Now in its seventh decade of publication, the American Jewish Year Book continues to present a uniquely thorough account of Jewish life in this country and throughout the world. The current volume, appearing on the eve of the final deliberations of the Ecumenical Council, provides a solid historical background and a comprehensive analysis of the Council's debate on the "Jewish Declaration." Also covered in this article, by Judith Hershcopf of the American Jewish Committee's Interreligious Affairs Department, are Christian and Jewish reactions to the events as they unfolded at the Ecumenical Council.

Another highlight of this volume is the 75-page study of Orthodox Jewry in the U.S., by Dr. Charles S. Liebman of Yeshiva University. Gathered together in this exhaustively researched compendium are descriptions of Orthodox institutions and their leaders, demographic and sociological data, and a summary of trends in American Jewish Orthodoxy today.

Civil Rights — America's number-one domestic crisis — comes in for extensive coverage. The article, by Lucy Dawidowicz, reviews the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the 1964 Presidential elections, the role of extremist groups, and a general evaluation of the civil rights movement in the U.S.
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Special Articles
HERBERT H. LEHMAN:
IN MEMORIAM

BY LOUIS FINKELSTEIN

The passing of Herbert H. Lehman was a profound loss to all who had labored with him for the welfare of the Jewish community and, indeed, to all in our country and throughout the world who had shared his concern for humanity. To a nation still mourning the untimely death of its young president, the loss of this second life, long an inspiration to the forces of enlightenment, deepened the sense of desolation and darkness that hung over those tragic days.

The nation lost more than a venerated statesman whose dedication to the cause of justice and humanity had made his name a legend throughout the world. Lehman the idealist, the man of action, the man of courage, stood as the shining symbol of America at its finest. No one more truly represented the spirit of liberty and brotherhood so deeply rooted in the history of this country than this second-generation American Jew. For traditions and teachings older than the country itself had contributed to mold his character and to fire him with the passion for social justice that illumined his entire life.

Sixty years of that life had been devoted to the service of his fellowman, crowded years of dedication and unremitting industry, marked by milestones of progress and reform. His interests had led him to vastly different areas of activity, in national and international affairs, in the government of city and state, in the realm of commerce and labor, in the world of education and philanthropy. And to each undertaking Lehman had applied himself with all the spiritual and physical resources he could command. He had followed only one line—and that was the line of his conscience from which he could not be swayed. He knew what was right, and he did it without regard for personal interest. In providing
leadership for the forces of morality in this country he was not afraid to take a lonely or unpopular stand.

Awesome to contemplate in their scope and span are the achievements of this one man, the great causes associated with him both at home and abroad. As Governor and as Senator he worked incessantly to build a better America: stabilized finances, welfare and housing programs, improvements in relief distribution, in prison conditions, are some of the solid landmarks of the Lehman administration in Albany that helped to ease the conditions of social and industrial upheaval that existed between the wars. Later, in Washington he was always to be found in the forefront of the battle to protect the rights of the individual; his often the lone voice raised in the Senate to protest against the forces of reaction.

Lehman's commitment to those in distress was not bounded by barriers of frontier, religion or race. As an early member of the Joint Distribution Committee he gave valiant service to his fellow Jews in the pogrom-ridden lands of Eastern Europe. Through JDC and its ancillary, the Agro-Joint, he was able to bring relief to millions who had suffered under Russian persecution. Lehman's work helped to rehabilitate entire communities ravaged by the First World War. Later, as Director-General of UNRRA, he undertook responsibility for a monumental life-saving operation that has no parallel in history, one that involved the welfare of 44 million people. It was a challenge Lehman found infinitely rewarding and he threw heart and soul into the job. His was undoubtedly the greatest single contribution made by any one person to the epic task of post-war rescue and rehabilitation.

When the Governor died all America, indeed all lovers of freedom, mourned with a sense of irreparable loss, but perhaps the most grievous loss of all was suffered by American Jewry. Unique was the position that Lehman held: no other Jewish leader has exercised such power over, and enjoyed such prestige within, the entire community. Lehman himself always minimized the divisions in Judaism, maintaining that the forces unifying Jewry were far stronger than the differences that held us apart. "All that I require of a Jew," he insisted "is that he follow the basic laws, precepts and traditions of our faith. It makes no difference to me whether a man goes to a Reform, Orthodox or Conservative synagogue." And he gave evidence of his conviction by becoming in time a member of synagogues conducted by all three groups.

Politically, Lehman could depend upon the loyal support of the community. The liberals of New York City helped to vote him into office time and time again, with increased majorities. For although in his origins
and early advantages, Lehman differed from the urban multitudes, he represented their general outlook and ideals. In essence, the values that Lehman stood for were the fundamental values of enlightened liberalism.

**JUDAISM A WAY OF LIFE**

The Lehman epoch had particular value for his fellow Jews—a proud reminder of the eternal values of the Judaic tradition. We recognized in his struggles against injustice, in his protests against man's inhumanity to man, the guiding precepts of the ancient Hebrew prophets.

These precepts, part of his spiritual heritage, were strengthened by family training and tradition. Born to wealth and status, there was developed in the young Lehman, almost from infancy, a powerful sense of responsibility towards those less fortunate. His father, Mayer Lehman, was wont to have the six-year-old child accompany him on his visits to hospitals and other missions of mercy.

That sense of commitment, translated into constructive deeds, runs like a leitmotif through the career of Herbert Lehman. His lifelong concern for the poor and the persecuted was an almost ingrained response to the ethical teachings, biblical in origin, which have been inculcated by prophet and rabbi through the centuries. Lehman was in every sense an heir to this rich legacy.

His life exemplified consistently the talmudic tradition of service for its own sake or "for the sake of heaven." He belongs not only to the great tradition of Jewish servants of mankind, but to the specifically American tradition which included in its roster the Schiffs, the Warburgs, the Sulzbergers, the Guggenheims, Julius Rosenwald, Louis Marshall, Sol M. Stroock, and a host of others, less well known, but equally dedicated.

Lehman himself, aware of the sources of the inspiration which made him the great man he became, seized many public occasions to stress how largely his sense of social responsibility stemmed from "the faith that I acquired earlier in life—faith in the fundamental ideals and traditions of Judaism." To Lehman, Judaism was always "a way of life, dictating all the actions of men, coloring all their thoughts."

Fundamental to this way of life, Lehman showed, was a perpetual concern with the basic human rights of all men. Long before these ideals became common currency amongst the nations, the Torah had laid this charge upon the Jews. He declared:

The sanctity of human life, the right of every man to certain unalienable rights, the concern for man as man, regardless of how humble his status or background—these are the ideals inherent in the Jewish faith.
Thus, to be a Jew and an heir to the great spiritual legacy of talmudic teaching was to bear a constant commitment to the service of all men. In moving terms Lehman defined his commitment in the address he gave in 1936 at the semi-centennial celebration of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America—of which he was a board member and later chairman of the board of overseers:

So long as we can live and work, each of us owes to himself, to his country and to humanity the duty to apply to each social problem the spiritual values which experience has shown are universal, immutable and eternal.

The Jew could not stand passively on the sidelines when injustice was perpetrated but was duty bound to come to the support of those victimized. On the attitude of Jewish teachings to the social evils of the day, the Governor was explicit:

Judaism stands in persistent protest against the exploitation or oppression of any human being. It insists that each man, woman and child is an incarnation of the spirit of God, is entitled to the fullest life. . . . There is a wonderful continuity in the ideals to which Israel has devoted itself through the centuries, characterized by a continuous yearning for freedom that has grown out of its own experience. For Jews speak in social terms, not as theorists, but out of the pain of countless generations who remembered the injunction to bring freedom and justice to all men, even as they themselves were brought to freedom out of Egyptian slavery.

He went on to make the observation that even as today’s widely accepted principles of human rights and freedoms stemmed from rabbinic teachings, he was convinced that a study of the talmudic tradition would produce further insights meaningful to the problems of the day. What was needed, he felt, was a study of the Bible as a source of “fresh insights for living.” He urged

... translating the ancient moral law into a guide post for a compelling present might reveal that not by power and might but by humility and spirituality will we build the world anew.

It was in response to these exhortations that the Seminary in 1958 established the Herbert H. Lehman Institute of Talmudic Ethics in honor of the elder statesman’s 80th birthday.

Lehman took strenuous issue with those who argued that religion was a spent force and could expect to play little part in the future affairs of men. As a philosophy of life, he believed that Judaism could provide its
adherents with spiritual inspiration. On one occasion, discussing postwar political tensions and unrest, he expressed the belief that the root of many current problems was a spiritual one:

What we need at this juncture of history is a faith for living, a philosophy of life that will give us a sense of direction and serve as a guide through the confusion of our times. We need a faith that will inspire us with hope and courage against the inhumanity of the world.

This faith, if it is to capture the imagination of people, must be based on the best of the past, concerned with present-day problems, and a forward look into the future. Judaism, properly interpreted, has a vital role to play in this crisis. It can contribute towards the deepening of the world’s conscience and give all of us a sense of world responsibility. It can give us the hope and faith we need so badly to face the next critical decade.

**Leadership in Jewish Community**

Lehman bridged the gap between two generations of American Jewish leaders. He entered service as an apprentice in the footsteps of Jacob Schiff, Louis Marshall, and those other titans who graced the early years of the century, and he continued to serve side by side with succeeding generations to the last day of his life.

There is scarcely an organization within the community that did not benefit from his wisdom and wealth of experience. He sat on the boards of virtually every major Jewish educational and philanthropic institution, and despite the tremendous burden of responsibilities he constantly carried for government or political affairs, he never lost touch with the needs of his community. The list of important offices he held is almost endless. His honorary chairmanships alone constitute a roll of American Jewish community agencies: American Association for Jewish Education, American Friends of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, American Friends of the Hebrew University, American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, Brandeis University, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews, Israel Bond Organization, Jewish Agency for Israel, Jewish Child Care Association, Joint Distribution Committee, National Foundation for Jewish Culture, Palestine Economic Committee, Surprise Lake Camp, Synagogue Council of America, United Israel Appeal, United Jewish Appeal, and World Organization for Rehabilitation through Training.

To the Jews in the oppressed lands of Eastern Europe, where the JDC
accomplished its memorable work, Lehman was a legend, his name synonymous with hope. Lehman, who was one of the founders, was absorbed in every aspect of its work. Had this been his sole accomplishment, it alone would have won him a place in the annals of Jewish history.

As chairman of the JDC's Reconstruction Committee, he was the prime mover in restoring the shattered communities of Russia after the First World War. The Agro-Joint, through Lehman's efforts, was able to free from the ghettos hundreds of thousands of Russian Jews and to help them start on new, freer lives as farmers and artisans. ORT, which set up technical and vocational schools for indigent communities in many parts of the world, was another project Lehman helped to sponsor, characteristic in its emphasis on self-help. Imperative to his mind, was the importance of re-establishing self-respect in those he helped, and in this he was mindful of the teaching of Maimonides, who enjoined that the noblest form of charity was the gift that enabled a man to regain his livelihood, and to become free from dependence upon his fellow-men.

Herbert Hoover called Lehman's work at this time "one of the most striking feats of human engineering."

Lehman often spoke of the inspiration he had received from those he came to succor. For the first time he was drawn into close contact with the pious Jews of Eastern Europe, and he developed a profound admiration for Orthodox Jews who, despite all vicissitudes, clung so tenaciously to their ancient values. It served to reinforce his own spirit. In 1928 he said:

If anything has made me feel the value of Jewish spirituality, it is my connection with the cultural and religious activities of the JDC.

When you know of hundreds of thousands of men and women who preferred to have money used for the development of their religious life, rather than for terribly needed food and shelter; when you see these people making tremendous sacrifices to maintain their synagogues and religious schools and to bring up their children in their ancient creed, then you realize why the Jewish people and faith have indomitably survived the storms of several thousand years.

Lehman gave ten years to the massive task of Jewish relief and rehabilitation in Europe. The work helped to broaden and mature him. It transformed the sociable, sports-loving young man into an earnest, hardworking man of action concerned with social problems and world affairs. His exposure to suffering deepened his sense of commitment until it embraced all mankind.
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His work with JDC and its ancillaries had an important direct benefit—it provided him with a unique experience in organization and planning that prepared him for the even greater responsibilities he would assume in the future, in the wake of yet another world war. As Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) Lehman held one of the most inspiring roles of humanitarian leadership to be undertaken by one man. It was under his directions that this epic task force, in an unprecedented expression of international unity, assumed the burden of restoring to productive life the human souls crushed by the Nazis. Of his services for UNRRA, which saved millions of lives and brought many millions more on the road to recovery, Lehman later wrote:

... despite its headaches, its heartaches, its frustrations, this was, bar nothing, the most rewarding experience of my life.

Lehman accepted the challenge of the UNRRA assignment in a spirit of consecration. It seemed that the whole of his previous life had been but a preparation for this mission of mercy. His temperament, his training, his distinguished record in philanthropy, all marked him as the best man for the job. Roosevelt's choice was widely applauded. The immediate reaction of the American public in December 1943, when his appointment was announced, was expressed in the comment of one well-known journalist who wrote:

No one who has known him will doubt that he is the ideal man for this important and difficult undertaking. We in New York know his management will be sound, able, patient and courageous.

He flung all his energies into the task, working unsparingly. The situation was urgent and speed was imperative. Every day hunger, cold, and weakness brought death for hundreds. Following in the wake of the Allied forces, UNRRA strove desperately to meet the demands of the devastated countries for food and supplies. As the Nazi-dominated lands were liberated the open gates of the concentration camps set free enormous numbers of helpless human beings marked by the Germans for destruction. Homeless and hopeless, these displaced persons, Jews, slave workers, war prisoners, political deportees, depended upon UNRRA for survival, and the organization grew constantly to meet its increasing responsibilities.
Lehman's job at the helm of this complex machine involved constant vigilance at many levels. He had to scrutinize the procurement of supplies, the creation of transport, the hiring of personnel, the rise and fall of the financial barometer. He had to evaluate new relief plans every day; to enlist and coordinate the work of the many voluntary agencies working with UNRRA—of which there were some thirty scattered in Germany alone; and to see that the claims of UNRRA to Lend-Lease resources and military surpluses were pressed.

An important aspect of his job was to enlist support for his mission from Americans at a time when a return to pre-war isolationism claimed many supporters. At a large rally in Central Park on "I Am an American Day," in May 1945, Lehman argued that true Americanism embraced a responsibility for less fortunate nations. He exhorted:

Are we going to allow starvation in Europe or prevent it? Are we willing to make a small sacrifice at home in order that millions abroad can regain their health and dignity?

It was an issue on which feeling ran high. Lehman, always sensitive to personal attack, continued to campaign valiantly, despite the pain of carping criticism. UNRRA faced fire from many sides; among other problems it had to cope with the hostility of the military commands, attempted pressures by foreign powers, refusal by some national relief agencies to coordinate activities, indifference or even opposition of the American public. Above all it was dominated by the increasing need for funds, to pay for food and urgent services.

In an energetic campaign to persuade Congress to pass on the appropriation for UNRRA, Lehman set himself to mobilize public sentiment. Tirelessly he addressed rallies, marshalled witnesses, canvassed his friends in the Senate and House. Enlightened opinion was on his side and he had the backing of many influential newspapers across the country. Eisenhower's strong endorsement was decisive and Congress passed the appropriation which enabled one per cent of the national income to be used to alleviate the desperate need of war-wrecked Europe.

By spring 1946, the picture in Europe had changed. Thanks to the contribution UNRRA had made, famine had been stayed, epidemics blocked, the naked clothed, the unemployed given hope and work. The agency had helped with the restoration of roads, railways, canals and ports, dispatching a vast staff of experts to advise on rehabilitation in every field. In that year alone UNRRA delivered 24 million tons of supplies to 17 nations; it had distributed more clothing than any other agency; it had conducted the largest international medical program in history.
Lehman had worked himself to the point of utter exhaustion when he left UNRRA in March 1946. By then it had virtually fulfilled the vital task of bringing life-saving relief, and Europe was ready for the second stage of its recovery in which American assistance would take the form of Marshall Plan aid. For his spectacular contribution, Lehman was showered with decorations and with tributes both by his own countrymen and by the men of other nations. A perceptive evaluation of this contribution was given by a British statesman, Philip Noel Baker:

No tougher assignment was ever faced by any one man. He has carried it through . . . but the greatest service of all has been his personal leadership—the moral authority which he has established with the governments and peoples of the world, the sense of spiritual power he has given all his colleagues in this work.

**IMMIGRATION REFORM**

Of the tragedies to which he had been witness during his UNRRA service, none had moved him so profoundly as the plight of the pitiful victims of the concentration camps, against whom all the nations had barred their doors. Upon his return to political life Lehman resumed his attack on restrictive immigration policies. In his plea that the United States extend a welcome to the peoples of all races, Lehman was expressing not only his convictions, and those of the liberal forces he represented; he was also speaking in the voice of the American tradition which, from the founding of the Republic, had provided a haven for the oppressed.

The political climate of post-war America was against him but Lehman never abandoned the fight for immigration reform. He fought against the passing of the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952, denouncing it as "repugnant to every concept we call America."

Year after year he introduced his own counter-measures, suggesting rational standards for immigration quotas that would rest on worth and need. None of these measures got off the ground, but Lehman's persistence kept immigration reform a living issue.

**DEFENDER OF ISRAEL**

Lehman became a staunch defender of the State of Israel. Earlier, like many others, he had been convinced that the future of Jewry lay in the countries of the diaspora, and he had demonstrated this faith by his labors for the rehabilitation of the Russian Jewish communities at the time of the First World War.
The course of history changed his convictions. By the end of World War II he recognized the importance of Israel to the Jewish refugees. Bitterly he assailed the British policy that denied admission to these hapless victims. Movingly he put their cause:

I have visited many countries and I have seen with my own eyes the indescribably pathetic plight of the pitiful remnant of Jews which survives in Europe—a million and a half out of six million. And yet they stand before us, not as beggars pleading for crumbs of charity. They stand before us with a stirring faith and will—as brave men and women who are anxious to take their rightful place in the world.

His respect for human dignity led him to support particularly the many educational institutions which arose in Palestine and later in Israel. The Hebrew University, the Technion and the Weizmann Institute for Research at Rehovot, all benefitted from his counsel and his generosity.

For Lehman there was involved no clash of loyalty in being an American and being a Jew: he felt on the contrary that the spiritual heritage the Jewish immigrants brought to this country found its perfect soil in the atmosphere of freedom, and that freedom had been in turn enriched.

EARLY INFLUENCES

It was the promise of freedom that brought Mayer Lehman over from Bavaria in 1848. He was part of a steady stream of German Jewish immigrants who, stirred by the winds of change moving across Europe, saw in the New World the opportunity at last of being able to live free from the age old threat of persecution. Many of those immigrants settled in the South in the decades preceding the Civil War. These newcomers, with their industry, intelligence, and business skills, played an important role in the commercial development of the southern states. Some were the founders of dynasties which were to make outstanding contributions to the growth and greatness of this country.

Lehman's father and his two uncles started out as cotton traders in Montgomery, Alabama. In 1863 Mayer Lehman, well-known as a Southern patriot, was chosen by the Confederate Army to act as negotiator in an exchange of prisoners with the North.

After the Civil War, the families moved to New York and Lehman Bros. became recognized as one of the city's more important brokerage houses. The partners, who helped to organize the New York Cotton Exchange in 1871, were prominent citizens, zealous in fulfilling their obligations in civic affairs and in philanthropy.
It was into a warm, comfortable, loving family circle that Herbert H. Lehman was born, on March 28, 1878. The Lehman family formed part of a solidly established and prosperous German Jewish community, who accepted, as the obligation imposed on their position of privilege, the duties of philanthropy and public service. Both at home, and in the religious school of Temple Emanuel, that sense of social responsibility was a fundamental part of the training young Lehman received. Overriding in his upbringing was the emphasis on utter personal integrity, and his whole life serves to underline how deeply these teachings took root.

Precept and example deepened the natural sympathetic instincts of his character. Early in life they made him aware of the existence of human misery. The visits with his father to the hospital charity wards, which started when he was six years old, were followed a few years later by others to the poverty-stricken districts of the city. The scenes of squalor and suffering he witnessed strengthened his resolve to be of help. Later, recalling these early experiences, Lehman wrote:

I was shocked. How much direct effect it had on my later thinking, I don’t know, but probably a great deal.

He had barely left his teens when he was fired with enthusiasm for the great work Lillian Wald was accomplishing in the Lower East Side. He became an active member of her task force, at the Henry Street Settlement, helping to organize and run a boys group. Lehman never lost interest in the work of the Settlement, which continued to benefit from his advice and support.

It appears that his father had originally harbored plans for Herbert to be a mining engineer, for which his son professed neither talent nor inclination. Fortunately, Mayer Lehman decided to send his son to Williams College. There, after an initial period of loneliness, the boy’s open nature won him many friends and the respect of his teachers.

**BUSINESS CAREER**

After his graduation from Williams in 1899 Lehman settled unhesitatingly upon a career in business. He did not immediately choose to enter the family banking house, but decided instead to take a job as a salesman in a large textile concern. At the age of 28, through his own industry and business acumen, he had become vice president and treasurer of the business. In 1909 he became a partner in Lehman Bros. and under his leadership the banking house entered upon its most important phase of development. Widely expanding its interests, the company undertook many major
financial ventures, taking part in the development of the South by financing railroads, utilities, timber plants, and mills. In New York it helped to organize banks and trust companies, to form the great gas, ferry and traction concerns.

Lehman Bros. was among the first banking firms to undertake support of the vast mercantile houses, acting as financial agents for such stores as R. H. Macy, Gimbel Bros., Federated Department Stores, Allied Department Stores and the Interstate group. The firm retained leadership in this field, so that it could be said in 1950:

Of today's twenty largest retailing enterprises Lehman Brothers has been or is presently regarded as investment broker for more than half.

The sale of Bamberger's, in Newark, to R. H. Macy was Herbert Lehman's last important transaction as a banker before he abandoned his business pursuits to enter public life in 1929. By that time the family business was firmly established as one of the most respected in the city. Lehman Bros. had built a reputation for responsibility and constructive progress accomplished through sagacious, conscientious management.

With the family business on solid footing, Lehman could with clear conscience turn his attention to other matters. His business experience had brought many satisfactions, and he had become recognized as an authority on problems of finance and industry. He had enjoyed the excitement of negotiating complex deals, the challenge of devising programs that brought weak companies back to strength. Nevertheless, at heart he was not a businessman.

PUBLIC OFFICE

Most of all Lehman felt the urge to enter public affairs. During the First World War he had served briefly as an aide to Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and in this important role he had acquitted himself with distinction, earning the DSM for his services. The war over, Lehman returned to his business career. Yet he looked back with a great deal of satisfaction to his two-and-a-half years in Washington. His stint of government work had left him with a feeling of positive accomplishment and the desire to make a further contribution.

Twelve years later, the pattern repeated itself. Lehman returned to public office, again as aide to F.D.R. Inexorably, he had been drawn into public life. Appointed by Alfred E. Smith to head a commission investigating conditions in the garment industry, he had been successful in averting a major strike: as adjudicator, his integrity and capability won
the confidence of both sides. Democratic party leadership was swift to recognize Lehman's potential as a force for influencing voters. In 1928 Smith became a candidate for the presidency, and seeking means of increasing his support from New York, urged Roosevelt to run as Governor. The New York Democrats were in a weak position and faced with a strong Republican nominee. F.D.R. evinced a natural reluctance for the combat. Further, he argued, in the unlikely event of his election, his condition—he was then convalescing—would make it impossible for him to carry the heavy responsibilities of the Governor's office. Thus the choice of his running mate, one who could be relied upon to bolster public support and to undertake part of the administrative burden, became a decisive factor. One man was completely qualified—Herbert Lehman. Smith lost the state and the election to Herbert Hoover, but, by a small margin, F.D.R. was elected, and Lehman with him as Lieutenant-Governor of New York. Lehman, justifying Roosevelt's confidence, proved himself an administrator of great competence and compassion. While he knew less of the ways of politics than most elected officials, Lehman drew upon his knowledge of finance, of management, and of human problems.

Lehman's wide business experience and his close association with labor and philanthropic groups, coupled with his prodigious energy and industry, made it possible for the Governor to delegate significant responsibilities to his lieutenant. For the first time the position became important in the administration of the state's affairs. Lehman executed his tasks with a precision and thoroughness that won him the confidence of the legislature. To the crippled Governor he was "my good right arm."

In 1930, both Roosevelt and Lehman were returned to office in a landslide: their record of constructive reform had worked for them. On the eve of his nomination, the New York Herald Tribune in an editorial warned the Republicans that if Lehman were named, only a man of the highest capacity could hope to defeat him. In 1928 Lehman had carried the state by 14,000. In 1930 he had a plurality of 565,000.

It followed logically in 1932, when Roosevelt became Democratic candidate for the presidency, that Herbert Lehman would succeed him as Governor. But even his supporters were astonished by his unheard-of election plurality of 849,000 votes.

The sequel of his political career in New York is history, but the achievement reads more like legend. Governor Lehman was reelected three times, serving the state as Governor for four successive terms. He remained the most successful vote-getter in New York history.

Lehman's political prospects were most favorable when he decided to
forsake political life and to dedicate himself to the task of rehabilitating the stricken people of Europe. He returned to the political scene on the completion of his mission for UNRRA, to be twice elected United States Senator from New York.

It was a time when the country lay under the shadow of the forces of reaction. The doctrines of McCarthyism dominated the capitol and had succeeded in poisoning the minds of a large segment of the public. When valor gave way to discretion, and liberals of weaker fiber fled the scene, Lehman remained uncowed. Often his was the lone voice protesting the degradations inflicted on the human spirit. Time and time again in the Senate he waged an unequal battle. Despite the odds against him he would not give up. Nor could any question of political expediency cause him to slacken his vigilance. When adherence to principle imperiled his position, he was prepared to sacrifice the position, but not the principle.

His position on the McCarran-Walter Internal Security Act was heroic. The large body of the American public was eager to accept the bill, which they were persuaded was a powerful weapon to smash the Communist conspiracy. Lehman was one of the small band of senators who fought the bill as an invasion of civil liberties, and, of the seven voting against the bill, only he was running for reelection.

The bill came to a vote two weeks before the Democratic state convention at which Lehman would come up for nomination. Tremendous pressure was put on Lehman to vote for the bill: he was warned by party officials that a negative vote would destroy his hopes of renomination.

On the eve of the Senate vote Lehman said:

There are many citizens of my State and elsewhere who mistakenly understand—they have been so told—that the McCarran bill is an anti-communist bill. Because of this misunderstanding, some of my colleagues, whom I highly respect, will vote for the McCarran bill. The time will come when they will regret that. As for me, Mr. President, I will not compromise with my conscience. I will not betray the people of my State in order to cater to the mistaken impression which some of them hold. I shall try to clarify the issue and not to confuse it. I am going to vote against this tragic, this unfortunate, this ill-conceived legislation. My conscience will be easier, though I realize my political prospects may be more difficult. I will cast my vote to protect the liberties of our people.

Those were his words on that day in June 1950. A week later, in Syracuse, the convention unanimously, even proudly, nominated Herbert Lehman to run for reelection.
Lehman held to the same basic principles throughout the whole of his political career. Injustice in all forms was the enemy; prejudice by color or race invoked his special ire. He was a fighter. He could not be intimidated by the opposition nor silenced by considerations of political expediency. To the friends who strove to persuade him to pursue more cautious tactics, he replied with intensity:

I cannot stand above the battle. I identify myself with the victims of oppression and discrimination wherever they may be.

He worked incessantly to translate his ideals into action. Stories of Lehman's industry have become legend. As New York's Governor he had a working routine that lasted sixteen hours each day. In Washington his was the largest and most active working team employed by any Senator, part of the cost being borne by Lehman himself. Through the tensions of his years at UNRRA, he drove himself without respite, sustaining physical hardships that would have crushed a man of fewer years, less stalwart in spirit.

**ELDER STATESMAN**

His "retirement," achieved only when he declined to run for reelection, was the signal for Lehman to turn with renewed enthusiasm to other numerous areas of community and civic life. Education, civil rights, party reform—these are but a few of the many causes to which he gave vigorous leadership during those latter years.

He was in his eighties when he won one of the greatest political triumphs of his career; the defeat of the old hierarchy that had long dominated the Democratic party in New York. Leading the struggle to reconstitute the party on truly democratic lines, Lehman himself worked tirelessly. The young men who worked with him during that broiling summer of 1961 recall with awe the gallant campaigner who canvassed without respite, day after day, addressing rallies and meetings throughout the city. To his influence and inspiration is largely due the victory of the reform forces.

The Rabbis tell us that the wisdom of the righteous increases with the harvest of their years. So it was with Herbert Lehman. The years, instead of diminishing, deepened and intensified his qualities of mind and heart. His influence was at its zenith—crowned with honors, in the fullness of his powers, he was actually on the point of departing for a conference with the President—when, on December 5, 1963, in his eighty-sixth year, he died suddenly. His loss was felt not only by his constituency but by millions throughout the country and around the globe. Posthumously,
there was conferred upon him The Freedom Medal, the highest civilian award in the United States.

The veneration he inspired was dramatically demonstrated at his funeral. A simple ceremony had been planned in accordance with Lehman's life-long eschewal of pomp. Yet, so great was the spontaneous outburst of grief, that the scene was one rarely witnessed in New York.

No one present on that day will ever forget how New Yorkers, in hundreds of thousands, converged upon Temple Emanuel where the funeral was to be held. Halting traffic, the crowds lined the streets for long blocks across upper Fifth Avenue. Silent and stricken with sorrow, they stood there on that cold winter day, shoulder to shoulder, people of all classes and races and faiths, come together to mourn what each of them felt as a personal loss.

Memorable and infinitely moving was this concerted expression of grief. From his first entry into public life, a rare personal relationship had existed between the Governor and the people he represented. He had served New York in many capacities; always with the complete confidence of the electorate, who knew there was no more trustworthy custodian of the public weal. As long as he chose to run, New Yorkers returned him to office, each time with increased majority.

In his latter years, as the revered Elder Statesman, particularly after his retirement from the Senate set him free to devote more time to affairs on his home ground, it was touching to witness the demonstrations of affection he evoked from his fellow citizens. As the venerable white-haired figure was recognized, striding purposefully about New York, voices from the crowd would be heard in solicitous comment, "He looks strong," proudly; or, anxiously, "He doesn't look well today." Strangers would touch his sleeve as he passed. These were expressions of affection that came straight from the heart; it was affection for one who would fight with the same intensity for the rights of the little-known individual as for the great liberal causes.

His profound interest in people and in human problems had been one of the compelling factors that drew him into public life. His preference for the title of Governor over the more honorific Senator, he once explained with a smile, lay in the implicit personal relationship it represented. As Senator Paul Douglas observed:

Lehman is kindness personified—not only to mankind in the abstract, but to mankind in particular.

Countless are the instances of his personal kindness and thoughtfulness. The Children's Zoo in Central Park, that has become one of the
greatest delights of youngsters in this city, was a gift from the Governor and his wife, a token of their special attachment to children. It was one of a series of public spirited donations on the occasion of their fiftieth wedding anniversary in April 1960. The zoo is located close to the late Governor’s New York residence, and, when the Lehmans were in town, scarcely a day passed without a visit to the zoo and a kindly word and helping hand to the many juvenile visitors who surrounded the Governor and his wife.

**HIS MARK ON PUBLIC LIFE**

The Lehman saga is the story of a Jewish immigrant’s son who rose to become a great American statesman. Yet the student who pauses to examine the characteristics of this history is apt to be disconcerted by a number of paradoxical elements. Lehman’s rise to eminence was achieved in flat contradiction to the formula for political success prescribed by the rules.

Few public servants in our time have been so universally respected, admired and trusted as was Lehman. Throughout his political career he remained New York’s “most unbeatable candidate.”

However, qualities which are usually held to be vital to a politician’s advance, were lacking in Lehman. It was said of him that he “neither looked nor talked like a politician.” In appearance he was unimposing, in personality, non-flamboyant. He eschewed the usual publicity techniques, disdained tricks. Although there were occasions, as when his strongest emotions were aroused, when he could rise to heights of eloquence, he was not a rhetorician apt to sway crowds or dazzle with his wit: he spoke in earnest tones, of matters that meant much to him, and was oftentimes accused of monotony.

Lehman’s popularity demonstrates that the electorate, which frequently permits itself to be swayed by the aura of “glamour” or by persuasive oratory, is unerring in its judgment when the rare, dedicated spirit stumbles somehow onto the political arena.

The strength of Lehman’s appeal was rooted in his character—his qualities of conviction and courage. There was about the Governor an air of sincerity that immediately inspired trust. His honesty was quite patent for all to see. His conscience remained his sole guideline and he followed his principles without regard to partisanship, or pressures. Sensitive to criticism, he was prepared to suffer unpopularity rather than compromise on what he believed to be right.

At a seminar of the Institute of Talmudic Ethics at the Seminary,
Lehman was once asked how he handled the conflict to which a democ-
cratically-elected legislator was subject, in attempting to reconcile the
dictates of his own conscience with his obligations to represent the possi-
bly opposing views of his constituency. With a characteristic twinkle, he
told his questioner that he always followed his conscience, but that he
had observed that its dictates were in accord with the long-range interests
of the citizens of New York. If the electorate took a shorter-term view,
he suggested, they could always find another representative! His constit-
uents were apparently well satisfied; they continued to reelect him until
he withdrew his name as candidate.

He risked political repercussions on many occasions when his con-
science compelled him to take an unpopular stand. Frequently he was
under fire from his own party, especially from the forces of Tammany
who opposed him, knowing Lehman could not be bullied or "bought."

Nor was he afraid to stand up to the powerful figures of the day when
a moral issue was at stake. It was an act of great courage on his part, at
the time Roosevelt was planning to "pack" the Supreme Court, publicly
to denounce the scheme: it was an act which might well have resulted
in the complete severance of their relationship and the end of Lehman's
political aspirations.

In Washington, the courageous fight waged by Lehman against Mc-
Carty and McCarthyism remains one of the brightest episodes in a
shabby decade of American politics. Were it not for Lehman, posterity
might almost have been left to conclude that the spirit of freedom was
absent from the Senate during that era.

It was said of Herbert Lehman that he became a statesman without
ever passing through the intermediary stage of being a politician. He
never acquired the art or the taste for the political maneuvering, for the
"deals" that play such a large role in the operation of the legislature.
Lehman could not bring himself to compromise on a moral issue, nor to
accept a dubious course as an expedient. And, in consequence, he never
became a member of the Senate's power clique. His power was not of
this ephemeral kind.

Lehman's greatness is of the stuff that transcends politics—it is of the
fabric that molds the mind and the character of a nation. The moral
leadership exercised by this beloved figure has provided one of the great-
est sources of inspiration of our day. Many are the causes Herbert Leh-
man labored for, both Jewish and nonsectarian. His memory will be
recalled with affection and gratitude by the millions whom he served, at
home and abroad. The world has been greatly enriched by his presence.
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This essay is an effort to describe the communal aspects and institutional forms of Orthodox Judaism in the United States. For the most part, it ignores the doctrines, faith, and practices of Orthodox Jews, and barely touches upon synagogue life, which is the most meaningful expression of American Orthodoxy.

It is hoped that the reader will find here some appreciation of the vitality of American Orthodoxy. Earlier predictions of the demise of

I am indebted to many people who assisted me in making this essay possible. More than 40, active in a variety of Orthodox organizations, gave freely of their time for extended discussions and interviews and many lay leaders and rabbis throughout the United States responded to a mail questionnaire. A number of people read a draft of this paper. I would be remiss if I did not mention a few by name, at the same time exonerating them of any responsibility for errors of fact or for my own judgments and interpretations. The section on modern Orthodoxy was read by Rabbi Emanuel Rackman. The sections beginning with the sectarian Orthodox to the conclusion of the paper were read by Rabbi Nathan Bulman. Criticism and comments on the entire paper were forthcoming from Rabbi Aaron Lichtenstein, Dr. Marshall Sklare, and Victor Geller, without whose assistance the section on the number of Orthodox Jews could not have been written. To all of these, and to Mrs. Ruth Gould for her editorial assistance, I am deeply grateful.

In general, Hebrew has been transliterated according to the Israeli pronunciation, but Hebrew names of institutions are usually given as the institutions themselves give them. See p. 507 for abbreviations.
Orthodox Judaism in the United States have been premature, to say the least. Orthodoxy is on the upsurge. Its inner core is growing in numbers and financial strength. It is experiencing a greater sense of confidence and purpose, but its ultimate direction and form are still undetermined. An attempt is here made to pose the alternatives, at least for Orthodoxy's public posture.

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ORTHODOXY**

**Number of Orthodox Jews**

We propose to discuss Orthodoxy, as a differentiated movement among American Jews, in institutional terms. Hence we define Orthodox Jews as all Jews who are affiliated with nominally Orthodox synagogues. Alternate definitions would include Jews who view the *halakhah* or Jewish law as an obligatory standard for all Jews; or who behave as Orthodox Jews in ritual or halakhic terms, or who define themselves as Orthodox without regard to their behavior. There are definitional problems in the first two alternatives, although an estimate is given at a later point of the number of such observant Orthodox Jews. With respect to the number of Jews who consider themselves as Orthodox, no reliable estimates can be made because we have no quantitative study of Orthodoxy in New York City. Studies made in various communities outside New York indicate that as many as a third of the Jews who consider themselves as Orthodox are not affiliated with any congregation. On the other hand, these and other studies show that at least a third of Jews affiliated with Orthodox synagogues outside New York City consider themselves as something other than Orthodox (usually Conservative), whereas a far smaller proportion of members of Conservative synagogues consider themselves as Orthodox.

---


3 For example, Leonard Reissman, *Profile of a Community; A Sociological Study of the New Orleans Jewish Community* (New Orleans: Jewish Federation, 1958); Sidney Goldstein, *The Greater Providence Jewish Community; A Population Survey* (Providence: General Jewish Community, 1964); or the series of studies by Manheim Shapiro, under the sponsorship of the American Jewish Committee, of attitudes of Jews in Miami, Memphis, Baltimore, Kansas City, and White Plains.
When the present study was undertaken in 1964, there were no reliable estimates of the number of Jews affiliated with Orthodox synagogues in the United States. With the assistance of Victor Geller and other staff members of the Community Service Division of Yeshiva University, lists of all known Orthodox synagogues were compiled for the 40 communities outside Greater New York (New York City, Westchester, Nassau, and Suffolk counties) which have 10,000 or more Jews or three or more known Orthodox synagogues. A questionnaire was sent to an Orthodox community leader, generally a practicing rabbi, in each of these communities. It listed the known Orthodox synagogues and asked the respondent to estimate the number of adult male members in each. Respondents were asked to correct the lists by removing congregations that were not at least nominally Orthodox and adding any that had been omitted, including private minyanim (conventicles) unaffiliated with organized synagogues. Thirty-three replies were received. Figures for the other seven communities were taken from local community studies (Detroit) or estimated by a staff member of the Community Service Division on the basis of his synagogue contacts. Estimates for all other known Orthodox synagogues in the United States outside New York City and the 40 major Jewish communities were made by Victor Geller. This included estimates for New York suburbs.

Estimates for New York City were arrived at somewhat differently because of the large number of Orthodox synagogues (approximately 800), about many of which little is known. Large-congregation memberships were estimated by CSD staff members most familiar with each borough. Memberships of smaller congregations in New York City were estimated by applying an arbitrary multiplier, which varied from borough to borough and neighborhood to neighborhood. In the Bronx and Queens the multiplier was 30; on the Lower East Side of Manhattan it was 100; in Brooklyn, with most of the synagogues, and particularly the small ones, it was 80.

Thus there is an estimated total of 205,640 men affiliated with the 1,603 known Orthodox synagogues in the United States.

It should be clear then that the figures given in the table are only estimates and that the margin of error is surely quite high. The method employed to make the estimates would account for formal membership only;

---

The actual number of synagogues in New York City was derived from New York City's List of Tax-exempt Properties for 1962.

The figure of 1,103 Orthodox synagogues, presented in the 1964 Statistical Guide for New York City, is based on estimates by the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations and is not current.
TABLE 1. NUMBER OF KNOWN ORTHODOX SYNAGOGUES AND AFFILIATED MALE WORSHIPPERS IN THE UNITED STATES, BY STATE, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Synagogues</th>
<th>Male Worshippers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>100,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>86,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>12,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>45,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester, Nassau, Suffolk, and Rockland counties</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstate New York</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1. (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Synagogues</th>
<th>Male Worshippers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>204,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Excluding approximately 15 synagogues in downtown business districts which are used exclusively for saying kaddish and have no regular membership or Sabbath services, or the approximately 50 synagogues which respondents judged to lie between Orthodox and Conservative; but including yeshivot known to be places of worship.

b The number of regular worshippers far exceeds the number of members, but many of the worshippers are tourists in the Miami area who are presumably affiliated with synagogues in their home towns. However, the transient character of many residents probably means that membership figures for Florida are not a good criterion for estimating the strength of the local synagogues.

c Figures for Detroit were not available. The Michigan estimate of 4,212 includes 3,977 men belonging to Orthodox synagogues in Detroit, estimated on the basis of a 1956 sample survey in Albert J. Mayer, op. cit., and 235 in the rest of the state, estimated by CSD staff members. As the AJYB went to press, data became available for 1963: Albert J. Mayer, Social and Economic Characteristics of the Detroit Jewish Community: 1963 (Detroit: Jewish Welfare Federation, December 1964). They suggest that our estimate is probably too high.

d Based on estimates derived from the 1962 List of Tax-exempt Properties.

it does not include family members or others served by the synagogue, or people who worship there only on special occasions. If it did, the figure would be much higher.

The men referred to in the table may belong to more than one Orthodox synagogue, as indicated by two studies of dual memberships. Howard Polsky found that 91 per cent of Milwaukee Jews affiliated with Orthodox congregations belonged to only one such congregation and over eight per cent to two.6 This means that the actual number of affiliated Orthodox Jews was only about 95 per cent of what the membership rolls would seem to indicate. In Providence, R.I.7 the figure was 96 per cent. It can therefore be assumed that there is some duplication of members in the figures presented, but it does not appear to be substantial.

No effort was made to estimate the number of all Orthodox Jews by applying a multiplier to the total of men. Any multiplier would have to

7 Sidney Goldstein, op. cit.
take into account factors beyond the scope of this paper, including these:

1. The average size of Orthodox families compared with the average size of all Jewish families in the United States, currently estimated at 3.3 by the research department of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.

2. The age distribution of Orthodox Jews, compared with the total Jewish population.

3. The effect on fertility of the concentration of Orthodox Jews in central cities rather than suburbs.

4. The total effect of the halakhic proscription against most types of birth control, which has contributed to an average birth rate of six to seven children per Orthodox family in Williamsburg.\(^8\)

5. The greater propensity of people with children to affiliate with synagogues than single people or young married couples.

The (Reform) Union of American Hebrew Congregations uses a multiplier of 3.5 individuals per family as the first stage in arriving at their estimate of the number of Reform Jews; the (Conservative) United Synagogue of America uses 4.5. For institutional purposes, most organizations and movements no doubt need membership estimates, but since Orthodox data are insufficient for the purpose, the effort will not be made here.

