meeting be banned. Giving the warning particular emphasis was the fact that Libyan and Kuwaiti delegations happened to be in Madrid at the time, negotiating contracts of importance to Spain. The government refused to ban the meeting; but no Spanish official attended either the WJC gathering or the groundlaying ceremony, conducted by WJC president Nahum Goldman. And an audience scheduled for WJC leaders with the King never took place.

Some change in the Jewish education of some 110 youngsters was expected with the opening of the new Ibn Gabirol school in Madrid. The major language of instruction was to be Spanish, rather than French. Various problems, such as how the community would continue to collect tuition fees in a school over which there was to be more direct government control, remained to be worked out. However, community leaders reported that the Spanish Ministry of Education has shown understanding of the special needs of the Jewish community. In Barcelona, some 80 children received a Jewish education, and Israeli youth counselors were active in organizing youth activities. Both communities had active Center and summer-camp programs. Madrid's rabbi was Benito Garzon, who also gave a course in Jewish thought at Madrid university; Salomon Bensabat was rabbi in Barcelona. The Madrid community was preparing to host a European Jewish Youth Seminar Passover at its Piedrahita camp.

Israeli-Spanish Relations

Despite the absence of formal diplomatic relations, trade between Israel and Spain grew steadily. In 1974 Israeli exports to Spain totaled \$17 million, as against \$19.4 million in Spanish imports. Spain's consulate general in Jerusalem long antedated the Jewish state, but was not accredited—an anomalous situation which, however,

seemed to pose no great practical difficulties. There was, too, significant strengthening of cultural ties. In April 1975 a number of leading Israeli scholars came to Madrid for a symposium sponsored by the Israel Interfaith Committee and the Center of Jewish-Christian Studies in Madrid. This was followed, in September 1976, by the visit to Israel of a group of Spanish university deans and professors in the fields of theology, history, and sociology for a ten-day seminar with their Israeli peers on the subject "Religious Community and National Community." The meetings were envisaged as a basis for increased cooperation between Spanish and Israeli universities and academic institutions.

The Center of Jewish-Christian Studies, directed by Father Vincente Serrano, was the focal point for most of the work done in Spain in Christian-Jewish relations. Since its founding in 1972, the Center has published four volumes on Christian and Jewish themes, organized bimonthly courses on Judaism as well as correspondence courses for the Spanish clergy, and helped arrange various lectures and meetings in cooperation with Jewish community leaders in Madrid and Barcelona. The Center was planning to publish a monthly magazine, *El Olivo*.

Jews did not escape the violence that marked Spanish life in 1976. In September the door of the Barcelona synagogue was torn out by a bomb. In December sticks of dynamite placed on a window ledge of Madrid's synagogue blew out the windows and caused serious damage half an hour before Friday evening services were to begin. Both acts were believed to be the work of small extreme right groups, but the perpetrators could not be found. Several community leaders received threatening letters telling them to leave the country or face death.

Before Franco's death, there had been some evidence that the more radical right-wing groups, such as Blas Pinar's Warriors of Christ King, were losing influence. In 1974 Jewish leaders in Madrid and Barcelona were instrumental in the government's ban of an international meeting of CEDADE, an openly neo-Nazi group, that was to be held in Barcelona. The trend toward greater democracy in Spain in 1976 was, of course, being vigorously fought by the ultra-rightists, who summoned supporters in other countries to participate in some of their more violent activities.

In their daily lives, Jews met with no discrimination. Press attitudes toward Israel were mixed. Israel-Arab issues seemed to be of little interest to the Spanish people, if post-Yom Kippur war polls were any indication. Of respondents in that survey, 16 per cent were for the Arabs, 13 per cent for Israel, and 71 per cent indicated that they did not know or care.

ABRAHAM KARLIKOW

Portugal

A REVOLT by Portuguese military men in April 1974 overturned the regime of Marcello Caetano, successor to Antonio de Oliveira Salazar who had died in 1970 after nearly 40 years of authoritarian rule. The Armed Forces Movement behind the revolt, stimulated by disgust with the cost to Portugal of continued fighting in Angola and Mozambique, first turned to General António de Spínola as president, but five months later drove him into exile when he sought to block Communist and left-wing takeovers of the press, trade unions, and local authorities. Considerable political and economic turmoil ensued as peasants seized land, widespread nationalization of banks and industries took place, and worker control was installed in factories. Military discipline collapsed when the Army radicals themselves split over what political line to follow.

However, in the face of leftist demands for "people's power" or control by "committees for the defense of the revolution," Portuguese voters, in April 1975 gave over 70 per cent of the vote to three democratic parties (38 per cent to the Socialists and 26 per cent to the centrist Popular Democrats) and only 17 per cent to the Communists and their allies. Finally, in November 1975 more moderate military elements headed by Lieutenant-Colonel (later General) António Ramalho Eanes took over. Eanes, the strong man behind the government, was elected president in June 1976, four months after he signed a pact relegating the army to a fairly minor constitutional role. In 1976 parliamentary polling, the Socialists, headed by Mario Soares, won the largest single vote, 35 per cent; the Social Democrats 24 per cent; the Center Democrats 16 per cent, the Communists not quite 15 per cent. Soares became premier of a Socialist minority government.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

The Portuguese Jewish community, the smallest in Europe today with less than 400 Jews, was severely marked by the 1974–75 turmoil in the country. Its members were affected not as Jews, but as part of the economic and professional middle class to which virtually all belong. They were especially hard hit by the economic disruption in Portugal that accompanied the revolution, and there was a tendency to join relatives abroad.