**Social Characteristics**

To determine the social characteristics of the nominally Orthodox Jews, we must rely almost exclusively on data originating outside New York City. Studies of various Jewish communities have included questions on synagogue affiliation or self-identification of Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and unaffiliated or unidentifying Jews.\(^9\) Respondents have often been further classified by one or more such variables as age, income, education, and occupation.

All such studies have found the nominally Orthodox to be older, of more recent immigrant origin, of lower income and occupational status, and with more limited secular education than Conservative, Reform, or unaffiliated Jews. However, no published study traces the relationship of

---


social characteristics to denomination over time. Details from a study in progress are not yet available, but it appears that the income and the educational and occupational levels of the American Orthodox Jew are rising relatively to other Jews, and that Reform is reaching into lower-middle-income levels for the first time.

**EARLY ORTHODOX COMMUNITY**

The demographic data on the social characteristics of the nominally Orthodox support the popular notion of the development of Orthodox and Conservative Judaism in the United States. According to this notion, the masses of East and Central European Jews who came to the United States between 1870 and 1924 were overwhelmingly Orthodox. Under the impact of economic necessity and cultural challenge, they changed. Some abandoned religion completely, a few became Reform. Some, however, and many more of their descendants, adjusted their religious tradition to the mores of contemporary America and evolved a form of worship and ritual that eventually became known as Conservative Judaism. Of course, many remained Orthodox. But these were the aged, the poor, and the poorly-educated, who established their early synagogues in the downtown areas of most large American cities. As the Jewish population gained in social status and new generations migrated outward and abandoned Orthodox practices, they left behind a residue of socially static Orthodox.

There is reason to challenge this notion. Unquestionably, a large group of immigrants, who conformed superficially to many Orthodox norms, were viewed as Orthodox by their "uptown" coreligionists. But a second look affords some contrary impressions. That the new immigrants founded countless small synagogues almost immediately upon arrival was not in itself evidence of religiosity. If the function of the synagogue was primarily for worship there was no need for such multiplication whereas if the primary purpose of the synagogue was to meet the social and cultural needs of small groups originating in the same European community, the multiplication is more understandable. In fact, the activity within

---

10 A comparison of the social characteristics of Greater New York areas where new Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform synagogues were established, or existing facilities were expanded, is being prepared by the author for future publication in AJYB.

11 The popular literature is replete with such assertions. For a scholarly study that makes this point see Howard Polsky, *op. cit.* Polsky's material is drawn from Milwaukee.

12 I am indebted to my wife, Carol Liebman, for suggesting this line of inquiry.
these new synagogues raises serious questions about their religion. The synagogues were social forums and benevolent societies adapted to the requirements of poor, unacculturated people. The oft-cited absence of decorum during the services strongly suggests that even the act of worship was perhaps a social more than a religious function, although this may have been true in Eastern Europe as well.

If the immigrants were indeed religiously motivated, the practical exigencies of strict ritual requirements would demand a mikveh, the lustration bath, before a synagogue. (For a discussion of mikveh see p. 90.) There is at least anecdotal evidence that mikvaot were scarce and inaccessible outside New York City, and sometimes even within it.

Talmud Torah—the study of the Jewish tradition and particularly its holy texts—and the maintenance of educational facilities certainly take halakhic precedence over the establishment of synagogues. But the new immigrants conspicuously neglected Jewish education. A survey in New York in 1908 indicated that only 28 per cent of the Jewish children between the ages of six and sixteen received even the scantiest Jewish education.14 Until 1915 there were only two Jewish day schools in the whole country. The immigrants flocked instead to the public schools, to night classes, and to adult-education courses,15 not only for vocational purposes but for general cultural advancement. The dangers to Orthodoxy of secular education must have been evident from the outset, but only since World War II have strong voices within the Orthodox camp been raised against college education, the institutionalization of secular knowledge.

The Young Israel movement in its infancy was frequently castigated as being “too modern” and hence non-Orthodox. But attempted mergers between Young Israel and neighboring Orthodox synagogues often failed not because of Young Israel's modernity and questionable Orthodoxy, but rather because its requirement that all congregational officers be Sabbath observers could not be met by the older, more “traditional” synagogue.

The early East European immigrants came to the United States at a

---

13 There is a vast literature on this point as well. For one of the most pertinent and interesting series of essays in English see Charles S. Bernheimer, ed., The Russian Jew in the United States (Philadelphia, 1905).


15 Moses Rischin, op. cit., and every other study of the East European Jews in the United States.
time when traditional Judaism, even in Eastern Europe, had been thoroughly shaken by Enlightenment and secularism. Even for those Orthodox who idealized religious life in Eastern Europe, the revival of traditional Judaism did not begin until the 1920s, at the end of the great wave of immigration to the United States. In fact, Agudath Israel, which represented the most traditional element in Jewish life and whose membership rose to an estimated half million in Eastern Europe, sought and failed to establish an organization in the United States in 1922 although almost all the great rabbinical leaders of Eastern Europe supported it. (Significantly, the organization did succeed in establishing a youth organization.)

There was a paucity of distinguished rabbis and scholars among the immigrants. Although an estimated 50,000 Jews immigrated from 1881 to 1885, the leading East European congregation of the time in New York had only a part-time rabbi of meager scholarship. When 26 Orthodox congregations met to choose a joint leader for New York Jewry, no American rabbi was even considered, and in 1887 the secretary to Rabbi Isaac Elhanan Spektor, the outstanding rabbinic authority of Russia, referred to American rabbinical leaders as "improper men."

Those who emigrated first can be expected to have been the least traditional, whose piety was at most what Leo Baeck called Milieu-Frömigkeit. Willing as they were to take extended leave of family and home, they were no doubt less committed to tradition than their relatives and neighbors who came much later. When the Rabbi of Slutsk visited America and appeared at a public meeting of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations during the first wave of immigration, "he chastised the assemblage for having emigrated to this trefa [impure] land." Similarly,
would-be emigrants were warned to stay home and not endanger their Judaism by such renowned rabbinic authorities as the Hafetz Hayyim, Rabbi Israel Meir Hacohen.\textsuperscript{20} Immigrants, often unable to separate the essential from the unessential in Judaism, would surrender an element of custom such as a beard, and then feel free to compromise everything else. Parents, brought to America by children who prepared the way, first wept for their children's violations of ritual, then adjusted. And of the older men who did go to work, most succumbed to violations of the Sabbath.\textsuperscript{21}

The evidence suggests an absence of religious as distinct from ethnic commitment on the part of most nominally Orthodox immigrants to the United States. Thus, the rise of Conservative Judaism and secularism in American Jewish life did not entail a decision to opt out of traditional religion. It was, rather, a decision to substitute new social and cultural mores for the older ones, which had been intermingled with certain ritual manifestations.

Of course, this discussion does an injustice to those truly religious Jews who worked to build the early mikvaot and day schools and who sought the continuation of their authentic religious tradition in the United States. The significant fact, however, is that people of this sort represented a much smaller minority than has heretofore been imagined; and even of them or their descendants, many were attracted by the nascent Conservative movement, which they felt held greater promise for modern-day religiosity.

**UNCOMMITTED ORTHODOX**

Two groups of Orthodox Jews will be defined and considered in this section—the residual Orthodox and the non-observant Orthodox. The Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada (Agudat Ha-rabbanim) is treated together with the residual Orthodox only for clarity of presentation. The rabbis themselves obviously do not fall into this category.


Residual Orthodoxy

We shall designate as residually Orthodox those remnants of the East European immigrants who remained nominally Orthodox more out of cultural and social inertia than out of religious choice. In all likelihood they still constitute the bulk of nominally Orthodox Jews in the United States; they probably determine the social image of Orthodoxy and are doubtless responsible for the statistical picture which shows a skewed distribution on the high end of the age continuum and on the low end of the income and educational continuum. The residual Orthodox represent a dying generation. Until the Second World War their children, with few exceptions, abandoned Orthodoxy. Since 1940, however, an increasing number of these, having been afforded the opportunity for a day-school education or a certain measure of social status in modern Orthodox synagogues, have become committed and practising Orthodox Jews, or have retained at least nominal affiliation with Orthodoxy.

It would be misleading to conceptualize a communal structure for the residual Jew, whose major identification came through the local synagogue. To the extent that such a structure existed, however, it was headed by the shoo rov or chief rabbi of each community. This was particularly true outside New York City and Chicago. Cities like Newark, N.J., Boston, Mass., Philadelphia, Pa., Baltimore, Md., Cleveland and Cincinnati, O., Milwaukee, Wis., Springfield, Mass., Rock Island, Ill., and Detroit, Mich. each had one rabbi who towered over the Orthodox community; he supervised kosher slaughtering, baking, and the processing of other foods, and presided over the local Jewish court. These were Orthodox leaders par excellence. New York and Chicago never produced a shoo rov, although one effort in that direction was made when Rabbi Jacob Joseph was brought from Vilna in 1888 to serve as chief rabbi of New York. The failure to organize either of the two major Jewish cities around a single rabbinic personality could be attributed to their size, Jewish diversity, and the fact that the residual Jew was not communally oriented. Nevertheless, even in New York and Chicago there were a handful of rabbis whose names were known to Orthodox Jews and who together could make some claim to leadership in the Orthodox community. These, and the lesser rabbinic personalities who revolved about them, were organized in the Union of Orthodox Rabbis, which gradually lost its ascendancy as the position of communal rabbi declined. This decline mirrored the decline of the communal rabbi's constituency, the residual Orthodox, who at one time probably constituted the majority of all Jews in the United States.
Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada (Agudat Ha-rabbanim)

Agudat Ha-rabbanim is the oldest organization of Orthodox rabbis in the United States. Founded in 1902, it was led for many years by Rabbi Israel Rosenberg, a leading New York rabbi and a founder of Yeshiva University. Its prestige rested on the affiliation of the leading rabbis of most Jewish communities. Its members were instrumental in founding most early day schools in the United States. At the beginning of World War I they established the Central Relief Committee, which was eventually absorbed by JDC, and during the 1920s they sponsored the visit to the United States of leading European rabbinic authorities. Today, however, little remains of Agudat Ha-rabbanim's influence and prestige. Three factors contributed to its decline.

First, the role of the communal rabbi declined drastically as the Jew increasingly became congregationally rather than communally oriented. With Americanization and the growth of the YMHA, community centers, and Conservative, Reform, and finally even Orthodox synagogue centers (not to speak of country clubs and fraternal lodges), fewer and fewer Jews looked for an authoritative rabbinic figure to speak for the community. Most Jews looked for communal services that were essentially philanthropic rather than religious. An authoritative figure who could answer questions of religious law was no longer required, since such questions were now rarely asked.

The second factor accounting for the decline of the Agudat Ha-rabbanim stemmed from the nature of the Orthodox immigrants who began arriving in the late 1930s. If the communal rabbi received little support from the acculturated Jew, his position was not bolstered by the more aggressively Orthodox Jews who immigrated in the Nazi and postwar era from Poland, Hungary, and Germany. The new Orthodox immigrants did not relate to the existing network of American Jewish institutions and had little need and much distrust for Orthodox rabbis who served the function of Orthodoxy's representatives in the larger Jewish community.

Agudat Ha-rabbanim members were caught, in the midst of changing Jewish identification, between the less religious left and the more religious right, and they were unable to respond. The Yiddish-speaking, often bearded rabbi—a severe and inflexible figure—was a symbol of a past generation with which the secularized, Americanized Jew had little in common. To the new immigrant and the younger, more militant Orthodox Jew, on the other hand, that rabbi was too compromising. The rashe yeshivot, the Talmud scholars who headed the yeshivot, rose to promi-
nence in this period, when the younger, more committed, observant Jew noted that the communal rabbi's talmudical scholarship could not equal that of his rosh yeshivah.

The issue which most severely damaged the image of the Agudat Ha-rabbanim type of rabbi was kashrut supervision. Rightly or wrongly, an image persisted of the communal rabbi who, pressured by butchers, food processors, and slaughterers to ease kashrut requirements, and plagued by the indifference of Jewish consumers, lowered his standards of supervision. The Agudat Ha-rabbanim, unlike the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, took no organizational responsibility for the supervision of its members and affiliates. Nevertheless, there was a feeling of distrust within the new Orthodox community toward many of the organization's members and hence toward the organization itself.

A third factor contributing to the organization's decline was its policy regarding new members. Members were required to have the qualification of yadin yadin, or at least be on the road to it, and this qualification demanded study beyond that offered by most American yeshivot. The reason for this policy—whether it was to maintain high standards or to serve some other purpose—is of no interest here; its result was to close the organization's ranks to most American-trained rabbis. (One large category of exceptions were the graduates of the Yeshivah Rabbi Israel Meyer Hacohen in Queens, N.Y., whose ordination includes yadin yadin.) But it was the American-trained rabbis to whom the larger, more prosperous, modern Orthodox congregations were attracted. These rabbis joined the Rabbinical Council of America, raising the status and prestige of that organization at the expense of Agudat Ha-rabbanim.

Nevertheless, Agudat Ha-rabbanim was not without resources or energy in 1964. With over 600 members and an annual budget of $25,000, it led other Orthodox groups in such activities as the successful lobbying for enactment of the New York State Sabbath Closing Law in 1963 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 65). It also sponsored 'Ezrat Torah, an organization under the leadership of one of the great scholars and saintly souls of his time, Rabbi Elijah Henkin, which was concerned with welfare assistance to needy yeshivah students and Talmud scholars, particularly in Israel.

In 1960, in an obvious reaction to the changing power distribution within American Orthodoxy, Agudat Ha-rabbanim enlarged its three-member presidium to include the two most prestigious leaders of the yeshivah world, Rabbi Aaron Kotler, rosh yeshivah of the Beth Medrash Govoha in Lakewood, and Rabbi Moses Feinstein, rosh yeshivah of
Mesivta Tifereth Jerusalem and probably the leading active posek (halakhic authority) in Jewish life. After Rabbi Kotler's death in 1962 his position was filled by Rabbi Jacob Kamenetzky, rosh yeshivah of Torah Vodaath. Significantly, then, Agudat Ha-rabbanim has responded to only one challenge—the one from the right rather than the one from the left.

Nonobservant Orthodox

Having considered the residual Orthodox, we are ready to look at the second group of uncommitted Orthodox, the nonobservant.

Their number is difficult to estimate, but they surely represent a significant proportion of all nominally Orthodox Jews. They are the Jews who are affiliated with Orthodox synagogues but have no commitment to the halakhah or even to the rituals which the residual Orthodox practice. (Studies of Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Pa., and Providence, R.I., to cite a few examples, indicate that anywhere from 25 to 60 per cent of Orthodox Jews do not even purchase kosher meat regularly.) Their social characteristics, too, are distinctly different from those of the residual Orthodox. They are not necessarily the aged, poor, or newest immigrant groups, whose adherence to ritual is often only a result of their inability or unwillingness to acculturate. On the contrary, they represent perhaps the most affluent element of Orthodoxy. Of course, in social characteristics some of the nonobservant may also be residual.

There are a variety of reasons why the nonobservant Orthodox affiliate with Orthodox institutions. Sometimes they affiliate because Orthodoxy exercises a monopoly in a city or a section of it. A survey of Kansas City, Mo., by the American Jewish Committee in 1961 provided an illustration of this. In that city the Orthodox group was heavily weighted by members of a new synagogue in a suburb which had not yet acquired either a Conservative or Reform temple. As might be expected, a very high proportion of this synagogue's members did not consider themselves as Orthodox, and regularity of attendance was quite low. Only 40 per cent regarded themselves as Orthodox, 38 per cent as Conservative, 16 per cent as Reform, and 6 per cent as none of these. The social charac-

teristics of the sample surveyed, as indicated by place of residence and age, corresponded to those of the nonobservant Orthodox; that is, young age and high income. Only 53 per cent of the sample stated that they purchased kosher meat and only 47 per cent that they kept two sets of dishes. The Kansas City finding led Shapiro to conclude that

the choice of a particular branch of synagogue affiliation among American Jews today is rarely the product of a choice made on the basis of conscious analysis of theological or ideological philosophies. The decision is likely to be more closely related to such factors as geography, socio-economic positions and aspirations, distance from the immigrant generations, general impressions of the relative demands made by a particular branch of Judaism, relationships to parents and childhood experience, their own estimates of their own degree of commitment to what they assume Judaism to be, and many others.26

Another instance of Orthodox monopoly or near monopoly developed in New Orleans, where until 1960 there was no Conservative synagogue and the social status as well as the religious pattern of the existing Reform temples made them forbidding to many Jews.

Sometimes nonobservers are attracted to Orthodoxy by its outstanding rabbis. Some are attracted to the several Orthodox synagogues, such as Shearith Israel in New York, with distinguished historical traditions and high social status. Some join because membership fees are often lower than those of competing synagogues. Finally, there is the completely marginal Jew, who is almost indifferent about synagogue affiliation but, having been raised in an Orthodox environment, finds nostalgic satisfaction in attendance at familiar Rosh Ha-shanah and Yom Kippur services. To him, as to his coreligionist at the other end of the spectrum, Orthodoxy is "more religious" than Conservatism or Reform.

Elsewhere27 I have indicated that there are three other forces operating today in favor of the Orthodox synagogue to counteract the more obvious anti-Orthodox trends. In fact, one can almost posit that as Conservative and Reform synagogues gain new members at the expense of Orthodoxy, countervailing forces are set in motion to restore the balance partially. These forces are religious status, small size, and community of interest.

Religious status favors Orthodoxy in an era in which religion has gained not only respectability but even intellectual recognition and some scientific assent. In a period in which affirmation of supernaturalism is no

26 Ibid., p. 8.
longer a cause for embarrassment, and where one prevailing mood among the intellectual avant-garde is to stress individual and personal religious experience of a non-rational nature, Orthodoxy finds a receptive ear. It is a time when a Reform rabbi, writing with a tinge of envy and much sympathy about ultra-religious hasidic groups, barely conceals his disdain for his own congregants. In this atmosphere a Jew, particularly if he is middle-class, gains a certain status among Jewishly alert groups through affiliation with an Orthodox congregation. This status is inversely related to the degree to which the Orthodox congregation modernizes its service, grows in membership, and emulates the Conservative and Reform synagogues in the variety of non-sacred activities offered to the membership.

The large size of the Conservative and Reform synagogues propels some Jews to seek alternatives. The physical plant itself, no matter how artfully constructed, which is intended to seat a thousand or more worshippers, to educate hundreds of children, and to provide social and recreational activities for an entire neighborhood, may be inspiring and attractive to most people, but it will be forbidding to at least a few.

Finally, the lack of warmth and the anonymity of the large Reform and Conservative congregations suffer by contrast with the intimate feeling of community promoted by small Orthodox synagogues, independently of belief or disbelief in credal Orthodoxy.

There is one crucial difference between the residual Orthodox and nonobservant Orthodox which gives a clue to the future. The children of today's nonobservant Orthodox are far more likely to be drawn into the network of intensive and superior Talmud Torahs and all-day schools than were the children of the older residual Orthodox, who were raised when there was little opportunity for intensive Jewish education. In the older generation, the residual Orthodox were Jewishly better-educated than the nonobservant, but the reverse is true of their children.

**COMMITTED ORTHODOX**

It is not possible accurately to determine the number of committed Orthodox—that is Jews who strive to conduct their lives within the framework of the halakhah. Traditional Sabbath observance is a crude measure of committed Orthodoxy, and an educated guess puts the figure of Sabbath observers at 200,000, or approximately four per cent of American Jewry.^{28}

---

^{28} These estimates were made by staff members of CSD, based on figures supplied by Torah Umesorah.
Since the rest of this essay will deal with the committed Orthodox, and since even the residual and nonobservant Orthodox increasingly take their cues from that group and affiliate with their synagogues and other institutions, the word Orthodox will hereafter refer to the committed Orthodox, unless otherwise stated.

Most of the committed Orthodox are in the Greater New York area. Either by affinity or necessity they tend to be geographically clustered. The Orthodox Jew requires a variety of institutions, in addition to a synagogue, which a handful of individuals alone cannot support. He needs a mikveh, a reliable kosher butcher, and preferably a Sabbath-observing baker. A day school for his children, certainly at an elementary-school level and increasingly at a high-school level, is highly desirable if not essential.

Centers of Orthodoxy in New York are Washington Heights and the lower East Side in Manhattan; Boro Park, Crown Heights, Bensonhurst, and portions of Flatbush in Brooklyn; Far Rockaway and Kew Gardens-Forest Hills in Queens, and Spring Valley-Monsey in Rockland County. However, in none of these areas do all the Orthodox Jews constitute one community in a structural or even social sense.

The Monsey area might serve as an example. Monsey is approximately 35 miles from the heart of New York City. Most of its Orthodox residents—all of them committed—have moved there since 1956. On the whole, they are of similar income and almost all of them have had an intensive Jewish education. Within Monsey proper there are nine Orthodox synagogues serving roughly 850 regular adult male Sabbath-attending worshippers and their families.

There are two large elementary day schools, with about 300 students each, which serve the neighboring community of Spring Valley as well. One day school conducts its Jewish studies in Hebrew, the other in Yiddish. A third day school, under a hasidic rabbi, provides an old-world type of education for about 50 boys. In addition there are a few hasidic rabbis who train a handful of pupils on a private basis in their homes, providing a minimum of secular education. To complete the elementary educational picture there are a number of Talmud Torahs attached to Orthodox synagogues which serve primarily the non-Orthodox community, since the synagogue members themselves send their children to the day schools. A Yiddish-speaking high school for boys in Monsey proper was joined by a second, which moved to the vicinity in 1964; there is also a tradition-oriented Beth Jacob high school for girls. None of these educational facilities is used by the 60 to 70 families of hasidic followers of
the Skverer Rebbe, who live in the neighboring community of New Square and sponsor an educational, social, and religious network of their own. Finally, there is the Beth Medrosh Elyon, a kolel (school for very advanced talmudic study, usually beyond what is required for ordination) with about 160 men, which serves a national constituency but receives strong local financial support.

The only local facilities in which almost all Orthodox Jews of Monsey are involved is a hevra kaddisha (burial society), the local mikveh, and the two local Sabbath-observing bakeries. Few communal activities involve all synagogue members or even leaders. Most of the members of one group of synagogues, predominantly American-born, college-educated, prosperous businessmen and professionals (prices of homes from $18,000 to $50,000), enroll their children in the Hebrew-speaking elementary school and then in New York City high schools, especially Yeshiva University high school. Members of a second group of synagogues, composed of a much higher percentage of foreign-born, with less secular education and of somewhat lower economic status, support the Yiddish-speaking elementary day schools and the local religious high schools. Some of these same people, however, also support the local hasidic day school, which deemphasizes secular education. Finally there is a German synagogue, many of whose members are oriented toward (the German) Adath Jeshurun of Washington Heights in New York City, and who transport their children to the day schools of that synagogue. Except for the relative absence of residual and nonobservant Orthodox and the high concentration of committed Orthodox (estimated at 30 to 35 per cent of the total Jewish community), the constellation of institutions in Monsey is similar to what it is in other Orthodox communities. The non-Orthodox of Monsey are either unaffiliated or are associated with the Conservative or Reform congregations in Spring Valley.

Orthodoxy in the Jewish Religious Spectrum

Before discussing the divisions within the Orthodox camp, it will be well to understand the nature of Orthodoxy within the totality of Jewish life.

Orthodoxy perceives itself as the only legitimate bearer of the Jewish tradition; to Orthodoxy this tradition is expressed almost exclusively in religious form (which is not to say that all elements of the tradition are necessarily religious in their essence). While Conservative and Reform see themselves as legitimate heirs to the Jewish tradition, neither claims to be its exclusive bearer. This distinction between Orthodoxy and the
other denominations has analytically separable consequences which only seem to operate at cross-purposes. Since neither the Reform nor the Conservative lays claim to exclusive doctrinal "truth," they are free to cooperate with one another, with Orthodoxy, and even with secular Jewish groups; they risk only institutional losses. The doctrines of Orthodoxy, on the other hand, are more precise and are by definition beyond compromise or even the appearance of compromise. Hence Orthodoxy must be constantly on guard against appearing to surrender or water down its doctrine.

But there is a second consequence that flows from Orthodoxy’s exclusive claim to the truth and its major tenet that it is the obligation of every Jew to observe the mitzwot (religious commandments). While Conservatives and Reformists are under no obligation to do anything about the matter, the Orthodox are doctrinally obligated to encourage the observance of Jewish law here and now. In addition, the doctrine of ahavat Yisrael (love of Israel), particularly as elaborated by the late Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook, chief rabbi of Palestine until his death in 1935, impels Orthodoxy to extend itself to the non-Orthodox. If non-Orthodox Jews were unorganized, the consequences of Orthodoxy’s doctrinal position would not be contradictory. It could simply undertake missions to the non-Orthodox. But when, in fact, about half of the non-Orthodox are organized in the Conservative and Reform movements, and the remainder are almost beyond reach of any religious group in Jewish life, then Orthodoxy is confronted with two mutually exclusive mandates—to promote faith and observance among non-Orthodox Jews, while giving no recognition and comfort to the only existing institutions which can reach those Jews. In practice, different groups within Orthodoxy have emphasized one mandate or the other, and most of the divisions within Orthodoxy, in practice, reflect this division. But the point to be stressed is that, with the possible exception of the Satmar hasidim (pp. 83–85), all Orthodox groups consider both mandates as binding. (The Satmar probably do, too, but feel that the obligation to promote observance is simply impractical in this day among all but a handful of Jews and that there own piety is not so secure as to justify undertaking “missions” to other Jews.) Hence, no matter how zealous the right wing may be in its stress on religious continuity, maximal observance, and condemnation of the non-Orthodox, it hesitates to characterize the non-Orthodox as beyond hope of redemption. And no matter how outgoing and conciliatory the left wing may be toward the nonobservant and the institutions of the non-
Orthodox, it is always restrained by its acceptance of the basic doctrinal principles as being beyond compromise.

Orthodoxy and the Demands of Society

The differences within Orthodoxy are best understood in the broad framework of the sociology of religion. While the concepts here developed are not directly applicable to Judaism, they are suggestive of differences among Jewish groups and serve heuristic purposes.

Students of religion, drawing their data primarily from the development of Christianity, have developed a typology of religions based on distinctions between church and sect. Following Yinger’s refinement of Troeltsch,28a church and sect are defined as ideal types, that is, end points on a continuum along which religious groups can be placed and compared with one another as they approach one end or the other.

The central problems to which the church-sect dichotomy is addressed are how a religious body confronts the secular world and how it provides a religious response to the personal needs of its adherents. The church “recognizes the strength of the secular world and rather than either deserting the attempt to influence it or losing its position by contradicting the secular powers directly, accepts the main elements in the social structure as proximate goods.” The major function of the church is its effort to insure social cohesion and order and to do so it must extend its ministry to everyone. As a result it must be willing to “compromise with the wide ranges of behavior that may be found in a society.” 29

The sect is a smaller group, arising from the inability of the church to meet some members’ needs by virtue of its very flexibility and adaptability. The sect “repudiates the compromises of the church, preferring isolation to compromise.” 30 Hence, unlike the church, it is hostile or indifferent to the secular order. It seeks primarily to satisfy individual religious needs rather than societal ones.

It is apparent that the church-sect dichotomy is not applicable in this form to Judaism today. The typology assumes a closed society in which the religious order is confronted only by the secular order and the individual needs of its members. When Judaism represented a basically closed society, before Emancipation, the dichotomy appears to have been more applicable. Where the definition of church or sect says “society,” we can

29 Ibid., p. 144.
30 Ibid., p. 146.
read “Judaism” or “Jews.” Thus, the early development of hasidism appears to fit the definition of sectarian growth and development.

But religious groups within Judaism today are confronted with problems of the larger Jewish society—what we may call the secular (or non-religious) institutionalized Jewish order—as well as of the non-Jewish society, and the problems of the religious denomination are not only to adapt to Jewish society and insure social cohesion and order within Judaism, but also to adapt to general society and insure cohesion and order within it. Furthermore, Judaism must meet not only the individual needs of members as they arise by virtue of Jewishness, but also those that arise by virtue of membership in the general society. An effort to solve one kind of problem frequently exacerbates another. To sum up—the Christian denomination plays a double role: vis-à-vis the social order or general society, and vis-à-vis the individual needs of its membership. To the extent that the Christian denomination stresses the solution to one order of problems it raises questions for the other. Judaism faces not two but four problems. It must meet the needs or demands of the broader society and of the narrower, Jewish society. It must meet the needs that arise from an individual’s problems in the general society and those that arise from his problems in the Jewish society.

Let us be specific about the nature of these problems as they have emerged in the United States.

1. To meet the needs of the general society, it is necessary to affirm the democratic political structure and to develop a symbolism (transcendental or not) for its transmission; to affirm the unity of all Americans and the primacy of American national interests and needs.

2. To meet the needs of the Jewish society, it is necessary to achieve unity among Jews and to maintain Jewish identification in a permissive gentile society; to maintain defenses against prejudice and discrimination.

3. To meet the individual’s needs in the general society, it is necessary to confront the problems of good and evil, of reward and punishment, and of alienation and anomie in an urban, heterogeneous society.

4. To meet the individual’s needs in Jewish society, it is necessary to interpret traditional Jewish beliefs and practices in the light of the individual’s present needs and problems.

Bearing in mind these four types of demands or needs, we can classify all Jewish organizations by the problem or combination of problems to which they have addressed themselves. Each of these classifications can, in turn, be refined according to the manner in which the problem is approached. Within any given organization there is bound to be some con-
conflict or tension over which problem should assume priority. A general theory of Jewish organizational life would have to take account of the manner in which social status, education, accommodation to the American milieu, and other such factors cut across the leadership and constituent groups of each organization, determining the perspective in which problems are viewed and solutions chosen.

Our concern here is with Orthodoxy, but first we must look briefly into the Conservative and Reform groups, which today come closer than Orthodoxy to assuming the characteristics of church rather than sect. By and large, Conservatism and Reform address themselves to problems arising from societal demands. The application is made at an individual level and to individual problems, but the context out of which the problem emerges is generally societal—social cohesion and moral order—rather than individual. Until recently, Reform was more oriented towards general societal problems and Conservatism toward those of Jewish society. This is changing somewhat as Conservatism becomes more self-conscious about its role as a church and Reform, with a longer church experience, becomes more aware of the limitations of a church in reaching its membership directly.

For an illustration of the growing emphasis on a societal-church role for Conservative Judaism, the 1962 proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly are useful. Its convention that year was devoted to the day-school movement, and the speakers stressed the reasons for developing Conservative as distinct from Orthodox day schools. One rabbi complained about the Orthodox day schools:

In many, if not most instances, school holidays in the Yeshivot are set without any consideration for the dates of public school holidays so that Yeshiva students cannot possibly meet with or join in activities with friends who attend other schools.\(^{31}\)

A Conservative educator called for mobilizing the Jewish community in behalf of day schools by stressing 11 points, most of which emphasized the compatibility of day schools with America, democracy, and even the public-school system.\(^{32}\) Another rabbi, asking, “What should be distinctive about our Conservative day schools?”, answered:

First, I would say, is the principle of motivation. Our motivation is not isolationism, but preparation for Jewish living in the context of general life, in America, or anywhere else in the world. . . . Not only the civic

---

\(^{31}\) Rabbinical Assembly of America, *Proceedings*, 1962, p. 44.

\(^{32}\) Ibid., pp. 54–56.
and political positions of Jews, but our understanding of the true nature of Judaism demands that we regard isolation from the general community and world culture as a goal devoutly to be shunned.\(^{33}\)

A third rabbi commented:

The road to further progress in this area of our educational work is still strewn with obstacles, both major and minor. Many of the laymen have yet to be convinced that a Conservative Day School is not parochial, and does not deprive its pupils of a full experience in the American milieu. Some of our own colleagues are afraid lest an expanded Day School movement weaken our opposition to federal aid to education, and tempt us into the Orthodox camp altogether.\(^{34}\)

And finally this proud boast of a fourth rabbi:

To be specific, from the very start of our Hillel Day School in Detroit, we paid more attention to American sancta than they do in any public school. That may be too categorical a statement, but we know that Thanksgiving day is roundly ignored in the public school. We glorify it, because it is one of the sancta of American life which can be glorified very naturally. . . . We find that it is possible to instill the best of our American holidays and integrating them with Jewish values, and conversely taking Jewish holidays like Pesah and integrating them with American overtones. . . . There is a slight diminution of daily contact with non-Jewish children, but it can be made up for by a deliberately designed integrated program.\(^{35}\)

Papers delivered at the 1963 meeting of CCAR offered a striking contrast to those presented at this convention of Conservative rabbis. According to one observer, himself a Reform rabbi, it had been rumored that the 1963 convention would precipitate a theological revolution.\(^{36}\)

The papers were described as follows:

They focus on God where the old liberals concentrated on man. They are concerned with the authoritative claim traditional texts and traditional observance have on them. They take the concept of Halachah seriously and seek to determine what is law for them today. They do not hesitate to use religious terms which the liberals ignored or reinterpreted away, like revelation, sin, the fear of God. They, too, try to define them in a modern way but one which will not do violence to

\(^{33}\) Ibid., pp. 61–62.

\(^{34}\) Ibid., p. 78.

\(^{35}\) Ibid., p. 81.

their traditional Jewish intent. One might simply describe their position as seeking to take the Jewish religion with full personal seriousness but not literally.\footnote{Ibid., p. 480.}

Most pertinent to our argument is this comment by the pseudonymous author: "Reform rabbis are interested in theology today because they know that they have little else to offer the cultured, ethical man, and only a living relationship between God and Israel can justify the continued effort to remain Jewish."\footnote{Ibid., p. 485.} The point is that an intellectually significant element within Reform Judaism seeks a withdrawal from Reform's church-like, societally-oriented posture. No comparable development in Conservative Judaism is noticeable.

In contrast to Conservative and Reform Judaism, much of Orthodoxy's energy has been addressed to finding solutions within a halakhic framework for individual problems arising in contemporary life. Orthodoxy has been the least church-like of all Jewish religious groups. In part this stems from the absence (until recently) of any self-consciousness. Only recently has Orthodoxy begun to define itself as a particular movement in the United States and been brought into contact with the broader society by the accelerated acculturation of its adherents and its own institutional growth. This new confrontation has raised problems that formerly did not exist for Orthodoxy or were overlooked. Thus, Orthodox leaders have been much slower than other Jewish leaders to define their attitude toward problems of civil rights or labor.

Since 1960 much of this has changed. In 1964, speaking to a Young Israel meeting in New York, Rabbi Aaron Soloveichik, one of the leading talmudic authorities in Jewish life, delivered a major address on civil rights from a halakhic perspective. In that same year a joint conference of the Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, and the Social Action Committee of RCA heard a series of papers by young Orthodox rabbis on religion and labor. Such developments were a portent of serious stirrings within Orthodoxy.

Reform and Conservatism, however, still are more church-like than Orthodoxy, not only in their role in the general society but also in Jewish society. The ideologists of Conservatism resemble those of Orthodoxy in the nature of their formal commitment to halakhah and tradition. But the practical difficulties of reconciling a corpus of law having no effective sanctions with the proclivities of modern man has resulted in varying solutions. Conservatism has increasingly, albeit slowly and often grudg-
ingly, found its solution in the doctrine that the halakhah must be molded to suit modern man's material and intellectual needs. But its left wing has long argued that the potential for change is too severely limited by the necessity to fit all changes to Jewish law. The left wing has theretofore pressed its leadership to change the law by reliance on non-legal criteria (psychology, aggadah, etc.). Their success on this score has been limited, but they have accepted a procedure, introduced in 1948 upon the organization of the present Committee on Jewish Law and Standards, whereby unless the law committee of RA resolves a given division by issuing a unanimous opinion, Conservative rabbis are free to uphold any contending opinion. In fact, the Conservative rabbi is bound only by his own concept of Jewish propriety in advising his membership what they can or cannot do under Jewish law. The discretion thus allowed is more abstract than real, however, since Conservative rabbis are, in fact, rarely consulted on halakhic matters. Thus, Conservative Judaism has been able to meet the Jewish societal demands of its congregants without challenging individual conduct or behavior. As one JTS professor noted in private conversation, the RA deliberates and the laity decides. The rabbis debate whether it is permitted to ride to the synagogue on the Sabbath and the laymen ride. The outcome of the Rabbinical Assembly deliberations is either a foregone conclusion or irrelevant. Thus, the Conservative movement moves closer toward our definition of a church, as indeed it must if it is to achieve universality and bring the masses of Jews under its umbrella.

Orthodoxy faces a similar problem, and some of the divisions within its camp are best understood by analyzing the different positions of Orthodox leaders and institutions as they approach the church or sect ends of the continuum. The line between the left (or church) wing of Orthodoxy and the right wing of the Conservative movement is a very thin one. In fact, it is institutional loyalty far more than ideology which separates the two groups practically, though there are other, subtle distinctions, as well.

There are two alternative explanations for the differences among the Orthodox. The first argues that the two major categories of Orthodox—modern or church Orthodox and sectarian Orthodox—differ from one another in their degree of acculturation. It is true, as we shall show, that the sectarian Orthodox tend to be of lower income, poorer secular education, and more recent immigration than the modern Orthodox. (Sociologists of religion have noted that these tend to correlate with affinity to sect rather than church among Christians as well.) But the sectarians
can boast their share of outwardly acculturated adherents; the leaders of the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists, to be discussed below, are far more sectarian than modern in terms of their concerns and orientations. And, most significantly, acculturation must be viewed as a dependent rather than an independent variable. The large number of American-born advanced yeshivah students who attend college at night to minimize interference with their talmudic studies and value their secular education only for its vocational benefits have in a sense deliberately rejected acculturation because of their sectarian tendencies, rather than being sectarian because unacculturated.

A second explanation for the differences among the Orthodox distinguishes among them along a fundamentalism-liberalism scale. It argues that the sectarian Orthodox differ from the modern or church Orthodox by virtue of their beliefs concerning the Mosaic authorship of the Torah or the Sinaitic origin of the Oral Law. Although some modern Orthodox thinkers would consider Franz Rosenzweig's position, for example, as within the framework of Orthodox belief, questions of actual dogma have not yet been broached among Orthodox leaders. When they are, as seems likely, there will be explosive consequences. Unquestionably there are Orthodox intellectuals who would like to raise the question, but with few exceptions neither they nor the fundamentalists have yet articulated exactly what they mean by Mosaic authorship or Sinaitic origin of the Oral Law. It is fair to say that the entire belief structure of American

39 Rosenzweig accepted the notion of a biblical Redactor, but saw the task of compiling the Bible as the human presentation of divine revelation. Rosenzweig's oft-quoted statement is that for him the symbol "R" does not stand for Redactor but for Rabbenu (our rabbi, our master).

40 In one respect the argument that the written law (the Torah) and the oral law, which constitute the basis of halakhah, were given by God to Moses at Sinai requires no elaboration. It has always been an article of faith for the Orthodox Jew, and the meaning of the words and their historical referent seems simple enough. Biblical criticism has not challenged this belief; on the contrary, biblical criticism becomes meaningful only when this article of faith is denied. But it is this very article of faith in its plain meaning which has become "preposterous" to the modern mind. (This, of course, says nothing about the truth or falsity of the doctrine. A round world once also seemed preposterous.) That segment of American Orthodoxy which lives in the orbit of the rashe yeshivot does not find such a faith preposterous. It has no severe problem in reconciling its conception of God and human experience to its faith in the divine origin of Torah. That is not so for the more acculturated Orthodox Jew. The observer is perhaps forbidden to challenge a man's belief, but he is entitled to ask whether the secularly acculturated Jew truly believes in Torah min ha-shamayim (Torah from heaven) when the entire structure of behavior and belief of that Jew seems inconsistent with this one article of faith. Inevitably efforts will be made to reinterpret the meaning of Torah min ha-shamayim in an effort to resolve the inconsistency. A variety of strategies are pos-
Orthodoxy still finds verbal expression within the bounds of a rather narrow fundamentalism. Privately, the modern Orthodox admit that they simply interpret the same words to mean different things from what they mean to the sectarian Orthodox. They have sought to keep the subject outside the area of controversy, making no serious effort, for example, to engage in biblical criticism, and thereby ruling out the development of any outstanding Orthodox biblical scholars in the United States. Modern Orthodoxy pays lip service to the notion that something ought to be done in this area and that aspects of biblical criticism can be incorporated into the Orthodox tradition, but no one is prepared to undertake or even encourage the work. It is sometimes acknowledged that some abandon Orthodoxy because their intellectual predispositions cannot be reconciled with traditional patterns of belief. But such losses, qualitatively important, are quantitatively insignificant. The main body of Orthodoxy in the United States appears at present to be doctrinally untroubled.

Institutions and Currents

Using the church-sect dichotomy, then, let us turn to a discussion of specific institutions and currents within Orthodoxy. As we noted in the introduction, little attention is given to synagogue practice, although it is really in the synagogue that the full variety of Orthodox types become evident in their pure form. At one extreme are the shtibl-type synagogues. They meet in small rooms, where bearded men cover their heads with tallitim (prayer shawls) to pray, generally unheeded by the leader of the service, their bodies swaying. Women are separated from the men by a full-length wall in the rear, punctured by several peepholes through which a few can peer. At the other extreme are the modern edifices with spacious auditoriums. Here services are conducted by a cantor whose trained voice is carried to the ends of the hall by a microphone. Men and women are seated together, and the heart of the service is the rabbi's

---

41 The same is true of Conservative and Reform leaders among themselves with regard to the concept of revelation.

42 For an illustration of the variety of Orthodox synagogues in one suburban county see Jacob Sodden, The Impact of Suburbanization on the Synagogue (New York University, unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1962).
sermon. Although mixed seating and the use of a microphone on the Sabbath violate *halakhah*, the modern congregation considers itself as Orthodox and is in fact more likely to support many of the supracongregational institutions to be discussed below than the *shtibl*.

**MODERN ORTHODOX**

By modern Orthodox we mean those individuals and institutions among the committed Orthodox who tend toward the church end of the church-sector continuum. On the one hand, they seek to demonstrate the viability of the *halakhah* for contemporary life; on the other, they emphasize what they have in common with all other Jews rather than what separates them. Until recently they composed almost the entire upper-income, well-educated strata of the committed Orthodox. Many of the best-known Orthodox congregations in the United States, and most of the wealthy ones, are led by modern Orthodox rabbis.

Like the other groups within American Orthodoxy, the modern Orthodox have not produced any systematic statement of their ideology; in part, perhaps, because they shun the practical consequences of their philosophical or theological position, and in part because none has been sanctioned by eminent talmudic scholars, still acknowledged as the arbiters of ideology. To the extent, however, that the modern Orthodox have produced an ideologist, it is probably Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, although his position is not representative of all modern Orthodox Jews. He is certainly the favorite target of the Orthodox right wing, notwithstanding the private concession of at least some of its members that he has brought more people into the Orthodox fold than any other person. Rackman has published widely on *halakhah*, Jewish values, and contemporary life.\(^43\) His concern is with understanding the meaning of the halakhic injunctions in order to find contemporary applications. In the course of his efforts he has suggested what many feel to be a radical reinterpretation of the *halakhah*:

> The Halakhah is more than texts. It is life and experience. What made the Babylonian and not the Palestinian Talmud the great guide of Jewish life in the Diaspora was not a decree or a decision but *vox populi*.

---

From Maimonides it would appear that it was the acceptance of the people who by custom and popular will constituted the authority. Can a Halakhic scholar lose himself in texts exclusively when the texts themselves bid him to see what practice “has become widespread among Jews,” what is required socially “because of the precepts of peace,” what will “keep the world aright,” and many other social criteria? These standards are as much a part of the Torah as the texts themselves.\(^{44}\)

Rackman is also prominently associated with the idea that Orthodox Jews, both individually and institutionally, must cooperate with the non-Orthodox. He is outspoken in his conviction that Orthodox rabbis should be free to associate with such groups as the New York Board of Rabbis (composed of Reform and Conservative as well as Orthodox rabbis) and that Orthodox groups should remain affiliated with the umbrella organization for all religious groups, the Synagogue Council of America.

Before considering the groups within which modern Orthodoxy is dominant, some comment on the sources of authority and unity within the Jewish community will be made. We will seek to demonstrate why the drive for unity, even within the organizations controlled by modern Orthodoxy, has been blunted in recent years, and what the Orthodox basis for unity has become.

**Authority in the Jewish Community**

There are four possible bases of authority within the Jewish community today: numbers, money, tradition, and person or charisma.

Authority of numbers is rarely exercised directly. Although organizations and institutions make some claim to authority on the basis of their numerical superiority, issues have rarely been resolved on this basis. There have been a few exceptions, the most noteworthy being the American Jewish Conference and particularly its 1943 meeting in which the sympathy of the masses of American Jews for the Zionist program was reflected in the division of votes (AJYB, 1944–45 [Vol. 46], pp. 169–70). Today almost no Jewish organization lays claim to authority within the community by virtue of its size. In part this is because no organization has a generally accepted, trustworthy membership list. More significantly, it is because no mass organization in Jewish life can even pretend to be able to mobilize its membership behind one position or another.

The most potent claim for authority in Jewish life today is exercised by money. Perhaps this was always so, but until recently the claim was exer-

cised in alliance with religious tradition. Tradition’s loss of status has resulted in the dissolution of this alliance and today those who control the purse strings, alone, usually speak for the Jewish community and decide questions within it. Although the professionals and staff members of the various organizations generally initiate policy, their authority is often determined by their access to financial resources and particularly to the few big contributors. Orthodoxy cannot accept the authority of money because it contains neither a class of large contributors nor a group of professionals with access to large contributors. In this regard, the Conservative and Reform rabbinate are in a far better, though by no means ideal, position, as they confront the “secular” Jewish institutions. The potency of money in the rest of the community, therefore, has the effect of pressuring Orthodoxy to withdraw from the community. In other words, the rule of the game in the Jewish community is that “money talks the loudest.” Because Orthodoxy only loses by these rules, there is a constant pressure from within for it to leave the game unless the rules are changed. Of course, the concessions and compromises made by the Orthodox in order to play the game become unnecessary when they withdraw from it and they then move to a more intransigent right-wing position.

Orthodoxy claims the right to preserve the unity of the Jewish community by invoking the authority of tradition and charisma. With regard to the first, it claims communal support for its essentially parochial schools on the ground that these are traditional schools which simply teach Judaism as it has always been taught (in terms of content, of course, not method). This claim to legitimacy has been challenged recently, most particularly by the Conservatives. The foregoing is not meant to imply that numbers or money have only recently become sources of authority, or that tradition has lost all its force. It does mean that the weight of the different bases of authority has changed, and that Orthodoxy’s claim to its exclusive access to this authority has been challenged.

The fourth possible source of authority in the Jewish community is that of person, or charisma. Jews in the United States have never produced a charismatic leader for the entire community, although Louis Marshall, Judah Magnes, Stephen Wise, and Abba Hillel Silver came close to being such leaders.

The only group within Jewish life which lays claim to charismatic leaders today is the Orthodox. Preeminent among these for the modern Orthodox is Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik. RCA’s claim to leadership in the general Jewish community and its belief that it ought really to exercise this leadership rest almost entirely on the fact that Rabbi Soloveitchik is
its leader. RCA members consider it enormously significant that the non-Orthodox Jewish community has accorded his opinions an increasing respect. Rabbi Soloveitchik, acknowledged by most Orthodox Jews as one of the world's leading talmudic authorities, has become increasingly active in social and political life and is quite conscious of his role as a communal leader. As the descendant of the longest extant line of gedolim, rabbis who combined talmudic and communal authority, this could hardly be otherwise.\footnote{His father, Rabbi Moses Soloveitchik, was one of the great talmudic scholars in the United States in the last generation. His uncle, Reb Velvel Soloveitchik, was the gedol ha-dor (“the great man of his generation”) of the last generation in Palestine. His grandfather, Reb Hayyim of Brisk, the famous Brisker Rav, was the leading talmudic scholar of his time, and his great-grandfather, Rabbi Joseph Beer Soloveitchik, after whom he is named, was the rosh yeshivah of Volozhin, the greatest talmudic academy of its time. For a biographical sketch of Rabbi Soloveitchik and a popularization of some elements of his thought see his son-in-law’s article: Aaron Lichtenstein, “Joseph Soloveitchik,” in Simon Noveck, ed., Great Jewish Thinkers of the Twentieth Century. (Washington, 1963), pp. 281–97.}

On the other hand, the more right-wing yeshivah world (to be discussed below) rests its claim to authority on the leadership of the outstanding rashe yeshivot who claim the mantle of traditional as well as charismatic authority.

We turn now to those organizations in which modern Orthodoxy holds a dominant position, stressing that in none of these groups is that position exclusive.

**Rabbinical Council of America (RCA)**

The Rabbinical Council of America is the largest and most influential Orthodox rabbinical body in the United States. It has 830 members, all ordained by recognized rabbinic authorities. About 600 are in the active rabbinate, and most of the rest are teachers and school administrators. About half of the active rabbis were ordained at Yeshiva University’s Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (RIETS), and another 15 per cent at the Hebrew Theological College in Illinois. As noted below, both of these institutions represent a point of view different from that of other yeshivot in the United States which confer ordination. Another 20 to 25 per cent of the RCA membership come from these other American yeshivot, and the remaining few are from Europe.

A major controversy within RCA has centered on the question of its relationship with non-Orthodox rabbinical groups, particularly the affiliation of its members with the New York Board of Rabbis. In 1955, 11 rashe yeshivot, the most influential leaders of all the large academies for...
advanced talmudic study in the United States (except Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Theological College), issued an *issur* or prohibition against Orthodox rabbis joining organizations in which non-Orthodox rabbis were officially represented. Their position was phrased in halakhic terms as a *pesak din*, a juridical decision, but has been buttressed with the practical political argument that by officially recognizing the non-Orthodox rabbi as a rabbi, Orthodoxy accorded him a status to which he was not entitled under Jewish law and which cut the ground from under its own claim as the only legitimate bearer of the Torah tradition.

RCA referred the question to its own *halakhah* committee under the chairmanship of Rabbi Soloveitchik. At the end of 1964 the committee had not yet reported, and showed no disposition to do so as long as the *status quo* was maintained within the Jewish community.

Nevertheless, the political aspects of the question were raised on numerous occasions; in all instances the forces for separation in RCA, led by Rabbi David Hollander, were defeated, although there is a growing sympathy for the values which Hollander espouses. The opponents of separation have argued that by cooperating with the non-Orthodox they are able to restrain them from public violation of *halakhah* and are in a better position to help shape policy for the whole Jewish community. They pointed to Judaism's response to the Second Ecumenical Council (p. 128) as an example of how Orthodoxy, under the leadership of Rabbi Soloveitchik, was influential in maintaining a semblance of order among most Jewish leaders and groups on behalf of a policy which all Orthodox groups favored. Besides, they suspect that the vast majority of nominally Orthodox Jews do not see any sharp distinctions between Orthodoxy and other denominations, that a policy of separation would fail of general support, and that it would jeopardize the considerable support for Orthodox institutions that comes from non-Orthodox Jews.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, they feel that RCA members do not view themselves as living in a community apart from the rest of American Jews. The Orthodox rabbi, particularly outside New York City, lives among and serves a non-observant constituency. In addition, he himself is likely to be American-born, a product of the American culture, which places a premium on compromise, sanctifies majority rule, and decries dogmatism.

With an annual budget of $80,000 for expenditures in the United States in 1964 and a separate budget of $15,000 for its newly established *Beth Din*, RCA maintains a manifold program.\(^46\) It conducts welfare

\(^46\) All budget figures were given to the author or to CJFWF.
activities on behalf of its members, supports a variety of projects in Israel, and publishes the distinguished quarterly, Tradition, and a halakhic journal in Hebrew, Hadorom. Its house organ, the RCA Record, is probably the most candid organizational bulletin circulated among any American Jewish group. The Beth Din is concerned with family problems, offers counseling, and is engaged in developing extensive records on Jewish marriage and divorce. Its purpose is to render authoritative decisions in areas which are either halakhically or emotionally too complex for any one rabbi to handle.

RCA looks for spiritual and, more recently, political leadership to Rabbi Soloveitchik, known affectionately to his followers as the Rov (Sephardi: Rav). One can almost distinguish a Jew’s religious position by the manner in which he refers to Soloveitchik. The non-Orthodox are likely to call him Rabbi Soloveitchik; the RCA modern Orthodox call him the Rov; his own students, Rebbe; and the right wing, J.B., for the first two initials of his name.

RCA has moved to the right in recent years, though not as far to the right as its separatists would like. It has continued to concern itself with communal problems but has become increasingly outspoken and antagonistic toward other groups, both religious and secular, within Jewish life. This is a result of a number of factors. The younger rabbis, particularly those from Yeshiva University, are more right-wing today in both their practice and their communal outlook than their predecessors of a decade or more ago. Secondly, as the Orthodox community has grown in numbers and risen in income and status, the rabbi has attained greater personal security and confidence in the future of Orthodoxy and has become less compromising. Thirdly, the right wing within Orthodoxy has become more acculturated. This means that it is better able to communicate with the left wing and make an impact on it. Finally, RCA has reacted to the Conservative movement’s new aggressiveness.

The Conservatives have issued challenges in domains which the Orthodox believed were by tacit consent, at least, exclusively theirs. One such domain is the supervision of kashrut. A second is that of day schools. Conservative development of rival day schools, which the Orthodox may deplore but can hardly consider inherently objectionable, has been accompanied by increased expectation on the part of Conservative rabbis, often supported by local Jewish federations and welfare funds, of a stronger voice in the policy making of traditional Orthodox day schools. The Conservative movement, furthermore, exercises a powerful lever in the form of finances. Most Orthodox day schools outside Metropolitan
New York are dependent on federation support or contributions from large donors, many of whom are members of Conservative synagogues. Recently, the Orthodox have found that the price they must pay for the support of Conservative rabbis has gone up, at the same time that Conservatism's own increasingly militant posture has diminished its willingness to make concessions as readily as in the past.

RCA's move to the right has had the further effect of healing somewhat the breach between its modern Orthodox and sectarian elements on such questions as the development of halakhah, which is only indirectly related to the controversy over communal involvement. Rackman, as we have noted, is the leading advocate of radical halakhic development, but his viewpoint is almost totally isolated. Rackman elicits a sympathetic response from his colleagues when he demands that the rabbinic leaders grapple with contemporary problems and when he criticizes them for their "ivory tower" posture. But there is less sympathy with him on what the content of the response should be. As one observer put it, "The RCA rabbi doesn't want heterim [lenient rulings], he only wants a good explanation for a pesak [a ruling]."

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (UOJC)

Officially RCA is the rabbinical arm of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (UOJC), the major national congregational organization of Orthodox synagogues. UOJC is best known for its kashrut supervision, conducted in cooperation with RCA. Almost half of its nearly $750,000 budget is for this purpose. UOJC also provides administrative and program assistance to Orthodox congregations whether or not they are affiliated with it; provides assistance to Orthodox servicemen; publishes a popular bimonthly, Jewish Life; sponsors a women's division and the National Conference of Synagogue Youth, which publishes some outstanding material for young people; provides office space and at least nominal sponsorship for two other organizations, Yavneh and the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists (to be discussed below), and represents congregational Orthodoxy on the National Community Relations Advisory Council, the Synagogue Council of America, the National Jewish Welfare Board, and similar groups.

The forum for the controversy over Orthodox participation in non-Orthodox roof organizations has shifted in the last two years from RCA, where the separatists have been defeated, to UOJC. At its 1964 convention a resolution by the separatists was defeated, but on the ground that withdrawal would be unwarranted unless a roof organization for
all Orthodox groups was first established. Toward this end, Orthodox organizations like RCA, the Religious Zionists of America, the Rabbinical Alliance of America, and Agudath Israel were invited to submit position papers on their conditions for entering a unified Orthodox organization. Agudath Israel, whose position probably best reflects that of the sectarian Orthodox, stipulated two conditions for its participation: that all members of the proposed organization withdraw from anything more than ad hoc participation in non-Orthodox roof organizations, and that a council of Torah authorities, composed essentially of Agudath Israel leaders, be the arbiters of the new organization. It was unlikely that the modern Orthodox would meet either of these conditions.

For many years UOJC was led by a young, Americanized, modern Orthodox element without any real constituent base among the mass of Yiddish-speaking, immigrant synagogue members. In the past decade a closer relationship has developed between Orthodox synagogues and the parent synagogue body, and UOJC has grown considerably. This is because the synagogue leadership has become more acculturated; the UOJC leadership has moved to the right, away from modernism, and the success of Conservative and Reform parent congregational bodies, as well as of Young Israel, has shown the importance of a united Orthodox synagogue body. None the less, UOJC is still not as representative of Orthodox congregations as the United Synagogue is of Conservative, or UAHC of Reform, congregations.

UOJC refuses to reveal the number of its member congregations because, they say, their definition of membership is somewhat ambiguous. Congregations whose dues are in arrears are still considered as members. UOJC has at various times claimed to serve, without regard to affiliation, 3,100 Orthodox congregations, but according to our own estimates (p. 24) there are probably no more than 1,700 synagogues in the United States which even consider themselves as Orthodox. It also claims that as the spokesman for all Orthodoxy it speaks for the 3 million Jews who, they estimate, are affiliated with the 3,100 Orthodox congregations which, they say, exist in the United States and Canada. (According to one UOJC official, there are actually 4.2 million Orthodox Jews in the United States, since by his definition all Jews who are not Conservative, Reform, or atheist are Orthodox.)

UOJC congregations range from those with mixed seating to those which go beyond the letter of the law in observing halakhic standards. Individual members include Jews from all walks of life and with a variety of opinions. Conscious of its hybrid membership and anxious not to
offend any group within it, UOJC has avoided policy formulation in areas of controversy affecting internal Orthodox Jewish life and has turned much of its attention toward the broader Jewish society and the general society. Thus its resolution of 1962, repudiating its long-standing opposition to Federal aid to education, can be taken to mean that the consensus that once existed in opposition to Federal aid is no longer present.

The changing temper within the Orthodox community—the increased emphasis on halakhic observance—is reflected within UOJC. Thus, whereas status once accrued to the leaders and rabbis of congregations without mehitzot (barriers separating the men’s and women’s sections of synagogues), and a certain contempt was evident toward those “old-fashioned” congregations which still had mehitzot or even separate seating for men and women, the situation today is reversed. Since 1955, according to a spokesman for UOJC, some 30 synagogues which formerly had mixed seating have installed mehitzot, the first break in a trend which had been moving in the opposite direction since the 19th century.

Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists (AOJS)

Although affiliated with UOJC, the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists (AOJS), sponsors of the quarterly Intercom, does not belong under the rubric of modern Orthodox. It is far less oriented toward problems of Jewish society and hardly at all to problems of the general society. It is rather concerned with problems arising out of the individual Orthodox Jew’s role in the secular and scientific world. In 1964 it claimed approximately 500 members and 12 local chapters in the United States and Canada. The overwhelming majority of its members, according to its 1962 directory, are natural scientists with universities or large corporations, rather than social scientists, whom the organization has also been anxious to attract.

AOJS is preoccupied with the problem of secular education. It has never thought it appropriate to adopt a position on some of the moral issues confronting American society or American scientists as a result of the new technology and its uses, but hardly a national meeting passes in which some discussion, and usually a major address, is not devoted to the subject of the study of science or secular education in the light of the halakhah. It is as if the membership had to keep reassuring itself or others that their vocation is a proper one for Orthodox Jews.

Members of AOJS include some distinguished intellects, but the organization has exhibited little critical concern with the nature of Amer-
ican or Jewish life. In general, the natural sciences have attracted more Orthodox Jewish graduate students than the social sciences or humanities. This may be because they offer preparation for more lucrative and prestigious professions today, or because they raise fewer critical problems for Orthodox Jews. It is not difficult to dichotomize religious belief and scientific work, whereas the very assumptions of the social sciences are often thought to run counter to traditional Orthodox views. Whatever the reason, AOJS reflects the special concerns of the natural scientist and has failed to attract to its ranks the growing number of Orthodox Jews in the social sciences and the humanities who might be expected to adopt a broader and more critical approach to Jewish and general affairs.

Yavneh, National Religious Jewish Students’ Association

In contrast to AOJS, Yavneh, one of the two national Orthodox collegiate bodies, exhibits great intellectual ferment and general communal concern. Founded in 1960, Yavneh had close to a thousand paid members in over 40 chapters in American colleges and universities by 1964. The founders of Yavneh were largely Yeshiva High School graduates who were dissatisfied with the complacency and lack of intellectual excitement in the Jewish community generally, and Orthodoxy particularly. A generation earlier most of them would no doubt have abandoned Orthodoxy completely. In the 1960s they chose instead to create a subcommunity within the Orthodox world that affirms the Jewish tradition but is concerned with its application to contemporary social and political problems.

Yavneh’s founders were soon joined by a more conservative group of students who sought to move the organization along more traditional lines, both programmatically and organizationally; they favored, for example, abolishing mixed-swimming weekends. Yavneh chapters are usually dominated by one group or the other. All chapters, however, have attracted students from non-Orthodox homes who find in the high level of Yavneh’s programs an alternative to accepting the deficiencies of the Jewish and general communities. On many campuses Yavneh has come into conflict with local Hillel groups because of its unwillingness to accept the latitudinarian status quo.

Although Yavneh has a higher proportion of non-Orthodox members than AOJS—as high as 25 per cent, according to some members—it is by no means non-observant. Notwithstanding their eagerness to explore the ramifications of the halakhah, Yavneh members share a commitment to it. Of the many seminars and classes sponsored by the organization on campuses, at national meetings, and at its special study program in Israel,
Talmud study sessions are the most popular. Yavneh's attitude is that regardless of private individual practices, halakhah must continue to be the public standard at least. This halakhic commitment is interesting because it may portend a future direction for American Orthodoxy. Unlike left-wing Orthodoxy, it does not call for radical reinterpretation of halakhah. Unlike the right, it does not demand that every Jew live his life in accordance with the halakhic prescriptions of the rabbinical authorities. Rather, it calls for an understanding of what the halakhah is and then a decision by the individual. In many respects this is a revolutionary outlook for an Orthodox organization, Rosenzweigian in its implication that the ultimate criterion for an individual's observance is his own judgment.

Besides its halakhic commitment, there is almost an obsession with pure intellectual activity in Yavneh. Thus, when one chapter found that many of the youth attracted to its Saturday-night discussion group came primarily for social purposes, it abolished the activity. At its 1964 national convention in New York a guest speaker, a prominent professor of philosophy and an Orthodox Jew, chose to lecture in untechnical language in the hope of making himself widely understood. An observer commented later that the speaker would have been better received had he spoken above the heads of most of the students present—they would have appreciated the compliment.

National Council of Young Israel

The Young Israel movement, with 95 synagogues and approximately 23,000 affiliated families, may be the largest single organization in American Orthodoxy. There are probably more families affiliated with the member synagogues of UOJC, but the relationship between UOJC's leadership and the members of its congregations is still so tenuous that it would be unreasonable to compare it with Young Israel, a large proportion of whose members identify closely with the movement and a few of whom are more intensely committed to the national movement than they are to their own synagogues. This is not to suggest that all or even most member families in the Young Israel are Orthodox in their personal behavior. But there is no question as to where the direction of the organization lies. In fact, only Sabbath observers are permitted to hold office in a Young Israel congregation, and synagogues remove their mehitzot only at the price of their charters.

Young Israel was formed in 1912 by a handful of Orthodox Americanized youth who felt themselves a part of American society, rejected
many of the folkways and practices of their parents, but wished to remain Orthodox. At first the movement was nurtured intellectually by some Jewish Theological Seminary faculty members, who saw in it a hope for American Orthodoxy. As Young Israel grew, however, it dissociated itself from the nascent Conservative movement, while the Seminary became more involved with it. By the 1920s Young Israel and the Seminary had drifted apart.

Until World War II, Young Israel was a lay movement, dominated by a lay leadership. It was led by native-born, middle-class, college-educated Orthodox Jews, who in their own rather disorganized fashion stood as a bridge between Orthodoxy and the rest of the Jewish community. With modern facilities, stress on decorum in worship, and an attractive social program, Young Israel brought thousands of Jewish young people into the synagogue, many of whom were encouraged to enroll in intensive study courses or to enter yeshivot. (Ironically, some of them emerged from the yeshivot only to condemn Young Israel for not being sufficiently Orthodox.)

As late as World War II, Young Israel was looked upon as the least observant Orthodox group. This misconception was partly due to ignorance. In part, however, it reflected an awareness of Young Israel's deviations from Orthodoxy. In developing an attractive social program, for example, Young Israel had closed its eyes to such activities as mixed dancing, which few rabbinic authorities would sanction. Its lay leadership, which was not yeshivah-trained, refused to defer to an Orthodox rabbinate who, they felt, lacked secular training, sophistication, and community status comparable to theirs. Being church-oriented, it tended to lay less stress on matters of individual observance and more on Orthodoxy's role in the Jewish community.

Young Israel was among the first Orthodox organizations to seek to raise the level and dignity of kashrut supervision, to work with the American chaplaincy, and to lend support to Zionism, youth, and collegiate work. Its semimonthly Young Israel Viewpoint was, until it ran into financial difficulty and some conflicts of personalities in 1964, one of the best English-language Jewish newspapers in the United States.

Since World War II the nature of the Young Israel movement has changed. In the first place, the lay leadership has been challenged by the Council of Young Israel Rabbis, the rabbinical organization of Young Israel congregational rabbis. Native-born and acculturated, with increased sophistication and, most importantly, time and information, the postwar rabbi was able to compete with the lay leader. The very growth of the
movement had created a need for greater professionalism. In addition, the expansion of membership brought a larger number of marginal affiliates, who recognized the rabbi, rather than the lay leader, as a legitimate spokesman for Jewish religious values. With increasing power at the congregational level, the rabbis were in a position to determine the effectiveness of the national program, and their cooperation became essential. As the locus of money shifted to the congregation, the layman, who viewed himself as part of a national movement seeking a national impact, was replaced by the rabbi, whose interests were more local, and status accrued to the rabbi of the largest, wealthiest, and most observant synagogue.

Another factor accounting for the changes in Young Israel has been the general move to the right within Orthodoxy—the intensification of demands for halakhic observance, which means, almost by definition, the ascendancy of the Orthodox rabbi as the halakhic authority of the congregation. This has particular significance in the case of the Young Israel rabbi, who is not typical of most Orthodox American rabbis, either European-trained or the products of Yeshiva University. The European rabbi is often disadvantaged by his lack of acculturation, and even when he fancies himself as a communal or chief rabbi, he is conscious of his utter dependence on lay approval. Yeshiva University graduates are not all of the same mold; but at least until recently they tended to be church-oriented, communally involved, and very much aware of the necessity for compromise. Rabbis ordained by other American yeshivot, like Torah Vodaath, Rabbi Chaim Berlin, and Rabbi Jacob Joseph, on the other hand, reject the Yeshiva University model. These Americanized, non-Yeshiva University graduates tend to be more aggressive and less compromising. About half of Young Israel’s congregational rabbis are just such men; only 43 per cent are from Yeshiva University. In the borough of Queens, in New York, for example, there are 56 nominally Orthodox synagogues with 75 or more members. Fifty-five per cent of these synagogues are served by Yeshiva University rabbis. By contrast, of the nine Young Israel synagogues in Queens, only three, or 33 per cent, have Yeshiva University rabbis.

The general move to the right was perhaps more pronounced in Young Israel than elsewhere because of the influence of Dr. Samson Weiss, who served as national director of that organization from 1945 to 1956, when he moved to UOJC. It is best illustrated by the changing emphasis in Young Israel programs. The current topic of debate is whether the movement should halt its expansion efforts and concentrate instead on raising
its level of education and observance. The movement has increasingly looked toward the rashe yeshivot of the right-wing yeshivot for leadership. Its national director, Rabbi Ephraim Sturm, addressing the 1963 convention, urged a united Orthodox front which would look to the gedole Torah, the heads of the various yeshivot, for direction, and be bound by their decisions not only on purely halakhic matters, but also on nonlegal matters. In recent years one synagogue has gone so far as to abolish the practice of calling to the Torah on Saturday mornings in its main sanctuary, those who do not observe the Sabbath.

Nevertheless, Young Israel has not lost its old character entirely. It still elicits a loyalty from its membership which transcends congregational attachment. Nor has the Council of Young Israel Rabbis been entirely successful in transforming many quasi-official practices. Contrary to the Council's official policy, for example, many congregations sponsor, at least unofficially, mixed dancing. Finally, changes within the adult group appear to have had little impact on the youth. The Intercollegiate Council of Young Adults, with about 1,000 members, has, in contrast to Yavneh, continued to be an essentially social organization, notwithstanding its joint efforts with Yavneh to sponsor kosher facilities on a few college campuses.

Religious Zionists of America (RZA)

The Religious Zionists of America came into being as the result of a merger in 1957 of the two Orthodox Zionist adult male groups in the United States—Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi. The women's organization of each group, as well as their respective youth groups, Mizrachi Hatzair and Bnei Akiva, have remained separate.

There are no reliable RZA membership figures. Figures of 30,000 and higher are quoted by official representatives, but other observers estimate the number at under 20,000. The organization's budget is in the neighborhood of $250,000, of which about $25,000 goes to the National Council for Torah Education (Wa'ad Ha-hinnukh Ha-torani).

RZA attracts an Orthodox Jew similar to the Young Israel members, and there is a large overlapping membership. Its most active officers and members are themselves rabbis but they play little role in the organization as rabbis. Spiritually, RZA looks to Rabbi Soloveitchik for leadership, and, as in the RCA, his influence has increased in recent years as he has become more outspoken on contemporary issues. A measure of his influence in RZA is that although many of its leaders were embar-
rassed by his criticisms in 1963 of the State of Israel on the missionary question, none publicly expressed his misgivings.

RZA gives political, social, and philanthropic support to Israel and to the Israeli National Religious party, with which it is affiliated. It also engages in Zionist activities in the United States and publishes a monthly magazine *Jewish Horizon* on contemporary topics, a Yiddish monthly *Mizrachi Weg*, and a Hebrew-language journal *Or Hamizrach*.

The National Council for Torah Education, which publishes two semi-annual journals, *Bitaon Chemed* in Hebrew and *Yeshiva Education* in English, is one of the two major national organizations involved in Orthodox education. The council organizes and serves day schools and Talmud Torahs. It provides a variety of educational services, assistance in teacher placement, and sponsorship of the National Association for Orthodox Education. Its stress is on Israel, Zionism, and the study of Hebrew, and it is identified with a positive approach toward secular education.

It is not clear how many day schools are actually affiliated with the National Council. It claims to have been instrumental in organizing 85, but credit is often difficult to establish. Certainly, not all of those 85 day schools are affiliated with the National Council, but the parent body does not confine its services to affiliated schools. Whatever the number of affiliates, they are fewer than those of Torah Umesorah, the other national educational agency to be discussed below.

*Yeshiva University*

The one institution most prominently identified with modern Orthodoxy is Yeshiva University. Indeed, the very growth of the university bespeaks the increasing concern of Orthodoxy with problems of the non-Orthodox community, both Jewish and non-Jewish. Beginning as the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary (REITS), Yeshiva University has developed or acquired 17 schools and divisions, including a new West Coast center in Los Angeles. This tremendous growth has occurred since 1940 under the leadership of its president, Samuel Belkin, who has remained singularly exempt from the public criticism directed against Yeshiva University by many in the Orthodox world. The university engages in a host of activities, including sponsorship of three Jewish periodicals and a semi-scholarly series of monographs in Judaica, "Studies in Torah Judaism." Among its other divisions are a Hebrew Teachers Institute for men and another for women, a liberal-arts college for men and one for women, graduate schools of education, social work, and science,
and a medical school. The relation of some of its divisions to Orthodoxy has, at best, become tenuous. Interestingly, however, the brunt of the right-wing Orthodox attack against the institution has not been against the secular divisions but rather against the college and the Jewish divisions associated with it.

Students at the all-male college (we are not discussing Stern College for Women) are required, in addition to their regular college program, to enroll in one of three Jewish study programs; RIETS, with almost exclusive stress on Talmud and preparation for entering the three-year semikhah (ordination) program upon completion of undergraduate studies; the Teachers Institute for Men, with heavy stress on Talmud but a varied curriculum of Bible, history, literature, etc., all taught in Hebrew, and a Jewish-studies program for students with little or no background in Jewish studies.

The last program has been the most dramatically successful. In 1964, in its ninth year, it admitted 100 freshmen (the men's college has a total of about 750 students). The program is adapted to the needs of the students, most of whom are from non-Orthodox homes. It is led by a group of sympathetic and dedicated teachers, who produce, at the end of four years, reasonably well-educated (certainly by American Jewish standards), observant, committed Jews. Some graduates continue their studies in Hebrew and Talmud, transferring to RIETS or going on for further study in Israel. Even the severest critics of Yeshiva University have acclaimed the remarkable success of this program and are inclined to concede that no other institution within Orthodoxy is equipped to do a comparable job. The program's impact on American communities is only beginning to be felt, but inevitably its graduates will assume positions of responsibility. (In contrast to the Jewish-studies program is the Lubavitcher movement, which has also achieved a measure of success in winning youth to Orthodoxy but finds that these converts are often unable to reintegrate themselves effectively in the community from which they came.)

Contrary to popular opinion in the Orthodox world, neither the college nor RIETS espouses any particular philosophy or point of view within the Orthodox spectrum of opinion. RIETS, in particular, is almost a microcosm of the committed Orthodox world and includes among its instructors some who are out of sympathy with secular education. Both the strength and weakness of the institution, no doubt, derive from this eclectic philosophic attitude. Within its walls the whole constellation of Orthodox ideologies contend. It is probably true, however, that were
Yeshiva University to impose a definite direction, it would have the most profound repercussions within the Orthodox world. There are close to 1,000 Yeshiva University rabbinic alumni; 33 rabbis were graduated in 1963, and 28 in 1964. In 1964, 373 graduates held pulpits in nominally Orthodox congregations, 95 were in Jewish education, 65 in Jewish communal work, and 69 on the university’s faculty and administrative staff. In addition, a large number of graduates of the Hebrew Teachers Institutes (for both men and women) served the Jewish community in educational and administrative positions.

As in RCA and RZA, the preeminent personality at Yeshiva University is Rabbi Soloveitchik, who teaches Talmud. At the university, however, his leadership in communal matters is not necessarily accepted by the other Talmud instructors, many of whom have also achieved eminence in the world of Talmud learning. Besides, President Belkin, a scholar in his own right, stands forth as an independent personality. Belkin, however, has been elevated above controversy in recent years and the students’ image of him is somewhat hazy.

In addition to its purely educational functions, the university plays a major role in the Jewish community through its Community Service Division. The division is responsible for rabbinic and teacher placement, conducts adult-education and extension courses, provides educational services to many Talmud Torahs and youth groups, sponsors seminars for teenagers throughout the United States, and has had a hand, together with the Rabbinic Alumni Association, in sponsoring Camp Morasha, a summer camp which opened in 1964, patterned on the Conservative Ramah camps but with an Orthodox orientation.

Powered by a large staff of experienced professionals, CSD has become increasingly important as a source of information and assistance for other Orthodox bodies. Its placement activities, in particular, have so strengthened the Rabbinic Alumni that rabbis from other Orthodox yeshivot have sought (and been granted) associate membership in that association.

Although CSD places rabbis in non-Orthodox congregations, it draws the line at those affiliated with either the Conservative or Reform movement. It also has a relatively new policy of not placing rabbis in congregations which have lowered their standards of Orthodoxy. This is subject to differing interpretations. Although CSD’s prominence made it the target of attack for alleged lack of Orthodox standards, few people contend that other yeshivot have higher standards for placing graduates. The point is made, however, that Yeshiva University, unlike other Or-
Orthodox institutions, operates from a position of prestige and financial strength, and therefore has no need to compromise. Of course, these are relative terms. With an annual operating budget of almost $30 million, a capital-fund budget of $65 million, and a deficit of $10 million, Yeshiva administrators are not always certain they can negotiate from a position of strength. CSD justifies placing rabbis in synagogues which do not conform to Orthodox standards not only as expedient but also as the only real means of bringing Jews back to Orthodoxy. It can also point to the fact that in the last few years its standards have become far more explicit and tighter than they ever were in the past, although they are still not satisfactory to a significant group of Orthodox leaders.

There are a number of people on the faculty and in the administration who are critical of Yeshiva University for other reasons. They complain about a certain intellectual complacency, an absence of thought and purpose. They feel that Yeshiva has failed not so much in providing religious standards as in providing intellectual standards. They contend that Yeshiva at times lacks a degree of Jewish and Orthodox self-respect—that there is evidence that Jewish studies and Jewish scholars are not accorded the support and distinction they deserve. The college, in particular, is criticized for not introducing courses with more specifically Jewish content; of having excessive pride in the number of its graduates who win awards, prizes, and fellowships to other graduate schools (the proportion is indeed phenomenally high), and of not taking sufficient interest in those who wish to specialize in Jewish scholarship. Nevertheless, this group of generally young and aggressive personnel remain loyal to the university as the single greatest hope for a resurgence of tradition and, indeed, the survival of American Judaism.

Hebrew Theological College (Jewish University of America)

The Hebrew Theological College, in Skokie, near Chicago, Ill., resembles Yeshiva University in many respects, although it is much smaller and its impact more regional. Established in 1921, it has ordained a total of 335 rabbis, of whom an estimated 185 are in the practicing rabbinate. However, its rabbinical program has declined in the last decade, and in 1963 only 8 rabbis were ordained and 11 teachers certified. The college has a secular division attached to it and is currently in the midst of a $5-million capital-expansion effort. Its 1964 budget was slightly over $500,000.
Sephardi Community

There are an estimated 25,000 Sephardim and 63 known Sephardi congregations—congregations which do not follow the Ashkenazi form of worship or are not of Ashkenazi descent—in the United States. They are largely of Spanish and Portuguese, Syrian, Greek, Egyptian, North African, and Yugoslav origin.

The Spanish and Portuguese, whose origin in the United States predates that of all other American Jews, are the most prestigious, and the leading Sephardi congregation is the famous Spanish and Portuguese Shearith Israel of New York. In 1963 the chief rabbi or Hakham of the Sephardi community of the British Commonwealth, Rabbi Solomon Gaon, was also made a rabbi of Shearith Israel, and given the responsibility for the school and authority in all matters of religious law.

Unlike the members of the large Spanish and Portuguese congregations, like Shearith Israel and Mikveh Israel of Philadelphia, Pa., those of most other Sephardi congregations are predominantly first-generation Americans. All Sephardi congregations appear to share a strong sub-ethnic commitment to their form of worship (which differs from one group of congregations to the other), and a relative neglect of private ritual observance. (Thus, even the lay leadership of the Sephardi congregations tend to be quite lax in their religious practice. However, this has in no way affected the intensity of their desire to retain the traditional Sephardi public ritual.) The Syrians, with eight congregations in the Bensonhurst section of Brooklyn, constitute one such self-sufficient community under the leadership of their chief rabbi, Jacob Kassin. Under the initiative of Shearith Israel and its present rabbi emeritus, David de Sola Pool, a Union of Sephardic Congregations was created in 1927, but with Rabbi Pool's retirement in 1956 the organization declined. The possibility of its revitalization rests on the development of more widespread acceptance of Rabbi Gaon as spiritual leader for all Sephardi congregations in the United States.

As a minority within the American Jewish community, the Sephardi congregations face the problems of cultural dilution. Without facilities to train their own rabbis, and more importantly their own hazzanim (leaders of the religious service), they face danger of extinction. In 1962 they turned to Yeshiva University, which initiated a program (financed by the Sephardi community) to train religious leaders for them. (Ner Israel in Baltimore and the Mirrer Yeshiva in Brooklyn have also attracted some Sephardi students.) The Yeshiva University program is under the official
direction of Rabbi Gaon. Its success depends to a large extent on its ability to recruit college-age students from within the Sephardi community.

Sectarians

Jewish sectarianism, unlike that of many Protestant groups, results not from the beliefs of the membership but mostly from a differing strategy as to the best way of maintaining the tradition. Thus, an organization such as Agudath Israel, which is essentially a sectarian group in the United States, was deeply involved in problems and activities of a Jewish and even a general political nature in Eastern Europe. In the United States, on the other hand, they have felt that communal participation with other Jewish groups would perforce involve a recognition of the legitimacy of non-Orthodox religious groups and institutions.

With few exceptions, the sectarian camp is of lower income, poorer education, and more recent immigration than the modern Orthodox.\textsuperscript{47} The world of sectarian Orthodoxy is preeminently a yeshivah world, and its leaders are the \textit{rashe yeshivot} and a few prominent hasidic rebbes. It is a mistake to think, as many even within Orthodoxy do, that the Orthodox world which has been created in this country is a replica of the European or even East European one. In fact, the \textit{rashe yeshivot} have achieved a degree of authority in this country unparalleled in Eastern Europe, in good part because there is no counterweight to this authority here in the \textit{shpot rov} or communal rabbi, as there was in Europe.

The years before and immediately after the Second World War brought to the United States an influx of Orthodox immigrants far more militant than those who had come earlier. They found in this country an Orthodox community largely composed of residual Orthodox and under the ostensibly leadership of communal rabbis who seemed to be in despair about

\textsuperscript{47} There is a vast literature on the relationship between religious sectarianism and social class indicating that among religious groups low social class correlates with sectarianism. The classic study is H. Richard Niebuhr, \textit{The Social Sources of Denominationalism} (New York, 1929; reprinted Hamden, Conn., 1954). See also: Liston Pope, \textit{Millhands and Preachers} (New Haven, 1942); Russell R. Dynes, \lq\lq Church-Sect Typology and Socio-Economic Status,\rq\rq \textit{American Sociological Review}, 1955, pp. 555-60; Donald O. Cowgill, \lq\lq The Ecology of Religious Preference in Wichita,\rq\rq \textit{Sociological Quarterly}, 1960, pp. 87-96; Nicholas J. Demerath, \lq\lq Social Stratification and Church Involvement: The Church-Sect Distinction Applied to Individual Participation,\rq\rq \textit{Review of Religious Research}, 1961, pp. 146-54, and Liston Pope, \lq\lq Religion and Class Structure,\rq\rq \textit{Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences}, 1948, pp. 84-91. Not all sects, however, are lower-class. Both Christian Science and the Oxford Movement were middle- and upper-class groups. See Yinger, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 146.
the future of Orthodoxy and convinced of the necessity for compromise. They found institutions such as kashrut in the hands of people whom they considered as unreliable or careless. They found a bare handful of day schools and a Yeshiva University or RCA ready to accommodate themselves to secular culture. They found almost no institutions with total commitment to the Torah life which had been their world.

They began by creating their own institutions or taking over the few existing ones which they found acceptable. The first step was the creation and expansion of yeshivot.

In 1941 Rabbi Aaron Kotler, rosh yeshivah of Kletzk in Polish Lithuania, famous as a Talmud scholar and Orthodox leader, arrived in the United States intending to spend a short time here and then move on to Palestine. A handful of Orthodox Jews persuaded him to stay in the United States to build Torah institutions. Reb Aharon, as he was known in the Orthodox world, assembled 20 students, mostly graduates of American yeshivot, many already ordained as rabbis, and established the Beth Medrash Govoha of America, in Lakewood, N.J., now also known as the Rabbi Aaron Kotler Institute for Advanced Learning (the first kolel in the United States). His choice of site was a deliberate attempt to isolate his students from American life and facilitate total concentration on the study of Talmud. Within a few years he was joined by some former students from Europe; by 1946 registration had risen to 100, and by 1964 to over 200.

Reb Aharon's conviction was that Torah could grow and be “experienced” in America only through lernen (“learning”—in the parlance of the Orthodox world, studying Talmud). According to one of Reb Aharon's former students, only “sharing the experience of the halakhic process could enable the Jew to understand the heartbeat of Judaism.” The student at Lakewood lived on a small subvention from the yeshivah and whatever other financial help he got from his family or wife. Students sat and learned for as long as they wished. When they felt ready to leave the yeshivah, they left. By 1964, 90 of its former students were teachers of Talmud, 21 were school administrators, and 42 were practicing rabbis.

Reb Aharon, himself, did not confine his activity to Lakewood. He engaged in a multitude of activities where his point of view gained recognition. He served as a rosh yeshivah in Israel, became the head of Chinuch Atzmai (Hinnukh 'Atzmai the independent, religious, Agudath Israel-oriented school system in Israel) upon its founding in 1952, leader of

48 For a biographical sketch see Alex J. Goldman, Giants of Faith; Great American Rabbis (New York, 1964), pp. 257–73.
Agudath Israel in 1952, and chairman of the rabbinical administrative board of Torah Umesorah, the National Society for Hebrew Day Schools in the United States, in 1945. Though (interestingly enough) a poor fund raiser in contrast to some other rashe yeshivot, Reb Aharon elicited tremendous passion and dedication from those who came in contact with him. He brooked no compromise, nor did he ever question or seem to doubt his own path. He was a preeminently charismatic leader.

The influence of Reb Aharon and like thinkers extended to the higher yeshivot in the United States, except for Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Theological College. Thus, older institutions like Yeshivah Torah Vodaath, with its own famous menahel (principal) Shragai Mendlowitz, or Yeshivah Rabbi Chaim Berlin under Rabbi Isaac Hutner, were caught up in the emphasis on lernen and separatism. In 1944 Rabbi Mendlowitz founded the Beth Medrosh Elyon in Monsey, N.Y., at first called Esh Dat ("Fire of Religion"), as a pilot institute for training Jewish educators to found and staff the day-school movement. Within a short period the original idea was abandoned and the institution was reorganized to make it similar to the one in Lakewood.

**Advanced Yeshivot**

At the heart of the sectarian Orthodox world are all the post-high-school yeshivot except Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Theological College. There are today approximately 4,000 men studying Talmud intensively at yeshivot on a post-high-school level. Of these, about 825 or 20 per cent were at Yeshiva University or the Hebrew Theological College. According to the latest available figures from the 31 higher yeshivot in the United States, more than 250 graduates were ordained annually (not all 31 yeshivot give ordination); about 15 per cent of ordinations were from Yeshiva University and the Hebrew Theological College. About 600 of all post-high-school students were older than 24; and many of them were married. Many were organized in kolelim, which permitted them to spend the entire day studying Talmud while receiving a subvention of about $50 a week from the yeshivah. Most of the students in the kolelim have already been ordained or have no intention of obtaining a rabbinical degree which, in fact, has a practical value only for purposes of becoming a practicing rabbi. (Many European rashe

---

49 Now known as Rabbi Mendlowitz, the former principal of Torah Vodaath used to refuse to use the title of Rav. His stress on the importance of Hebrew grammar and of pedagogy made him a unique figure in the yeshivah world.