Half of the Jews were over 50 years of age; another third between the ages of 25 and 60, and almost all the rest were below 15. The 15 to 25 age gap occurred because virtually all young people of that age either left Portugal or were sent out of the country by their parents to study abroad.

Since Portugal had been a refugee haven during World War II, East and Central European and French Jews had joined the nuclear community of Sephardi, whose

forbears had come over from Gibraltar, Morocco, and the Azores in the 18th and 19th centuries to restore a community that had disappeared with the expulsion of the Jews from Portugal in 1497. At the end of World War II, the Jewish population was over 1,200. The Salazar regime permitted full communal and religious freedom. But the founding of Israel and, later, the Portuguese war in Angola signaled the beginning of an exodus, essentially to Brazil and Canada, and to Israel.

The April 1974 revolution that saw the Caetano regime overthrown gave further impetus to Jewish emigration. Although numerically insignificant, Portuguese Jews left their mark on Lisbon, where, except for a few families in Oporto and a handful in the Algarve, they lived. Among them were highly esteemed professionals, including rectors and deans of universities, and leading doctors; but most were in business or commerce. A proud community that had always taken care of its needy and aged, and its institutions, and had been of notable assistance to Jewish refugees in critical times, Portuguese Jewry suddenly found itself stripped as contributors died, or emigrated, and those remaining saw their bank accounts blocked and businesses failing. Outside assistance was rapidly forthcoming, primarily from the American Joint Distribution Committee, for the maintenance of the centrally located He-Haver Center, a focal point of Jewish activity. Deficits were mounting as of this writing in the Jewish hospital and home for the aged, and funds were needed for the upkeep of the Lisbon synagogue and cemetery.

Community Activities

The 130 or so Jewish families maintained four financially autonomous sets of institutions: synagogue and cult; the Jewish hospital and old age home; the Zionist youth organization He-Haver, and activities on behalf of Israel and international organizations like WIZO and ORT, the latter virtually suspended for the last few years. Jewish cultural activities, at their nadir after September 1974, resumed more normally in December 1975 with the commemoration of He-Haver's 50th anniversary, and a dinner party in honor of Abraham Cohen, the community's only rabbi, who had been granted *semihkah* shortly before. Rabbi Cohen conducted classes in religious education several hours a week for the few remaining children. The most prominent personality among Portuguese Jews was Professor Moses Amzalak, well over 80 years of age, a leading jurist and economist. Community vice-president Semtob Sequerra died in February 1976, after a sudden illness. Heading He-Haver was Dr. Joana Sequerra Amram.

Portugal and Israel exchanged trade representatives in 1958 and there was an Israeli Consulate in the country from 1960 onward. The early post-Caetano government, which was heavily leftist influenced, consistently voted against Israel in the United Nations and other international bodies. When Soares came to power, the situation improved somewhat, and there were reports that diplomatic relations between the two countries would be established.

Italy

Domestic Politics

THE CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATIC MINORITY GOVERNMENT, headed by Giulio Andreotti, was completely dependent on Communists' (PCI) abstention in both houses of parliament. This unprecedented situation was willfully caused by the refusal of the former allies in the left-center coalition (Socialists, Social Democrats and Republicans), too, to support Andreotti, other than by abstention. The Christian Democrats (DC) incessantly repeated that they would never accede to the Communists' request for a "historical compromise," nor to the Socialists' call for an "emergency coalition" of all but the neo-fascist parties, since any kind of coalition with Communists would be unacceptable to the majority of their supporters, and thus suicidal. However, the PCI already exercised de facto influence on governmental decisions similar to that of a coalition partner.

Andreotti's weakness was heightened by the virtual existence in the new parliament of a majority, though small, of the so-called Great Left, encompassing Republicans to Communists. The latter, however, refused such prospects, stating that in the present circumstances Italy could not be governed by a precarious majority, as the Chili experience taught, especially not against the Christian Democrats, who had even gained strength in the June elections.

In a kind of palace revolution, the Socialists (PSI) in July elected Bettino Craxi, a faithful of Pietro Nenni, to replace their secretary, Francesco de Martino. The latter thus was made the scapegoat for the electoral defeat, and rightly so, since he had provoked the anticipated parliamentary elections in June. Craxi, however, was paralyzed by crosscurrents within the party, which therefore continued on its baffling zigzag course. PSI refused a coalition with DC, although it still would have a comfortable parliamentary majority. Socialist leaders promoted the Great Left coalition, but only in the event its power relation with the Communist party (now roughly one to four) would have changed considerably in their favor. They also advocated an "emergency government" to contain no, or if unavoidable, "only a few Communist ministers, never in key positions." They ignored, or pretended to ignore, the risk even this would involve; they did not heed the example of Hitler's access to power, nor French Socialist leader François Mitterrand's explicit warning that, if in France the relation of power between Socialists and Communists had been the same as in Italy, he "would never have gone near the PCF."

Of the small lay parties, the Social Democrats, after their disastrous defeat in the June elections, insistently tried to reestablish contact with the Socialists. The Liberals, in a very similar position, demonstratively but rather ingenuously shifted their five parliamentary seats from the right to the left of the Christian Democrats. The

Republicans, too, were in disarray, with their dream of becoming at least a medium-size party definitely shattered. The four Radicals and four Demo-Proletarians, with all their verbose bustle against everybody, did not count. The neo-fascists split in January 1977; half of their deputies and senators founded the Democrazia Nazionale (National Democracy party).

In November, 900,000 voters in various cities all over the country went to the polls to elect municipal council members. Results were in part contradictory, but a moderate DC gain and Communist loss were predominant.

In January 1977 the image of confusion and perplexity resulting from opinions of diverse political, economic, and trade-union forces on what measures were urgently needed for a normalization of the Italian economy and currency situation was alarming. The country seemed to slide ever more into the wide open arms of the Communists, with institutions, including the press, already consistently infiltrated. The only timid hope centered on timely, efficient help from the allies in the Atlantic Pact and the partners in EEC, and on their full understanding of what was essential for Italy's and their own freedom.

Relations With Israel

The attitude of the Italian political parties toward Israel and the Middle East conflict was often adverse or ambiguous, and rarely helpful to Israel. Only the Republicans remained truly friendly; the Social Democrats, in panic as they were, looked fawningly to the Socialists, and these, in turn, to the Communists. A few days before January 12, 1976, when the United States vetoed the sharp anti-Israel resolution introduced by the Arabs in the United Nations, four Socialist members of parliament, including party leader Luigi Mariotti, with the backing of the party organ *Avanti*, quite surprisingly asked the government to have the Italian delegate vote with the Arabs. The Republican party, on the other hand, expressed satisfaction over the Italian abstention on that resolution.

The Israel Mapai party refused the invitation to the February Socialist Party Congress in Rome because, for the first time, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) had been invited by the Italian Socialists—or by any other member party of the Second Socialist International—to attend as guest observer. Mapam was represented by Perez Merchaz and Aron Nierensztajn. The Socialist party's secretary expressed regrets about Mapai's absence and explained that "all liberation movements" had been invited, but that this meant neither that the Socialists accepted the PLO's point of view nor that their traditional support for Israel had changed. The PLO delegates were enthusiastically applauded by the Congress; the Israelis much less. Neither delegation spoke, probably by tacit understanding with the hosts. The Libyan delegation hurled hateful accusations of "Zionists, racists, fascists" against the Israelis, and dramatically left the Congress, an incident that was ignored by the press.

Jewish Communist Senator Umberto Terracini sent a vigorous message to a

nonsectarian meeting in Milan on "Freedom of thought and scientific activity for Jews in the USSR," which said in part that "Public opinion is a strong lever of human moral and political progress" and asked for the liberation of all languishing in Soviet camps and prisons, be they Jews or members of other nationalities. The Communist party organ *Unità* significantly omitted that message in its report on the meeting. Terracini later admitted that the anti-Zionist attitude of the Left stemmed from scant knowledge of the problem, from the superficial identification of Israel and the Zionist movement with the United States. Therefore the accusations of "conservatism," of "reactionaryism", must be abandoned; for Israel was by far more progressive than the various Arab emirates or even the Italian Republic. Terracini's remarks must be viewed in light of the fact that he was considered the party's "lone wolf."

Another Communist leader, M.P. Giancarlo Pajetta, by now far more influential than Terracini, stated in an interview that his party disagreed with the PLO on the anti-Zionist UN resolution. While he blamed the Israel government for its "self-damaging aggressiveness," he thought this could not be the reason for criticism and propaganda abroad. Interestingly enough, he added that democratic forces, and Communists above all, should constantly remember the reactionary character of antisemitism, an evil plant which, he admitted, could not easily be extirpated even by democratic or Socialist revolution.

While the whole Western world applauded Israel's Entebbe operation (see article on Israel), in the heavily politicized climate of Italy the PCI immediately expressed indignation over the offense against "Uganda's sovereignty," the killing of one hundred (sic!) Uganda soldiers and Israel's "cynicism" in not wanting to negotiate with the terrorists, "risking so many lives for a principle." The press generally showed satisfaction with the Israeli raid; but, with the exception of the truly independent papers and the Republican party organ *Voce Repubblicana*, far too many of the Communist criticisms were repeated. The PCI even requested the foreign minister to send a strong protest to the Israeli government. The Republicans, on the other hand, asked the government to back Israel fully in the Security Council and to join the Western world in its fight against terrorism. Uganda's defeat in the Security Council was hardly mentioned by the obedient press.