50 Figures are either from interviews or as submitted to CJFWF. All figures were for 1963–64 or later. See the Appendix.
yeshivot never had semikhah, which is simply a certificate attesting one's competence to decide questions of Jewish law. A scholar of renown needed no such certificate.) The very process of learning Talmud is a raison d'être and way of life to these men, who eventually will become rashe yeshivot and teachers of Talmud.

Graduates of the sectarian yeshivot provide the major source of staff for the day-school movement. Many of these graduates, including those with ordination, avoid the rabbinate because they neither wish nor are able to serve predominantly non-observant Orthodox memberships. By choice and absence of alternative they enter the less prestigious and more poorly paid field of Jewish education. Students from Lakewood itself have established five institutions of intensive Jewish learning at the high-school level in different parts of the United States.

Yeshivah graduates who enter Jewish education frequently supplement their talmudic training at college evening sessions, and some even take graduate courses in education. But contrary to their hopes and expectations, many of them are unprepared for the world they enter. Outside the walls of the yeshivah they meet new problems of both a secular and Jewish nature. Furthermore, there is no organization that speaks in their idiom, capable of providing help and direction for them. They continue to regard lernen as the highest end, but have no direction in living life short of that end. Of course this is a problem for all yeshivah graduates, not only those who choose Jewish education as their vocation. As true sectarians, they reject the communal Orthodox institutions surrounding them; their only source of leadership and guidance remains their rosh yeshivah.

Some yeshivah graduates do, of course, enter the rabbinate. This is a most dangerous course for a sectarian, and each has to make his own compromise with the world. A small proportion serve Reform congregations; more serve Conservative congregations, usually the smaller, less successful ones, which pay the smaller salaries. Of the majority who serve Orthodox congregations some make their peace with modern Orthodoxy, join RCA, associate themselves with the Yeshiva University Rabbinic Alumni, and are indistinguishable from Yeshiva University graduates. A few have chosen to remain isolated from the larger camp of Orthodox rabbis and are organized in the Iggud Ha-rabbanim (Rabbinical Alliance of America), to be discussed below.

We can consider now the institutions of the yeshivah or sectarian world, bearing in mind that the most sectarian (exclusive of the hasidim) are the least organized and simply continue to revolve in the orbit of their
rashe yeshivot. We should also note that even the sectarian organizations' involvement in communal activity is not at all a reflection of the rank and file's interests or wishes.

K'hal Adath Jeshurun (Breuer Community)

Much of the preceding discussion does not apply to K'hal Adath Jeshurun. The Breuer community, in Washington Heights, named for its rabbinic leader, represents the continuation in the United States of the separatist Orthodox community in Frankfurt established in 1849 and led by Samson Raphael Hirsch after 1851. The establishment of Hirsch's separatist community is a fascinating story but not of direct concern here. The New York community, established in 1940, now has over 700 affiliated families and 1,300 adult members, mostly of German origin, and provides a day school, high school, and advanced classes in Talmud for its graduates, who, in the German tradition, are encouraged to attend college. The community sponsors a mikveh and provides rabbinical supervision for a host of butchers, bakers, and other food processors in the area. The leadership has maintained the strong anti-Zionism of the German period and is publicly identified with Agudath Israel.

Unlike the East Europeans, the German Orthodox separatists had already made a successful accommodation to western culture before emigrating to the new world; secular education was, indeed, a positive good in the Hirschian philosophy of Judaism. The leaders of the Breuer community might well have expected that, as the most acculturated and economically comfortable but also strictly observant and rigidly disciplined Orthodox institution in the United States, their point of view would sweep American Orthodoxy. Instead, although the community has been quite successful in establishing its own institutions, it has won few converts to its particular ideological position of both communal separatism and a positive acceptance of secular culture. On the contrary, it is on the defensive against the more parochial elements of Orthodoxy.

In part, of course, this is a result of its own decision. As a tiny minority in this country it was faced with the choice of identifying itself communally with Yeshiva University, its neighbor in Washington Heights, and the world of modern Orthodoxy, or with the European yeshivah world with which it had been aligned in Europe. It chose the latter. But in Europe, boundaries and distances separated the followers of Hirsch from the world of the Mirrer or Telshe yeshivot, where secular education was dis-

51 The best English-language account is Herman Schwab, History of Orthodox Jewry in Germany, trans. Irene R. Birnbaum (London, 1950).
couraged. Even so, there were signs just before the Nazi period that some of the best talent was attracted away from Germany by these and other Lithuanian-type yeshivot. In the United States this continues to be the problem. The Breuer community is forced to look outside its own ranks for educational staff, and some of its teachers and administrators have a negative attitude toward secular education. Its institutions are the envy of the Orthodox world, but its future as a doctrinal community is problematical. According to some observers, the Hirschian philosophy is repeated more by rote than understanding. Having lost the Hirschian faculty for Orthodox self-criticism, the Breuer community finds itself increasingly overwhelmed by the fervor of the yeshivah world, despite some inroads by modern Orthodoxy.

National Society for Hebrew Day Schools (Torah Umesorah)

Torah Umesorah is the largest national body serving Orthodox day schools. With an active affiliated membership of some 100 schools, the organization claims to serve all Orthodox day schools without regard to affiliation. Approximately 150 principals are associated with its National Conference of Yeshiva Principals and almost 100 local PTA's are affiliated with its National Association of Hebrew Day School Parent-Teachers Associations. Torah Umesorah's annual budget is over $150,000. It publishes Olomeinu, a children's magazine; The Jewish Parent; Hamenahel, a journal for principals, and various bulletins and newsletters.

Although Torah Umesorah is staffed by one of the most competent groups of professionals in the Orthodox world, it is, nevertheless, a small body, which must operate within a framework created by rashe yeshivot who are somewhat disengaged from contemporary problems, a lay group of officials who tend to be rather uncritical, and a corps of teachers many of whom are untrained. A rabbinical administrative board, composed almost entirely of rashe yeshivot; officially dictates Torah Umesorah policy. The board was formerly led by Rabbi Aaron Kotler; since 1962 Rabbi Jacob Kamenetzky of Torah Vodaath has been chairman.

An insight into the composition of the lay leadership of Torah Umesorah is made possible by an analysis of its annual awards. Of the 19 awards given to lay leaders in 1963, 18 went to Americans. Of these, nine lived in New York City, and nine outside the city. Of those from New York, seven were contributors to the Lakewood Yeshiva, and/or Chinuch Atzmai, and/or the Beth Jacob schools (a network of girls' schools with an Agudath Israel orientation). Only one award winner was a contributor to or participant in communally-oriented activities. Of the
nine award recipients outside New York, only one was a contributor to the Orthodox institutions indicated above, and eight were contributors to or participants in such communally-oriented activities as Zionist, Israeli, and UJA causes, local communal groups, and UOJC. Notwithstanding the distribution of awards between New York City and "out of town," control of the New York-centered organization is naturally in the hands of a New York or New York-oriented leadership.

In an attempt to raise the technical and ideological level of Hebrew educators, Torah Umesorah instituted teacher-training programs at Ner Israel in Baltimore in 1961 and at Torah Vodaath and Mesifta Tifereth Jerusalem in New York City in 1962 and 1964, respectively, and has cooperated with a training program of the Telshe yeshivah in Cleveland since 1964.

According to Torah Umesorah, there were in 1964 about 300 Orthodox day schools with 56,000 pupils in the United States and Canada. Some day schools had only a few grades, and a few only a kindergarten. According to data compiled by Alvin Schiff of the Jewish Education Committee of New York, there were 257 Orthodox day schools in the United States in 1963, of which 132 were in Greater New York (97 elementary schools and 35 high schools) and 125 outside (94 elementary schools and 31 high schools).\footnote{52} Figures given in this article are based upon Dr. Schiff's study, but in any case the number of day schools continues to grow. In 1935 there had been 16 day schools in New York and one in Baltimore; in 1944, 33 and 12, and in 1948 there were 56 and 55.

A number of New York City schools are in neighborhoods of declining Jewish population. This has constricted enrolment and created severe financial problems. In many day schools outside New York, too, the financial problem is critical. Often this is the consequence of inadequate community support. Sometimes the Orthodox financial base is too narrow to support the schools independently, and the wider Jewish community, as represented by federations and non-Orthodox rabbis, often demands too great a voice in school policy to make its support acceptable. The situation differs from one community to another. In many areas, as long as the secular department of the day school functions well, community support is forthcoming.\footnote{53} But where the Orthodox base of a com-

\footnote{52} I am indebted to Dr. Schiff for permission to see a draft of his forthcoming book, The Jewish Day School in the United States, to be published by the Jewish Education Committee of New York.

\footnote{53} This situation may change with the growing antagonism of Conservative leaders toward the ideology of the Orthodox day schools, but to date the Conservatives themselves have been handicapped by their own rabbis' unwillingness to
Community is quite small, day schools find difficulty in pursuing a policy of intensive Orthodoxy within the institutions’ walls while projecting the image of a broad Jewish communal institution deserving of non-Orthodox support from without. In addition, while the non-Orthodox parent may be indifferent to the ideological content of the day-school program, he is not indifferent to the general personality, characteristics, and attitudes of the day-school Hebrew teacher, who is himself often the product of an “other-worldly” environment and a yeshivah where secular education was downgraded.

Of course, not all Orthodox day schools are within the orbit of Torah Umesorah, nor are they all of the same type. There are 28 hasidic day schools . . . found mostly in the well populated areas of New York City—notably Williamsburg and Crown Heights and Boro Park to a lesser extent—now predominantly inhabited by followers of the leading Hassidic “Rebbeyim”. . . . The major emphasis in these schools is upon preserving the distinct philosophy and way of living of the Hassidic group to which the pupils belong. Personal piety, with the particular and unique manner of observance of the Hassidic sect, is stressed. . . . Attention to general studies is secondary. Generally, these are studied only until the end of the compulsory school age.54

Within New York City, the language of instruction carries definite ideological overtones. Schools which stress Yiddish are primarily designed to prepare boys for advanced Talmud study, because Yiddish is generally the language of instruction in the advanced yeshivot. In addition, Rabbi Kotler is reported to have had particularly strong feelings for Yiddish and to have urged principals to abandon the use of Hebrew and substitute Yiddish instead. There are 31 elementary, non-hasidic, Yiddish-speaking schools in New York City and 19 such high schools, or a total of 50 Orthodox Yiddish day schools. The schools whose Jewish studies are in Hebrew are more likely to be of the modern Orthodox type, placing greater emphasis on Israel and some modern Hebrew literature. The current tendency is toward the use of the Sephardi (or rather, Israeli) pronunciation, although those traditional yeshivot which use He-
brew as a language of instruction, such as the Beth Jacob schools for girls, teach the Ashkenazi pronunciation. There are 41 Hebrew-speaking Orthodox elementary schools in New York and 11 such high schools, for a total of 52 Orthodox Hebrew day schools. (Two elementary schools and one high school teach Jewish studies in English.) Of the 50 Yiddish-speaking schools in New York City, only two are coeducational, in keeping with the policy of such groups as Torah Umesorah's rabbinical administrative board and the rashe yeshivot to segregate boys and girls after the fourth grade. (None of the 28 hasidic schools is coeducational.) Of the 52 Hebrew-speaking schools, 33 are coeducational, reflecting their more liberal outlook. It is fair to say that not quite half the New York City day schools are outside the orbit of the rashe yeshivot or the Hasidim.

Outside New York City, the division between Yiddish and Hebrew or coeducational and segregated schools is less meaningful, since there is no base of Yiddish-speaking parents, and segregating the sexes means, besides, to increase the financial burden of these generally smaller schools (average pupil enrolment 146, against 346 in New York). Thus, there are only 18 Yiddish-speaking schools outside New York City, and only 30 schools that are not coeducational.

Day-school enrolment as a percentage of total Jewish-school enrolment has grown steadily from two per cent in 1935 to nine per cent in 1964, and in Greater New York from seven per cent to 29 per cent. There is evidence, however, that day-school growth, measured as a percentage of total Jewish-school enrolment, is leveling off. There have been recent indications of a rise in high-school enrolment as a percentage of total day-school enrolment, at least in areas of large Jewish concentration. In other words, there has been no percentage increase in the number of children enrolled in day schools, but a greater percentage of elementary day-school graduates go on to Orthodox high schools. In Greater New York high-school enrolment, as a percentage of total day-school enrolment, has climbed from 14 per cent in 1956-57 to 22 per cent in 1963-64. While elementary-school enrolment barely grew in these years, even in absolute terms, high-school enrolment increased from 5,186 to 9,076, or 75 per cent. In no year was the increase less than 10 per cent.

Rabbinical Alliance of America (RAA; Iggud Ha-rabbanim)

The Rabbinical Alliance of America, founded in 1944, is composed of graduates of sectarian American yeshivot who were unwilling to affiliate with the Yeshiva University-dominated RCA and either were excluded from membership in the Agudat Ha-rabbanim by its semikhah require-
ments, or themselves rejected the Agudat Ha-rabbanim image. The first members of RAA were primarily from Torah Vodaath (with a few from Rabbi Jacob Joseph) and to this day placement for RAA rabbis is handled through Torah Vodaath under an arrangement reached in 1957-58, when RAA cut its formal ties with the yeshivah. Currently the membership numbers around 250, of whom about 100 are in the practicing rabbinate and most of the rest in Jewish education. Many of the practicing rabbis also teach part-time.

Structurally the organization is weak. It exists more because of dissatisfaction with the two other Orthodox rabbinic organizations than through any positive program of its own. It issues an occasional periodical, Perspective. Without a purposeful ideology and unable to compete with RCA in benefits or prestige, RAA is experiencing some difficulty. Its position has been further shaken by RCA's move to the right, but RAA still differentiates itself from that organization by its adherence to the separatist issur of the rashe yeshivot and its refusal to cooperate in mixed bodies of Conservative and Reform rabbis. Nevertheless, almost half the practicing rabbis in RAA are also affiliated with RCA. Spiritually the RAA is in the camp of the rashe yeshivot.

Agudath Israel

Agudath Israel was organized in the United States in 1939 as part of a worldwide movement, founded in Europe in 1912, which represented the largest organized force in the European Orthodox world before the Nazi period.

The widespread neglect of Agudah's growth in Europe by Jewish scholars has resulted, according to Agudah spokesmen, in a distortion of both the Agudah's position and of modern Jewish history. Historians and observers, particularly in the United States, have written from a viewpoint which regards modern Jewish history as an almost unbroken process of declining Orthodoxy and rising secularism, socialism, and Zionism. Such a perspective ruled out Orthodoxy as a subject of serious consideration, holding it to be bankrupt. Agudath Israel, on the other hand, without denying the tremendous inroads made by the non-Orthodox, contends that in the 1920s a counterrevolution began to take place in European Jewish life which was ended by the Nazi holocaust. That contemporary scholars have not even considered this claim may well be a reflection of their own biases and prejudices.55

55 Although there is undoubtedly a paucity of data regarding the Orthodox by comparison with such groups as the Bundists, the YIVO archives in New York City
In the light of its history, one might well ask why the organization has not become a more potent force among the Orthodox in the United States. The number of members is difficult to estimate, but undoubtedly falls below 20,000, many of whom are indifferent to Agudist ideology but become members automatically by virtue of their affiliation with Agudath Israel synagogues.

All observers are of the opinion that Agudah sympathizers and potential members outnumber those presently enrolled in the organization. There are a number of reasons why the organization has not been able to reach them. First of all, Agudah arrived relatively late in the United States. An effort to establish the organization in 1922 had failed. However, the Zeirei Agudath Israel (Agudah youth) predated the parent body. It was established in 1921, and by 1940 had seven flourishing chapters in New York City,\(^56\) one in Philadelphia, and one in Baltimore. Much of the potential leadership talent did not join the parent organization until 1949, when the adult group forced a resolution requiring that no one above the age of 28 or married could remain affiliated with the youth organization. The adult body, however, was never able to develop the \textit{élan} and social program that were so attractive to the youth.

A second and more important reason for Agudah's weakness stems from the depoliticalization and sectarianism of the \textit{yeshivot}. Reb Aharon and the other \textit{rashe yeshivot} who were leaders in Agudah trained a younger generation to value only one activity, \textit{lernen}. The result was a devaluation of and contempt for political and societal activity in the Jewish community. Thus, the yeshivah students who might have formed the nucleus for a revitalized Agudah never joined the organization; nor has the organization ever become an active communal force. Its youth organization, now firmly under the control of the parent organization, avoids controversial topics of communal concern within the Orthodox community and confines its local activities to \textit{lernen}. This, however, is hardly
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---

have an abundance of source material on the subject, much of which is simply ignored. In 1937 there were 192,000 students in Jewish schools in Poland, including vocational, Hebrew-Polish, Zionist, Yiddishist, Labor Zionist, Mizrahi, and Agudath Israel schools. (See Miriam Eisenstein, \textit{Jewish Schools in Poland, 1919–1939} [New York 1950], p. 96.) Of these, 85,000 were in Agudah schools and 15,000 more were in \textit{yeshivot}. Furthermore, Agudah schools were the most rapidly growing of all Jewish schools. Nevertheless, Eisenstein devotes some 70 per cent of her study to the Yiddish and Zionist schools and only about ten per cent in a chapter titled "The Ultraorthodox and Orthodox Schools," to Agudath Israel schools.
an attractive program to young people who spend most of their time in a yeshivah where the level of *lernen* is likely to be as high if not higher.

In an effort to reach the new generation of yeshivah graduates and educate them politically, Agudah undertook in 1963 the publication of an English-language monthly, *Jewish Observer*. It is significant that Yiddish was no longer felt to be an adequate medium of communication for this world. (Agudah has published a Yiddish monthly, *Dos Yidishhe Vort*, since 1952). *Jewish Observer* has had limited success. It has either failed or refused to enlist writers who might have aired controversial issues from which a positive Agudist position could emerge. The journal has with one exception avoided any discussion that might be offensive to any group within Agudah, and it even failed to report the sharp differences which emerged at the *Kenesiyah gedolah*, the international convention of Agudath Israel held in Jerusalem in 1964.

At the head of Agudath Israel stands the *Mo'etset gedole ha-Torah* (the Council of Torah Authorities) formerly led by Rabbi Kotler and, since 1962, by Rabbi Moses Feinstein. The extent to which the *Mo'etsah* actually makes policy for Agudah, at least in the United States, is problematical. Officially, all controversial questions on issues of a public character, whether of a halakhic or non-halakhic nature, are decided by that body. Groups both to the left and the right of Agudah charge that the *Mo'etsah* is simply a front for the professional and lay leadership—that the rabbinic sages are so removed from practical affairs that they permit themselves to be led by others. This is probably an injustice to the rabbinical leadership. It is inconceivable that men who individually spend hours deciding matters of halakhic minutiae would be indifferent to questions which they feel are of national and even international concern. What is more likely, however, is the opposite, at least in the United States. The *Mo'etsah* is handicapped by the absence of controversy. It can respond only to problems that are raised. It can act effectively only in the context of a dialogue in which its wisdom is confronted with practical exigencies and demands of the hour—in which its decisions must be weighed by practical consequences. Agudah, in the United States, has been a sectarian organization which has not challenged its own leadership and consequently has not obtained a measure of response.

*Po'ale Agudath Israel (Workers of Agudath Israel)*

The American section of Po'ale Agudath Israel, which exists as an independent political party in Israel, has never been an effective competitor to Agudath Israel in the United States. Its pro-Israel sympathies and
positive social program might have captured the more energetic and youthful Agudists, but the organization has lacked the sanction of the rashe yeshivot. It has remained a small group in the United States, oriented primarily to its parent body in Israel.

Hasidim

As noted above, the original Hasidim represented a sectarian element in Jewish life. A variety of factors contributed to the rise of hasidism in the 18th century, but a discussion of its early period and its doctrines and religious expressions lies beyond the scope of this paper. We note only that the enmity between the Hasidim and the Lithuanian mitnaggedim was quite bitter. The Hasidim, with their particular doctrinal stresses and their original deemphasis on talmudic learning, were considered by many to lie perilously close to the outer limits of normative Judaism.

The rise of the Enlightenment, Jewish socialism, and secular Zionism occasioned a reinterpretation by the mitnaggedim of hasidic behavior as an aspect of piety rather than rebellion. By the 20th century there were strong ties between the Hasidim and mitnaggedim which resulted, finally, in the joint participation of many of their leaders in Agudath Israel.

In the United States a further blurring of ideological differences between Hasidim and mitnaggedim has occurred because most Hasidim retain little that makes them doctrinally unique among ultra-pious Jews. Although they cling tenaciously to some of their special customs and generally retain their traditional European dress, with few exceptions they cannot be distinguished ideologically from the rashe yeshivot. The one constant that remains is the notion of the rebbe or hasidic leader, to whom the followers attribute extraordinary qualities and around whom they cluster.

Habad, the Lubavitcher Movement

The best-known Hasidim are, of course, the followers of the Lubavitcher Rebbe. It is impossible to estimate their number because, unlike

57 A sympathetic portrayal of the Lubavitcher movement and a description of their rebbe and his followers is presented by a Reform rabbi in two articles: Herbert Weiner, "The Lubavitcher Movement," Commentary, March and April 1957. Descriptions of other hasidic groups in the United States and Israel, which attempt to capture the essence of their religious meaning and attraction, are found in other articles by Weiner. See, for example, his "Dead Hasidim," ibid., March and May 1961 and "Braslav in Brooklyn," Judaism, Summer 1964. There is a vast literature on Hasidism and the Lubavitcher movement in particular by both observers and followers. See for example publications of their former Rebbe, Joseph I. Schneersohn, Some Aspects of Chabad Chassidism (New York, 1944) and Outlines of the Social and Communal Work of Chassidism (New York, 1953).
other hasidic groups, they are not concentrated in any one area, organized formally, or affiliated with any one institution. The Lubavitcher movement is in many respects the least sectarian of Orthodox groups although doctrinally it is among the most faithful of all hasidic groups, to the tenets of its founders. (It is also the most doctrinally sophisticated and intellectually organized of all hasidic groups.) Its unique texts are taught in its advanced yeshivot or in private groups, together with the standard sacred religious texts shared by all Orthodox Jews.

The relationship of its followers to the Lubavitcher movement may best be described as one of concentric circles around the Lubavitcher Rebbe, Rabbi Menahem Mendel Schneersohn, with the inner circle located predominantly, but not exclusively, in the Crown Heights section of Brooklyn, where the Rebbe lives and the headquarters of the movement is located.

Unlike other hasidic groups, the Lubavitcher have friends and sympathizers, estimated by some members of the movement to be as many as 150,000, who far outnumber the immediate coterie of followers. The overwhelming majority are said to be non-Orthodox. Many Jews seek the Rebbe's advice on personal matters and accept him as a religious guide, and he sees an estimated 3,000 people a year for personal interviews averaging 10 to 15 minutes in length.

There are 14 Lubavitcher day schools throughout the United States, besides the Central Lubavitcher Yeshiva and the Beth Rivka school for girls in New York. The total number of students in all Lubavitcher schools is about 4,000.

Outside New York City students are often from families who have little interest or concern for Orthodoxy, much less hasidic doctrine, but are attracted by the negligible tuition rates and the custodial function performed by the school. On the other hand, many followers of Habad, within and outside the city, whose homes are not close to the schools, make no particular effort to enrol their children.

The phenomenon of non-Orthodox Hasidim (President Zalman Shazar of Israel is the outstanding example) is troublesome to many in the Orthodox camp. They wonder how a presumably ultra-Orthodox leader can find such affinity with and arouse such sympathy among unobservant Jews, and whether he has not in fact compromised some essential demands of Orthodoxy in order to attract this great following. The Lubavitcher movement, however, can only be understood on its own terms, and it does in fact stand outside the Orthodox camp in many respects.
The movement does not recognize political or religious distinctions within Judaism. It has refused to cooperate formally with any identifiable organization or institution. It recognizes only two types of Jew, the fully observant and devout Lubavitcher Jew and the potentially devout and observant Lubavitcher Jew. This statement is often cited as a charming aphorism. In fact, it has tremendous social and political consequences. In every Jew, it is claimed, a spark of the holy can be found. The function of the Lubavitcher emissaries who are sent all over the world is to find that spark in each Jew and kindle it. From the performance of even a minor mitzvah, they argue, greater observance may follow. Thus, every Jew is recognized as sacred, but no Jew and certainly no institution outside the Lubavitcher movement is totally pure. Consequently the Lubavitcher movement can make use of allies for particular purposes without compromising its position. It can follow a policy of expediency because it never confers legitimacy on those with whom it cooperates.

One result is that sympathy for the Lubavitcher movement generally declines the further along the continuum of Orthodoxy one moves. The militantly Orthodox are continually disappointed by the independent policy which the movement pursues. This is partly due to the fact that the rashe yeshivot are from the tradition of the mitnaggedim who once bitterly opposed Hasidism and viewed its doctrines as heretical. Since the Lubavitcher are the most doctrinally faithful Hasidim, they would naturally encounter the greatest opposition. But in larger part, the antagonism is a result of the fact that Lubavitcher sectarianism is very different from other Orthodox sectarianism.

Judgment as to the success of the Lubavitcher movement depends on one's vantage point. It is indisputable that many Jews, previously untouched by Judaism, received their first appreciation of their religious faith through the missionary activity of Lubavitcher emissaries. Almost every week students from colleges all over the United States, totally removed from Judaism, visit the Central Lubavitcher Yeshiva in New York City under the prompting of a Lubavitcher representative who visited their campus. But some Orthodox observers question how many of these students who thus visit the yeshivah or pray with an etrog and lulav at the urging of a Lubavitcher representative, whom they encounter by chance on the street, in school, or in a hospital, are genuinely affected by their experience. Despite pride in its intellectual foundation, the Lubavitcher appeal today is almost exclusively emotional. More than any group in Orthodox and Jewish life, the movement offers solutions to
individual problems arising not only from the Jewish condition but from man’s societal condition.

The strength of the Lubavitcher movement outside the United States is also impossible to ascertain. It is believed to have the only effective Jewish organization in the Soviet Union. Before Young Israel undertook a public campaign on behalf of Soviet Jewry, its leaders consulted the Lubavitcher Rebbe because of his acknowledged expertness on Soviet Jewry. When the question arose in 1964 whether the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry should undertake public demonstrations, many yeshivah youth, following the lead of Agudath Israel, argued that such activity would only provoke retaliation in the Soviet Union against the Jews. The student leaders consulted experts from Columbia University’s Russian Institute on the point, but a decisive factor leading many students, at least at Yeshiva University, to join the demonstration was that the Rebbe did not express his disapproval.

The Rebbe continues to be accorded a certain universal deference within Orthodoxy that no other leader enjoys. When his mother died in 1964, both the Satmar Rebbe and Rabbi Soloveitchik were among those who came to “comfort the mourner.” Few Orthodox Jews would expect the Lubavitcher Rebbe to do likewise in similar circumstances.

Despite the tremendous authority of the Rebbe, the Lubavitcher organization is administratively decentralized. The present Rebbe is the son-in-law of his predecessor Rabbi Joseph Schneersohn. Rabbi Schneersohn’s other son-in-law, Rabbi Shemariah Gourary, exercises almost independent control of the school system. Other Lubavitcher activities, such as its publications department and youth program, are also relatively independent of one another. It is not clear to the writer whether this is by chance or design.

**Klausenberger, Wischnitzer, and Other Hasidim**

In addition to the Lubavitcher movement and the rebbes in the Satmar’s orbit, to be discussed in the following section, there are two prominent hasidic groups which retain a strong measure of independence. The Klausenberger Hasidim, from Rumania, who still number between 200 and 300 families in the United States, have been leaving this country in growing numbers to follow their Rebbe to Israel, where he has established his own village. The Wischnitzer Rebbe, from Rumania, who has also established a center in Israel, participates in activities of Agudath Israel, with which his approximately 250 families in the United States are generally aligned. Other hasidic rebbes with followings that are
ideologically associated with Agudath Israel include the Bostoner, who went from Poland to Palestine and finally to New York, the Navominski from Poland, and the Boyoner, Kapitshinitzer, and Bluzhever from Galicia.

*Satmar Hasidim and Their Allies*

The Satmar community is of Hungarian origin and is the most sectarian of all Orthodox groups in the United States. By the 19th century Hungarian Orthodox Jews had gained a reputation as the most zealous opponents of the non-Orthodox and as sponsors of a school system which introduced more intensive study of Talmud, and at an earlier age, than even the traditional Lithuanian-*mitnagged* yeshivot. The community is governed by the Satmar Rebbe, Rabbi Joel Teitelbaum, head of the Central Rabbinical Congress and leader of religious and political communities which are not identical.

As rov of the religious *kehilla* (community), Rabbi Teitelbaum is final arbiter in all matters of religious law. The *kehilla* numbers about 1,200 families, located primarily in Williamsburg, with smaller branches in Boro Park and Crown Heights (all in Brooklyn). Many of these families lost their rebbes to the Nazis and turned to the Satmar Rebbe when they came to the United States. The *kehilla* provides a full complement of religious and social services to its members, including welfare institutions, schools, mikvaot, bakeries, supervision over a variety of processed foods, and, informally, insurance and even pensions. It requires a high degree of religious conformity from its adherents, extending even to matters of dress.

The Satmar schools provide the most intensive Talmud training of all Orthodox day schools. Students begin their Jewish schooling at the age of three or four, and emphasis is on the amount of material covered. There are presently 3,500 boys and girls in the Satmar schools. Of these, some 2,200 are in the Williamsburg center.

As rebbe, political or societal arbiter, the Satmar’s influence extends to a number of smaller hasidic groups of Hungarian origin, each with its own rov. These include such groups as the Tzehlemer, Szegeder, and Puper. The total, together with the Satmar’s own *kehilla*, is conserva-
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58 There is no study on Satmar Hasidim *per se*. For general studies of Hasidim in Williamsburg, much of which is applicable to the Satmar Hasidim, see George Kranzler, *op. cit.*; Solomon Poll, *op. cit.*; and Michael Cohn, ed., *The Hasidic Community of Williamsburg, Brooklyn*, (New York: Brooklyn Childrens Museum, Occasional Papers in Cultural History, No. 4 [1963]).
The Satmar Rebbe is also recognized as religious leader of the ultrasectarian Netore Karta of Jerusalem (AJYB, 1958 [Vol. 59], pp. 387–88) who number under 200 families.

The Satmar Rebbe is the leading advocate of isolation of the Orthodox and intensification of religious observance within the community of the faithful. Unlike other hasidic groups, the Satmar do not seek converts from among other Jews. The Rebbe is a strong opponent of the State of Israel and cooperation of any kind with the authorities in Israel. The pages of Der Yid, the Yiddish weekly of the community, reserves some of its bitterest attacks for Agudath Israel, which, they feel, has compromised its religious principles by acknowledging the State of Israel, joining the government at one point, and developing a network of schools which, though independent of the Israeli authorities, is under their partial supervision and receives some 85 per cent of its funds from them. The Satmar community is well-disciplined, and the word of the Rebbe is almost always authoritative, although he has refused to render opinions on some matters and has thereby opened the way to various interpretations.

On rare occasions he has even been frustrated by his community. He has, for example, long been seeking a tract of land outside of Williamsburg sufficiently large to accommodate his community. According to some observers, he has been prevented from doing so not only by technical difficulties but also by the unwillingness of the entire community to leave Williamsburg. A few years ago a mirror in his home was broken by some zealots who felt it unbecoming for a rebbe's wife to use a mirror. Granted that the act had little support, it nevertheless indicated that even among the most ultra-Orthodox there were varying opinions about religious propriety.

The long-range impact of the Satmar community should not be minimized. Standing outside the mainstream of the communications network of even the Orthodox Jewish community, isolated from almost all Orthodox groups, it is easily ignored except when it erupts in some demonstration, such as picketing the Israeli consulate, which brings it to the public's attention. With 5,000 families averaging perhaps seven or eight, the Satmar community today numbers between 35,000 and 40,000 individuals.

Although its attitude toward secular education is negative, some degree

59 The lowest figure was provided by a Satmar representative. Among those interviewed for this report the Satmar group was the only one whose own membership and school-enrolment estimates were lower than those hazarded by rival observers.
of acculturation is inevitable. The community has recently opened lines of communication with some personalities in Agudat Ha-rabbanim and invited Rabbi Moses Feinstein to a conference of its rabbinic body. The Satmar Rebbe was one of the half-dozen prominent sectarian leaders who delivered a eulogy at the funeral of Rabbi Kotler, while Rabbi Soloveitchik, who also attended, was not asked to speak. Der Yid is now distributed more widely than ever before in the yeshivah world, in an obvious effort to win the sympathy of that community. If the kehillah is successful in retaining the enthusiasm of its youth, it will inevitably play a more prominent role in Jewish life, and increasing numbers of Jewish leaders will have to reckon with the Satmar Rebbe.

LEADERSHIP

Orthodox institutions, as essentially religious organizations, “must rely predominantly on normative powers [as distinct from coercive or remunerative powers] to attain both acceptance of their directives and the means required for their operation.”

Religious authority has been traditionally exercised charismatically. That is, the religious leader has been one able to “exercise diffuse and intense influence over the normative orientations of the actors.” But according to the value system and traditional expectations of Orthodox Jews, charisma can inhere only in a Talmud scholar. Talmud scholarship is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the exercise of maximum religious leadership or for becoming a gadol (plural, gedolim). The nature of the gedolim has been defined as follows:

In Jewish life we rely completely on the collective conscience of the people that it will intuitively recognize its leaders and accept their teachings. There surely was no formal vote that thrust the Chofetz Chaim or Reb Chaim Ozer into world leadership. They emerged naturally.

There may be many [who] are recognized Torah scholars and yet they don’t attain this wide acclaim. There is some ingredient, that transcends scholarship alone or piety alone—that makes one a Godol. Obviously, these qualities of knowledge, erudition, and piety are basic. But, over and above these there is another that is crucial and that is what we generally describe as “Daas Torah.” It assumes a special endowment or capacity to penetrate objective reality, recognize the

61 Ibid., p. 203.
facts as they "really" are, and apply the pertinent Halachic principles. It is a form of "Ruach Hakodesh," as it were, which borders if only remotely on the periphery of prophecy. . . . More often than not, the astute and knowledgeable community workers will see things differently and stand aghast with bewilderment at the action proposed by the "Godol." It is at this point that one is confronted with demonstrating faith in "Gedolim" and subduing his own alleged acumen in behalf of the Godol's judgment of the facts.62

The notion of gedolim is, however, becoming increasingly institutionalized, at least for the sectarian Orthodox camp. Its first formal manifestation was in the establishment by Agudath Israel of its worldwide Mo'etzet Gedole Ha-torah (Council of Torah Authorities). Rabbi Aaron Kotler, until he died in 1962, was the preeminent gedol ha-dor (gadol of the generation) for the yeshivah world. The fact that he also led the Mo'etsah did not add to his luster. Many, even in the Mizrahi camp or in the ultra-sectarian hasidic camp to the right of Agudath Israel, recognized his eminence. Besides serving as chairman of the Mo'etsah, he was chairman of Torah Umesorah's rabbinical administrative board and head of Chinuch Atzmai.

With Reb Aharon's death, the vacant posts had to be filled, putting the unity of the right-wing Orthodox world to the test. In the absence of a personality comparable to Reb Aharon's, would the successors to his offices inherit authority equal to or approximating his? Would, in other words, Reb Aharon's charisma of person pass to charisma of office? Could there be "routinized charisma," so essential to organizational equilibrium, at least among religious groups?

There are three potential successors to Reb Aharon's authority among the American rashe yeshivot. (Only rashe yeshivot would be eligible since only they possess the necessary qualification of Talmud scholarship.) The most prominent candidate is Rabbi Moses Feinstein, rosh yeshivah of Mesifta Tifereth Jerusalem, who was elected chairman of the Mo'etsah and head of Chinuch Atzmai in 1962, but only vice-chairman of Torah's Umesorah's rabbinical administrative board. He is also one of five members of the Agudat Ha-rabbanim's presidium. Reb Mosheh is, as we noted, the leading posek (halakhic authority) of his generation. Within the world of authoritative posekim he is also the most lenient. His decisions, in fact, have bordered on the radical in departure from halakhic precedents to meet contemporary needs. However, greatness as

a *posek* has never by itself entitled a scholar to the highest reverence in the traditional world. Reb Mosheh is a retiring, modest, unassuming person, who, while acknowledging his role as a leader of Orthodox Judaism, none the less, unlike Reb Aharon, seeks a strong consensus on political and social questions (in contrast to religious-ritual-ethical questions) before acting.

The second outstanding *rosh yeshivah* is Rabbi Jacob Kamenetzky of Torah Vodaath, chairman of Torah Umesorah’s rabbinical administrative board and a member of the *Mo‘etsah*. He is also a member of the Agudat Ha-rabbanim’s presidium and rose to prominence in recent years after the death of Rabbi Mendlowitz, the *menahel* of Torah Vodaath, in 1948. In a sense Rabbi Kamenetzky was pushed forward to fill the leadership post which Rabbi Mendlowitz had already endowed with a degree of charismatic authority. There are few people today, outside Torah Vodaath, who feel that he could indeed unite the other *rashe yeshivot* and the Orthodox world around his personality or office.

Finally there is the iconoclast of the yeshivah world, Rabbi Isaac Hutner, *rosh yeshivah* of Chaim Berlin. Rav Hutner’s authority over his own students is unique even for a *rosh yeshivah*. He remained in the shadow of Orthodox leadership until after Reb Aharon’s death, when he emerged as a forceful spokesman on a number of issues. The hierarchical relationship between himself and the other *rashe yeshivot* has not yet been clarified, but Rabbi Hutner has adopted positions on some issues contrary to theirs. He disagreed with them, for example, on the handling of the missionary situation in Israel, the controversy between the Israeli and American Youth *Pe‘ilim* (activists), and the question of secular education.

There is a younger, predominantly American-born group of *rashe yeshivot* who will be assuming positions of greater authority in a few years. Torah Umesorah has given them some expression in a newly formed group called *mishnim* (deputies), which takes a somewhat active role in areas of less than crucial policy importance. Its members are becoming increasingly well known in the Orthodox world, but whether they develop sufficient independence of thought or personality to capture the admiration of the modern Orthodox as well as the sectarians remains to be seen.

The characteristics of leadership in the modern Orthodox camp are similar to those of the sectarian Orthodox. The modern Orthodox counterpart to Reb Aharon is Rabbi Joseph Soloveitchik (the Rov), and as long as the Rov remains active he will maintain his dominant
positions in such organizations as RCA, RZA, Yeshiva University Rabbinic Alumni, and to a lesser extent UOJC. The future leader of the modern Orthodox world is likely to be Rabbi Soloveitchik’s successor to the chairmanship of RCA’s halakhah commission, an office which the rabbi is endowing with charismatic authority. At one time Rabbi Soloveitchik might have achieved a comparable role as spiritual mentor in Young Israel, but he rejected their overtures. (Significantly, his brother, Rabbi Aaron Soloveichik, also a renowned Talmudic scholar, has come closer to the Young Israel recently and may possibly emerge as their religious authority. On the other hand, there is great reverence for Rabbi Hutner in the Young Israel movement and particularly in the Council of Young Israel rabbis.)

Unlike Reb Aharon, the Rov assumed his leadership position only gradually. Indeed, the sectarians often charge that he never really became a leader, but is simply a front for the modern Orthodox. If that was true at one time, it certainly is no longer so, although he has been thought to change his mind on enough issues to introduce a measure of uncertainty among his own followers as to where he stands on a number of matters.

To call the Rov the leader of modern Orthodoxy is not to imply that he is always comfortable in that camp or happy with that designation. Nevertheless, his position is sharply differentiated from the sectarian rashe yeshivot by his positive affirmation of many elements in Western civilization (he holds a Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Berlin) and his willingness to operate in a modern Orthodox framework. But the Rov is also part of the traditional yeshivah world. Indeed, in recent years he has moved to the right and has become more outspoken in his criticism of certain aspects of life in Israel, in his own halakhic interpretations, and in his attitude toward rabbis serving synagogues with mixed seating. The Rov may be the leader of modern Orthodoxy, but he is not really modern Orthodox. Modern Orthodoxy has yet to produce a leader from its own ranks because it still continues to acknowledge mastery of the Talmud as a qualification for leadership and yet has refused to endorse, even at Yeshiva University, a restructuring of talmudic education that would encourage bright, inquisitive minds which lack the fundamentalist positions of the rashe yeshivot to undertake the many years of dedicated and arduous learning required to become a talmudic authority.

Day-to-day leadership of Orthodox organizations has been assumed by professionals, almost all of whom are rabbis. The role of the professional
is growing in importance, but the tremendous charismatic authority invested in the spiritual leader has contained the professional’s image and often constrained his initiative.

The lay leader is left in a rather unfortunate position. He commands neither the prestige of the talmudic scholar nor the time and information of the professional. No one within the Orthodox camp really regards him very highly or takes him very seriously. Even among laymen (that is, nonprofessionals), possession of rabbinic ordination, or at least extensive Jewish education, is increasingly becoming a ticket of admission to the councils of decision making.

The only other premium is that placed on the money the layman contributes or raises, but any effort to dictate how the money should be used is resisted. However, as long as the Orthodox community contains only few men of really substantial wealth, it is inevitable that these will occupy positions of status and prestige. On the other hand the growth of yeshivot means that Orthodoxy is producing a growing number of Jewishly educated laymen, many of whom acquire a good secular education and economically comfortable positions. This group is only beginning to make an impact on both the Orthodox and non-Orthodox Jewish community. It seems inevitable that they will play a more prominent role in all aspects of Jewish life.

DIRECTIONS AND TENDENCIES

In essence, contemporary American Orthodoxy or at least committed Orthodoxy, whence springs the leadership and direction of the community, is characterized by the growth of institutions whose origins and spirit are sectarian and who are reacting against the church-like direction of Orthodoxy in its pre-World War II period. Orthodoxy, in truth, might have been characterized in that earlier period as simply lower-class Conservative Judaism. That this is no longer the case is due to changes in both Conservatism and Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy today is defining its role in particular and differentiated terms and more than ever before sees itself as isolated from other Jews. The result has been an increased sympathy for its own sectarian wing. But the sectarians themselves have not withstood all change. As one sociologist has written, if a sect is to influ-

63 One of the few Orthodox leaders who would augment the role of the laymen and argues that non-halakhic policy decisions should be made by the practicing rabbinate and lay leadership, together with the “masters of halakhah,” is Yeshiva University’s president: Samuel Belkin, Essays in Traditional Jewish Thought (New York, 1956), pp. 150–51.
ence the world to change, "it must itself acquire or accept the characteristics of this world to a degree sufficient to accomplish this goal." It must become "of this world" and in the process it changes its definitions of what is or is not acceptable. Thus, the sectarian institutions themselves are beginning to move in a church-like direction. Strident opposition to Israel among all but the Satmar Hasidim is a thing of the past. Coeducational day schools outside New York are formally disapproved of and tacitly accepted even by the rashe yeshivot. Yiddish, which Reb Aharon stressed as a vehicle for maintaining tradition, has been deemphasized ever since his death.