This sharp contrast between the reaction in Italy and in the rest of the Western world can only be explained by a strong, intimidating joint action by PCI and pro-PLO circles. Later in the year, the Entebbe affair had further repercussions. The publication by Sonzogno of the translation of William Stevenson's *Ninety Minutes in Entebbe* was delayed by a demonstrative 24-hour strike of that firm's employes in protest against the "aggressively pro-Zionist content" of the book. Except for the extreme-left *Manifesto*, the press, even *Unità*, was unanimous in its condemnation of the strike as an inadmissible act of force against freedom of expression. The Sonzogno strike was unique in Europe; but the bombing of the four or five cinemas which later on showed the book's film version had antecedents in Denmark and Germany. The theaters courageously continued to show the film and were prepared

to run the Israeli version of it (*Operation Thunderbolt*).

On the subject of "Euro-Communism" Renato Mieli pointed out in *Giornale Nuovo*, October 3, 1976, that PCI's obsequious seconding of Soviet Middle-East policy was the best proof that, despite party secretary Enrico Berlinguer's often repeated protestations to the contrary, PCI was not truly independent of Moscow.

In December a delegation of seven members (ranging from left of DC to Communists) of the Forum for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Mediterranean, a research group sponsored by parliament, toured Israel to obtain information on peace prospects. The group, which was expected to become politically important in the event the plan for a Helsinki-like agreement for that area would become a reality, had earlier visited Lebanon and Syria. After its return, it unconditionally supported the Palestinians and the condemnation of the Christian's attack on the Palestinian Tell Zaatar refugee camp. A large sector of uninformed, emotionally-stirred public opinion joined unconditionally in the censure of the Tell Zaatar incident, much to the despair of Christian Lebanese, who had expected more solidarity, or at least objectivity, from the Italians, the "Rock of Christendom."

When the group returned from Israel, its members admitted that PLO leader Yasir Arafat's idea of a "lay democratic state" had to be abandoned regardless of what happened in Lebanon, and that the true test of PLO maturity was its forthcoming Cairo conference: that is, whether or not they would drop the references in their covenant to the destruction of Israel. Vittorio Orilia, member of the Forum and of the PCI's foreign section, wrote an article in the PCI's weekly *Rinascita*, rebuking Israeli statesmen for their rejection of an independent Palestinian state and of talks with PLO, "preferring to negotiate with the most backward Arab states, such as Jordan." Still, Orilia put his hopes in Israeli "progressive" groups, Communists and pacifists, "led by such relevant personalities as Eliav, Uri Avneri, General Peled." He also lauded the intense activity of the Israeli Communist party as extremely "lucid and combative," even though they were, as he rather euphemistically expressed it, "in the minority." He also advised PLO to move toward the recognition of Israel "in whatever form," since such a step would increase pressure on Israel by the governments of Europe and the United States to sit at the conference table with PLO, thus implying that such recognition would be no more than a tactical maneuver.

In preparation for the November UNESCO conference in Nairobi, a strong campaign was undertaken by the Italian press and intellectual circles for the readmittance of Israel into the agency's European section, and thereby to full operational membership. On September 30 a Committee for the Universality of UNESCO organized a meeting, sponsored by the Milan municipality, which was attended by outstanding personalities from the Western world. The press gave ample coverage to this and a similar meeting in Paris a few days later.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

In this time of stress Italian Jews felt endangered; for they knew from long experience that social upheavals, especially when brought about by totalitarian or dogmatic forces, were bound to turn against them in one way or another. Emerging Marxism was wrought with many specific dangers. Once in power, it would necessarily shatter the economic existence of Italian Jews, most of whom belonged to the upper- and lower-middle class, from merchants or small manufacturers (rare) and their employees to the poor ragpickers in the ghetto of Rome.

The number of Jewish students and intellectuals who continued to be attracted by the PCI steadily diminished because of the party's anti-Israel propaganda and ever more direct links with the Arabs. However, truly faithful Marxists were also to be found among the small number of Jewish workers. Growing Arab influence directly threatened Italian Jews: their ties to Israel or to their families in that country were strong, and a Communist regime in Italy could sever them. Careers in public life might become impossible for Jews. A good many Italian Jews were traditional in observance, and, although PCI might not oppose religion specifically, many Jews feared that it would. They also knew that a Communist regime could endanger Jewish day schools.

"Jews no longer feel secure in Italy" was the cover story of the illustrated Milan weekly *l'Europeo* (October 22, 1976). Some of their fears might not come true, some might be unfounded; but the uneasiness of Italian Jews was a fact. This was very well illustrated by architect Bruno Zevi in a firm and dignified speech at the solemn commemoration of the October 16, 1943, deportation of Jews from the Rome ghetto, held in Rome's capitol building and attended by the mayor and religious, civilian, and military authorities. "It is not enough to commemorate" was Zevi's keynote. He denounced anti-Israel propaganda as disguised antisemitism, as well as Marxist opposition to any form of Jewish self-affirmation. This state of things must end, he concluded, as must also the discriminatory passages remaining in the Concordat with the Catholic Church.

Full freedom of self-affirmation was also an essential condition for the fight against creeping assimilation, which had particularly fertile ground in Italy. Its Jewish population was only 35,000, of whom 15,000 lived in Rome and 10,000 in Milan (i.e., 0.5 per cent of all residents in these two cities). The rest were scattered in six medium-sized and 14 small communities, ranging down to a score of families (all in all, 0.6 per 1,000 of the total Italian population). Twenty-four per cent of all Italy's Jews were not native-born. Only the excess of immigration, from Eastern Europe and, more recently, from North Africa, over emigration prevented the more rapid aging of the Jews, as compared with the Italian population, and their numerical decline.

Assimilation thus posed a grave danger for the survival of Italian Jewry, since here, as elsewhere, religious adherence was weakening, although all synagogues were nominally Orthodox. According to Italian-born Rabbi Menachem Artom of

Israel, the latter did not mean that the Italian Jews were more attached to halakhah; perhaps the contrary was true. In a remarkable analysis of the reasons why Reform Judaism did not strike roots in Italy, presented at a Florence rabbinical seminary in February, he held that where reform of ritual or rules is not introduced, each Jew resolves his own problems of religiosity without expecting, or pretending, to find official justification for his own reforms.

In recent decades Jewish leaders have made strong efforts to compensate for the declining religious content of Jewish life. Jewish day schools (currently attended by about 60 per cent of Jewish children), camps, cultural centers (a new one was established in Florence in 1976), and youth and sports organizations were maintained despite the financial burden involved.

A still more important positive factor has been the Israel-orientation of Italian Jews, as best indicated by the fact that roughly half the content of the Jewish monthly *Shalom* or the Milan community's *Bulletin* was generally devoted to Israel, as was that of other Jewish periodicals. Another indication was that the Great Synagogue in Rome has been crowded not only on the High Holy Days, as are most other synagogues in Italy, but also on all occasions related to Israel, like visits of Israeli personalities or decisive events in the Middle East conflict. What was called solidarity with Israel there, commented Rabbi Elio Toaff after his return from the Solidarity conference held in Jerusalem in December 1975, was for him more than that, namely, reinforcement of Jewish consciousness.

In February the Unione delle Comunità Israelitiche Italiana (Union of Italian Jewish Communities) appealed to Italian Jews to remember on every occasion the indissoluble ties uniting all Jews wherever they live. This sense of oneness has, for thousands of years, helped surmount the greatest difficulties. In our time it was the foundation on which rested hope for common progress and freedom and which now demonstrated to the world the firm will of the Jews "to oppose any attempt to question a historical and moral patrimony: the irreversible realization of the profound aspiration and true needs of the Jewish people."

Response to Antisemitism

The most serious of antisemitic excesses was the throwing of Molotov cocktails during the night of Rosh Ha-shanah at the gates of the Great Synagogue in Rome. Two weeks earlier similar attacks had been made on the Zionist Federation's headquarters, the premises of the JDC, and a private Jewish firm, as well as on many non-Jewish targets. On Rosh Ha-shanah eve, too, large demonstrations in support of the Palestinians took place, with demonstrators carrying anti-Israel posters. For the occasion, some 20,000 persons were brought to Rome from all parts of Italy. There was, therefore, little doubt about the origin of the bombs. The police, though advised of the forthcoming rallies, took no special security measures. Major damage to the Great Synagogue was prevented only because the ghetto streets around it were still crowded, and the fire could be checked quickly. The

psychological effect was strong and lasting; never before had a Rome synagogue been directly assaulted.

This event might, therefore, have contributed to the vigorous reaction of Roman Jews when, in November, the military court granted conditional freedom to former SS Colonel Herbert Kappler, who was serving a life sentence in the fortress of Gaeta. He had ordered the massacre of 335 hostages on March 24, 1944, in reprisal for the death of 33 German soldiers, who had been killed by a bomb assault in the center of Rome. The reprisal order came directly from Hitler through General Albert Kesselring, the German commander-in-chief in Italy. Kappler was convicted because he had added, on his own initiative, five victims in excess of the Nazi reprisal rule of "ten for one German killed;" because he himself had at random selected the victims, ranging in age from 15 to 82 and including 80 Jews, from among the inmates of the Central prison where they had been incarcerated for months. Kappler, who suffered from cancer, was brought to the military hospital in Rome in summer 1975. He was still hospitalized when the court reached its decision. There was suspicion that he might be brought to Germany, where the conditions and limitations for his release—and even less so a possible later revocation of it by the Italian court—would be put into effect.