On the other hand, the entire community is more rigid in its halakhic observance. Mixed dancing, once practiced even among Agudath Israel youth, is a thing of the past in most committed Orthodox groups. The formalistic requirements of "feminine modesty," such as covering the hair, are stressed far more than ever before. Observance of the laws of "family purity" and mikveh, which once seemed to be on the verge of total desuetude, are rising. There are 177 public mikvaot in the United States—36 in the Greater New York area alone—and a number of private ones. There is even a Spero Foundation, which assists communities planning to build mikvaot with architectural plans, specifications, and suggestions. But, if ritually the community is more observant, even the most sectarian groups are becoming church-like or communally oriented in the problems they take cognizance of and their means of solution.

Both camps, the modern Orthodox and sectarians, are growing, but the basic sources of their new-found strength are different. For the sectarians it is the young yeshivah graduates now at home in at least the superficial aspects of American culture and committed to tradition and the rashe yeshivot. They need not adjust completely to America because they are sufficiently well acquainted with it to be able to reject many of

---

65 The observance of mikveh, which requires that a married woman go to a lustral bath a week (generally) after menstruation, before which she is prohibited from having marital relations, is the best single measure for determining who is a committed Orthodox Jew. To the uncommitted, it is inconceivable that so personal a matter should be subject to ritual regulation. To the committed, it is inconceivable that an aspect of life so important as marital relations should not be subject to halakhic regulation.
66 One example can be found in the pages of the *Jewish Press*, an Orthodox weekly whose editorial position is akin to the sectarian yeshivah world but whose pages devote an increasing proportion of space to news and features of general Jewish interest.
its manifestations. For the modern Orthodox it is the ba'ale-teshuvah, the penitents who were raised in nonobservant homes but find in Orthodoxy an emotional or intellectual fulfillment. The first group lacks the intellectual-philosophical perspective to broaden its appeal, but while it may not expand, it will survive. The second lacks halakhic leadership and sanction for much that it reads into Orthodoxy; it lives in a half-pagan, half-halakhic world, and the personal problems of its members are more serious.

A characteristic difference between religious life today and a few years ago, particularly among the modern Orthodox, is that problems have become far more personal. In other words, the personal significance of religion has assumed increased importance over its communal significance. This has fostered increased interest in sectarianism among the ostensibly modern Orthodox, as has the right wing's courage, conviction, and sincerity. Modern Orthodoxy's appeal is dulled by the lingering suspicion of its adherents that they themselves have suffered a loss for living in a half-pagan world.

Many Orthodox Jews have been personally as well as intellectually and emotionally alienated from the non-Orthodox world through employment discrimination. Instances of observant Jews who have been denied employment in Jewish federation-supported institutions or national Jewish organizations because they are Sabbath and holiday observers are legion. And even on a more personal level, Orthodox Jews have often suffered the effects of discrimination, prejudice, and stereotyping by some non-Orthodox Jews who are prominent in Jewish educational, cultural, and communal life. Many of these Jewish leaders, themselves reared in Orthodox homes, abandoned their Orthodoxy because they believed it held no future for Judaism. The upsurge of Orthodoxy among young people bewilders them and makes them resentful. But the Orthodox who suffer at their hands are not inclined to be tolerant. Since it is the modern Orthodox who are most likely to encounter this type of discrimination, a reaction is inevitable.

Relative prosperity, a sense of alienation from other Jews, and increased concern for halakhic observance serve to unite the different groups within the Orthodox camp. But that very unity has dulled Orthodoxy's critical sense, and there is a dearth of systematic criticism to be found, even at Yeshiva University, the most likely arena. A few young faculty discussion groups meet for "lofty" intellectual purposes, but as yet their point of view has found no forceful expression. Observers note that the student body itself tends to be more right-wing than ever in the past. Jewish scholarship per se, which might have served as a critical
tool, is only beginning to grow within Orthodoxy and still encounters fierce opposition even at Yeshiva University. Talmud study, which is as much a religious as an intellectual experience, is no substitute; it serves to awaken an awareness of tradition and a passion for religion, but not a critical faculty for the social and religious condition of Judaism in the modern world. The pages of Tradition have served as vehicles of criticism of the non-Orthodox Jewish world, particularly of Jewish scholarship, but even it has so far failed to develop a characteristic Orthodox response to contemporary problems, and it has ignored self-criticism. A new journal by a few students at Yeshiva University, Gesher, was intended to fill the gap, but its first two annual issues, in 1963 and 1964, fell short of the mark.

* * *

The only remaining vestige of Jewish passion in America resides in the Orthodox community, and it is passion and dedication, not psychoanalytic studies of divorce, which will stem the tide of intermarriage. It is significant that the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, the only spontaneous movement concerned with Soviet Jews, is directed and led primarily by Orthodox youth, as is the only other college group recently to show signs of dynamic movement and growth, Yavneh. Whether the Orthodox community as such, however, can generate sufficient force to meet the intellectual stirrings and emotional quests in the American Jewish world remains to be seen. The non-Orthodox intellectual is not ready yet to embrace Torah and halakhah in their entirety.

But two things have changed. First, the old antagonisms to the world of Orthodoxy are gone from many intellectuals furthest removed from Orthodox life. Secondly, there is a recognition and admiration for Orthodoxy as the only group which today contains within it a strength and will to live that may yet nourish all the Jewish world.
## APPENDIX

### KNOWN YESHIVOT PROVIDING INTENSIVE, POST-HIGH-SCHOOL "TALMUDIC STUDY IN THE UNITED STATES"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year founded</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Present Rosh Yeshivah</th>
<th>Antecedent Yeshivah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>R. Judah David Bernstein</td>
<td>R. Samuel Belkin</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Joseph B. Soloveitchik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish University of America-Hebrew</td>
<td>Skokie, Ill.</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>R. Saul Silber</td>
<td>R. Simon Kramer</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Mordecai Rogow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Selig Starr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesifta Tifereth Jerusalem</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>about 1925</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>R. Joseph Adler</td>
<td>R. Moses Feinstein</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish University of America-Hebrew</td>
<td>Skokie, Ill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Joseph Adler</td>
<td>R. Moses Feinstein</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Joseph Adler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish University of America-Hebrew</td>
<td>Skokie, Ill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Joseph Adler</td>
<td>R. Moses Feinstein</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R. Joseph Adler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavne Hebrew Theological Seminary</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>R. Nahum Shapiro</td>
<td>R. Bezalel Kaden</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Torah Vodaath</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>R. Shragai Mendlowitz</td>
<td>R. Jacob Kamenetzky</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Ner Israel</td>
<td>Baltimore, Md.</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>R. Jacob Ruderman</td>
<td>R. Jacob Ruderman</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year founded</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>Present Rosh Yeshivah</td>
<td>Antecedent Yeshivah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America (Yeshivah Rabbi Israel Meyer Hacohen)</td>
<td>Queens, N.Y.</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>R. David Leibowitz</td>
<td>R. Enoch Leibowitz</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Arugath Habosem</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>R. Levi Isaac Grunwald</td>
<td>R. Levi Isaac Grunwald</td>
<td>Arugath Habosem (Deutschkreuz, Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi Chaim Berlin Yeshivah</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>R. Isaac Hutner</td>
<td>R. Isaac Hutner</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Yeshivah Tomchei Tmimim Lubavitch</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>R. Joseph Schneerson</td>
<td>R. Isaac Pekarsky</td>
<td>Lubavitcher Yeshivah (Otwock, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Yeshivah Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>R. Abraham Joffen</td>
<td>R. Abraham Joffen</td>
<td>Beth Joseph Yeshivah (Bialystok, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College of Telshe</td>
<td>Wickliffe, Ohio</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>R. Hayyim Katz</td>
<td>R. Mordecai Gifter</td>
<td>Yeshivah Etz Chaim of Telshe (Telšiai, Lithuania)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Seminary Yeshivah Chachmey Lublin</td>
<td>Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>R. Mosheh Rothenberg</td>
<td>R. Mosheh Rothenberg</td>
<td>Lublin Yeshivah (Lublin, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Yeshivah</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Students in 1945</td>
<td>Rosh HaYeshivah</td>
<td>Principal Rosh HaYeshivah</td>
<td>Primary Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Medrash Govoha of America</td>
<td>Lakewood, N.J.</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>R. Aaron Kotler</td>
<td>R. Shneur Kotler</td>
<td>Yeshivah of Kletzk (Kletsk, U.S.S.R.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Chofetz Chaim of Radun</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>R. Mendel Zaks</td>
<td>R. Mendel Zaks</td>
<td>Yeshivah of Radun (Radun, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Ch'san Sofer</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>R. Samuel Ehrenfeld</td>
<td>R. Gedaliah Schorr R. Samuel Ehrenfeld</td>
<td>Yeshivah Ch'san Sofer (Mattersdorf, Austria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrer Yeshivah</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>R. Abraham Kalmanowitz</td>
<td>R. Samuel Birnbaum</td>
<td>Mirrer Yeshivah (Mir, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Farm Settlement</td>
<td>Mount Kisco, N.Y.</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>R. Michael Dov Weissmandel</td>
<td>R. Solomon Ungar</td>
<td>Nitra Yeshivah (Nitra, Czechoslovakia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Talmudical Academy Torah V'Yirah</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>R. Joel Teitelbaum R. Joseph Meisels R. Simeon Posen</td>
<td>Satmar Yeshivah (Szatmár, Hungary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Bet Ha-talmid</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>R. Ahieh Leb Malin R. Hayyim Wysokier</td>
<td>Mirrer Yeshivah (Mir, Poland)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Known Yeshivot Providing Intensive, Post-high-school a Talmudic Study in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year founded</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Founder</th>
<th>Present Rosh Yeshivah</th>
<th>Antecedent Yeshivah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi Jacob Joseph School and Mesifta</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>106 b</td>
<td>R. Mendel Kravitz</td>
<td>R. Mendel Kravitz</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Karlen-Stolin</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>50 b</td>
<td>R. Jochanan Perlow</td>
<td>R. Abraham Trup</td>
<td>Karlen-Stolin Yeshivah (Stolin, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Be'er Shmuel</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>100 b</td>
<td>R. Joseph Horowitz</td>
<td>R. Moses Horowitz</td>
<td>Yeshivah of Hunsdorf (Huncovce, Czechoslovakia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Eretz Yisrael</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>40 b</td>
<td>R. Judah Gershuni</td>
<td>R. Judah Gershuni</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>R. Levi Krupenia</td>
<td>R. Levi Krupenia</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamminetzker Yeshivah</td>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y.</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kamminetzker Yeshivah (Kamieniec, Poland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Bet Torah</td>
<td>New Haven, Conn.</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>R. Mordecai Yoffe</td>
<td>R. Mordecai Yoffe</td>
<td>Beth Medrash Govoha of Lakewood, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Louis Rabbinical College</td>
<td>St. Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>R. Samuel Faivelson</td>
<td>R. Samuel Faivelson</td>
<td>Beth Medrash Govoha of Lakewood, N.J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshivah Zichron Tzvi</td>
<td>Woodridge, N.Y.</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>R. Levi Krupenia</td>
<td>R. Levi Krupenia</td>
<td>Kamminetzker Yeshivah (Brooklyn, N.Y.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The yeshivot listed here may have an elementary and/or high-school division as well. Data in the Appendix are only for the post-high-school division, where students may spend anywhere from two or three hours to a full day. This appendix is not exhaustive. There are undoubtedly other yeshivot which were inadvertently omitted. In addition, there are post-high-school students studying Talmud privately or in small groups established. Sources are either CJFWF reports or information obtained directly from each yeshivah.

* This refers to the year in which the post-high-school division was established.

* Unless otherwise noted, these are the latest enrolment figures as submitted by each yeshivah to CJFWF and published in its 1964 reports.

* Includes the post-high-school enrolment in the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary and 229 students in the Teachers Institute for Men.

* Every instructor in Talmud in the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary is called a rosh yeshivah. Officially Dr. Belkin, a former instructor in Talmud and now president of the University, gives the semikhah (ordination) and is the THE rosh yeshivah. Most people outside of Yeshiva University think of Rabbi Soloveitchik as THE rosh yeshivah.

* Includes 11 students in the Teachers Institute.

* There is no rosh yeshivah. Dr. Kramer is the president, Rabbi Rogow lectures to the senior class, and Rabbi Starr has the class beneath him.

* Figure supplied by a representative of the yeshivah.

* Figure by observers.
On November 20, 1964, the assembled Fathers of the Ecumenical Council, then concluding its third session in Rome, adopted, by a vote of 1,770 to 185, a statement on the attitude of the Roman Catholic church toward the Jews and Judaism. This statement was part of a larger declaration on the church's attitude toward non-Christian religions, including Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism; the omnibus declaration was approved by a vote of 1,651 in favor, 99 opposed, and 242 in favor with reservations.

That aspect of the declaration dealing with Jews stated (in unofficial English translation of the Latin text):

With a grateful heart, the church of Christ acknowledges that, according to God's saving design, the beginnings of her faith and her election were already among the Patriarchs, Moses and the prophets. She professes that all who believe in Christ—Abraham's sons according to faith—were included in the same Patriarch's call, likewise that her salvation is typically foreshadowed by the chosen people's exodus from the land of bondage.

The church, therefore, cannot forget that she received the revelation of the Old Testament from the people with whom God in His ineffable mercy concluded the former covenant. Nor can she forget that she feeds upon the root of that cultivated olive tree into which the wild shoots of the gentiles have been grafted (cf. Rom. 2:17-24). Indeed, the church believes that by His cross Christ Our Peace reconciled Jews and gentiles, making both one (cf. Ephes. 2:14-16).
The church keeps ever in mind the words of the Apostle about his kinsmen; theirs is the sonship “and the glory and the convenants and legislation and the worship and the promises; who have their fathers and from whom is the Christ according to the flesh” (Rom. 9:4-5), the Son of Mary the Virgin (Rom. 9:4-5). No less does she recall that the Apostles, the church’s mainstay and pillars, as well as most of the early Disciples who proclaimed Christ’s gospel to the world, sprang from the Jewish people.

Even though a large part of the Jews did not accept the Gospel, they remain most dear to God for the sake of the Patriarchs. This is the witnessing of the Apostle, as is the utterance that God’s gift and call are irrevocable.

In company with the Prophets and the same Apostle, the church awaits that day, known to God alone, on which all peoples will address the Lord in a single voice and “serve him shoulder to shoulder” (Zeph. 3:9; Is. 66; Ps. 65(66):4,5; Rom. 11:11-32).

All Persecution Condemned

Since the spiritual patrimony common to Christians and Jews is of such magnitude, this sacred synod wants to support and recommend their mutual knowledge and respect, a knowledge and respect that are the fruit, above all, of Biblical and theological studies as well as of fraternal dialogues. Moreover, this synod, in her rejection of injustice of whatever kind and wherever inflicted upon men, remains mindful of that common patrimony and so deplores, indeed condemns, hatred and persecution of Jews, whether they arose in former or in our own days.

May, then, all see to it that in their catechetical work or in their preaching of the word of God they do not teach anything that could give rise to hatred or contempt of Jews in the hearts of Christians.

May they never present the Jewish people as one rejected, cursed or guilty of deicide.

All that happened to Christ in His passion cannot be attributed to the whole people then alive, much less to those of today. Besides, the church held and holds that Christ underwent His passion and death freely, because of the sins of all men and out of infinite love.

It is, therefore, the burden of Christian preaching to proclaim the cross of Christ as the sign of God’s all-embracing love and as the fountain from which every grace flows.

From the overwhelming vote in its favor, future generations might conclude that the declaration was a routine matter, both substantively and procedurally. In fact, it was from the outset a highly-charged matter which became one of several key issues dramatizing the split between liberal and conservative viewpoints within Roman Catholicism and the
fierce struggle for control between forces representing these viewpoints at the council. Like some of the other controversial subjects on which there was sharp division between a majority of the bishops and a small, but powerful and influential minority, it was subjected to various procedural delays and other tactics designed to prevent it from coming to a vote. Furthermore, the statement on the Jews became involved with political considerations never intended by its authors and the object of intensive diplomatic representations and political pressures.

During the course of its various formulations, it became something of a bone of contention within the Jewish community as well. There was openly-expressed disagreement both as to the intentions and value of the declaration and as to the role, if any, that Jews should play with regard to it, and to the Ecumenical Council generally. On the latter point there was a broad range of opinion, planning, and action among various Jewish religious and communal organizations and representative spokesmen. Some organizations and individuals related themselves to the Ecumenical Council in varying ways, including the preparation of special materials, and correspondence and meetings with Catholic prelates in the United States and abroad. This article is written primarily from an American angle of vision.

**Catholic-Jewish Relations: The Background**

While the declaration in question was essentially a statement of attitude whose effective implementation would require specific directives and in some parts of the world would need to be undergirded by sustained educational and disciplinary measures, it was immediately seen as a symbol of fundamental change within the Roman Catholic church. Its supporters claimed that it did not enunciate any new doctrine, but that it did remove—in the words of America magazine—the source of a "ghastly ambiguity." Many Jews believed that, new doctrine or not, the authoritative removal of a tradition depicting them as deicides, cursed by God and doomed to punishment in each succeeding generation, would do away with one of the deeply-rooted sources of antisemitism; for the charge had been used to justify many of the hostile policies of the church and of Christian rulers toward Jews throughout history.

The fact that Christianity had its historical beginnings as an argument within Judaism, and that the early church felt compelled to define itself in contradistinction or opposition to the mother faith, indelibly colored the relationship between the two from that time on. The earliest Christians were not anti-Jewish as we understand that term today; most were
themselves Jews, disappointed or angry that the overwhelming majority of the Jewish community, including its religious leaders, rejected their claim that Jesus was the promised Messiah, and fearful that the small group of faithful followers would be swallowed up by the synagogue. To the great misfortune of future generations, many of their bitter denunciations were canonized into the sacred scripture of Christianity and elaborated upon with particular vehemence by the early Church Fathers. And fear of the competitive power or appeal of “the synagogue” persisted as an idée fixe in Christianity even after it had become the dominant religion of the West. The ability to perceive a small, powerless, and persecuted minority as an all-powerful conspiracy is common in the psychology of prejudice, but in the case of the Jews this was reinforced—in effect sanctified—by religious tradition. As one Protestant scholar has summed up the process:

The doctrine of the impartial and universal judgment of God was transformed into a particular and irrevocable curse on Jews; the inclusion of the Gentiles into the chosen people became an inclusion of Gentiles to the exclusion of the Jews; what had once been an internal conflict within Judaism was externalized as a conflict between Jews and Gentiles.

The first restrictive measures against Jews, like the first separatist rulings of the Christian faith—such as changing the day of Sabbath to Sunday and fixing the date of Easter independently of Passover—were probably inspired by a desire to protect the faith of the Christian and maintain its distinctiveness from the parent religion. But what started out as protection for the Christian soon became a policy of harassment of the Jews. The initial hostility compounded by the “stubborn” refusal of Jews to convert, hardened into legislation which increasingly cut the Jews off from normal social and economic life and made outcasts of them. The official church view regarding the Jews, as it developed over the years, was that they should not be killed, because they provided a living witness

1 E.g., “For . . . you crucified him, the only spotless and righteous man . . .” (Justin Martyr); “Since their deicide, the Jews have been blinded, can no longer lead anyone at all” (Eusebius); “Murderers of the Lord, assassins of the prophets” (St. Gregory of Nyssa); “God has forsaken the Jews. They have denied the Father, crucified the Son . . . their synagogue is the house of demons and idolatry . . . you should turn away from them as from a pest and a plague of the human race” (St. John Chrysostom); “The Jews, they seize him. . . . The Jews, they bind him, they crown him with thorns, they spit upon him, they flagellate him, they heap insults upon him, they hang him from the wood, they pierce his flesh with their spears” (St. Augustine).

to the truth of Christian history; but that they were to live in degradation, because they had crucified and rejected the Lord—be a witness to the curse of God which they had brought down upon themselves:

... a curse which entered into their very bowels, like water, and into their bones like oil: cursed also in the cities, and cursed in the fields: cursed in their going in, and cursed in their going out: cursed the fruit of their wombs and of their lands and of their flocks. ... ³

Not content to declare the curse on the Jews, the church frequently chose to act it out. "Whenever ecclesiastics ... wrote about the 'insolence' of the Jews," remarked one observer, "it is safe to assume that the civil powers were treating them as human beings. ... Jewish prosperity anywhere was regarded by the Papacy as contrary to Holy Writ and a menace to Christendom." ⁴ Efforts to reconcile tolerance and subjugation define the boundaries of church legislation (which, for much of Christian history, meant civil legislation as well) regarding the Jews.

On the one hand, the Jews were subjected to humiliating, restrictive legislation: forbidden to appear on the streets during Easter (councils of Orleans, 538 and 545); forbidden to officiate as judges (council of Mâcon, 581). These enactments were made by regional church councils and not universally enforced; but the Fourth Lateran council, beginning in 1215, gave church-wide endorsement to these and other degrading measures, including the order that Jews must wear a distinctive badge on their clothing. Later rulings outlawed the Talmud, authorized the ghetto, affirmed the validity of forced sermons intended to lead to baptism, and denied Jews admission to the universities.

On the other hand, the medieval popes also protected the Jews and condemned violence against them. Pope Calixtus II in 1120 issued an edict, reissued in 1199 by Pope Innocent as the Constitutio pro Judaeis, which prohibited the killing of Jews, the use of violence to force baptism, and the desecration of Jewish cemeteries. (This charter of liberties was to apply only to "those Jews who have not presumed to plot against the Christian faith.") Gregory IX protested vigorously against the slaughter of Jews by crusaders in France. In 1247 Innocent IV sent two vehement letters of protest to the archbishop of Vienne (France), condemning the brutal torture and slaughter of Jews following a ritual-murder charge, and commanding that the instigators be restrained and the stolen property restored.

³ From a letter of St. Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons, to the Bishop of Narbonne. Quoted in Malcom Hay, Europe and the Jews (Boston, 1960), 34.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 34–35.
It is perhaps a petty point that the archbishop of Vienne ignored the latter order, but it illuminates the larger problem: the church was seldom able to prevent the hatred it inculcated from being translated into the violent slaughter it deplored. If the popes and councils insisted on punishment with preservation, the masses (and sometimes the magnates) of Europe did not always make such fine theological distinctions. Thus, from the crusades to the 20th century, from accusations of ritual murder and well-poisoning to charges of international conspiracy, from the auto-da-fé to Auschwitz, the Jewish people remained the outcasts and the primary scapegoat of Christendom. Certainly, the institutions of Christianity cannot be held accountable for the entire record of persecution, expulsion, and slaughter, particularly for the racist ideology of the Nazis. But whatever the multiple and complex causes of antisemitism, it was fed by a tradition of religious teaching which cut the Jews off from the rest of mankind, depicted them as inherently base and evil—the “synagogue of Satan”—and viewed their sufferings as punishment visited upon them by a just God.

Religious animosity toward the Jews was compounded by the fact that, from the 18th-century Enlightenment on, Jews and the clergy of the established religions generally found themselves on opposite sides of the political fence in Europe. The church, much of whose secular power had been broken by the French Revolution, was suspicious of Enlightenment and liberalism, and tended to ally itself with the enemies of the French Revolution. The Jews, hoping for entry into secular society after centuries of exclusion and segregation in Christendom, supported the forces of Enlightenment and liberalism. An older image of the observant Jew as the enemy of Christ was overlaid with the newer image of the secular Jew as conspirator against the church. (At the Ecumenical Council, Ernesto Cardinal Ruffini of Sicily asserted that the Jews should declare their affection for the church, rather than vice versa, since—he said—the Talmud included passages offensive to Christians, and the Jews have supported Freemasonry, which the church has condemned.)

There were periods when Jewish communities lived in peace with their Christian neighbors and on relatively friendly terms with the clergy. And while the church sometimes supported antisemitism, as in the Dreyfus case, it also spoke out against it, as in Pius XI’s famous dictum of 1938, declaring antisemitism “a repugnant movement in which we Christians can have no part.” Still, the religious teaching and preaching which depicted the Jews as accursed, debased, and doomed to perpetual servitude
—a tradition which Jules Isaac termed "the teaching of contempt"—remained in the mainstream of Christian thought.

Developments Since World War II

Dramatic changes in the Roman Catholic church within the last two decades have been noted by many observers. Liberal and conservative factions struggle for predominance in an institution formerly thought to be monolithic. The liberals, including theologians, intellectuals, and prelates from either newly-emerging nations or countries with a pluralist and democratic tradition, have publicly expressed dissatisfaction with the "Roman" mentality of the Curia, and have spearheaded the thrust for collegiality, liturgical reform, recognition of the inherent right of religious liberty, and expanded dialogue with other religious groups. This ferment has itself come about as a result of many causes: the World War II defeat of fascist regimes with which the church had established concordats (Italy, Germany); the loss of Catholic countries to the Soviet sphere (Poland, Hungary, Lithuania); the growing threat of a militantly atheistic Communism; rapid social and technological change; the positive experience of the church in the United States, where—with separation of church and state—it had grown and flourished. This article is confined to one specific aspect of change within the Catholic church: the reexamination and revision of its thinking and teaching regarding Jews and Judaism.

Here again, the reasons are varied. Both internal trends, such as the Biblical Renewal movement, and external events, such as the foundation of the State of Israel, affected Christian thinking about Jews. The Biblical Renewal movement, which emphasized the continuity between Old and New Testaments, brought increased respect and understanding of the Jewish heritage of Christianity. The emergence of the State of Israel shattered stereotypes about the Jews. But first and foremost was the traumatic impact on men's minds and feelings of the tragic fate of European Jewry during the Hitler era. The reality of that fate could not be denied: in the heart of civilized Europe, in the middle of the 20th century, a group of men had drawn up a plan to wipe an entire people from the earth by systematically rounding them up, transporting them through an intricate network of trains, buses, and trucks to designated death factories, and murdering them to the last man, woman, and child. Further, the success of the plan depended upon the indifference, acquiescence, or active cooperation of great numbers of people. For thinking Christians, the un-

avoidable question was, "How could this have happened in nations of Christian tradition?" However pagan, racist, and inherently anti-Christian the antisemitism of Nazi ideology, it fed on themes and attitudes promulgated through centuries of Christian teaching. To overcome antisemitism, acknowledged by major Christian church groups to be a sin against God and man, the distorted teachings must be confronted and revised.

Obviously, the revisions could come only from Christians themselves, out of their own conviction and their own initiative. But the preliminary task of stimulating widespread awareness of the problem, of illustrating and analyzing distortions and bias, fell to Christians and Jews alike. Britons like the scholarly Anglican clergyman James Parkes and the lay Catholic author Malcolm Hay called attention to traditional Christian antisemitism. The distinguished French-Jewish historian, Jules Isaac, made a profound impact in Europe, particularly in France, with the publication of his *Jésus et Israël* in 1948, and he continued to wage an intellectual struggle against the "teaching of contempt" until his death in 1963. (His subsequent efforts included additional books and lectures, personal audiences with Pius XII in 1949 and John XXIII in 1960, and active leadership in *l'Amitié Judéo-Chrétienne*, the French interfaith organization.)

In 1947, at the little Swiss town of Seelisberg, Catholic and Protestant representatives met together with Jews and proposed guidelines as a practical basis for Christian teaching. Known as the Ten Points of Seelisberg, and drawing heavily upon Jules Isaac's suggestions, these proposals, dealing "with the need to emphasize the close bonds which exist between Judaism and Christianity, to present the Passion story in such a way as not to arouse animosity against the Jew, and to eliminate from Christian teaching and preaching the idea that the Jewish people are under a curse," were urged upon the churches together with some practical suggestions.

Investigations of the contents of religious textbooks provided actual examples of distortion and prejudice. Studies by Protestants of their own religious-school materials, initiated by the American Jewish Committee and the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the 1930s at Drew Theological Seminary and in the 1950s at Yale Divinity School, and

---

6 Isaac identified three major themes in the "teaching of contempt": that the dispersion of the Jews was a providential punishment for the Crucifixion; that Judaism was degenerate in the time of Jesus, and that the Jews were guilty of the crime of deicide. He argued that these themes were historically and scripturally inaccurate.


8 Bernhard E. Olson, *op. cit.*
a similar study of Catholic parochial-school textbooks\textsuperscript{9} undertaken at the Jesuit St. Louis University with the Committee's encouragement, furnished significant data and suggestions for improving these materials. A study of French Catholic textbooks, undertaken by a French priest,\textsuperscript{10} called attention to similar problems, and stimulated subsequent revisions.

An article by a prominent priest, in the Brazilian counterpart to the American Jewish Committee's \textit{Commentary}, pointed to omissions and faulty generalizations regarding Jews in Brazilian textbooks and missals.\textsuperscript{11}

On the highest levels in the Catholic church there were several positive developments. In 1949 Pius XII authorized \textit{pro perfidis Judaeis} in the Good Friday prayer for the Jews, to be translated into the vernacular as "unfaithful" or "unbelieving." (Actually, the Latin phrase has that meaning, but it had been too frequently translated as "perfidious" in the vernacular.) In 1959 John XXIII did away with the word altogether, both in Latin and in the vernacular. He also did away with two other prejudicial sentences, one in the Act of Consecration to the Sacred Heart, recited every first Friday, and the other in the ritual of baptism of converts.

Such changes were encouraging, but progress was still patchy and unequal, varying from country to country—indeed, from region to region. Even those Catholics most active in efforts to purify religious teaching and foster improved understanding between Christians and Jews felt that progress would remain piecemeal unless definitive approval and encouragement were to come from the highest levels of the church, preferably in the form of an official declaration. It was Pope John who gave these hopes the prospect of realization.

Obviously, Pope John did not create the forces of renewal within the church, but he personified them to an extraordinary degree. He gave voice and direction to those seeking an \textit{aggiornamento} (literally, updating) of the church, and he is said to have explained this term to a visitor who asked its meaning by going to the nearest window, opening it wide, and letting in the fresh air. In his very person, as much as by his public statements, he gave his blessing to the expanding dialogue with non-Catholics. When he announced the summoning of an Ecumenical Council and spoke of a renewal that would restore "the simple and pure lines that the face of the church of Jesus had at its birth" it seemed to many a


historic opportunity for the Catholic church formally and authoritatively to clarify its attitudes toward Jews and Judaism: to show that it repudiated, once and for all, that part of its tradition whereby Jews had been segregated, degraded, charged with wicked crimes, and valued only as potential converts; and to lift those tensions between Christian and Jew that had engendered hostility and bitterness across the centuries. The time was ripe.

While the preparatory commissions for the Ecumenical Council were going about their work, the nightmarish details of the Nazi genocide against the Jews were being vividly recalled by the trial of Adolf Eichmann in Jerusalem. The moral questions posed by the revelations of the Eichmann trial were not ignored by religious spokesmen. While the American Catholic press tended, by and large, to ignore the long history of Christian antisemitism when discussing the phenomenon of Nazi antisemitism and to emphasize the aid and assistance given to Jews by Catholics there were also moving and self-critical responses. Commonweal editor James O'Gara (May 12, 1961) asked:

Could the Nazi horror have sprung full-blown out of nowhere, without centuries of anti-Semitism to nourish it and give it strength in secret? And when the dark shadow of Nazism appeared over Germany, was the Christian response to this evil even remotely adequate? To my mind, the painful answer to both questions has to be no.

The Catholic Sentinel (Portland, Ore., April 20, 1961) pointed out:

Anti-Semitism was not confined to Nazi Germany, or limited to the time that Adolf Hitler ruled the Third Reich. Persecution of the Jews is a black mark on the history of Christendom. . . .

And the Catholic Star Herald (Camden, N.J., December 15, 1961) commented:

... let us recognize the duty to wash away any traces of anti-Semitism in the hearts of the young. A future generation may forget such incredible cruelties if we are not at pains to instruct them in love for our Jewish brethren.

Preparatory Stages and Early Jewish Involvement

As the church girded itself in preparation for Vatican II, it soon became evident that the key figure with regard to any position concerning

---

the Jews would be Augustin Cardinal Bea, named by John XXIII as head of a special Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity. (The secretariat was elevated to the status of commission in October, 1962). The cardinal, an octogenarian, a Jesuit, a Bible scholar, a figure of great personal prestige and influence, proved from the outset to be one of the most articulate and effective architects of renewal and reform within the church—a symbol of the ecumenical spirit. That Cardinal Bea was entrusted with seeking contacts, advancing dialogue, and improving relations with non-Catholic Christians was itself a radical departure from the Curia’s mentality, which saw conversion as the only justification for any conversation. But it soon became known that Cardinal Bea had been entrusted with even wider responsibilities, that he and his secretariat had been authorized (later, Cardinal Bea was to state he had been expressly requested) by Pope John to draft a statement regarding Catholic-Jewish relations, and to seek representative Jewish viewpoints. The way was open for communication and exchange of views with Jewish institutions.

Such communication took various forms. Substantial documentation in specific areas of scholarship was provided by the American Jewish Committee. Its concern centered on Catholic teaching about Jews and Judaism in the broadest sense (textbooks, liturgy, sermons, films, etc.) and the desirability of a forceful repudiation of the deicide charge against Jews. These questions had been highlighted through a protracted (November 1960—August 1961) symposium on Christian teaching concerning Jews in Evidences, American Jewish Committee’s French-language periodical, which included articles by eminent Protestant and Catholic scholars.

On July 13, 1961, over a year before the opening of the Council’s first session, the American Jewish Committee submitted to Cardinal Bea, by prior agreement, the first of several comprehensive memoranda. Entitled “The Image of the Jew in Catholic Teaching,” the 32-page document identified and illustrated slanderous interpretations, oversimplifications and sweeping statements, unjust or inaccurate comparisons, invidious use of language, and significant omissions in American Catholic textbooks, and cited existing Catholic sources that could serve as correctives. The memorandum did not raise questions on a theological level, but stressed the human-relations implications of various references to Jews. It was submitted after consultation with Jewish scholars representing Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform viewpoints.

On November 17, 1961, a second memorandum, “Anti-Jewish Elements in Catholic Liturgy,” prepared for the Committee by an eminent
Jewish scholar, was submitted to Cardinal Bea's secretariat. The document acknowledged recent deletion of anti-Jewish passages in the liturgy of the church, but noted that the concept of Jews as deicides still figured in certain liturgical passages, in popular and scholarly commentaries on the liturgy, and in homiletic literature.

In December 1961, Professor Abraham J. Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America met Cardinal Bea in Rome, and one of the outcomes of the meeting was an invitation to submit suggestions for positive Ecumenical Council action to improve Catholic-Jewish relations. In May 1962, he submitted a memorandum, prepared in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee, recommending rejection of the deicide charge, recognition of Jews as Jews (rather than as potential converts), promotion of scholarly and civic cooperation, and the creation of church agencies to help overcome religious prejudice.

In March 1962, a memorandum was sent to Pope John, urging the elimination of anti-Jewish references from Catholic texts, liturgies, inscriptions and pictorial representations. Signed by Dr. Nahum Goldmann, chairman of the World Conference of Jewish Organizations (COJO) and president of the World Jewish Congress, and Label Katz, co-chairman of COJO and president of B'nai B'rith, it was endorsed by all the constituent members of COJO with the exception of the British Board of Deputies. The memorandum charged that allegations of ritual crimes by Jews were perpetrated in inscriptions, pictorial representations, and commemorative services.

Voices opposed to Catholic-Jewish rapprochement were also heard at this early stage from two major sources which were to continue massive efforts to prevent Council action: the Arab nations and a group of ultra-conservative officials of the Curia. Gamal Abdul Nasser's Voice of the Arabs broadcast on November 7, 1963 that there was "a world Zionist plot to capitalize on the Vatican Council to further the oppression of the Palestinian refugees," and Arab states made representations against the creation of any special "under-secretariat for the Jews," when rumors to this effect appeared in Italian papers. Arab opposition was double-barreled, coming from both governments and Roman Catholic prelates in Arab nations who warned of possible reprisals against Catholics in Arab states. Theological opposition from conservative sources was re-

flected in an article by Giacomo Lauri Volpi which appeared in Osservatore Romano (the quasi-official Vatican paper) on March 8, 1961, describing the Roman emperor Titus, who destroyed the Second Temple, as possibly the "executor of a supernatural will," who knew that the "Jewish people had stained themselves with a horrible crime deserving of expiation."

This early opposition was successfully withstood by Cardinal Bea and his secretariat, reportedly with the active support of Pope John. Other developments also seemed to foster an encouraging atmosphere for growing Christian-Jewish rapport. A forceful denunciation of antisemitism issued in December 1961 by the World Council of Churches, embracing over 200 Protestant and Orthodox denominations, could not escape notice by Catholics. Besides condemning antisemitism as a "sin against God and man," the World Council cautioned: "In Christian teaching the historic events which led to the Crucifixion should not be so presented as to fasten upon the Jewish people of today responsibilities which belong to our corporate humanity and not to one race or community."

A month later, in January 1962, Cardinal Bea presided at an unprecedented event in Rome: an agape—a feast of fraternal love—in which representatives of 16 different faiths, including Jews, took part. The cardinal declared it was "the primordial duty of all groups of mankind to unite to overcome the hatreds of the past."

By the spring of 1962 Cardinal Bea's secretariat had prepared a draft statement on the Catholic attitude toward Jews and Judaism, and intended to introduce this document during the first session of the Council, with Pope John's blessing. However there occurred an incident which enabled the opposition to prevent consideration of the document during that session—and, indeed during the lifetime of Pope John. The incident centered on the question of Jewish observers at the Council.

Jewish representation at the Ecumenical Council had not been a matter of strenuous public debate. If Cardinal Bea's secretariat had considered it, no affirmative decision had been made. Jewish religious groups were opposed. The American Jewish Committee had communicated its view that there should be no Jewish observers at the Council unless other non-Christian religions were invited. On June 12 Dr. Nahum Goldmann of the World Jewish Congress announced that Dr. Hayyim Wardi, an Israeli government official, would attend the Council as an unofficial observer.

14 Chief Rabbi Elio Toaff of Rome; Sergio Piperno, president of the Union of Italian Jewish communities; Mario Disegni, of the Roman Jewish community, and Zachariah Shuster, European director of the American Jewish Committee.
and representative of WJC, and that he had received a leave of absence from his government for that purpose. Although there were Jewish protests (the Rabbinical Council of America expressed "grave alarm" at WJC's efforts to seek representation) and Dr. Goldmann later (August 1) claimed his earlier announcement had been misrepresented, the damage was done. Arab states protested vehemently, charging that Israel was deviously seeking political involvement in a religious gathering. Conservative elements opposed to the work of Cardinal Bea's secretariat, which was also preparing a draft statement on religious liberty, seized upon this incident as proof that Christian-Jewish relations had become hopelessly politicized. The commission of the Council charged with determining the agenda omitted both the statement on the Jews and the statement on religious liberty (the latter for different reasons).

Whether, in fact, the Wardi incident was the sole reason for shelving the declaration on the Jews, or whether the conservative opposition might have been able to prevent its consideration in any case, is a speculative question. There was ample evidence that the opposition to any favorable statement regarding the Jews was intense, and that such opposition had access to extraordinary channels of distribution. Thus, a few days before the session ended, every prelate found in his box a privately-printed 900-page volume, *Il Complotto contro la Chiesa* ("The Plot Against the Church"), filled with the most primitive antisemitism. The volume charged that there was a Jewish fifth column among the Catholic clergy plotting against the church, and even justified Hitler's acts against the Jews. No one knew how the book was distributed to the Council Fathers, and it reportedly produced little effect other than indignation. But it showed to what lengths the opposition was prepared to go.

The first session of Vatican Council II (October 11 to December 8, 1962) closed without official consideration of religious liberty or Catholic-Jewish relations. And in November Pope John suffered the first severe attack of the malady that six months later was to bring about his death.

While no great accomplishments appeared to emerge from the first session, and most of the arguments seemed procedural, the fundamental lines of conflict emerged early. The conservative forces, long entrenched

---

15 This attack was obviously directed at a few priests associated with Cardinal Bea's commission who were converts from Judaism and who played some role in the drafting of the declaration, such as Msgr. John Oesterreicher and Father Gregory Baum, both of whom have written widely on the matter of Jewish-Christian relations.
in Rome, self-assured, accustomed to giving instructions to the bishops through the Curia, expected to be able to dominate the Council. The bishops coming from lands across the earth did not really know each other, nor as yet their collective will. But from the first vote they broke the bonds the Curia had sought to impose, refusing the Curia-sponsored commissions and sending several schemata back to commissions for re-drafting. Having routed the conservative forces in one vote after another, the progressive elements left Rome at the session’s close optimistic and enthusiastic, certain the Council was riding the winds of change. Key issues on which the future battle would be joined, it was clear to both sides, were the collegial powers of the bishops, the schema on the church and the modern world (dealing with such questions as birth control and nuclear warfare), religious liberty, and a declaration on the Jews—a declaration whose fate would now be more closely linked to the general struggle within the Council. The latter two statements, at Pope John’s instruction, were attached to Cardinal Bea’s schema on ecumenism, for consideration at the next session.

**Developments between Sessions**

In March 1963, Cardinal Bea visited the United States to lecture at Harvard University on the subject of Christian unity. Subsequently he was honored at an interfaith agapé in New York devoted to the theme of “Civic Unity under God.” Cardinal Bea used that occasion—attended and addressed by such personalities as U Thant, Zafrulla Khan, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Henry Luce, Dr. Henry Pitney Van Dusen, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Greek Orthodox Archbishop Iakovos and Rabbi Heschel—to issue an affirmative statement in support of freedom of conscience.

Cardinal Bea’s visit was also the occasion of an unpublicized and unprecedented meeting with a group of Jewish religious leaders, which was held at the American Jewish Committee on March 31. The Jewish participants represented Orthodox, Conservative and Reform viewpoints, but each attended in a personal capacity.16 In responding to a series of prepared questions regarding the prospects for Council action on a Jewish declaration, the cardinal declared that the events of the Passion could not be charged against Jewry as a whole; that it was possible, and indeed necessary, to give the right interpretation to dogma to clarify the true

---

16 Rabbis Louis Finkelstein, Theodore Friedman, Abraham J. Heschel, Joseph H. Lookstein, Julius Mark, Albert Minda, plus several officers and staff members of the American Jewish Committee.
sense intended by the writers of the New Testament; that there was a need for interreligious communication and cooperation, and that his views were endorsed by Pope John.

Two months later John XXIII was dead. His death, on June 3, 1963, was mourned by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. In his brief pontificate of four and one-half years, he had infused the church with a new spirit and had evoked an exceptionally sympathetic response in the non-Catholic world; he was, as Léon Cardinal Suenens of Malines-Brussels described him, "the pope of dialogue." The election of Giovanni Battista Cardinal Montini of Milan to the papacy on June 21 did not come as a great surprise, but it left many questions unanswered. A close friend and associate of John, Cardinal Montini was expected to follow in his predecessor's footsteps. His prompt announcement as Pope Paul VI that he would continue the Ecumenical Council, and at the unexpectedly early date of September 29, was seen as reassuring by those interested in the progress of aggiornamento.

On the specific question of the Jewish declaration, however, pessimistic voices were heard. In June a much-respected Catholic theologian, Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., declared at the convention of the National Community Relations Advisory Council that a declaration on Catholic-Jewish relations had been prepared for the first session of the Council but not introduced because of Arab pressure. He also predicted that the Council would continue to avoid the issue. (There was a rapid denial from sources in Rome and Father Weigel declared himself happy to stand corrected.)