The Rome Jewish community and the National Association of Nazi-Victims organized a silent protest march to the hospital, in which the mayor of Rome participated. At the hospital, single groups holding sit-ins asked to see Kappler, and their request was finally granted. These demonstrations were emotional, but never got out of hand, though the tension in the ghetto was high. Most baffling in this matter has been the insistence of consecutive West German governments, including the present, on Kappler's release. Understandably, Bonn had to request for its citizen the application of the Italian statute permitting, under certain circumstances, the conditional release of convicts for life after 28 years. But requests for clemency dated back to the 1960s, long before the end of the 28-year-term; and since, in similar cases, the consent of the victims' relatives was necessary, Willy Brandt had his ambassador to Italy probe Jewish leaders about such a possibility. It was even said—and shouted during the Rome demonstrations—that the German government recently linked financial aid to Italy to Kappler's release, an allegation that was denied by both sides. Finally, on December 16, the higher military court reversed the earlier decision, and Kappler remained in the hospital as prisoner.

Another matter that contributed to the malaise of Italian Jews was Libyan President Muammar al-Qaddafi's acquisition of 10 per cent of the stocks of the Turin FIAT automobile factory, announced in December. This was feared to be a signal for further, more massive Arab investments in Italy, with economic and inevitably also political consequences for the long run. On the day of the announcement, Gianni Agnelli, FIAT's board chairman, hastened to assure Israel Ambassador to Italy Moshe Sasson that the agreement contained no secret clauses aimed against Israel; that the Libyans would remain a powerless minority on the managing board,

and that FIAT's business with Israel would continue as usual. All this, however, could not allay quite understandable fears, and not only on the part of the Jews.

The Vatican

The Catholic Church was utterly shaken by the bitter schism-like dispute between the Pope Paul VI and the traditionalist French Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, which weakened its international position. The broadening of the Left dissent also in Italy, in the Vatican's "own" geographical area, and the Communist takeover in the June elections of the municipality of Rome, the "City of God," after the decisive anti-Communist stand of the Church during the campaign, also meant thorough defeat.

Rome's Mayor Giulio Carlo Argan, a renowned art historian who was elected as an Independent on the Communist slate, tried almost too insistently to show respect for the Pope and the Church. The Left coalition nominated him, instead of a Communist party member, obviously in an attempt to gain goodwill on the "other side of the Tiber." Argan was immediately compared with another mayor of Rome at the beginning of the century, the Jewish liberal Nathan, who, quite contrary to Argan, however, used to write sharp articles against the Pope and papacy. As for his ability to run the city of three millions, Argan, alluding to Rome's disastrous financial situation, wittily said that he would be helped by his familiarity with ruins. The real head of the city administration was in fact PCI member Ugo Vetere, the comptroller. Behind handshakes, solemn speeches, and low bows, a steady propaganda from the Left against alleged tax privileges for Church-owned real estate and housing speculations continued. The press also reported on various measures of the new Communist local and regional governments against Catholic-run hospitals and schools.

RELATIONS WITH JEWS AND ISRAEL

The first test in 1976 of Vatican relations with the Jews and Israel was not too satisfactory. The Vatican delegation to a Qaddafi-sponsored Islamic-Catholic conference, held in Tripoli in February, ingenuously signed a "joint" resolution containing attacks on Israel and Zionism. The Vatican was forced to disavow publicly two paragraphs in question in response to a storm of protests from American and West European bishops and Catholic organizations, and the firm stand of Jewish circles.

Another painful incident again involved a vote by a Vatican delegation—one in support of a resolution condemning Zionism—at the UN-sponsored Habitat conference in Vancouver (AJYB, 1977 [Vol. 77], p. 121–22). The Vatican publication *l' Osservatore Romano* presented the issue without indicating how the Vatican delegation voted. Speaking in Vancouver for the delegation, Molly Boucher, president of the board of the Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace, "justified" the vote on the grounds that there was no direct mention of Zionism in the declaration of principles (she simply disregarded the reference to the

UN-resolution equating Zionism with racism). "It sometimes needs two denials to make up one truth," one observer commented.

A setback of a sad kind to Vatican-Jewish relations was caused by the death on July 7 of Rev. Pierre Marie de Contenson, secretary of the Vatican Commission for Relations with the Jews. During his three years in that office, he untiringly worked for the intensification of dialogue all over the world, particularly in Israel, and excelled in thorough preparations for joint conferences. After a rather long delay, the Vatican appointed as his successor Rev. Father Jorge Mejia, university professor in Buenos Aires and former director for ecumenism at the Latin American Bishops' Conference (CELAM), who had close contact with Latin-American Jewry.

In anticipation of the expected revision of the Italian Concordat with the Church, the Union of Italian Jewish Communities submitted carefully prepared suggestions. In November, in the course of a parliamentary debate, it was revealed that a good many of them had been accepted by the mixed commission working on the document. It decided on the elimination of the 1929 Lateran Treaty's anachronistic definition of the Catholic religion as the "religion of state," which resulted in a number of privileges for the Catholic Church and in discriminations against minority religions (Jewish and Protestant). Quite in line with this, the present Concordat also established that "Italy considers the teaching of Christian doctrine as the basis and the highest achievement of its public education." Actually, Jews could avoid that teaching only by maintaining day schools, which was not possible everywhere because of the financial burden involved. So far, attendance of instruction in Catholic religion has been obligatory in public schools, unless parents filed a special request for exemption. Pietro Blajer, the new president of the Union of Jewish Communities, disagreed with the probable future wording of that provision, i.e., parents will have to declare "whether they want Catholic religious teaching or not," because, he argued, making the declaration obligatory was contrary to the concept of voluntary religious education.