Meanwhile a totally unexpected development, which would strain Catholic-Jewish dialogue over the next year or more, exploded on the scene. On February 20, 1963, a play entitled Der Stellvertreter (variously translated as "The Vicar," "The Representative," "The Deputy") opened in a Berlin theater. Written by a young German Protestant named Rolf Hochhuth, the play was a stinging and bitter indictment of the late Pope Pius XII for his failure to protest, publicly and officially, against the mass murder of Jews under Hitler. The pope was depicted as a cold and calculating figure, more interested in protecting the financial and institutional interests of the church than in his moral responsibility as the Vicar of Christ on earth.

The play launched a furious controversy, and its opening in several European cities was accompanied by riots or other disturbances. No less a personage than the present pope commented. In an article written before his election to the papacy but published soon afterwards in the
British Catholic *Tablet* (June 29) Cardinal Montini defended Pius XII as a pope who tried "so far as he could, fully and courageously to carry out the mission entrusted to him," and accused the author of "an inadequate grasp of psychological, political and historical realities."

Passionate as was the controversy aroused by *The Deputy*, in Europe it did not become a Catholic-Jewish issue. In the United States, however, it began to take on the overtones of interreligious conflict. In New York City, Jews are prominently associated with the theater, and the first announced producer, Billy Rose (who later withdrew), and director, Herman Shumlin, were Jews. Thus there was pressure from some Catholic sources (notably *America*, a national weekly published by the Jesuits) for Jewish organizations to repudiate the play and come to the defense of Pius XII's memory. Most Jewish organizations refrained from comment on the play, except as a civil-liberties issue.

*The Deputy* turned out to be a greater occasion for comment and controversy in the American religious press before it opened than after. It opened in New York on February 26, 1964, to mixed reviews, and in the ensuing months rapidly waned as a source of friction. In the United States, as in Europe, comments on the merits of the play did not run strictly along religious lines. Some Protestants and Jews criticized it as drama and as history, and several Catholics, while taking exception to the portrait of Pius XII, nevertheless said the author had performed a service by raising critical issues of conscience too often evaded.

How the Hochhuth play affected the fate of the Ecumenical Council declaration on the Jews is questionable. Very possibly it made no difference at all. Those who supported the declaration may have been strengthened in their resolve by the self-critical reactions of Catholics and Protestants alike. Those opposed may have claimed that the Hochhuth play was a reason for delaying or sidetracking the declaration, lest it appear that the church felt the need to defend itself against the charges of the author.

An occasional insinuation that the Jewish declaration was somehow related to the play was effectively disposed of by Catholic and Jewish spokesmen who pointed out that the declaration had its beginnings long before *Der Stellvertreter* made its first appearance in Berlin.

---

17 Questioned why Jewish leaders had not spoken out in protest against the play, Msgr. John Oesterreicher wrote in the November 9, 1963 issue, "In the end, the Jewish human-relations agencies will have to speak out against *The Deputy* in unmistakable terms. Otherwise they will defeat their own purpose."
Second Session

The second session of the Ecumenical Council opened in Rome on September 29, 1963. Though no official report had been made by Council authorities, it was widely rumored that a statement on Catholic-Jewish relations had been prepared. Then, on October 17, the New York Times reported that the draft resolution—part of the schema on ecumenism—would acknowledge the Jewish roots of the church, reject the idea that the Jews were exclusively or collectively guilty for the death of Jesus, and would vigorously condemn antisemitism.

The story reportedly stimulated strenuous protests from conservative elements and from prelates from Arab countries. Nevertheless, the draft document was printed and distributed to the Council Fathers on November 8, as chapter 4 of the draft schema on ecumenism. The text was not publicly released, but an official Vatican communiqué summarized its main points:

—A deep bond ties the church to the chosen people of the Old Testament. The church has its roots in the covenant made by God with Abraham and his descendants.
—The responsibility for Christ's death falls upon sinful mankind and not upon the Jews. “Therefore, it is unjust to accuse this people of deicide or to consider it cursed of God.”
—There is no scriptural justification for disdain, hatred, or persecution of Jews. Preachers and teachers are admonished never to present "a contrary opinion," and are urged to promote mutual understanding and esteem.

The communiqué firmly disclaimed any political intent, stressing that the declaration was neither pro-Zionist nor anti-Zionist, and rejecting “any use of the text to support partisan discussions or particular political claims” as wholly contrary to the framers’ intention. The document was distributed at that time, Father Thomas F. Stransky, O.S.P., an American member of Cardinal Bea’s staff told newsmen at a briefing session, “because some misunderstanding (regarding its purely religious nature) had appeared in the Arab press.”

The announcement on November 19 that Cardinal Bea would introduce chapter 4 of the schema on ecumenism and Bishop Emile de Smedt of Bruges chapter 5 (a statement affirming religious liberty) was greeted with great enthusiasm within the Council. Observers reported that this announcement generated more spontaneous applause than had been heard theretofore. Cardinal Bea declared that he had prepared a state-
ment on the Jews by the “express command” of the late Pope John. He pointed out that “there is no national nor political question here . . . There is only treatment of a purely religious question.” He stressed the content of the declaration as summarized above, and stated that the declaration was necessary in the light of the violent and criminal persecution of Jews which had taken place during the Nazi era. Since the Nazi propaganda might have an unfortunate effect on faithful Catholics, it was important to root out any ideas remaining through the influence of that propaganda. He declared that neither the Jews of our time nor even all the Jews at the time of Jesus could be accused of the crimes committed against him, and ended with a plea that the church follow “the example of burning charity of the Lord Himself upon the Cross.”

The draft statements on religious liberty and on the Jews were widely noted in the American Catholic press, and there were many affirmative editorial comments on the Jewish declaration. The introduction of chapter 4 also evoked positive responses from spokesmen for Jewish religious and community organizations and from the Jewish press.

Nevertheless, it was apparent that there was strong opposition to both declarations within the Council. The Oriental prelates were unanimously opposed to the statement on the Jews. Some bishops, while not opposed to a declaration on relationships with Jews, felt such a declaration must also refer to Moslems, Buddhists, and other non-Christians. There were prelates indifferent to the Jewish question, but strongly opposed to the statement on religious liberty for fear it would be used to undermine the authority of the church and encourage indifferentism or Communism. The ultra-conservatives were opposed to both.

As in the first session, so during the second also, an antisemitic publication was privately distributed to the Council Fathers. Gli Ebrei e il Concilio alla luce della Sacra Scrittura e della Tradizione (“The Jews and the Council in the Light of Scripture and Tradition”) by a pseudonymous Bernardus, cited authoritative Catholic sources supporting the deicide charge against Jews, proclaimed that Jews could only wipe out the curse upon them by converting to Christianity, and insisted that efforts to change the traditional view were the result of a conspiracy in the Council by Jews and Freemasons working on behalf of Communism.

While those opposed to chapters 4 and 5 were in the minority, they nevertheless exercised powerful control. Indeed, they successfully maneuvered to detach these chapters from the schema. On November 21 the Council moderators suddenly announced that there would be an immediate vote on acceptance of chapters 1–3 as a basis for discussion. The
secretary general added that voting on chapters 4 and 5 would take place "in a few days." The days came and went, and the Council's second session ended on December 4 without an opportunity for the Council Fathers to vote, in principle, on either chapter. (A vote of acceptance in principle meant that the present text would be the basis for debate. The lack of such a vote meant that both draft statements were again open to revision, including scrutiny by the Theological Commission and the Central Coordinating Commission, headed respectively by Cardinals Ottaviani and Cicognani, both leaders of the conservatives.)

Despite Cardinal Bea's assurance that "what is put off is not put away," and despite Pope Paul's dramatic announcement of his forthcoming pilgrimage to the Holy Land, there was a widespread, if muted, discontent among the liberals at the outcome of the second session. Paul's trip to the Holy Land and his meeting with Patriarch Athenagoras of the Greek Orthodox Church were unprecedented and newsworthy events, but the widespread publicity and enthusiasm they evoked did not prevent Catholic observers and commentators from asking what had gone wrong at the Ecumenical Council.

**Reaction in the United States**

In the United States the question was asked openly in the Catholic press by several journalists who had covered the Council. Msgr. James Tucek, official correspondent for the National Catholic Welfare Conference, wrote that the fate of the chapters on religious freedom and the Jews was "one of the mysteries of the second session" and that "something had happened behind the scenes." The explanation that the two chapters had not been submitted to a vote because of lack of time was "not convincing, especially in view of the fact that this same day's assembly closed a half hour earlier than usual."

Many other Catholic observers expressed disappointment at the outcome of the second session, and the fact that a small minority among the bishops appeared to have thwarted the will of the majority. A few commentators suggested that political and economic considerations underlay the liberal-conservative clash within the church. Gary MacEoin, a syndicated columnist, wrote that some bishops might balk at reform of the Curia because it would mean "the dismantling of the economic empire which is a big part of the Curia's power structure," and a prominent Catholic author, Michael Novak, suggested that the commitment of Vatican funds in Italian industry, and the fear of nationalization of some industries which might result from the shift to a left-center coalition in
Italian politics, could not be ignored in discussing positions at the Ecumenical Council.

Others commenting on the second session asked why the American bishops had not assumed greater leadership in pressing for the positions they supported. Unlike some other groups, they had not lobbied in support of chapters 4 and 5, although the American hierarchy generally favored them.

If the American hierarchy had not marshalled its collective strength during the second session, however, it began to speak out firmly and forthrightly in the months that followed. Expectations that religious liberty and the declaration on the Jews would be approved at the third session were voiced by American prelates on numerous occasions, and in some cases Jewish meetings provided the forum for such statements.

Albert Cardinal Meyer, addressing a group of Protestant ministers at the Chicago Theological Seminary in January 1964, stated that “the ecumenical movement cannot be securely founded until a clear statement on religious liberty is fully developed.” Richard Cardinal Cushing, speaking at St. Peter’s College in February, declared that without a Vatican Council endorsement of religious liberty the ecumenical movement would “fall on its face.” Archbishop Robert Lucey stated in San Antonio in March that “the American hierarchy should take the lead to procure adoption” of a decree proclaiming freedom of religion. Bishop Robert E. Tracy of Louisiana wrote in an article published in several Catholic journals in January, “I do not believe that even the best-contrived obstructionism can keep considerations on the church, the bishops, ecumenism, the Jews, and religious liberty from coming to a vote on the floor at the next session.”

Speaking before a meeting sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League and the Federation of Jewish Agencies in Philadelphia in March, Archbishop John J. Krol said that the statement pending before the Council “should help to eliminate future attempts to pervert the Gospel of love into a Gospel of hatred.” Archbishop Krol declared that the Gospel account of the Crucifixion had been distorted and used “as a pretext for persecuting the Jews,” but that the New Testament gives “no basis for hate and anti-Jewish feeling.” Archbishop John F. Dearden of Detroit predicted approval of the chapters on religious freedom and Christian-Jewish relations at the third session of the Council. So did Bishop John Wright of Pittsburgh.

A powerful condemnation of antisemitism was made by Cardinal Spellman at the annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee in
April 1964. Cardinal Spellman stated that antisemitism "can never find a basis in the Catholic religion" and that it was "simply absurd to maintain that there is some kind of continuing guilt which is transferred to any group and which rests upon them as a curse which they must suffer."

There were also initiatives from the Jewish side. In March 1964 a B'nai B'rith delegation of three\(^{18}\) met with Pope Paul VI and communicated the "profound interest" of the Jewish community in the proposed declaration on religious freedom and Catholic-Jewish relations. In May reports were received from Rome that the draft decree on Jews had been watered down, and that the specific repudiation of the deicide charge had been eliminated. On May 30, an American Jewish Committee delegation of six\(^{19}\) met with Pope Paul VI. In a statement subsequently published in the Vatican paper, *Osservatore Romano* (May 31, 1964), and picked up by the Catholic press in many parts of the world, the Pope expressed his hope that ethnic differences "should never be for you, or for any other ethnic group, a reason for undergoing any diminution in your human rights," and firmly disassociated himself from the "political question" (understood as reference to the State of Israel). Discussing the religious aspect, the Pope declared his "particular consideration for the Jewish religious tradition with which Christianity is so intimately linked" and strongly deplored "the horrible ordeals of which the Jews have been the victims in recent years." He declined, however, to comment specifically on the deicide question, except to say that he had read Cardinal Spellman's address and that Cardinal Spellman had spoken his sentiments.

Also in May, Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum of the American Jewish Committee and Joseph Lichten of the Anti-Defamation League were invited to speak before the Catholic Press Association in Pittsburgh. Both addressed themselves to the importance of a clear and forthright Ecumenical Council statement specifically repudiating the deicide charge. The Catholic press responded to these concerns with a strong outpouring of editorial opinion; over the next months, diocesan newspapers and other Catholic journals made editorial appeals in behalf of a strong Jewish declaration.

---

\(^{18}\) Label Katz, international president; Maurice Bisgyer, executive vice president, and Saul E. Jofes, secretary-general.

\(^{19}\) Morris B. Abram, president; Ralph Friedman, chairman of the executive board; Philip E. Hoffman, chairman of the board of governors; Zachariah Shuster, director of the European office; John Slawson, executive vice president; Mrs. Leonard M. Sperry, member of the executive board.
There were some comments from the Protestant side as well. In an "open letter" to the American Catholic bishops, in Commonweal on June 26, 1964, and in a similar article in Look magazine on October 6, 1964, Robert McAfee Brown, a Protestant theologian and delegate-observer to the second session of the Council for the World Presbyterian Alliance, urged "vigorous advocacy" of the statement on religious liberty and stressed the "urgency" of a statement on the Jews which would condemn both antisemitism and "any notion of the Jews as a deicide race." Failure to adopt a statement on the Jews that would not contain both of these crucial emphases, he wrote, "would be a bitter blow indeed to the non-Catholic world."

The blow, however, was half-struck already. Rumors that the draft declaration on the Jews had been watered down were reported in the New York Times on June 12. On August 25 Joseph Cardinal Ritter confirmed that the condemnation of the deicide charge against Jews had not been retained in the revised draft. Moreover, on September 3, the New York Herald Tribune published an unauthorized version of the text of the revised draft, which differed from Cardinal Bea's earlier version in several other critical particulars. In addition to avoiding the term "deicide"—and thus the rejection of this term as applied to the Jewish people—the new document contained what seemed to many Jews a clear call to conversion:

It is also worth remembering that the union of the Jewish people with the church is a part of the Christian hope. Accordingly, and following the teaching of the apostle Paul (cf. Rom. 11:25), the church expects

---

It should be noted that Protestant groups were clarifying their own theological perspective on the Jews during this same period. In Løgumkloster, Denmark, in April and May 1964, the Lutheran World Federation's Department of World Mission denounced antisemitism as "spiritual suicide" and urged the member churches of the federation to examine their publications and remove and oppose false generalizations about Jews: "Especially reprehensible are the notions that Jews, rather than all mankind, are responsible for the death of Jesus the Christ and that God has for this reason rejected His covenant people."

In June the General Board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA also passed a resolution branding antisemitism, "no matter what its origin, as absolutely irreconcilable with the profession and practice of the Christian faith" and recalling the World Council of Churches' statement in 1961 that "the historic events which led to the Crucifixion should not be so presented as to fasten upon the Jewish people of today responsibilities which belong to our corporate humanity and not to one race or community."

Similarly, in November 1964, the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church, in a strong unanimous statement, called the deicide charge against the Jewish people "a tragic misunderstanding of the inner significance of the Crucifixion."
in unshakeable faith and with ardent desire the entrance of that people into the fullness of the people of God established by Christ.

Everyone should be careful, therefore, not to expose the Jewish people as a rejected nation, be it in catechetical tuition, in preaching of God’s word or in worldly conversation, nor should anything else be said or done which may alienate the minds of men from the Jews. Equally, all should be on their guard not to impute to the Jews of our time that which was perpetrated in the Passion of Christ.

While the original version had stated that neither the Jewish people of today nor the Jewish people of the time of Jesus could be held accountable for the Crucifixion, the revised draft spoke only of the Jews of today, thus leaving open the question of collective guilt in earlier times. Perhaps most objectionable from the Jewish viewpoint, however, was the “therefore”—that is, the implication that respect for Jews was motivated only by missionary interest, and contingent upon Jewish conversion. Predictably, there were immediate negative responses from Jewish sources.\(^{21}\)

**Third Session**

When the third session of the Council opened on September 16, it was evident that prelates supporting a stronger statement on the Jews would fight to get it on the floor of the Council. Archbishop John C. Heenan of Westminster, Primate of Great Britain, publicly expressed astonishment that the text had been changed without the knowledge of the commission charged with its preparation. On September 16, 170 out of 240 American bishops, meeting in Rome, said they would press for a declaration on religious liberty and a stronger declaration on the Jews. Editorial support was also forthcoming. *America* (Sept. 19, 1964) commented:

The passages that seem to have disturbed Jewish commentators most, however, referred to Christian hope for the eventual approach of the Jewish people to a full gathering of the People of God. Here, regrettably, the translation in the press imparts to these carefully phrased statements a tone that understandably might cause a Jewish reader to question the sincerity of the document’s earlier insistence on promoting “mutual understanding and esteem between Catholics and Jews through theological research and brotherly conversations.” It may well be that this controversial passage will also meet with sharp questioning in the Council.

\(^{21}\) A description of Jewish reactions to the Ecumenical Council and the internal debate within the Jewish community may be found in the final section of this article.
Similarly, the Providence Visitor, a diocesan weekly, editorialized, (Sept. 25, 1964):

The failure of the new draft to restrict the absolution from the deicide charge to only the Jewish people of today leaves room for the belief that the Jews as a people in the past were the guilty ones. And yet we know by faith, and from the Scripture, that Christ walked freely to his death. . . . The Jews, despite all, have been employed as a handy scapegoat for us to unload our part of the guilt in the death of Christ by casting it on someone else.

And the Protestant Christian Century commented (Sept. 23, 1964) that the changed draft

... is not adequate atonement for the crimes Christians have committed against Jews and defended with the charge that Jews are God-killers. The first business of the church is not to evangelize the Jews but to repent of its sins against them.

The Jewish declaration, introduced on September 25, came up for debate on September 28 and 29. Predictably, it was opposed by prelates from Arab nations. Ignace Cardinal Tappouni, Syrian-Rite patriarch of Antioch, speaking also in the name of four other Oriental prelates, declared that adoption of the document would create “the most serious difficulties for the hierarchy and the Roman Catholic faithful in many localities,” because of the hostility of the Arab world to such a declaration.

But the sentiment of the great majority of Council Fathers was clear. The most frequent and energetic demand to be heard during 35 interventions was for the restoration of those aspects of the original text which dealt with the relationship of the Jewish people to the death of Jesus and the specific, unambiguous condemnation of antisemitic movements. A forthright appeal for justice echoed repeatedly in the Basilica of St. Peter’s. The statement must be made “more positive, less timid, more charitable,” declared Cardinal Cushing. “There is no Christian rationale—neither theological nor historical—for any inequity, hatred or persecution of our Jewish brothers. . . . If not many Christian voices were lifted in recent years against the great injustices, yet let our voices humbly cry out now.” “The Jews expect from us, first of all, words of justice,” said French Bishop Leon Elchinger of Strasbourg. It cannot be denied, he said, that in this century and past centuries as well, sons of the church—

22 Coptic-Rite Patriarch Sidarouss of Alexandria, Melkite-Rite Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh of Antioch, Chaldean-Rite Patriarch Paul II Cheikho of Babylon, and Armenian-Rite Patriarch Ignace Pierre XVI Batanian of Cilicia.
not infrequently in the name of the church—committed crimes against the Jews. "Why should we not find in the spirit of the Gospel the courage to ask for forgiveness in the name of so many Christians for so many serious injustices?" Bishop Sergio Méndez Arceo of Cuernavaca, Mexico, and Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle of Washington, D.C., urged that the church not only condemn antisemitism, but also expressly deplore and interdict all persecutions, especially those of Christian origin. Archbishops Lorenz Jaeger of Paderborn, Germany, Franjo Seper of Zagreb, Yugoslavia, and Bishop Jules Daem of Antwerp, Belgium, agreed that the only effective way to deprive persecutions and discriminations of their theoretical basis was for the Council to make the joint heritage of Revelation with Israel unmistakably clear. Franziskus Cardinal Koenig of Vienna asked why the revised text, in condemning persecution of the Jews, omitted the words "formerly or in our own times" which had appeared in the original.

A majority of the Council Fathers who spoke urged either a return to the original text or the addition to the present text of an express rejection by the Council of the deicide charge. American Cardinals Cushing, Meyer, and Ritter were especially vigorous in this demand, as were Cardinals Joseph Frings of Cologne, Achille Liénart of Lille, Giacamo Lercaro of Bologna, Paul-Emile Léger of Montreal and König; Archbishops Seper, Philip Pocock of Toronto, and Heenan; Bishops Elschinger, Méndez-Arceo and Pieter Nierman of Groningen (on behalf of the Dutch Episcopate), and Stephen Leven of San Antonio, Texas. Archbishop Heenan and Bishop Leven were particularly forthright. The original text, stated Archbishop Heenan, had become known everywhere. If, after a full-scale debate, the rejection of the deicide charge were dropped, it would seem that the church was still convinced that the Jews were deicides. "I humbly plead," he concluded, "that this Declaration of ours shall openly proclaim that the Jewish people as such is not guilty of the death of our Lord."

Replying to the suggestion that the statement on deicide had been suppressed because of the word "deicide" is philosophically and theologically absurd, Bishop Leven declared, "We are not dealing here with some philosophical entity, but with a word of infamy and execration which was invented by Christians and used to blame and persecute the Jews. For many centuries, and even in our own, Christians have hurled this word

---

23 Cardinal Spellman was hospitalized in New York at this time, but he had privately communicated his support of a strengthened declaration, and expended his efforts on behalf of it.
against Jews and because of it they have justified every kind of horrible excess and even their slaughter. . . . We must tear this word out of the Christian vocabulary so that it may never again be used against the Jews.”

As for the formulation of the church’s aspiration regarding Jewish conversion, several speakers wanted it rewritten. “The paragraph on the conversion of Jews must be changed, and less offensive wording must be chosen to express the hope of the union of all mankind,” said Cardinal Ritter. Archbishop O’Boyle said that the passage in question “brought to the minds of many Jews the memories of past persecutions, forced conversions and forced rejection of their faith. . . . There should be no hint of pressure or of the means that would disrupt fruitful dialogue between the Church and the Jewish people.”

(Several Fathers from Asian and African countries urged that the declaration be enlarged to include reference to Hinduism, Buddhism and even paganism.)

With such a mandate behind it, Cardinal Bea’s commission was now free to rewrite the document in its original spirit. The opposition intensified its efforts to block action. On September 30, speaking before leaders of the Eastern-Rite communities in Damascus, Syrian Premier Salah el-Bitar assailed the draft statement, and asked the heads of the Catholic communities to urge Pope Paul to thwart the attempt to exonerate the Jews from deicide. *Al-Baath*, the official newspaper of Syria’s ruling party, said the Syrian government would bring the issue before a conference of neutralist heads of state in Cairo in order to enlist wider opposition to the proposed declaration. Other diplomatic interventions also took place, reportedly from President Sukarno of Indonesia and Nasser’s plenipotentiary ambassador, made directly to Pope Paul. Once again, antisemitic pamphlets were circulated among the bishops, charging that the Jews had masterminded the declaration and that Cardinal Bea was himself Jewish. In addition, last-ditch attempts to block progress were made by the conservative minority within the Council who were disturbed by the general direction the Council was taking and for whom the document on the Jews was just another example of a dangerous departure from established tradition, with the declaration on religious liberty even more threatening.

On October 9 a letter came to Cardinal Bea from the secretary general of the Council, Archbishop Pericle Felici, acting, he said, on behalf of high authority, announcing the appointment of new mixed commissions to review both the document on religious liberty and that on the Jews.

This maneuver was seen as an attempt to delay or prevent Council
action despite the will of the majority, and the progressives responded with immediate action. A group of the leading progressive cardinals drew up a petition to Pope Paul firmly protesting the violation of conciliar independence. They charged that the conservatives were attempting to cut the Jewish document to one insignificant paragraph, to rewrite the declaration on religious liberty, to weaken the statement that the bishops share in the full authority of the church, and to bring the Council to a close before such controversial topics as birth control and nuclear weapons could be discussed.

Pope Paul supported the progressive cardinals on this occasion. Gaston Cruzat, head of the press office of the Latin American episcopate, announced that the Pope had expressed support for the progressives on all four points.

The document that was finally issued by Cardinal Bea's commission and distributed to the Council Fathers was entitled "The Relationship of the Church to non-Christian Religions" and dealt with Moslems, Buddhists and Hindus, as well as with Jews. The section devoted to Jews was even stronger than the initial draft decree of November 8, 1963. The specific repudiation of the deicide accusation had been restored. The implication that respect and esteem for Jews was contingent upon their conversion had been replaced by an expectation of "that day, known to God alone, on which all people will address the Lord in a single voice and serve Him shoulder to shoulder." It denounced hatred and persecution of Jews, and recommended mutual respect and fraternal dialogue.

The vote on the religious liberty declaration was set for November 19 and on the new text regarding Jews and other non-Christians for November 20. On November 19 Eugene Cardinal Tisserant announced in the name of the Council presidency that no vote would be taken on the religious-liberty document since certain Fathers had requested more time to read the new version. This announcement set off a serious disturbance on the floor of the Council. In less than a half hour more than 800 bishops, their number later increased to 1,400, signed a petition requesting the Pope "urgently, more urgently, most urgently" to change the decision of the presidency. Pope Paul refused to set aside that decision, but he promised that religious liberty would be the first order of business at the next session of the Council. It was in an atmosphere of tension and resentment that on the following day the long-awaited text on the Jews—now part of a more comprehensive declaration dealing with the Catholic attitude toward all non-Christians—came up for a vote after three years of struggle and procedural and political opposition. It passed with
The overwhelming margin noted above, and more than one commentator has suggested that the conservative minority might have maneuvered to delay it, too, if not for its reluctance to risk a repetition of the openly-expressed resentment over the postponement of the vote on religious liberty.

**Debate within the Jewish Community**

As previously noted, the declaration on the Jews, in its various formulations and through its ups and downs within the Council, stirred up a spirited debate within the Jewish community. There were two basic questions: the declaration itself and the role of Jews in relation to it.

As for the declaration itself, did it spring from a moral impulse to correct the failures of the past and purify the church's relationship to Jews, or was it an expediency, an easy way of glossing over centuries of abuse without accepting responsibility? Was the declaration intended to create respect and esteem for the continuing Jewish people, or to encourage their conversion? Was our generation witnessing a sincere effort by the church to overcome a long tradition of prejudice, or was it trying to pretend that the tradition had never existed?

Sharp differences of opinion regarding the intentions of the document and the motivations of the church were not immediately apparent. When the first announcements were made in the fall of 1963 that the Ecumenical Council would consider a document repudiating the deicide charge against Jews, the information was publicly welcomed by major Jewish organizations and criticized by none. There were a few dissenting individual voices, such as Rabbi Harry Essrig of Temple Emanuel in Grand Rapids, Mich., who called the document "too little and too late" and described it as "a sop to the rising intelligence of mankind," but such critical responses were exceptional at this early stage. Affirmative reactions were more characteristic, and expressions of gratification came from many Jewish spokesmen, including A. M. Sonnabend of the American Jewish Committee, Dore Schary of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), Nahum Goldmann of the World Jewish Congress (WJC), Rabbi Theodore Friedman of the Rabbinical Assembly, and Elio Toaff, chief rabbi of Rome. It was hailed by the general assembly of the Council of Jewish Federation and Welfare Funds.

But when the second session of Vatican Council II ended with no action on the declaration, criticism was more common. Behind this criticism could be sensed a mistrust of the church's motives, a suspicion that theological dialogue was the honeyed approach to conversion, and simple resentment over the prospect of some 2,500 bishops debating the extent of
Jewish culpability in the death of Jesus. Before the Rabbinical Council of America (RCA) in February 1964, Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik, a leading spokesman for Orthodox Jewry, attacked the proposed declaration as "nothing more or less than evangelical propaganda." He also discouraged religious dialogue with Catholics. Others charged that the "absolving" of Jews from a crime that they never committed was condescending. At a National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) meeting in July, (Orthodox) Rabbi Shubert Spero charged that the declaration was calculated to absolve the Jew "of some mythical guilt without the majority religion accepting any responsibility for the historic suffering and agony of the Jewish people." Remarked another rabbi "I don't feel that I have to be exonerated. I didn't crucify anyone."

With the publication of the revised text on September 3, when it became clear that the repudiation of the deicide charge had been omitted and the statement containing what Jews considered a conversionary appeal inserted, the document came under additional attack, this time including Jewish sources which had previously welcomed the declaration and which had, in various degrees, worked cooperatively with Catholic authorities here and abroad. Such spokesmen argued that Jews could not welcome a document which did not recognize the validity and integrity of Judaism, not merely as the mother faith of Christianity, but in its own right. Thus, Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee, stated with regard to the expectation of Jewish conversion "inevitably such an appeal must be rejected by Jews, for any declaration, no matter how well intended, whose effect would mean the dissolution of the Jewish people as such and the elimination of Judaism as a religion will be received with resentment by Jews throughout the world."

Rabbi Mordecai M. Kaplan, writing in Jewish Spectator (January 1965), stated that dialogue based on the expectation or desire of Jewish conversion was "unthinkable" and that it was tragic for the church to forget that "throughout the centuries it manifested 'its unshakeable faith, its ardent desire and its expectation' regarding the Jewish people by means of unspeakable atrocities against our forebears."

Rabbi Heschel described the revised draft as "spiritual fratricide" and said that he would rather go to Auschwitz if faced with the alternative of conversion or death—a reaction, which, according to Catholic journalist John Cogley, "struck even the most 'progressive' Council Fathers as somewhat extreme." Joseph Lichten of the ADL, then in Europe, commented that the chief objection to the revised draft was that "it fails to
state clearly that the Jews are not guilty of deicide," and foresaw an "unhappy result" if the present draft were adopted.

While it is true that there was some Jewish criticism of the declaration, the Ecumenical Council, and the church, it is also true that Jewish leaders reserved much of their criticism for one another. Jewish debate on the question of the role of Jews in relation to the declaration, and to the Catholic church in general, was passionate and at times acrimonious, and revealed basic differences in philosophy and policy.

The convening of an Ecumenical Council, so dramatically announced by Pope John in January 1959, shortly after his election to the papacy, was seen by many Catholics and Jews as a historic opportunity for the church to set its house in order regarding the Jews. Antisemitism had been condemned before, but here was the possibility for the church officially and authoritatively to repudiate the traditional interpretations of Catholic doctrine which have stimulated or rationalized persecution of Jews across the centuries: foremost among them, the notion of the Jews as a deicide race.

Obviously, such an action would be welcomed by all Jews. But, some felt, the Ecumenical Council being a totally Catholic internal affair, Jews should seek no relationship or involvement with it. Antisemitism, the argument went, is a Christian problem, and both the initiative and the means for overcoming it should come from the Christian community. It would be unseemly and undignified for Jews to plead in their own behalf. Others, particularly Jews associated with organizations which had over the years built up sustained, cooperative relationships in the Catholic community and had actively promoted interfaith dialogue, felt that Jews had not only the right, but also the responsibility to pursue certain aims. Antisemitism might be a Christian problem, they reasoned, just as anti-Negro prejudice is a white problem; but Jews, after all, were its victims and must advocate their own cause, just as American Negroes had taken the lead in the struggle for racial justice. In so far as antisemitism found sanction in Christian teachings about Jews, it was a problem of direct concern to Jews. In so far as the Ecumenical Council might put an end to such teachings, that was a legitimate goal to pursue. Obviously, certain initiatives would have to come from the Christian side, but Jews could and should point to the problems, appeal to the conscience of Christian leaders, and communicate their hopes for effective Council action.

Accordingly, some Jewish organizations devoted substantial time and energy to this end, publicly—in books, studies, articles, and radio and
television programs; by raising the issue before a whole variety of Church-related groups, or by providing forums for authoritative Catholic spokesmen to express their views—and privately, through correspondence and unpublicized meetings with Catholic leaders here and abroad.

The American Jewish Committee and the ADL were perhaps most heavily committed to this kind of program, but B'nai B'rith, WJC, and the World Conference of Jewish Organizations all, at one time or another and in diverse ways, became involved.

The American Jewish Committee not only submitted research memoranda on Catholic teaching and liturgy regarding Jews to Cardinal Bea's secretariat, and arranged for the confidential meeting of Jewish leaders with Cardinal Bea, as previously described, it also maintained communication with various Catholic prelates and experts. Articles by its European director, Zachariah Shuster, and its interreligious-affairs director, Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, dealing with various aspects of the deicide charge, appeared in scholarly and popular publications. Particularly noteworthy was Mr. Shuster's participation in a symposium (London Observer, August 11, 1963) in which Lady Barbara Ward Jackson presented a Catholic point of view. Rabbi Tanenbaum and Mr. Shuster were present in Rome during parts of the Council's sessions and conferred with Catholic authorities. In the summer of 1964 an American Jewish Committee delegation visited Latin America and met with several cardinals and bishops with regard to the pending declaration. The Anti-Defamation League was also actively involved in discussions with Catholic prelates and its representative, Joseph Lichten, was present in Rome during two of the Council's sessions. A summary of an ADL-sponsored survey indicating some relationship between antisemitism and the deicide charge was reprinted by the Dutch Documentation Center of the Council and widely distributed. Both the American Jewish Committee and ADL carried on extensive interfaith activity. Many of these programs, such as ADL-sponsored institutes on Catholic-Jewish relations and AJC-sponsored conferences on religious textbooks, provided the occasion for an exploration of Catholic teachings about Jews, and these events were frequently noted in the religious press, and used as the basis for constructive editorial comment.

The European representative of B'nai B'rith, E. L. Ehrlich, was also in communication with various Catholic prelates, as was Gerhart Riegner of the WJC, and Fritz Becker, the director of its Rome office.

Synagogal and rabbinical groups eschewed any organizational relationship with the Council, as did NCRAC; but a number of rabbis and com-
munity-relations professionals in America, Europe, and Latin America communicated with members of the Catholic hierarchy, exchanged views with Catholic friends and colleagues, and wrote or spoke out on the subject in their individual capacities. Some Jewish laymen were similarly active.

Since key Jewish religious leaders, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform, had been kept informed regarding the activities and efforts of the various communal agencies and had frequently been consulted in the preparation of specialized documents, there appeared to be a consensus within the Jewish community regarding the usefulness of these efforts. However, in the summer of 1964, when it appeared that the declaration had been emasculated, tempers began to fray and some Jewish organizations expressed open criticism not only of the draft declaration, but also of Jewish efforts on behalf of it. Officers of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), RCA, and WJC attacked “pressure” tactics on behalf of the declaration. CCAR was reported (New York Times, June 21, 1964) to have expressed a consensus that the Vatican statement was a Christian problem and Jews need not press for its adoption. Its president, Rabbi Leon Feuer, said in a presidential report that an “obsequious appeal for a statement by the Ecumenical Council can only be revolting to the Jewish spirit and an insult to the memory of Jewish martyrdom.” Later, in an interview reported in the New York Times, he criticized Jewish secular groups for “undignified pressure.”

In June, Orthodox rabbis assailed lay Jewish groups for having involved themselves on behalf of the proposed declaration. Rabbi Abraham AvRutick, president of RCA, and Rabbi Israel Klavan, executive secretary, argued that such groups were concerning themselves with questions of theology, in which they had no competence.

Similarly, before WJC in Jerusalem in July, Nahum Goldmann, criticized Jewish “pressure” on the Vatican and stated that “Jews as a people should maintain a position of self-respect and dignity and not try to raise the issue with too much intensity.” (To whom these strictures were addressed was not entirely clear, inasmuch as Dr. Goldmann himself had been involved in several approaches to the Vatican. Civiltà Cattolica, the leading Jesuit publication in Rome, recalled Dr. Goldmann’s visit to Cardinal Bea, and the memorandum submitted to Cardinal Bea by Dr. Goldmann and Label Katz.) There were similar criticisms (not unanimous) before NCRAC in July, which reported “an extensive feeling . . . that the overtures made by some Jewish groups toward the church for a statement on Catholic-Jewish relations have been excessive and unbe-
coming." *Viewpoint*, the periodical of the (Orthodox) National Council of Young Israel, commented tartly on July 19: "With all the Jewish secular leaders vying for audiences with the Pope, the Vatican must be subject to a virtual traffic jam."

Since the American Jewish Committee, whose delegation had recently met with the Pope, was the obvious target of some of these attacks—indeed, was so named by Rabbi Israel Miller of RCA—its president, Morris B. Abram, replied in a public statement that its activities in Catholic-Jewish relations were based on intergroup-relations considerations, not theology, and that where theological matters were involved it had consulted eminent Jewish theologians.

Jewish efforts on behalf of the Ecumenical Council declaration had their defenders as well as their detractors. Rabbi Jacob Neusner, writing in the Connecticut *Jewish Ledger* on November 19, said there was "nothing to condemn and much to praise, in the dignified and well-informed efforts" to do away with the deicide charge. He went on to state:

> With a sad heart we have seen vilification of meaningful and honest efforts to secure the good name of Jewry and Judaism among a vast and influential segment of mankind . . . We continue to hope that these efforts will bear fruit, and we continue to feel deep gratitude for the devotion of the men and institutions who currently labor for Israel's welfare despite Israel's complaint.

Despite differences of opinion and cross-criticism within the Jewish community, there was still considerable sentiment in the Jewish community that a strong declaration without evangelical connotations would be of great value, and that Jewish organizations should agree on a joint statement expressing a representative viewpoint. Accordingly, 14 major Jewish organizations joined, on Oct. 6, in issuing the following "Statement to the Jewish Community": 24

> Throughout our history we Jews have been the bearers of a distinctive religious commitment. No matter how great the pressures, no sacrifice has been too great for us to maintain our unique religious character.

> A concern with the common destiny of all men is deeply rooted in our spiritual heritage. We, therefore, note with satisfaction the develop-

---

ment of increasingly harmonious relationships among the great faiths that have engendered common positions and actions on vital humanitarian issues. The ever increasing contact between peoples in the modern world has created new dimensions in human relations which Jews have welcomed and in which they have fully participated. Yet today, no less than in the past, the Jew remains steadfast in his historic commitment, determined to preserve his faith and heritage.

The Ecumenical Council currently meeting in Rome is a convocation of the religious leadership of the Catholic church, concerned with the problems of Christian unity and the definition of Catholic religious doctrine. It would, therefore, be improper for the Jewish community which is not a part of Christianity or its ecumenical movement to offer suggestions concerning religious doctrine to this Council. However, it is our hope, that this Council will further harmonious relationships among the religions of the world to seek solutions to the problems of mankind.

All men of good will are encouraged by the concern of this Council with the fact that certain teachings of the church have been used at times as a source of antisemitism. It is to be hoped that the final determination of the Council will contribute to the effective elimination of antisemitism and all sources of bigotry and prejudice and will lead to better understanding amongst all peoples.

The declaration as finally voted at the Ecumenical Council, with the objectionable passage changed and the deicide accusation firmly rejected, was welcomed by the same organizations. When the Council Fathers have voted its promulgation, they declared in a joint statement, “the Catholic church will have made a historic contribution to the advancement of harmonious relations among the peoples of the great faiths.” The statement went on to “reiterate our belief in the distinctive role of Judaism as a separate faith community in making its contributions to the achievements of the common goals of humanity.” The declaration was also welcomed by President Zalman Shazar of Israel. Receiving a delegation of archbishops and bishops from Africa, Asia, and South America, he stated that “all honor is due to the Ecumenical Council” for having voted “the daring and purifying pronouncement that explicitly forbids hatred of the Jews and abrogates that ancient accusation for which there is no ground in fact, but which has drenched my people’s history with blood.”

Acclaim was not unanimous among Jews. Rabbi Emanuel Rackman of Yeshiva University stated in November that there could be no worthy discussion (with the Catholic church) until Jews were regarded as equals; but while the declaration speaks of a common patrimony, “not once does
it accord Judaism recognition as an equal..." Leo Pfeffer, special counsel to AJCongress, dismissed the declaration as "not an act for the preservation of the Jews, but for the preservation of the Catholic church."

The Future of the Declaration

The declaration, although accepted in principle, continues to be the target of a sustained campaign by Arab nations to prevent its final adoption. The Vatican correspondent of the Roman news magazine, Il Punto, (quoted in London Jewish Chronicle, January 22, 1965) reported that President Charles Helou of Lebanon, the only Christian Arab head of state and a former ambassador to the Holy See, had been charged by the Arab League with expressing officially the opposition of Arab leaders to the Jewish document, and that Arab diplomatic circles did not exclude a visit to the Vatican by President Nasser of Egypt. The Arab governments have also communicated their views to papal nuncios and asked Catholic and other Christian leaders in their various countries to communicate their opposition to the declaration to Pope Paul.

Patriarch Kyrillos VI of Alexandria, head of the Coptic Orthodox church in Egypt, branded the Council's preliminary approval of the declaration "an imperialistic plot that has nothing to do with religion" and went on to say: "The Holy Bible convicted the Jews and their children of Christ's crucifixion and to absolve them of that crime would be open to refutation of the Bible." (Religious News Service, New York, November 20, 1964.) The patriarch extended invitations to patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops of the Coptic Orthodox churches in Ethiopia, Sudan, Jordan, and other Arab countries to attend a summit conference to register disapproval of the declaration. The Greek radio reported that Greek Orthodox Patriarch Chrisophorus of Alexandria also strongly protested the draft declaration (Religious News Service, December 4, 1964).

In an article which appeared in all Jordanian newspapers on November 23, 1964, a leader of a Protestant church in Amman called on Jordanian Catholics to boycott services held in churches belonging to various monasteries and to say their prayers at home in Arabic "in order to force the Vatican to cancel its decision absolving Jews." A meeting of Jordanian Christian notables sent a cable to the Pope asking that the declaration be dropped from the agenda of next year's session of the Council (Religious News Service, November 20, 1964). A Syrian government news bulletin reported that Chaldean-Rite Bishop Stéphane Bello of Aleppo has dispatched "tens of telegrams" to the Vatican in protest (Providence Visitor, October 9, 1964).
Despite repeated public assurances from Cardinal Bea and others that the purpose of the declaration is purely religious, Arab leaders continue to claim it to be Zionist-inspired and part of a plot "to mobilize world Catholic opinion against the Arabs for reigniting the Palestinian question," in the words of Syrian Premier Salah el-Bitar. (Providence Visitor, October 9, 1964.)

A final observation might be made regarding the extent and intensity of Arab efforts to prevent and then to overturn that section of the declaration which deals with Catholic-Jewish relations. When the late Father Gustave Weigel announced in June 1963 that the proposed Jewish declaration had been sidetracked at the Ecumenical Council because of Arab opposition, the Arab Information Center was quick to issue a disclaimer. Saadat Hasan, chief of press and public liaison of the Arab Information Center, stated that the Arab nations would welcome "a clear and forthright statement by the Ecumenical Council on antisemitism." Arabs make a distinction between Judaism and Jews on the one hand and Zionism and Israel on the other, he declared, and are anti-Zionist but not anti-Jewish. Yet by October 1964 Arab political opposition to the Jewish declaration had led Moslem government officials into Christian theological debate, and a Syrian government radio broadcast (as reported by the National Catholic Welfare Conference) declared: "When the Jews dipped their hands into the innocent blood of Jesus Christ they were in fact trying to assassinate Christ's principles and teachings" (Providence Visitor, October 9, 1964).