Paragraph 33 in the present Concordat, giving the Vatican full responsibility for the care of all catacombs in Italy—thus far understood as including also the Jewish catacombs—will in future refer only to Christian catacombs. The *Unione* also requested full implementation of paragraph 18 of the Lateran Treaty, which requires the Vatican to make "visible and accessible" all objects of religious art (including the Jewish) in possession of the Vatican and Lateran museums.

The *Unione* also dealt with the existing privileges of *Sacra Rota*, the Catholic matrimonial court, whose acts of annulment were automatically made effective by civil courts, whereas decisions on marriage and divorce by the rabbinical courts were not recognized. In this situation, there had been a tendency for the *Sacra Rota* to broaden the grounds for annulment to make this kind of divorce easier to obtain than a civil divorce (AJYB, 1976 [Vol. 76], pp. 324–25). Jews objected because they saw this procedure as a possible vehicle for proselytism. According to the new text, any such ecclesiastical act will have civil effect only if it complies with Italian law. This obviously voids Jewish requests for equality of rights in this special field, which

will have to be determined by a special Italian law on the basis of an agreement with the Jewish communities.

In January Volume 9 of the *Actes et documents du Saint Siege relatifs a la Seconde Guerre Mondiale* ("Acts and Documents of the Holy See Relating to World War II") was published by the Vatican. In this volume, more than in any of the preceding ones, the editors tried to substantiate the considerable help given to Jews during Nazi persecutions. While many of the relevant documents had not been published before—and many remained unpublished, as the footnotes indicate—the dimension of that assistance had already been known and duly acknowledged by Jewry and Israel. Surprisingly, the editors selected documents to show how far the Holy See had moved away from Zionism since the Balfour Declaration. Thus, they included a letter from Monsignor Angelo Roncalli, who had been the apostolic delegate in Istanbul during World War II and later became Pope John XXIII, expressing doubt whether it was right, from the religious point of view, for the Church to aid Jewish immigration to Palestine, but immediately repressing such doubts in view of the desperate situation of the Jews, and finally, in any event, considering a resurrection of the "Kingdom of Judah" as utopian.

This rather clumsy digression by the editors from the main subject—i.e., the unnecessary emphasis on the known non-Zionist character of the Church's humanitarian assistance to the persecuted Jews and, generally, its equally known antagonism to Zionism from its beginning—just at the time the infamous UN resolution against Zionism was adopted, called to mind, and lent support to, charges leveled against the Church of having too often and too easily acquiesced to those in power; of having failed to oppose forcefully their injustices and misdeeds in accordance with its own teachings. In fact, the Vatican did not join the Western world in officially denouncing the anti-Zionist resolution: the timid objections in its press merely pointed out that the resolution would not help peace efforts.

Publications

In *Davide* ("David"; Rusconi, Milan), Carlo Coccioli, a convert to Judaism, portrays the Great King reviewing his rich life in a continuous dialogue with God, as he faces death. Coccioli, who has been living abroad, mostly in Mexico, and wrote in Spanish, French, and Italian, was considered a maverick by the Italian literary world. The unanticipated success of this spiritual work—it was a bestseller for months—was for him a triumphant affirmation as a writer and thinker.

Commento alla Tora ("Commentary to the Torah"; Beniamino Carucci, Rome) is a collection of weekly pamphlets published some 20 years ago, in which Dante Lattes annotated the rigorously scholarly explanations of the Bible texts with erudite discussions of the fundamental problems of 20th-century Jewish society.

In *Israele: Terra antica stato moderno* ("Israel: Ancient Land, Modern State"; Cavallotti, Milan), the Milan non-Jewish political leader Gian Paolo Melzi d'Eril gives a step-by-step comparison of his recent trip to Israel with one he took 15 years

earlier, and with a similar journey his grandfather had taken and recorded a hundred years ago. The work touches on every aspect of Israeli life, including politics.

Il diritto di vivere ("The Right to Live"; Adda, Rome), in which social worker Luciana Coen Cardone writes about her experiences in a 50-year long professional career concerned with Jewish problem, presents an interesting cross-section of Italian society, including the Jewish community and its problems.

Maria Teresa Dainotti's novel, *Tempo di amare* ("Time for Love"; Sabatelli, Savona), which is set in Kibbutz Yad Mordechai toward the end of World War II, is pervaded with deep religious and sincerely pro-Jewish feelings, and expresses this Catholic writer's love and esteem for contemporary Israel.

e loro figli non sapranno ("And Their Children Will Not Know . . ."; Italscambi, Turin), a book of poetry by Nedelia Tedeschi Lolli, evokes, in the words of reviewer Primo Levi, "with force and kindness" her own, her family's, and the Jewish people's "difficult past and enigmatic present," from Masada to the Nazi camps.