Patriarch Maximos IV Saigh of Antioch issued a communiqué intending to reassure the Arab world that the declaration was not, in any sense, a political document. Referring to the Arab press response as an "orchestrated uproar," the patriarch stated that the declaration "is a purely religious statement, which pertains to the position of the Catholic Church toward the non-Christian religions." He cautioned Arab critics of the declaration to differentiate clearly between Judaism as a religion and Zionism as a political movement. This effort to pacify Arab hostility, however, was marred by some hostilities of its own. The patriarch said that "there certainly remains on the forehead of the Jewish people, as long as it is far from Christ the Redeemer, what the prophets of the Old Testament prophesied: a stain of shame. But this stain of shame does not constitute a personal crime . . ."; he continued that "because of their propaganda skill, the media which are in their hands and under their influence, the Jews can clothe reality as they wish. They exploit the least word that is said to serve their political interests"; and he concluded by
alleging that the great majority of the Council, and notably the American prelates, voted for the declaration for personal reasons and interests: "The personal reasons are dictated by a sentiment of pity due to the massacre of millions of Jews by Nazism and the interest is due to the fact that the great number of Americans have commercial interests with Jews."

(Replying to this communiqué, Msgr. George Higgins, director of the Social Action Commission of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, wrote in January 1965 that the theological accusation “did not reflect the spirit or the tone of the Council’s declaration and most certainly would have been rejected by the Fathers if it had been put to a vote on the floor of the Council.” He also said that Jews would legitimately resent the inference regarding their propaganda skill and influence, and that the motives attributed to the vote of the American prelates were “demonstrably unfair to the American bishops and, however unintentionally, . . . calculated . . . to fan the flames of anti-Semitism. . . .”)

The interest of the Arab world in the charge of deicide against Jews cannot be attributed to religious concern: the question is of little or no consequence to Islam. The Arab opposition to any statement expressing esteem or affection for Jews, suggesting a special relationship between Christianity and the Jewish people, deploiring specific acts of persecution against Jews, and removing a theological basis of antisemitism is politically motivated, and this opposition has been carried out on the highest political and diplomatic levels. Whether the Catholic church will respond to these pressures, and in what ways it may respond, are questions which will affect not only the ultimate disposition of the declaration but also the future of Catholic-Jewish relations.

Cardinal Bea, in a statement published in Osservatore Romano on November 30, cautioned against “arbitrary and twisted” interpretations of the declaration. “This is a religious question in which the Council aims at nothing else but the promotion of peace everywhere; it hopes that a religious matter will not be misused in order to justify political discrimination and prejudices.”
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Jewish Population in the United States, 1964

The Jewish population of the United States is currently estimated to be approximately 5,660,000. The individual community estimates (Appendix Table 3, p. 147) are arrived at variously, and changes in these may be as much the result of revised statistical procedures as of actual change. For this reason caution is necessary in comparing one year's figure for a community, a state, or the nation with those a few years earlier or later.

The data in Appendix Table 3 were obtained as before (AJYB, 1962 [Vol. 63], p. 135), communities with fewer than 100 Jews being omitted. State totals in Appendix Table 1 were obtained by adding to the figures in Table 3 those communities with fewer than 100 Jews and estimates for communities of unknown Jewish population (generally, twice the number of Jews known to reside in communities with fewer than 100). State totals were then adjusted where possible to take into account community estimates crossing state lines.

Urban-Rural Distribution

The Jewish population is almost entirely urban. The following table comes from the U.S. Census survey on "Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States: March 1957" [Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Series P–20, No. 79, February 2, 1958 (AJYB, 1959 [Vol. 60], p. 7)] and shows this graphically:
An even more dramatic evidence of the urban nature of the United States Jewish population may be seen from the following table listing the Jewish population of the New York-Northeastern New Jersey standard consolidated area, which includes New York City, its immediate suburbs, and several counties in New York and New Jersey. The Jews of this one area are almost half of all Jews in the United States.

TABLE 2. JEWISH POPULATION IN GREATER NEW YORK AND NEIGHBORING COUNTIES IN NEW YORK STATE AND NEW JERSEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1,836,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County</td>
<td>373,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland County</td>
<td>8,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris County</td>
<td>2,355</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County</td>
<td>34,610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson County</td>
<td>31,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen County</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic County</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex County</td>
<td>21,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset County</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,678,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the absence of new data, the estimates for New York City and suburban Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester counties have been maintained at 1962 levels (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], pp. 57–59, and 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 3–4). These are crucial for assessing the validity of the national estimate.

**AGE DISTRIBUTION**

The only source of information nationally on the age distribution of Jews is the 1957 Census survey. The table following is adapted from the report of that study and was first carried in AJYB, 1959 (Vol. 60), p. 6.

**TABLE 3. AGE DISTRIBUTION OF CIVILIAN TOTAL, TOTAL WHITE, AND JEWISH POPULATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>White Population</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 14</td>
<td>48,931,000</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>43,177,000</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>1,132,000</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>13,960,000</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12,476,000</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>9,743,000</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>8,699,000</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>233,000</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>23,437,000</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>21,165,000</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>23,113,000</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>21,093,000</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>729,000</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>34,399,000</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>31,673,000</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>1,393,000</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>14,681,000</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>13,750,000</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>503,000</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,264,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>152,033,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most marked differences in the 1957 age distribution between Jews and the total white population was in the group under 14, where the Jewish population was proportionately smaller, and the 45–64 group, where the Jewish population was proportionately greater. Studies of Jewish communities reported in AJYB, 1962 (Vol. 63), p. 60, indicated that these differences had been accentuated.

The communities of Camden, N.J., in 1964,1 and of Providence2 and Detroit,3 in 1963, studied their Jewish populations. The age distribution of each is shown in Table 4.

---

1 Charles Westoff, population study of the Jews of Camden, to be published by the Jewish Federation of Camden County. Acknowledgment is made here of the kindness of Dr. Westhoff and the Camden Federation for making the study available before publication.


### TABLE 4. AGE DISTRIBUTIONS REPORTED IN THREE JEWISH POPULATION STUDIES, IN PER CENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>34.7c</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Adapted from data in study.


* Computed from age data in study.

Differences and similarities can be noted more easily if the age categories are telescoped.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 5</th>
<th>5-19</th>
<th>20-44</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camden, 1964</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, 1963</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, 1963</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. white population, 1963</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Camden the age distribution of the Jewish community reflects an immigration of younger households. Providence is a stable community, and Detroit is between the two. The differences emerge clearly in the older groups, 45-64 and over 65. Table 4 shows Jewish median ages of 31.6, 34.7, and 36.2, respectively, for Camden, Detroit, and Providence, while the median for the total white population of the United States is 29.5.

These findings are similar to those reported for eight other communities in *AJYB*, 1963 (Vol. 64), pp. 60–61, 63.
FERTILITY

The fertility data from the 1957 U.S. Census survey, “Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States,” are reproduced below.

TABLE 5. CUMULATIVE FERTILITY RATE (NUMBER OF CHILDREN EVER BORN PER 1,000 WOMEN EVER MARRIED), BY RELIGION REPORTED, MARCH 1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>15 to 44</th>
<th>45 and Over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>2,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>2,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>3,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>3,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>2,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>2,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>2,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>2,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, none, and not reported</td>
<td>2,069</td>
<td>2,674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Women 45 years old and over have completed their childbearing. Since approximately half of all children born are girls, the average Jewish mother 45 and over has brought into the world 1.1 females; Protestant 1.4, and Roman Catholic, 1.5. For mothers under 45 at the time of this survey, Jewish women were the only ones that had not yet brought into the world enough girls to replace them. (See Erich Rosenthal, “Jewish Fertility in the United States,” AJYB, 1961 [Vol. 62], pp. 3–27.)

A less sensitive index than the cumulative fertility rate is the fertility ratio—the ratio of children under 5 to women between 20 and 44. Jewish population studies often resort to this less sensitive index, lacking more detailed birth data.

TABLE 6. FERTILITY RATIO (CHILDREN UNDER 5 TO THOUSAND WOMEN BETWEEN 20 AND 44) OF CAMDEN (1964) AND PROVIDENCE (1963), JEWS COMPARED WITH U.S. WHITES (1963)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City and Year</th>
<th>Fertility Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camden, 1964</td>
<td>480a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, 1963</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. white population, 1963</td>
<td>661b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Computed from age distribution.

Table 6 shows that the Jewish fertility ratio in Camden and Providence is far below the national white ratio. These findings are similar to those reported in AJYB, 1963 (Vol. 64), pp. 60–64.

The Camden and Providence studies also provided another measure of fertility, the number of children ever born to women ever married, by age of mother.

In Camden and Providence Jewish women, ever married, from 25 to 44 had as many children per mother as in the white urban population of 1960 for the same ages; but between the ages of 15 and 24, there are fewer Jewish births.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Married Women</th>
<th>Children Ever Born</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>U.S. Urban White, 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25–29</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–34</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Children
Ever Born. Per
1,000 Women, 20–44
Ever Married
2,210
2,086
2,185

Number of Children
Ever Born. Per
1,000 Women, 45 and
Over, Ever Married
2,020
2,088
2,428

° Too few cases for reliable estimate.

Fifteen per cent of all married women aged 15 to 44 in the general white urban population are between 15 and 19, but a much smaller proportion of Jewish women. From this the following conclusions suggest themselves:

1. The *completed* family size of Jewish families now in formation will approach that of the general white urban population.

2. Jewish families begin to be formed when mothers are older than the average for the white urban population.
3. The accretion to the Jewish population from births will be at a lower rate than for the general white urban population, since the span of time between two mature generations will be greater for the Jewish population.

Nativity

In the three communities studied, the foreign-born are mostly the aged and the aging. With the passage of time American Jews have been increasingly native-born.

Secular Education

In the three communities, 40 per cent or more of adult Jews have attended college, in contrast to 19 per cent for urban whites throughout the United States. The college education of younger Jewish men is especially striking. In Camden and Detroit, three-quarters of Jewish men under 45 attended college; 57 and 47 per cent, respectively, graduated. In Providence 74 per cent of Jewish men under 40 attended and 55 per cent graduated.

Jewish Education

The Camden and Providence studies provide some information about Jewish education. In Camden 12 per cent of the Jewish men (15 years old or older) and 38 per cent of the women had no formal Jewish education at all, or less than a year; in Providence, 7 per cent of the men and 28 per cent of the women. The difference between the sexes is smaller for the younger men and women than for the more elderly. The dominant Jewish educational institution is the afternoon Hebrew school, alone or in conjunction with Sunday school. The younger the respondents, the less they reported having studied in a Yiddish school or with a private teacher.

"Denominational" Preference

In the three cities the Jewish respondents were asked which they preferred, Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform Judaism. (Preference does not necessarily reflect actual affiliation or religious observance. Nor is it to be assumed that the respondents all meant the same thing by Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform.) Table 8 shows Conservatism preferred by a half to two-thirds of the respondents, Reform by a quarter, and Orthodoxy by 8 to 17 per cent, with the remainder having other preferences or none.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City and Year</th>
<th>Orthodox</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Reform</th>
<th>None or Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camden, 1964 a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, 1963 b</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence, 1963 c</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a All heads of households.  
*b All male heads of households.  
*c Total Jewish population, excluding approximately 2 per cent non-Jews and other.
The unaffiliated were 30 per cent in Camden, 51 per cent in Detroit, and 21 per cent in Providence. In general, affiliation rises with the age of respondents, presumably as parents seek Jewish education and identification for their children.

**Intermarriage**

The Camden and Providence studies reported low mixed-marriage rates (as a percentage of married couples)—three to four per cent. In addition, another two per cent of marriages reported a spouse converted to Judaism.

Both of these studies were based upon a sample from master lists. These findings therefore should be evaluated against the argument that the intermarried tend to be under-represented in such lists (Erich Rosenthal, "Studies of Jewish Intermarriage in the United States" (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], p. 17).

Providence reported that younger and third-generation males (largely interchangeable groups) had a higher rate of marriage to spouses not born Jewish than the married Jewish population as a whole.

Of 144 children in Providence families of mixed religious parentage, 84 were reported as Jews and 60 as non-Jews.

Providence respondents, answering a question on religious status of children and their spouses not living in the home (including therefore those outside of Providence), reported a larger proportion of mixed marriages than in the community as a whole. Of particular interest is the respondents’ report that 3.6 per cent of daughters’ marriages were with non-Jewish men not converted to Judaism; contrast the zero per cent for all Jewish women respondents in Providence.

**Occupation**

The Camden, Providence, and Detroit studies show a fifth to a third of working Jews in occupations classified by the Census as professional and semi-professional.

The younger generation exceeds these proportions. Camden, for example, reports 60 per cent of men between 25 and 34 in the professional and semi-professional category, and similar trends are reported by Providence and Detroit.

The reader must be cautioned with regard to generalizing from these and previous studies. The full occupational picture of the United States Jewish population will only be known when job patterns for New York City, Philadelphia, and Chicago are known. These three communities have historically had a large Jewish component of skilled and semi-skilled workers, and together their total Jewish population amounts to half the national total.

Alvin Chenkin
## APPENDIX

### TABLE 1. JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Estimated Jewish Population$^a$</th>
<th>Total Population$^b$</th>
<th>Estimated Jewish Per Cent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>9,435</td>
<td>3,407,000</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>18,985</td>
<td>1,581,000</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3,310</td>
<td>1,933,000</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>629,870</td>
<td>18,084,000</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>23,230</td>
<td>1,966,000</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>101,755</td>
<td>2,766,000</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>8,460</td>
<td>491,000</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>16,180</td>
<td>808,000</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>129,755</td>
<td>5,705,000</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>24,255</td>
<td>4,294,000</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>701,000</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>692,000</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>299,355</td>
<td>10,489,000</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>23,010</td>
<td>4,825,000</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,756,000</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td>2,225,000</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>11,290</td>
<td>3,159,000</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>16,115</td>
<td>3,468,000</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>8,285</td>
<td>989,000</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>144,960</td>
<td>3,432,000</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>242,350</td>
<td>5,338,000</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>97,945</td>
<td>8,098,000</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>35,430</td>
<td>3,521,000</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>4,185</td>
<td>2,314,000</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>80,675</td>
<td>4,409,000</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>705,000</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>8,495</td>
<td>1,480,000</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>408,000</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>654,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>352,280</td>
<td>6,682,000</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>1,008,000</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2,518,185</td>
<td>17,915,000</td>
<td>14.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>4,852,000</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>645,000</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>160,250</td>
<td>10,100,000</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>6,730</td>
<td>2,465,000</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>1,871,000</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>443,745</td>
<td>11,459,000</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>24,590</td>
<td>914,000</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>6,455</td>
<td>2,555,000</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>715,000</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>16,915</td>
<td>3,798,000</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1. JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES BY STATES, 1964
(Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Estimated Jewish Population</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Estimated Jewish Per Cent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>63,385</td>
<td>10,397,000</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>992,000</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>409,000</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>34,370</td>
<td>4,378,000</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>13,015</td>
<td>2,984,000</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>1,797,000</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>38,595</td>
<td>4,107,000</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>343,000</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UNITED STATES</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,669,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>191,334,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See p. 139.

b These data are for July 1, 1964 and represent estimates of the total resident population of each state. Members of the armed forces abroad are excluded. There is therefore a slight difference between these data and the estimates for the Jewish population since most estimates of the latter include persons in the armed forces by civilian residence rather than by military residence.


TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF UNITED STATES JEWISH POPULATION BY REGIONS, 1964*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regions</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Per cent Distribution</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Per cent Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>47,125,000</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>3,698,750</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>11,070,000</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>384,540</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>36,055,000</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3,314,210</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>53,370,000</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>756,855</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>37,619,000</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>619,155</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>15,751,000</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>137,700</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>59,252,000</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>509,575</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>28,311,000</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>378,210</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>12,678,000</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>41,825</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>18,263,000</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>89,540</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>31,587,000</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>704,000</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>7,697,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>51,310</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>23,891,000</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>652,690</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States</strong></td>
<td>191,334,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,669,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Details may not add to totals because of rounding.
### TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES\(^1\) WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1964 (ESTIMATED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniston</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dothan</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Los Angeles Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>492,000</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Modesto</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Danbury</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Oakland (incl. in Alabama and Contra)</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>Danielson</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selma</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Cities(^a)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscaloosa</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blytheville</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td>New London</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Smith</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>San Pedro</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot Springs</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>Rockville</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Bluff</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Arkansas(^b)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Torrington</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynne-Forest City</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Valley Area(^d)</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sun City</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda and Contra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tulare and Kings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Westport</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa counties</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Willimantic</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Ventura county</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Winsted</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsinore</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington (incl. rest of state)</td>
<td>8,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) There are five different definitions of urban area in use: 1. urban place "includes all places of 2,500 inhabitants or more and the towns, townships, and counties classified as urban"; 2. central city is identical with the political boundaries of the incorporated city at the core of an urban area; 3. urbanized area includes at least one central city of 50,000 inhabitants or more as well as the closely-settled surrounding area; 4. standard metropolitan statistical area includes at least one central city of 50,000 inhabitants or more, together with the county or counties which are economically and otherwise oriented to the central city; 5. standard consolidated areas are several contiguous standard metropolitan areas and additional counties that appear to have strong interrelationships: e.g., the New York-Northeastern New Jersey and the Chicago-Northwestern Indiana standard consolidated areas.

The areas covered by the population estimates in Appendix Table 3 do not uniquely fit into any one of these census definitions. The Jewish estimates are based upon the service and campaign areas of Jewish federations, and these show wide variations. Mostly, but with many exceptions, the areas in appended Table 3 would be closest in concept to urbanized area. Specific information about the area covered by a particular estimate can often be obtained by writing directly to the appropriate federation. (See "Jewish Federations, Welfare Funds, Community Councils," p. 536.)
### TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1964 (ESTIMATED) (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City Population</th>
<th>State and City Population</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLORIDA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard county 350</td>
<td>Southern Illinois 2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearwater 1,200</td>
<td>Springfield 1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytona Beach 950</td>
<td>Sterling-Dixon 110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale 1,925</td>
<td>Waukegan 1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Myers 475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Pierce 270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville 210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollywood 11,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville 4,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key West 315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeland 700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami 92,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando 2,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach county 4,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola 800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompano Beach 170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota 2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine 245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg 3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallahassee 525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa 4,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **GEORGIA**               |                           |                   |
| Albany 525                |                           |                   |
| Athens 140                |                           |                   |
| Atlanta 14,500            |                           |                   |
| Augusta 1,200             |                           |                   |
| Brunswick 230             |                           |                   |
| Columbus 1,000            |                           |                   |
| Dalton 210                |                           |                   |
| La Grange 100             |                           |                   |
| Macon 785                |                           |                   |
| Savannah 3,450            |                           |                   |
| Valdosta 210             |                           |                   |

| **HAWAII**                |                           |                   |
| Honolulu 700              |                           |                   |

| **IDAHO**                 |                           |                   |
| Boise 200                 |                           |                   |

| **ILLINOIS**              |                           |                   |
| Aurora 450                |                           |                   |
| Bloomington 210           |                           |                   |
| Champaign-Urbana 1,000    |                           |                   |
| Chicago Metropolitan Area 285,000 |           |                   |
| Danville 240              |                           |                   |
| Decatur 465               |                           |                   |
| East St. Louis (incl. in So. Ill.) 750 | |                   |
| Elgin 750                 |                           |                   |
| Galesburg 110             |                           |                   |
| Joliet 675                |                           |                   |
| Kankakee 245              |                           |                   |
| Mattoon 125               |                           |                   |
| Peoria 1,800              |                           |                   |
| Quincy 175                |                           |                   |
| Rock Island 2,000         |                           |                   |
| Rockford 950              |                           |                   |

| **IOWA**                  |                           |                   |
| Cedar Rapids 320          |                           |                   |
| Council Bluffs 245        |                           |                   |
| Davenport 1,000           |                           |                   |
| Des Moines 3,000          |                           |                   |
| Dubuque 105               |                           |                   |
| Fort Dodge 115            |                           |                   |
| Marshalltown 120          |                           |                   |
| Mason City 125            |                           |                   |
| Muscatine 120             |                           |                   |
| Ottumwa 150               |                           |                   |
| Sioux City 1,770          |                           |                   |
| Waterloo 435              |                           |                   |

| **KANSAS**                |                           |                   |
| Topeka 315                |                           |                   |
| Wichita 1,200             |                           |                   |

| **KENTUCKY**              |                           |                   |
| Henderson 140             |                           |                   |
| Hopkinsville 120         |                           |                   |
| Lexington 1,200           |                           |                   |
| Louisville 8,500          |                           |                   |
| Paducah 175               |                           |                   |

| **LOUISIANA**             |                           |                   |
| Alexandria 500            |                           |                   |
| Baton Rouge 1,400         |                           |                   |
| Lafayette 105             |                           |                   |
| Lake Charles 210          |                           |                   |
| Monroe 400                |                           |                   |
| New Iberia 100            |                           |                   |
| New Orleans 10,100        |                           |                   |
| Shreveport 2,400          |                           |                   |

| **MAINE**                 |                           |                   |
| Aroostock county 120      |                           |                   |
| Augusta 215               |                           |                   |

| **MICHIGAN**              |                           |                   |
| Ann Arbor 1,150           |                           |                   |
## TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1964 (ESTIMATED) (Cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Jewish State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Jewish State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battle Creek</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Newark (incl. in</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Keene</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Essex county)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benten Harbor</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Laconia</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Nashua</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>North Hudson</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>county*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron county</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paramus Area*</td>
<td>5,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Mountain</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paulsboro</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pens Grove</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette county</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perrineville</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Clemens</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Perth Amboy</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon</td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Brook</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plainfield</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Haven</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rahway</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Bank</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ridgefield Area*</td>
<td>8,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibbing</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rivervale Area*</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rutherford Area*</td>
<td>1,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saddle Brook Area*</td>
<td>1,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somerville</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South River</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksdale</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaneck*</td>
<td>12,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toms River</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vineland</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natchez</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodbine</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tupelo</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>4,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicksburg</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodbury</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joplin</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennett</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billings</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>6,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamos</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminia</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton (incl.</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all Broome county)</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canandaigua</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catskill</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohoes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corning</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and City</td>
<td>Jewish Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkirk</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellenville</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmira</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glens Falls</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloversville</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverstraw</td>
<td>480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Falls</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornell</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerhonksone</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>2,825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Manor</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Sheldrake-Hurleyville</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massena</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountaintop</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater New York</td>
<td>2,381,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>1,836,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>372,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyack</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogdensburg</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olean</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneonta</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswego</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parksville</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawling</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plattsburg</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Chester</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Jervis</td>
<td>560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potsdam</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poughkeepsie</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Springs</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fallsburg</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Valley</td>
<td>7,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffern</td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walden</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Lake</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NORTH CAROLINA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asheville</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel Hill</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastonia</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsboro</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendersonville</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mt</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteville Zone</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmingten</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston-Salem</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NORTH DAKOTA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OHIO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellaire</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Liverpool</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyria</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Philadelphia</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piqua</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandusky</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steubenville</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooster</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanesville</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OKLAHOMA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ardmore</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskogee</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1964 (ESTIMATED) (Cont'd)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State and City Population</th>
<th>Jewish State and City Population</th>
<th>State and City Population</th>
<th>Jewish State and City Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxford-Kennet Square</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
<td><strong>Oak Ridge</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philadelphia Metropolitan Area</strong></td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td><strong>Fredericksburg</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philadelphia</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td><strong>Hampton</strong></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittsburgh</strong></td>
<td>680</td>
<td><strong>Hopewell</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pittsburgh</strong></td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td><strong>Lynchburg</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pottstown</strong></td>
<td>700</td>
<td><strong>Martinsville</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pottsville</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td><strong>Newport News</strong></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td><strong>Norfolk</strong></td>
<td>8,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sayre</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td><strong>Petersburg</strong></td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scranton</strong></td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td><strong>Portsmouth</strong></td>
<td>1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shenandoah</strong></td>
<td>650</td>
<td><strong>Richmond</strong></td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State College</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
<td><strong>Roanoke</strong></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stroudsburg</strong></td>
<td>400</td>
<td><strong>Staunton</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunbury</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
<td><strong>Suffolk</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uniontown</strong></td>
<td>650</td>
<td><strong>Williamsburg</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vandergrift-Leachburg</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td><strong>Winchester</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warren</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td><strong>WONISIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td><strong>Bremerton</strong></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wayne county</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td><strong>Seattle</strong></td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Chester</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td><strong>Spokane</strong></td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilkes-Barre</strong></td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td><strong>Tacoma</strong></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Williamsport</strong></td>
<td>770</td>
<td><strong>WASHINGTON</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>York</strong></td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td><strong>Beckley</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHODE ISLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bluefield-Princeton</strong></td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newport</strong></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td><strong>Charleston</strong></td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pawtucket</strong></td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td><strong>Clarksburg</strong></td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providence</strong></td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td><strong>Fairmont</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woonsocket</strong></td>
<td>780</td>
<td><strong>Huntington</strong></td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Martinsburg</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aiken-Barnwell</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
<td><strong>Morgantown</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beaufort</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td><strong>Parkersburg</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charleston</strong></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td><strong>Weirton</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Columbia</strong></td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td><strong>Wheelerling</strong></td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Florence</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td><strong>Williamson</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenville</strong></td>
<td>600</td>
<td><strong>WISCONSIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orangeburg county</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td><strong>Appleton</strong></td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spartanburg</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td><strong>Beloit</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sumter</strong></td>
<td>190</td>
<td><strong>Eau Claire</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH DAKOTA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fond du Lac</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sioux Falls</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
<td><strong>Green Bay</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENNESSEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kenosha</strong></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chattanooga</strong></td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td><strong>Madison</strong></td>
<td>2,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jackson</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td><strong>Manitowoc</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Johnson City</strong></td>
<td>190</td>
<td><strong>Marine</strong></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knoxville</strong></td>
<td>830</td>
<td><strong>Milwaukee</strong></td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memphis</strong></td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td><strong>Oshkosh</strong></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nashville</strong></td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td><strong>Racine</strong></td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sheboygan</strong></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abilene</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td><strong>Superior</strong></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amarillo</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
<td><strong>Waukesha</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Austin</strong></td>
<td>835</td>
<td><strong>Wausau</strong></td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baytown</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td><strong>Wyoming</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beaumont</strong></td>
<td>950</td>
<td><strong>Cheyenne</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breckenridge</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td><strong>Utah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brownsville</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td><strong>Ogden</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corpus Christi</strong></td>
<td>990</td>
<td><strong>Salt Lake City</strong></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dallas</strong></td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td><strong>Bennington</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Paso</strong></td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td><strong>Burlington</strong></td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Worth</strong></td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td><strong>Rutland</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galveston</strong></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td><strong>St. Albans</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harlingen</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td><strong>St. Johnsboro</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Houston</strong></td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td><strong>TEXAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kilgore</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td><strong>Lubbock</strong></td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laredo</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
<td><strong>North Texas Zone</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longview</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td><strong>Odessa</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McAllen</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
<td><strong>Port Arthur</strong></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Angelo</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td><strong>San Antonio</strong></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texarcana</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td><strong>Tyler</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tri-county</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td><strong>Victoria</strong></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waco</strong></td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td><strong>Waco</strong></td>
<td>1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wharton</strong></td>
<td>350</td>
<td><strong>Wichita Falls</strong></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH DAKOTA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Virginia</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sioux Falls</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
<td><strong>Alexandria (incl.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENNESSEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Falls Church</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chattanooga</strong></td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td><strong>Arlington county</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jackson</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td><strong>Urbanized</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Johnson City</strong></td>
<td>190</td>
<td><strong>Fairfax county</strong></td>
<td>8,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knoxville</strong></td>
<td>830</td>
<td><strong>Arlington (incl in</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memphis</strong></td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td><strong>Alexandria )</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nashville</strong></td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td><strong>Charlottesville</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIRGINIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Danville</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexandria (incl.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Utah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Falls Church</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ogden</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arlington county</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Salt Lake City</strong></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urbanized</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bennington</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairfax county</strong></td>
<td>8,090</td>
<td><strong>Burlington</strong></td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arlington (incl in</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rutland</strong></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexandria )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>St. Albans</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charlottesville</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td><strong>St. Johnsboro</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Danville</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td><strong>WYOMING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheyenne</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td><strong>Wyoming</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a* Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia.

*b* Towns in Chicot, Desha, Drew counties.

*c* Centerbrook, Chester, Clinton, Deep River, Essex, Killingworth, Old Lyme, Old Saybrook, Saybrook, Westbrook.

---
Ansonia, Derby-Shelton, Seymour.

Greater Washington includes urbanized portions of Montgomery and Prince Georges counties, Md.; Arlington county, Fairfax county (urbanized portion); Falls Church; Alexandria, Va.

Includes winter residents.


Includes East Chicago, Hammond.

Includes Alpine, Cresskill, Demarest, Harrington Park, Haworth.

Includes Englewood Cliffs, Tenafly.

Includes Allendale, Franklin Lakes, Mahwah, Oakland, Ramsey, Saddle River, Upper Saddle River.

Includes Dumont and New Milford.


Includes Oradell, River Edge.

Includes Cliffside Park, Edgewater, Fairview, Fort Lee, Leonia, Palisades Park.

Includes Montvale, Northvale, Norwood, Old Tappan, Rockleigh.

Includes Carlstadt, East Rutherford, Lyndhurst, Moonachie, Wallington, Wood-Ridge.

Includes Bogota, Garfield, Hasbrouck Heights, Little Ferry, Lodi, Ridgefield Park, Rochelle Park, South Hackensack, Teterboro.

For lack of new data, 1962 estimates are maintained.

Burgaw, Clinton, Dunn, Elizabethtown, Fairmont, Jacksonville, Lumberton, Tabor City, Wallace, Warsaw; and Dillon, Loris, Marion, Mullins, S.C.

Towns in Alfalfa, Beckham, Cadelö, Canadian, Cleveland, Custer, Jackson, Kingfisher, Kiowa, Lincoln, Logan, Oklahoma, Payne, Roger Mills, Tillman, Washita counties.

Bensalem Township, Bristol, Langhorne, Levittown, New Hope, Newtown, Penndel, Warrington, Yardley.

Includes Kingsport and Bristol (including the portion of Bristol in Virginia).


Includes communities in Colorado, De Witt, Fayette, Gonzales and La Vaca counties.
Civic and Political

Civil Rights and Intergroup Tensions

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964 • CIVIL RIGHTS AND GROUP TENSIONS IN POLITICS (1): REFERENDA AND THE WALLACE PRIMARIES • CIVIL RIGHTS AND GROUP TENSIONS IN POLITICS (2): 1964 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION • POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ACTION • ECONOMIC AID AND COMMUNITY ACTION • VIOLENCE AND INTERGROUP TENSION • CIVIL-RIGHTS MOVEMENT

The year 1964 witnessed great forward strides in civil rights with the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the overwhelming national mandate given to Lyndon B. Johnson. Negro civil-rights organizations showed increased self-confidence and self-reliance, employing a wide variety of approaches and strategies to help Negroes achieve civic and economic equality. Locally, however, implementation of civil-rights programs remained difficult and intergroup tensions were acute in the North and the South, with violence erupting from time to time.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

On November 27, 1963, five days after President John Fitzgerald Kennedy had been assassinated in Dallas, Lyndon B. Johnson, speaking to an extraordinary joint session of Congress, called on it to translate Kennedy's dreams for America "into effective action," first of all, by passing the civil-rights bill. "No memorial oration or eulogy," Johnson said, "could more eloquently honor President Kennedy's memory than the earliest possible passage of the civil-rights bill for which he fought so long." Within a few days House Rules Committee chairman Rep. Howard W. Smith (D., Va.), who, opposing such legislation, had pigeonholed the bill in his committee, promised President Johnson to release the bill in January and House Republican leader Charles A. Halleck (Ind.) promised his support of the bill.
Passage of the Bill

Debate opened in the House on January 31, 1964; on February 10, the bill, somewhat amended, was passed by a generous margin of 290 to 130 (152 Democrats and 138 Republicans, for; 96 Democrats and 34 Republicans, against). That vote clearly reflected public opinion. A poll conducted by Louis Harris in April 1964 showed that 70 per cent of a nationwide sample favored the bill's passage. Organizations in favor of the bill included the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, a coalition of over 70 civic organizations; the leading industrial unions of the AFL-CIO, headed by the United Auto Workers; Protestant, Catholic and Jewish lay and ecclesiastical groups, and powerful groups within the government like the Justice Department and the White House itself. In an unprecedented show of religious unity, over 6,000 Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religious leaders met in Washington April 28 in an Interreligious Convocation on Civil Rights to call for quick action from the Senate. (The next day 177 of the participants met with President Johnson who spoke to them on the role of religion in “remolding social institutions” and “illuminating the dark places of the human heart.”)

Organized to fight the bill was the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms, financed principally by Mississippi and other Southern segregationist states, and headed by John C. Satterfield, a past president of the American Bar Association and legal advisor to former Mississippi Governor Ross Barnett (see also p. 194).

The bill's passage in the Senate was stormier. On March 9 debate began on whether the Senate should consider the bill at all. Its Southern opponents talked for 16 days to block formal consideration, but on March 26, the Senate voted 67-17 to take up the bill after the Easter recess. With firm bipartisan determination to pass it, the Senate opened formal debate on March 30. From this point on, the bill's real progress was guided largely by Senate minority leader Everett Dirksen (R., Ill.), who had undertaken to draft many amendments, particularly dealing with the bill's enforcement provisions in its public-accommodations and fair-employment titles. These amendments were designed to meet his own objections to the bill, to clarify and sometimes strengthen various sections, to meet objections from other senators, and thus to extend support among Republican Senators for both the bill and a vote for cloture. During the long weeks that the Southern Senators engaged in a desperate filibuster, Dirksen worked at his substitute package in the closest contact with Senate majority leader Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.). By mid-May, Dirksen's package of some 70 amendments was ready. It was designed chiefly to give the states more leeway in dealing with their own civil-rights conflicts before the Federal government was brought in to force compliance. After five conferences between a Senate bipartisan committee and administration leaders, including Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Deputy Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, an agreement was reached on the package and Dirksen introduced it in the Senate on May 26 as an amendment.
On June 10 these weeks of laborious and meticulous efforts brought historic results, when the Senate, with all 100 Senators present, invoked cloture 71-29 (44 Democrats and 27 Republicans, for; 23 Democrats and 6 Republicans, against). The 75-day filibuster, the longest in the Senate's history, was over in the first successful vote on cloture since the rule had been adopted in 1917. Then, after debate on amendments, the civil-rights bill was triumphantly passed on June 19, 73-27 (46 Democrats and 27 Republicans, for; 21 Democrats and 6 Republicans, against). On July 2 President Johnson signed the bill into law.

Summary of the Law

The following digest of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is based on a summary prepared by the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Title I: Voting

This section provides more effective enforcement of the right to vote in Federal elections and a speedier procedure by which voting-rights suits may be decided. It requires that the same standards be applied to all applicants for voting, that the only tests that can be used to determine literacy must be written, and that in contested cases the court must presume a sixth-grade education as evidence of literacy. The Attorney General or the defendant in a voting suit may ask for trial by a three-judge Federal court.

Title II: Public Accommodations

This section prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in hotels, motels, restaurants, lunch counters, movie houses, gasoline stations, theaters, stadiums, and any other place of public accommodation. (Exceptions include barbershops and beauty parlors, places of recreation which do not serve food, lodging houses with fewer than six rooms for rent, and, under some conditions, private clubs.) An individual or the Attorney General may file suit to enforce these provisions and the Attorney General may, under some conditions, enter a case brought by an individual, whenever he believes there is a "pattern or practice or resistance."

Title III: Public Facilities

The Attorney General is authorized to bring suit to compel desegregation of any publicly owned or operated facility like state or municipal parks, libraries, and hospitals, whenever he receives a written complaint of discrimination. He must believe that the complaint merits action and must certify that those making the complaint are themselves unable to take the necessary legal action.

Title IV: Public Education

The U.S. Office of Education is authorized to determine the availability of equal educational opportunity and to provide assistance in carrying out
school-desegregation plans and in training personnel to deal with desegregation problems. The Attorney General is authorized to file civil suits to compel desegregation of public schools, including public colleges, under the same conditions as set forth in Title III.¹

**Title V: Commission on Civil Rights**

This section extends the life of the United States Commission on Civil Rights until January 31, 1968, and gives the Commission added authority to serve as a national clearinghouse for civil-rights information and to investigate allegations of voting fraud.

**Title VI: Federally Assisted Programs**

Federal agencies which provide financial assistance through grants, loans, or contracts are required to eliminate discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin and such agencies may, after due notice and hearings, withhold Federal funds from state or local agencies that discriminate. (Federal assistance to individuals—e.g., social security or veterans' benefits—is not affected.)

**Title VII: Equal Employment Opportunity**

This section creates an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to assist in implementing a Federal right to equal opportunity in employment. Employers, labor unions, and employment agencies are required to treat all persons without regard to their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. In the law's first year in force, beginning July 1965, this section applies only to employers or unions with 100 or more workers. Coverage will be extended each year until July 2, 1968, when employers and unions with 25 workers will be included. The Commission is empowered to use conciliation to secure compliance. The Attorney General may bring the case before a three-judge court under the same conditions of "pattern or practice of resistance" specified in Title II.

**Title VIII: Voting Statistics**

The Secretary of Commerce is required to conduct a survey of persons of voting age by race, color, and national origin in areas designated by the Commission on Civil Rights. A similar survey must be conducted on a nationwide basis in connection with the 1970 Census.

¹ Critics have pointed out that the definition of desegregation in this title excludes problems of racial imbalance. According to Alexander Bickel, professor of law at Yale University, in "The Civil Rights Acts of 1964," *Commentary*, August 1964, pp. 33–39, the effect of this title's provisions will "be felt mainly in the South, and only, if at all, in such school districts in the North as may be found to have intentionally gerrymandered school attendance areas for purposes of separating the races."
TITLE IX: INTERVENTION AND REMOVAL IN CIVIL-RIGHTS CASES

The Attorney General is authorized to intervene in any Federal court action filed by private persons complaining they have been denied equal protection of the law on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin.

TITLE X: COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

This section establishes a Community Relations Service to provide conciliation service in the voluntary settlement of public-accommodations complaints and to provide assistance to persons or communities where civil-rights problems threaten peaceful relations in the community.

TITLE XI: MISCELLANEOUS

This section guarantees the right to jury trial in criminal-contempt cases arising out of all sections of the act except Title I, which retains the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 for more limited jury trial.

Compliance

President Johnson appointed Thomas Le Roy Collins, former governor of Florida, to be director of the newly created Community Relations Service, and Arthur H. Dean, a New York lawyer formerly a disarmament negotiator, to be chairman of the National Citizens Committee for Community Relations, a committee of 450 prominent citizens to assist in the peaceful acceptance of the civil-rights law.

In the first weeks after the law was enacted Negroes tested the public-accommodations section in every Southern and border state and in many strongholds of segregation. A survey issued by the Potomac Institute in August 1964 reported that many places of public accommodation in the South were complying with the law. Press surveys (Wall Street Journal, January 6, 1965; New York Times, January 24, 1965) showed considerable compliance in restaurants and other public accommodations, with compliance greater in large cities and industrial centers and with resistance and defiance greater in smaller communities, especially in rural areas. By the end of 1964 the Justice Department was investigating some 600 complaints of discrimination in public places. A few restaurants and hotels owned by diehard segregationists were closed or were converted into "private clubs."

A speedy constitutional test of the public-accommodations title was made, particularly because Mississippi Governor Paul B. Johnson and Alabama Governor George C. Wallace had claimed that the legislation was unconstitutional and should not be obeyed. Two cases involving an Atlanta motel and a Birmingham restaurant reached the Supreme Court, which on December 14 unanimously upheld the constitutionality of Title II, thus clearing the way for full-scale enforcement by the Community Relations Service conciliators and the Justice Department lawyers. By the end of the year the Justice Department had brought six suits against businessmen for "patterns" of discrimi-
nation and was watching the progress of another dozen suits brought by individuals against businesses alleged to discriminate.

While experts generally agreed that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was of enormous social and historic importance in the eventual elimination of discrimination in the United States, few believed that its effects would soon be felt. Some progress in eliminating discrimination in public accommodations was clearly apparent shortly after the law's passage, but it was generally recognized that Negroes would attain their rights only after prolonged and continued application of the law and its vigilant enforcement.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND GROUP TENSIONS IN POLITICS (1): REFERENDA AND THE WALLACE PRIMARIES

Public opinion overwhelmingly supported the passage of the civil-rights act and national polls showed most people thought it was wrong to discriminate against Negroes in employment and public accommodations. A national poll by Louis Harris (Newsweek, July 13, 1964) showed that 83 per cent of respondents believed it was wrong for unions to refuse Negroes membership; 79 per cent for churches to refuse Negroes membership; 76 per cent for employers to refuse to hire Negroes, and 68 per cent for restaurants to refuse to serve Negroes.

But attitudes differed considerably with regard to housing. Only 45 per cent believed it was wrong to refuse to rent or sell homes to Negroes, according to the same poll. The resistance to nondiscrimination in housing was greater than to nondiscrimination in public accommodations according to the results in a series of local and state referenda across the country. Alabama's Governor George C. Wallace undertook to put the civil-rights act to a popularity test in three Presidential primaries. Though he drew a larger vote than had been expected, the results showed that most people in these states favored the civil-rights bill.

Referenda

Beginning in 1963 the referendum and the initiative began to be widely used to oppose local ordinances and state laws intended to enforce constitutionally guaranteed basic civil rights. Originally the initiative and the referendum had been regarded as progressive forms of "direct democracy," introduced in local and state politics at the turn of the century to remedy abuses charged to elected and appointed government officials. Nowadays, however, these forms of direct legislation have, paradoxically, been most frequently invoked by conservatives, who would normally not be expected to resort to techniques of direct democracy. The rightist rejection of such techniques has been expressed in the laconic slogan: "A republic, not a democracy."

Kansas City: In 1963 the Kansas City Council adopted an ordinance, 10-2, prohibiting discrimination in public accommodations. Shortly thereafter the Tavern Owners' Association and an ad hoc rightist group, Freedom of Choice,
began a campaign to submit the legislation to a referendum, collecting about 20,000 signatures on a referendum petition. An intensive campaign to uphold the antidiscrimination legislation was conducted by civic and religious organizations, with particular emphasis on registering eligible Negro voters for the special election on April 7, 1964. The vote, 45,476 to 43,733, upheld the ordinance. The white community voted 2 to 1 against it, but the Negro vote provided the bare majority to pass it. A report on the campaign and the election concluded that the social-gospel teachings of the churches had little influence and that the position taken by union leadership had little effect on how union members voted.