Storia della letteratura ebraica post-biblica ("History of Jewish Post-Biblical Literature"; Beniamino Carucci, Rome) is a reprint of Umberto Cassuto's renowned work on the organic development of Jewish literature in its various forms and languages in various cultural centers throughout 22 centuries.

In *Mussolini contro Freud* ("Mussolini Against Freud"; Quaderni Guaraldi, Milan), Piero Meldini collected anti-Freudian articles published in the Italian press during the fascist era. Psychoanalysis was then attacked not only by the party's writers, but also by the followers of Benedetto Croce and, of course, by Catholics. As for fascism, Glauco Carloni's preface points out, its manifestations, ranging from mob hysteria to Mussolini's histrionics, could serve as a case history in "collective psycho-pathology." The book as a whole is an interesting contribution to the knowledge of the repressive effect of fascism on culture.

Anatomia dell'ebraismo italiano ("Anatomy of Italian Jewry"; Beniamino Carucci, Rome), by Sergio Della Pergola of the Hebrew University, is a serious sociological and demographic study of all aspects of Jewish life in present-day Italy, and an indispensable handbook for further research on this subject.

Art

In the reconstructed Piedmont Casale Monferrato synagogue, Jewish singers and musicians were heard in June in a concert of Jewish music. The program, which began with a monodic song from the 12th century, Obadyah's "Baruch Haghever" discovered in modern times in the ruins of an ancient Cairo synagogue, cut across the centuries to compositions by Ravel and Bloch, to modern Israeli composers like Saul Ben-Chaim, and ended with popular songs like "Unzer Rebenyu." The small synagogue, a jewel of Italian Jewish religious art, was crowded with local, Turin, and Milan Jews and non-Jews. Similar concerts were planned by the group for summer 1977.

In the same month in Florence, Paul Dessau's opera *Einstein*, depicting the scientist's escape from Germany and his dilemma regarding the construction of the atom bomb, had its Italian première. Performed by artists from the East Berlin State Opera, the work was highly acclaimed by both critics and the public.

Again in June, in Rome, the American Jewish composer and organist Herman Berlinski, musical director of the Washington, D.C. Hebrew Congregation, gave a concert of Hebrew music for the organ for a selected Jewish and non-Jewish audience.

In December pupils of the Rome Jewish day school, who some time earlier had founded the Anne Frank theater group, presented the *Diary of Anne Frank*, a dramatization by Hachett and Goodrich, which had a three-week run in a Rome theater. The play was enthusiastically received by the mostly Jewish audience and had very good reviews. Many of the ten-to-13-year-old youngsters showed real talent; all acted surprisingly well, no doubt thanks to their stage manager, the well-known Jewish actor Cesare Polacco.

In October the exhibit "The Old Testament in the Music of All Times," after long years of preparation by the Haifa Museum of Music, began its tour of Western countries in the new Rome National Library with a solemn opening ceremony. It was later shown also in Florence and Milan. The press gave it extensive, excellent reviews.

Personalia

Ferruccio Pardo, life-long Zionist, educator; headmaster of a public school and, after the introduction of Mussolini's racial laws, of the Jewish school in Bologna; as refugee in Switzerland entrusted by government to run their special school for Italian refugee youth; contributor to outstanding Italian and Jewish periodicals; author of numerous books on philosophy and education, many related to Jewish life; recipient of the Portico d'Ottavia prize for his last work, *Israel Among the Nations*, died in Bologna on January 27, at the age of 85.

Corrado Cagli, world-famous painter highly esteemed also for his human values and attitudes, who in 1938 had left Italy for Paris, and later New York, to escape racial persecution; fought as volunteer in the United States Army in Europe until the end of the war, during which he conceived his series of drawings about the martyrdom of his fellow-Jews, including the liberation of Buchenwald which he witnessed, and returned to Italy in 1948, died in Rome on March 28, at the age of 66.

Sergio Piperno Beer, judge of the court of cassation, president of the Union of Italian Jewish Communities for the last 20 years, untiring worker of the refugee-aid agency Delegazione Assistenza Emigranti (DELAEM) during the Nazi-occupation, one of the most popular and esteemed figures in Italian Jewry to which he was dedicated to the end of his life, died in Rome on June 5, at the age of 70.

Napoleone Sadun, for the last 20 years executive secretary and moving spirit of

the Rome Jewish community, died in Rome on July 2, at the age of 54.

Lelio Vittorio Valobra, founder in 1934 and since then the moving spirit of DELASEM, who obtained immigration visas for thousands of refugees and war deportees in Italy during the last 40 years; had cared for many of them in the underground during the Nazi occupation, and, after the war, helped organize *Alyah Bet*, died in Genoa on August 3, at the age of 76.

Davide Wischkin, eminent physician, for many years chairman of the Meran Jewish community and active Zionist, esteemed and loved by that town's Jewish and non-Jewish citizens alike, died in Meran on August 26, at the age of 64.

Guido Romanelli, promising young poet, whose verse spoke of daily joy and pain experienced by the Jews in the ghetto of Rome; psychologist and author of a much-noted dissertation on *Freud and Judaism*, died in Rome on August 22, at the age of 26

JULIO DRESNER