Maryland: On March 14 the Maryland General Assembly adopted a Public Accommodations Law (House of Delegates, 83-50; Senate, 26-3), forbidding discrimination in hotels, motels, and restaurants. This repealed and reenacted a law adopted a year earlier but omitted the earlier law's crippling provision of local option which permitted 11 of the state's 23 counties to exempt themselves. The new law had had the energetic support of Governor J. Millard Tawes and enough political support to overcome strong opposition from segregationist Eastern Shore counties. But the segregationists obtained sufficient signatures on a petition for a statewide referendum, thus preventing the law from going into effect on June 1. The referendum, held during the general election on November 3, upheld the law, 342,715 to 301,505. Ten counties, including Montgomery and Prince Georges, the populous suburban counties of Washington, and Baltimore City voted for the law; thirteen counties, including Baltimore county, largely suburban, voted against.

Tacoma, Wash.: On February 11 voters struck down a fair-housing ordinance by a proportion of 3 to 1. It had been adopted, 7-2, by the City Council in September 1963, but real-estate interests managed to bring the issue to a general vote. The local NAACP called for a boycott of the election on the ground that basic rights were not subject to popular vote.

Seattle, Wash.: On March 10 an open-housing ordinance put before the voters was defeated 112,448 to 53,453. A year earlier the City Council had charged its new Human Rights Commission with the responsibility of preparing open-housing legislation, but upon presentation by the commission of such legislation, the City Council referred it to a referendum. More than 75 community groups and nearly all the churches supported the proposed new ordinance; opposition was formally advocated only by realtors and apartment-houses owners, yet the legislation was defeated by more than 2 to 1.

Detroit, Mich.: In a primary election on September 1 voters passed, 137,671 to 114,743, a “homeowners' rights ordinance,” permitting discrimination in the sale of homes. (Thomas L. Poindexter, a Detroit lawyer, a former president of the Greater Detroit Homeowners’ Council who claimed to have drafted the ordinance, won nomination in this primary to the city’s Common Council and was elected councilman in the general election on November 3.) The ordinance had been opposed by the Detroit bar association, the governor, the mayor, most civic and all religious groups, and organized labor,

2 Sidney Lawrence, Observations on the Public Accommodations Ordinance (Kansas City: Community Relations Bureau, mimeo, April 1964).
and formally supported only by the Homeowners' Council and the realtors.

**Akron, Ohio:** An initiative petition to amend the city charter by repealing the city's ordinance against discrimination in the sale or rental of real estate was passed 63,240 to 46,590 on November 3. The issue as stated required a majority vote of the electorate on any similar ordinance that might be enacted in the future.

**California:** In the November 3 general election Californians voted, 4,526,460 to 2,395,747, for Proposition 14, an initiative constitutional amendment that prohibited the state or any of its subdivisions from passing any legislation that would forbid discrimination in the sale, lease, or rental of residential real property. It was intended to nullify the Fair Housing Law (Rumford Act), which the State legislature had enacted September 1963. California repeated the common experience. Civic, labor, and religious groups, the press, and even the governor campaigned extensively to defeat Proposition 14 which was supported only by the realtors, apartment-house owners, and an array of right-wing groups. Yet Proposition 14 won about two-thirds of the total vote. (Orange County, which elected a member of the John Birch Society to the State Senate, voted 77.8 per cent for Proposition 14). Proposition 14's sweeping victory confronted civic and church leaders with a bitter defeat, for they had deeply committed themselves to opposing it as an issue of morality rather than constitutionality.

**Wallace Primaries**

Alabama's racist Governor George C. Wallace entered three Presidential primaries—in Wisconsin (April 7), Indiana (May 5), and Maryland (May 19)—"to tell the truth about the so-called civil-rights bill and how it would destroy the private enterprise system in this country." Three reluctant stand-ins for President Johnson responded to his challenge: Wisconsin's Governor John W. Reynolds, Indiana's Governor Matthew E. Welsh, and Maryland's junior Senator Daniel B. Brewster. Wallace did unexpectedly well in all three primaries.3

Vote for Wallace in Wisconsin, Indiana, and Maryland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>266,136</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>170,727</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>214,837</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three states have had a history of conservatism: Wisconsin, a one-party (Republican) state for many decades; Indiana, with a Ku Klux Klan background; Maryland, with Southern loyalties and traditions.

Wallace drew his support from four categories of voters:

1. White workers, especially the less skilled, who voted for him in pro-

portion to the size and militancy of the local Negro community—usually Democrats;

(2) Whites with Southern traditions (Maryland's Eastern Shore and Indiana's southern tier) and white Southern migrants—usually Democrats;

(3) White middle- and upper-class suburbanites—usually Republicans and pro-Goldwater;

(4) Small-town conservatives—usually Republicans.

Prejudice appeared to be a constant factor in the Wallace vote, strengthened by political conservatism among Republicans and economic self-interest among working-class Democrats. Though foreign stocks gave substantial support to Wallace, that vote seems to have been influenced primarily by economic self-interest. The high Wallace vote among these traditionally Democratic voters raised Republican hopes for "backlash" votes that might accrue to them in November because of white disaffection with the Democratic position on Negro rights. These optimistic Republicans did not sufficiently appreciate the fact that Wallace's candidacy offered the voters an opportunity to make a cheap political gesture since no real political decision was at stake.

Group Voting

The Jewish liberal tradition manifested itself in all these elections, wherever the Jewish community was large enough for its vote to be quantitatively observable and significant. Though Jews were not less immune than other groups to prejudice, fears of declining property values, and resistance to neighborhood change, they repeatedly maintained their liberal voting patterns. In the Kansas City referendum Wards 8 and 9, with large Jewish populations, voted to uphold the public-accommodations ordinance. Though the Jews are not a majority in those wards, their influence was apparent in the vote.

According to a Detroit Jewish Community Council study, voters in predominantly Jewish precincts voted overwhelmingly against the homeowners' rights ordinance, in some places by as much as ten to one. The ordinance was defeated by substantial margins in all precincts in the Bagley area, an attractive, middle-class neighborhood with a large Jewish population.

Jewish precincts in Los Angeles voted about 2 to 1 against Proposition 14, while Californians as a whole voted 2 to 1 for it. A study made by the Los Angeles office of the American Jewish Committee showed that 5 precincts in East Fairfax, 70 per cent Jewish, lower-middle-class, and experiencing some Negro immigration, voted 67 per cent against Proposition 14; 5 precincts in West Fairfax, approximately 75 per cent Jewish and middle-class, voted 61 per cent against; 6 precincts in Beverlywood, about 70 per cent Jewish and upper-middle-class, voted 58 per cent against Proposition 14.

In the primaries Jews were the one group, besides Negroes, that voted overwhelmingly against Wallace. In Wisconsin Wallace ran in an open primary

---

4 Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Detroit, The "Homeowners' Rights" Ordinance (mimeo, October 2, 1964).
against Democratic Governor John W. Reynolds, a favorite son pledged to
President Johnson, and Republican Representative John W. Byrnes, an unin-
structed favorite son. Milwaukee’s prosperous suburbs Brown Deer, Glendale,
and Wauwatosa gave Wallace a plurality or majority of all votes cast. Elm
Grove, adjoining Wauwatosa, gave Wallace 33 per cent and Byrnes 45 per
cent (in 1962, Philip Kuehn, Republican candidate for governor, received
84.5 per cent of the vote). Elm Grove was the residence of William J. Grede,
a steel-foundry industrialist and a former president of the National Council of
the John Birch Society. His brother, Arthur, published a chain of weekly
suburban papers, including Elm Leaves in Elm Grove and News-Times in
Wauwatosa, which supported Wallace as well as the John Birch Society.

Wallace did less well in three other Milwaukee suburbs—Shorewood,
Whitefish Bay, and Fox Point. Generally Republican, these suburbs, surpris-
ingly, gave Reynolds over a third of their votes, more than he received in
1962. The distinguishing factor between these suburbs and Brown Deer, Glen-
dale, Wauwatosa, and Elm Grove is a substantial Jewish population.

Senator Brewster carried Maryland largely because of the 63 per cent of
the vote he received in the city of Baltimore from Negroes, Jews, and some
middle-class white Protestants. His greatest strength came from Negroes with
strong reinforcements from Jewish voters. Ward 17, practically all Negro,
gave Brewster 98 per cent of its vote. Negro precincts in Ward 15 gave
Brewster 94.1 per cent and adjoining Jewish precincts in Ward 15 gave him
93.5 per cent. The western half of Ward 27, mostly Jewish—except for some
well-to-do Protestants—gave Brewster 80 per cent of its vote. (The other
half of the ward, mostly middle-class Italian and prosperous old American
and German stock, gave Wallace 50.8 per cent.) Wheaton and Silver Spring,
Washington suburbs with substantial Jewish populations, also voted solidly for
Brewster.

In general, whether in primaries or in referenda, white working people—
mostly Italian-, Irish-, and Polish-stock Catholics, as well as native Protes-
tant southern migrants—tended to vote for Wallace and against civil rights.
In the Kansas City referendum Italians voted against the public-accommoda-
tions ordinance. In Milwaukee’s Ward 2, fairly close to the expanding Negro
neighborhood but solidly white, combining working class and middle class,
with German predominant among the foreign stock, Wallace got about 36
per cent of the vote, and in the Polish working-class Ward 14 about 30 per
cent. In Milwaukee about twenty per cent of the workers defected to Wallace,
but working-class voters have been so heavily Democratic that, despite the
defections, Reynolds received well over 60 per cent of their vote. Negroes, of
course, gave all their votes to Reynolds.

In Indiana Wallace carried two counties: Lake, with 51.5 per cent of the
Democratic primary vote, and adjoining Porter, with 54 per cent. In Gary it-
self the Negroes gave Welsh the margin to carry the city, but Welsh failed to
carry a single all-white precinct. Gary was the seat of considerable racial
tension, particularly over school segregation.
A high Wallace vote coupled with a high Goldwater vote—an obvious indicator of political conservatism—appeared in several strongly Republican Indiana counties, largely rural and small-town, with practically no Negroes. Their population has the characteristics long associated with the supporters of rightist movements—Fundamentalist and nativist. Disciples predominate in half these counties, and Methodists in the others. For them the civil-rights issue was a matter of abstract principle rather than practice. They voted for prejudice finally, giving Wallace about 40 per cent of the Democratic vote.

In Baltimore, Wallace did best in the white working-class neighborhoods of recent Southern migrants, semi-skilled and unskilled. In Wards 23 and 24, where workers of native stock predominate, Wallace received 62.5 and 65.5 per cent of the vote. In the Polish working-class districts (Wards 1 and 2) Wallace received 60 per cent of the vote. A part of Ward 26 consisting mostly of Polish working-class voters gave Wallace 60.7 per cent. The adjoining northern portion of the ward, inhabited mostly by lower- and middle-class Italians gave Wallace 61.1 per cent.

Christian churchmen, usually silent during partisan political campaigns, began to make themselves heard during the Wallace primaries, since Wallace's racism had turned these primaries into an unambiguous moral issue. Thus the Protestant Episcopal bishop of Maryland, Harry Lee Doll, wrote a letter to the 180 clergymen of his diocese accusing Wallace of having introduced a "bitter racism reminiscent of the early 1930's in Nazi Germany." The Catholic Herald Citizen, official paper of the Milwaukee Archdiocese, editorialized:

Moral evil does not float through the air. It walks through the world on the two feet of an individual person—directed by an evil mind and motivated by an evil heart.

Moral evil is invading Wisconsin. Gov. Wallace of Alabama has come to our state.

In Baltimore the archdiocesan Catholic Review was cautious in its social criticism: "There is an immense and decisive difference between a law-abiding segregationist and a law-defying racist." But wholehearted or half-hearted, the Catholic hierarchy generally opposed Wallace. Yet they had as little effect on their parishioners as the labor unions had on their membership, duplicating the Kansas City experience and foreshadowing the great failure, despite their deep involvement, of the Protestant and Catholic churches in California in the campaign to defeat Proposition 14.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND GROUP TENSIONS IN POLITICS (2): THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Barry M. Goldwater's candidacy for President of the United States on the Republican ticket inflamed and sharpened intergroup and racial tensions far more than the late John F. Kennedy's candidacy in 1960 had stirred inter-religious tensions.
To begin with, Goldwater appeared to all observers the candidate of a Republican Party that had been captured by a radical-rightist minority. Racism and nativism appeared to be concomitants of the radical right. The tolerance that Goldwater and his running mate William E. Miller, former Congressman from Lockport, N.Y., showed for the John Birch Society, the Ku Klux Klan, and other assorted racists, antisemites, and radical rightists aroused enormous anxiety among large segments of voters (see pp. 202–05). Fear that Goldwater might recklessly embroil the United States in nuclear warfare was perhaps the single most pervasive and persuasive campaign issue. His outdated position on social-welfare programs and his shortsighted views on civil rights were the most salient domestic issues. Generally concern among American voters over these basic foreign and domestic issues transcended ethnic, religious, and racial lines.

Civil Rights

Most significant for intergroup relations in the Presidential election was civil rights, which Goldwater had himself made a central issue in the campaign. As senator he had voted against cloture and even against the civil-rights bill. That was the one single fact responsible for his great popularity during his campaign forays into the South. Early in the campaign, the Charleston News and Courier, a notoriously racist paper, endorsed Goldwater with these words: “At last—a white man’s candidate.” Though Goldwater never discussed civil rights in the South, he was always surrounded by the staunchest segregationists. On September 16 Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina bolted from the Democratic party to support him. When Goldwater arrived at Greenville, S.C., the next day, Thurmond greeted him, wearing a gold elephant in his left lapel and a Goldwater button in his right. Thurmond joined the Goldwater campaign and that evening spoke with Goldwater at a rally in New Orleans. Seated on the platform next to Thurmond and frequently applauding Goldwater was Leander Perez, racist and antisemitic Louisiana political leader, excommunicated from the Roman Catholic church for his violent opposition to desegregating the Catholic parochial schools.

In campaigning in the North, Goldwater appealed to the “backlash,” that is, white voters who had been traditionally Democratic but who threatened to punish the Democratic party for its espousal of equal rights for Negroes. At Minneapolis on September 10, Goldwater charged that the Civil Rights Act was an attempt to “legislate morality” and was responsible for “violence in the streets.” In Chicago on October 16, he argued that “forced integration is just as wrong as forced segregation” and that laws should not infringe on the right of “free association.” At a campaign rally in New York City on October 5

Goldwater attacked plans to desegregate schools "by forcibly busing" children out of their neighborhoods.

**Group Appeals**

Goldwater's appeal was essentially to the small-town and rural white Protestant American, nostalgic for bygone days. Typical of this approach was the organization of "Mothers for Moral America," to protest "the rapidly deteriorating moral climate in our cities, states, and our country." He himself frequently used the theme of morality versus the disorders of the big city. He attacked the "rot and decay" besetting "the moral fiber of the American people" (Salt Lake City, October 10), appealed for a return to religion and piety, and condemned the big cities for crime, violence, and lawlessness.

The lack of Goldwater's appeal to the racial and ethnic minorities was apparent long before the campaign began in earnest. On August 12 the Republican party leaders who had assembled at Hershey, Pa., in a "unity conference" to patch up the differences between mainstream Republicans and Goldwaterites discussed also their difficulties in getting votes in the industrial states. Pennsylvania's Governor William Scranton said: "I cannot find the Jewish vote for us. I cannot find more than a handful of the Negro vote for us." Charles Percy, Republican candidate for Illinois governor, worried about the Negro vote as well as the Polish and Lithuanian vote. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower was apparently surprised by the sensitivities of minority groups. He had received a letter which said mention of switchblade knives in his speech at the Republican convention had been taken in Harlem to mean "that I took a crack at Negroes." That letter had been written by Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive. "I thought switchblade knives were always—and I hope there are no Italians here—identified with Italians," Eisenhower said.

Campaigning in South Bend, Ind., September 7, where the closing of the Studebaker plant had caused considerable unemployment and economic distress and where Wallace had done fairly well in the Democratic primary, Miller made a classic gaffe. He charged President Johnson with proposing to "open the floodgates for virtually any and all who would wish to come and find work in this country," a remark that did not endear him to Italians, Greeks, and other groups interested in immigration.

The Citizens for Goldwater-Miller campaign organization established an ethnic division to get votes, a usual political tactic. Co-chairmen were Hollywood actor Cesar Romero, son of a prestigious Cuban family, and Mme. Claire Lee Chennault, widow of the American air general, long associated with Nationalist China. These appointments, as well as those of spokesmen for Latvian Americans, Czech Americans, Hungarian Americans, Polish Americans, and Ukrainian Americans, spelled nothing more than advocacy of a "liberation" policy for the mother countries. Perhaps the most ludicrous "ethnic" appointment was that of Colonel Alexis David Tchenkeli-Thamys.

---

6 A report of this conference, taken from a confidential transcript of a verbatim recording of the proceedings, was published in Newsweek, December 14, 1964.
son of a Georgian member of the Russian Duma of 1906, to “win Georgian American Democrats” for the Goldwater-Miller ticket. (The Georgian Democratic votes came from the Southern United States, not Southern Russia.)

Appeal to Jews

The Goldwater campaign organization did not even try to win Jewish votes, apparently convinced by local reports and polls that most Jews would not support Goldwater. A Gallup poll published on September 16, 1964, showed 91 per cent of Jewish respondents favoring Johnson (the only group providing even more solid Johnson support was the “non-white,” with 94 per cent). A private poll conducted for President Johnson in August showed 97 per cent of Jewish voters for him (New York Times, September 17). Goldwater supporters published one ad in the Times, October 30, addressed to “Fellow Americans of the Jewish Faith,” appealing to Jews to vote against Johnson; it did not mention Goldwater. It was signed by 23 persons with obviously Jewish names but no prominence in the Jewish community.

Goldwater himself from time to time called attention to his Jewish origins. In answer to a question put to him by the National Jewish Post and Opinion, October 30, Goldwater said: “I am proud of my heritage. My grandparents and my father were Jews. My mother was a Christian. I was baptized a Christian, an Episcopalian. I have a high regard for the American Jewish community.” In his only campaign appearance in New York City, October 26, Goldwater said: “The Nazi and the Fascist types—the bigots—they’re not going to vote for me—because my grandfather was a Polish Jew.” But this had little effect on Jewish voters.

The most characteristic Jewish view of Goldwater was expressed by Rabbi Joachim Prinz in remarks from his pulpit at Temple B’nai Abraham, Newark, N.J., on September 26, when he said that “a Jewish vote for Goldwater is a vote for Jewish suicide,” that Goldwater himself was “a decent, honest, articulate, religious and most dangerous man,” who was surrounded by “every hate group in the United States, every antisemite in America, and the people who believe in simple solutions.”

Churches and Goldwater

On October 5, in a special election issue, Christianity and Crisis, a prestigious nondenominational Protestant journal edited by Reinhold Niebuhr and John C. Bennett, opposed Goldwater for president. This was the first time in its nearly 25 years of existence that the journal had taken a stand on a specific candidate. “We point simply,” the editorial explained, “to the objective, unarguable conflict between his record and the judgments of the Christian churches on most of the major issues of social ethics in our time.” This view was very widely shared among the more liberal Protestant denominations and in some Catholic circles. On October 13, at the general convention of the Episcopal church in St. Louis, William Stringfellow, a New York attorney and leading layman, announced that 726 Episcopalian laymen and clergymen, including 10 bishops, had signed a statement accusing Goldwater and Miller
of a "transparent exploitation of racism." (Presiding Bishop Arthur Lichtenberger had to interrupt the proceedings of the convention the next day to declare that the statement was not an official stand of the church.)

*Christian Century*, the nondenominational Protestant weekly and one of the most influential of Protestant journals, endorsed Johnson, the first presidential candidate it had supported since Wendell Willkie; it kept up a weekly attack on Goldwater for recklessness in foreign policy and racist exploitation in domestic affairs. Other Protestant journals which explicitly or implicitly (by referring to civil-rights issues) condemned Goldwater included the Episcopalian *Witness* and *Churchman*, the biweekly *United Church Herald*, the Methodist student journal *Motive*, the *Covenant Companion* of the Evangelical Covenant church, *American Lutheran*, *Texas Methodist*, *Presbyterian Life*, and the Methodist *World Outlook*.

Many individual ministers preached against Goldwater. One of the strongest statements (*Time*, October 9) came from the Rev. William Sydnor, of Christ Episcopal Church in Alexandria, Va.:

> When one listens to and reads Senator Goldwater, one finds that respect for God’s law is shockingly absent. Never in the history of our nation have an aspirant for the presidency and his backers espoused principles and practices that so brazenly ignore God’s commands dealing with love, peace, reconciliation, brotherhood, care of the poor, respect for law and the constitutional authority.

Dean Francis B. Sayre, Jr., of the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C., in a sermon on September 13, took a somewhat different position, charging that the electorate had a "sterile choice" between "a man of dangerous ignorance and devastating uncertainty" and "a man whose public house is splendid in its every appearance, but whose private lack of ethic must inevitably introduce termites at the very foundation."

**Election Returns**

President Johnson defeated Goldwater 42,676,220 to 26,860,314, with 61.4 per cent of the popular vote. Goldwater's 38.6 per cent of the popular vote was the second lowest for any candidate of a major party in the history of presidential elections: Republican Alfred M. Landon running against Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936 received 37.5 per cent of the major-party popular vote. (That year William Lemke, a Republican, ran as Union party candidate and received 890,000 votes. Had Lemke not split Republican votes, Landon might have received 40 per cent of the major-party vote.)

American voters repudiated Goldwater in landslide proportions. He carried only six states, his own Arizona and five in the deep South (Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina), emerging unmistakably as the candidate of the racists.

Goldwater's appeal was greatest in the South and weakest in the East (see Table 1), particularly the Northeast. The more populous states, with large cities, industrial centers, substantial population of foreign-born and foreign
stock (children of the foreign-born), and Negroes, gave Johnson a greater proportion of their votes than less populous states, with a small foreign-stock population and with fewer than 20 per cent of Negroes voting.

**TABLE 1. 1964 major-party presidential vote by regions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Johnson</th>
<th>Goldwater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>14,858,574</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>13,449,674</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>7,093,304</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South*</td>
<td>7,274,668</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,676,220</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include 209,848 votes cast for independent electors in Alabama.

In a preliminary attempt to analyze the 1964 presidential election, an index of Democratic voting average was used to measure the Democratic increase (Republican defection) or decrease (Democratic defection) as manifested in the vote for Johnson.  

The New England states showed the greatest Democratic increase (see Table 2) of the 41 states that gave Johnson a higher proportion of their votes than they normally give Democrats. In 9 Southern states the Democratic percentage decreased, contrary to the national trend. States with a greater proportion of foreign stock shifted more heavily to Johnson than those with small percentage of foreign stock. (The diversity of political traditions of the ethnic groups, too, is important. For example, the comparatively large and recent colony of Volga Germans in North Dakota, classified as Russians, was not likely to vote like foreign-born groups in industrial cities. Similarly, French Canadians, latecomers among immigrants, have shown marked conservative voting habits. Nor are Basque sheepherders in Nevada likely to vote like Polish immigrants in industrial centers.) Table 2 also suggests that the Republican defection was greatest on the Eastern seaboard, among the typical conservative Republicans, smaller in the Middle West, and least in the Far West, where populism and radical agrarian traditions still linger. (In the South, too, populism took hold, and strands of the populist heritage—distrust of central government and of industrial capitalism—are surely interwoven in the fabric of Southern ideology.)

Political analysts have tried to determine how many of the nearly 27 mil-

---

7 An average was taken of four elections for each state: two presidential elections (1956 and 1960) and two state elections, gubernatorial and/or senatorial for 1960 and/or 1962. The index is admittedly crude. For one thing, the vote in both presidential elections untypically magnified the Republican vote (Kennedy’s Catholicism and Eisenhower’s charisma). The use of Congressional votes might have given a truer picture for each state, but such computations were beyond our resources. Also, no account was taken of special state factors which may at times abnormally affect party voting. This index is intended to suggest possible ways of analyzing the sources of Goldwater support or resistance in the electorate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Democratic Presidential Vote 1964</th>
<th>Democratic Index</th>
<th>1964 Democratic Deviation</th>
<th>Combined Per Cent Foreign-Born and Foreign Stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maine</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>+28.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Massachusetts</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>+27.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vermont</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>+24.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. New Hampshire</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>+22.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. New York</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>+22.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rhode Island</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>+21.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. New Jersey</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>+21.1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hawaii</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>+19.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kentucky</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>+19.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Connecticut</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>+19.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Michigan</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>+17.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Colorado</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>+17.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pennsylvania</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>+16.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. West Virginia</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>+15.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Maryland</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>+14.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Wisconsin</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>+14.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Minnesota</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>+13.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Kansas</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>+13.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Montana</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>+13.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Washington</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>+13.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Wyoming</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>+13.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Alaska</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>+13.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. California</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>+13.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Ohio</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>+13.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Oregon</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>+12.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Iowa</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>+12.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. No. Dakota</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>+12.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Nebraska</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>+11.4</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Texas</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>+11.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Illinois</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>+11.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Missouri</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>+11.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Utah</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>+10.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. So. Dakota</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>+10.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Delaware</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>+9.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Indiana</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>+9.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. New Mexico</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>+7.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Oklahoma</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>+7.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Idaho</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>+6.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Arizona</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>+4.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Nevada</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. No. Carolina</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Florida</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Arkansas</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Tennessee</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Virginia</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>-9.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Georgia</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>-22.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Louisiana</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>-23.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. So. Carolina</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>-27.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Alabama</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>-27.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Mississippi</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>-67.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Johnson was not on the ballot: 30.5 per cent of the vote went to independent electors.
lion people who voted for Goldwater were in fact Goldwaterites, that is, committed to the radical-right ideology that Goldwater appeared to espouse. Some observers believe that about half of these votes were cast by “brass-collar Republicans,” described (New York Times, November 8) by a party official as “people who would vote for Walter Reuther if he were the Republican candidate for President.” A private postelection survey conducted for Republican leaders indicated that at most 5.4 millions may have been Goldwaterites; another assessment of the same data put the figure at 2.5 millions (Times, December 18). A Louis Harris poll (New York Post, January 11, 1965) concluded that 6 million regular Republicans defected in this election and that only 9 million, about one-third of the people who voted for Goldwater, approved of his views. Louis H. Bean and Roscoe Drummond (Look, March 23, 1965) concluded that “the pure Goldwater vote lies between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000—not more.”

Analysis of data from the Voter Profile Analysis (VPA) service—operated by Louis Harris, Columbia Broadcasting System, and International Business Machines Corporation—produced a profile (Times, November 8) of the committed Goldwater supporter: young, well-to-do, largely found in the new technical, industrial, aerospace centers of the South, Southwest, and Far West. Low-income and rural Goldwaterites were predominantly in the “core South.” Voters of German background were the most likely of any ethnic group to be Goldwaterites.

Group Voting

Negroes: The Negro vote was the most significant group vote in electing Johnson. Negro votes gave him the margin of victory in Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, and Virginia, and considerably increased his victory in North Carolina and Texas. VPA showed that Negro precincts voted 93 per cent Democratic in New Jersey, 94 per cent in New York and Maryland, 96 per cent in Pennsylvania, 98 per cent in Connecticut, and 99 per cent in Ohio and North Carolina.

Jews: The Electronic Vote Analysis of the National Broadcasting Company (U.S. News and World Report, November 16) showed Jewish precincts 90 per cent for Johnson in New York and 89 per cent in California and Florida. (The three sets of Jewish precincts in Los Angeles that had voted against Proposition 14 [see p. 163] voted 95 per cent for Johnson.) VPA (New York Times, November 4) showed heavily Jewish precincts in all reporting points averaging 89 per cent for Johnson.

In the New York Senatorial campaign between Democrat Robert F. Kennedy and Republican Kenneth Keating, many appeals to Jews were made, none reflecting any serious or real issue, but Kennedy ran considerably behind Johnson in Jewish districts. In New York Congressional primaries in June, Jewish appeals were made in contests between Reform Democratic candidates (William F. Haddad, Jonathan Bingham, and James H. Scheuer)
and regular Democrats (Leonard A. Farbstein, Charles A. Buckley, and James C. Healey, respectively), but none had substantive merit.

Irish: NBC's Electronic Vote Analysis showed 88 per cent of Irish precincts in Massachusetts for Johnson and 69 per cent in Illinois. The VPA showed Johnson carrying 66 per cent of Irish precincts.

Italians: NBC figures showed Italian precincts 89 per cent for Johnson in Massachusetts, 75 per cent in Illinois, and 68 per cent in New York State. VPA also showed the New York Italian vote at 68 per cent.

Slavic: According to NBC figures Slavs (presumably Poles, Slovaks, Ukrainians) voted 88 per cent for Johnson in Michigan, 86 per cent in Ohio, 80 per cent in Wisconsin, and 72 per cent in Illinois. VPA showed Polish precincts in New York 82 per cent for Johnson.

"Backlash"

The Wallace candidacy had suggested the possibility that white workers, traditionally Democratic, would punish the Democratic party for its espousal of Negro rights by voting Republican. The anticipated Democratic falloff was called the "backlash." But except for the racist South, that expected backlash did not materialize or was too slight to have any quantitative significance. For most non-Southern white voters, whatever their attitudes toward Negroes and civil rights, the issues of war and peace and economic security were more salient than their prejudices.

An analysis of votes for Johnson in selected areas that had given Wallace a larger vote than expected showed little evidence of backlash (U.S. News and World Report, November 16). For example, a Polish ward in Milwaukee which had voted 32 per cent for Wallace voted 18 per cent for Goldwater. A Gary, Ind., precinct that had voted 76.7 per cent for Wallace voted 35 per cent for Goldwater. Maryland counties that had gone 64 per cent for Wallace voted 42 per cent for Goldwater and Baltimore precincts 59 per cent for Wallace voted 25 per cent for Goldwater.

A study prepared for the Democratic National Committee, released April 1965, of voting returns in 233 selected wards in 15 major cities showed that Johnson had actually received a higher percentage of votes in predominantly Polish and Italian wards than had Kennedy in 1960.

**Political and Social Action**

Increasingly Negro civil-rights leaders turned their attention to political and social action as an effective means of improving the civic and economic situation of Negroes. Voter education and registration have long been their concern, while political action with a view to exercising political pressure has only recently attained prime significance in Negro strategy. Social action—through demonstrations, protests, boycotts, and other forms of community pressure—has also increasingly been used in the North and South, particularly in campaigns to desegregate public facilities and public schools.
Voter Education and Registration

The Voter Education Project organized by civil-rights agencies in April 1, 1962, and coordinated by the Southern Regional Council, registered 688,800 Negro voters in 11 Southern states between April 1962 and November 1964. Statistics compiled by the Voter Education Project showed that in Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, and Texas more than half of the Negroes eligible to vote were registered. In Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia about 45 per cent of eligible Negro voters were registered; 39 per cent in South Carolina, 32 per cent in Louisiana, 23 per cent in Alabama, and 6.7 per cent in Mississippi. Only 4,500 Negroes were registered in Mississippi during this period. In all, about 28,500 Negroes are registered there, amounting to 5.2 per cent of all registered voters, though Negroes are about 36 per cent of the population of voting age. After about two years of activity and an expenditure of over $50,000, the Southern Regional Council withdrew its support from the Voter Education Project in Mississippi on the ground that white resistance to Negro registration had made further effort futile.

Mississippi Freedom Summer Project

Early in 1964 an extensive plan for Negro political and social action, called the Mississippi Freedom Summer, was announced by the Council of Federated Organizations (COFO), consisting of four civil-rights organizations: the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Calling for the participation of about 2,000 full-time workers, including 1,000 white and Negro college students from North and South, the program envisaged “freedom schools” (with a curriculum ranging from remedial reading to political science), community centers, and “freedom registration,” designed to place 400,000 Negroes on unofficial voter lists; a “freedom election,” to be held during the regular Mississippi Democratic primary on June 2 and during the general election, to support “freedom party” congressional candidates and to lay a foundation for challenging the rights of the Mississippi delegation to sit in the House of Representatives on the ground that Negroes are denied the right to vote in that state.

The program was explicitly intended to bring the power of the Federal government into Mississippi, as Robert P. Moses, SNCC field secretary, told students on June 19, on the eve of their departure for Mississippi:

This is part of what we are doing, and getting the country involved through yourselves, that is, to open this up to the country and get the backing of the country and get pressure—public pressure, continual, mounting, steady public pressure—on all of the agencies of the Federal government and on all of the informal processes of this country. That’s the only way we’ll get any kind of creative solution to what’s going on down there (New York Times, June 21).

Early in June the General Board of the National Council of Churches of Christ (NCCC) approved the participation of NCCC’s Commission on Reli-
region and Race in providing orientation courses for the student volunteers and in helping them understand their legal position and the physical danger that they would face in Mississippi. (The anxiety was not exaggerated: three workers were murdered [see p. 185].) NCCC also recruited ministers to serve as counselors to the student volunteers. The Rev. Bruce Hanson, NCCC summer-projects director, explained the NCCC role (New York Times, June 17):

We have agreed to train students out of the conviction that the church has the responsibility to do everything possible to avert violence; out of recognition that organizations recruiting large numbers of students will find it difficult to provide orientation and training; out of the need for people trained in skills like literacy education and voter registration, and out of the belief that orientation and training will benefit not only organizations operating projects and students, but also the states where projects are taking place.

Legal aid was provided by three groups, in addition to the NAACP’s Legal Defense Fund: the leftist National Lawyers Guild; the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, founded in 1963, which limited itself to representing NCCC-recruited ministers and to persuading members of the Mississippi bar to defend civil-rights workers, and the Lawyers Constitutional Defense Committee (LCDC), founded in the spring of 1964. The LCDC, which received initial financial backing from the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Jewish Committee, and other organizations, sent about 125 lawyers to Mississippi.

In all, there were about 1,200 volunteers in Mississippi during the summer: about 800 student recruits; about 235 ministers, rabbis, and adult laymen working on voter-registration; 61 ministers serving as counselors; over 150 volunteer lawyers; a medical committee; some professional teachers, and the COFO staff. Nearly 50 Freedom Schools, with an enrolment of 2,500 children, were opened as supplementary educational centers and 17 community centers were in operation.

It has been estimated that between one-third and one-half of the student volunteers in Mississippi were Jews, though there were few rabbis among the counselling ministers. (One, Arthur J. Lelyveld, senior rabbi of Fairmont Temple, Cleveland, was beaten by segregationists on July 10 in Hattiesburg, while with two civil-rights workers.) Jews were also well-represented in the legal and medical corps working in Mississippi among the volunteers.

**Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party**

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic party was founded on April 24, in Jackson, Miss., by COFO, to help carry out its political-action project. The party’s first bid was to write John M. Bailey, Democratic national chairman,
in July, asking the Democratic party to demonstrate loyalty to the Negro, “particularly to the Negro in Mississippi, who has not even had the leavings from the American political table.” The Freedom party argued that it, not the regular Mississippi Democratic party, was loyal to the national party’s candidates and platform and that its delegates (elected at a state convention early in August) ought to be seated at the Democratic party convention.

In Atlantic City on August 25 the Democratic convention’s credentials committee, with Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, worked out a compromise plan to the Freedom party’s challenge to unseat the regular Mississippi delegation. The compromise recommended (1) the seating of those members of the regular Mississippi delegation who signed an assurance of loyalty to the party’s nominees in the general election, (2) the seating of two designated delegates from the Freedom party, with full delegate status, as delegates-at-large, (3) the admission to the convention as “honored guests” of the other Freedom delegates, (4) and instruction to the Democratic National Committee that the 1968 convention advise each state Democratic party to give all its voters, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, the opportunity to participate in party affairs. The convention overwhelmingly approved this compromise, but it was rejected by the regular Mississippi delegation (only 3 of its members signed the loyalty oath) and also by the Freedom party, though its two designated members (Aaron Henry, a Negro, president of Mississippi’s NAACP, and the Rev. Edwin King, a white Methodist minister at Tougaloo Southern Christian College) took their seats as delegates-at-large. Because the compromise had generally been considered as a significant victory for the Freedom party, the party’s refusal to compromise disappointed many friends and supporters. They thought the Freedom party’s position inflexible, purist, naive and absolutistic.

Freedom party leaders tried to get on the Mississippi ballot as congressional candidates in the general election, but the state’s Board of Election Commissioners ruled against them. Instead, the Freedom party held a four-day mock election, from October 30 to November 2, intended to demonstrate how Negroes in Mississippi would vote if allowed to register. The results were 45,218 for President Johnson, 12 for Goldwater. In mock congressional elections three Negro women, leaders of the Freedom party, were “elected”: Mrs. Fannie Lou Hamer, Ruleville, 18,450 votes; Mrs. Annie Devine, Canton, 2,805 votes; Mrs. Virginia Gray, Hattiesburg, 7,150 votes. They “ran” against Democratic incumbents Jamie Whitten, Arthur Winstead, and William M. Colmer.

On December 6 the Freedom Democratic party announced it would challenge the seating of all five members of the Mississippi congressional delegation on the grounds that their election violated a constitutional requirement that members of the House be elected by all the people and that only 6.7 percent of the Negroes of voting age were able to vote in Mississippi’s last election. By December 23, 17 liberal Democrats were supporting a plan to bar the seating of the five Mississippi congressmen. But a further proposal by the Freedom Democratic party that Mrs. Hamer, Mrs. Devine, and Mrs.
Gray be seated in their stead found little support even among those in the forefront of the Negro struggle for voting rights, on the ground that no winners of a mock election could legally be considered to have been elected to Congress under the Constitution and that their seating would establish a dangerous precedent.

**Protest Moratorium**

On July 29 leaders of major Negro civil-rights organizations called upon their members "voluntarily to observe a broad curtailment, if not total moratorium, of all mass marches, mass picketing, and mass demonstrations until after Election Day, next November 3." The statement was issued after a meeting of civil-rights leaders in the wake of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (see p. 155) and the Republican nomination of Goldwater (see p. 165), and represented a profound awareness of the importance of national politics to the advancement of civil rights. It was signed by Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive secretary; the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, SCLC president; Whitney M. Young, Jr., National Urban League executive director, and A. Philip Randolph, Negro American Labor Council chairman. James Farmer, CORE national director, and John Lewis, SNCC chairman, withheld their signatures pending meetings of their steering committees, which subsequently opposed the moratorium. (SNCC and CORE jointly sponsored what were generally considered nuisance demonstrations at the Democratic convention in Atlantic City.)

"The greatest need in this period," the statement declared, "is for political action" and its thrust was clearly against the Goldwater-dominated Republican party. The Republican platform was described as a "states'-rights platform" and the "Goldwater forces" were charged with having injected racism into the campaign. Indeed, the statement concluded, "the Senator himself maintains his position that civil-rights matters should be left to the states—clear enough language for any Negro American."

**Desegregation Demonstrations: (1) South**

In January militant Negro leaders in Atlanta, as elsewhere in the deep and upper South, began applying more aggressive tactics to secure the desegregation of public accommodations. At that time it did not seem that the public-accommodations section of the civil-rights bill would be passed. In Atlanta SNCC was particularly active in organizing a series of small-scale sit-in demonstrations at restaurants. On January 21 the Atlanta Constitution, in an editorial entitled "For a Public Accommodations Law; Against This SNCC-led Lawlessness," abandoned its opposition to the public-accommodations section of the civil-rights bill, since it had become clear that Atlanta owners would not voluntarily desegregate their facilities.

In February and March hundreds of Negro college students in Princess Anne, an Eastern Shore Maryland town, kept up militant demonstrations to desegregate local restaurants. Violence flared when large contingents of state police were called in, with dogs to reinforce their authority. Early in March
the students won a victory in their negotiations when they obtained a pledge that police dogs would not be used "unless there is a riot" and a promise from Governor Tawes that he would exert all the powers of his office to get through the new state law prohibiting discrimination in public accommodations (see p. 161).

In Jacksonville, Fla., Negro demonstrations in March against segregated hotels, motels, restaurants, and theaters erupted in mass rioting by whites and Negroes, numerous injuries, considerable property damage, and the arrests of more than 200 Negroes.

A campaign of a different sort was begun in March, when the NAACP made informal inquiries among concert artists whether they would be prepared to refuse to play before segregated audiences. The idea had come from the New York pianist Gary Graffman who, at SNCC's request, had turned down an engagement to play in Jackson, Miss. (New York Times, March 5). On March 9 the pianist Artur Rubinstein said musicians should "actively participate in fostering" civil rights. As a Jew, he said, he had personally experienced the painful consequences of prejudice. Many others among America's most distinguished musicians agreed to support the campaign, including the pianist Vladimir Horowitz, New York Philharmonic conductor Leonard Bernstein, and Boston Symphony music director Erich Leinsdorf.

In St. Augustine, Fla., America's oldest city, SCLC began a campaign at the end of March to end segregation in public accommodations. The demonstrations lasted well into June and were marked by sporadic violence; about 300 people were arrested and many injured in clashes with the police and the KKK. On June 17 Martin Luther King sent a telegram to the 75th Annual Convention of CCAR, meeting in Atlantic City, in which he described St. Augustine as a "battleground between the forces of good and ill will in our nation." He said "strong pockets of Birch and Klan resistance, combined with indifference and fear in the white community, create a virtual concentration-camp existence for Negroes." He concluded: "Won't you join me in a prophetic witness against the social evils of our time?" Later that day 16 Reform rabbis and one layman left for St. Augustine; the next day they were all arrested in an attempt to desegregate a public swimming-pool. But in a matter of hours a grand jury proposed a 30-day cooling-off period without demonstrations, after which a biracial committee was named to negotiate the problems of discrimination.

Desegregation Demonstrations: (2) North

In the North civil-rights groups concentrated their most aggressive strategies upon public-school desegregation. Many Northern cities witnessed agitation against de facto school desegregation: school boycotts, picketing, and demonstrations. School segregation in the North has largely been the consequence of segregated housing, but school-zoning practices have often solidified and perpetuated residential segregation. Civil-rights organizations have proposed various plans to remedy this situation: redistricting school zones, pairing schools in adjacent districts racially to balance the school population,
transporting children from one district to another on the basis of voluntary choice or by assignment. But racial balance in the big-city schools has been difficult to attain for a variety of reasons: (1) the resistance offered by a slow-moving school bureaucracy, (2) antagonism rooted in prejudice, (3) opposition based on parental anxieties about their children's safety and the quality of their education, and (4) the inflexible facts of population change in our big cities. Central cities have increasingly become the nearly exclusive habitat of small numbers of well-to-do whites and large numbers of poor Negroes, with the result that there are not enough whites to provide a satisfactory racial balance in the public schools, short of engaging in mammoth logistical maneuvers.

The responsibility which school boards have for eliminating de facto segregation has been widely litigated. Two cases reached the Supreme Court in 1964. On May 4 the Court left standing a lower court's ruling that the school authorities in Gary, Ind., were not constitutionally obliged to end de facto segregation which its own policies had not caused. On October 19 the Court declined to review another lower court's decision allowing the New York City Board of Education to take into account the factor of racial balance in zoning a new school. Legal experts believed that the Supreme Court generally favored giving local school boards wide constitutional discretion to handle problems of racial balance as they deemed best.

According to the NAACP's annual report on school desegregation, more than 13 northern and western school systems took substantial action in desegregating. In White Plains, N.Y., a suburban community of 50,000, where Negroes were 10 per cent of the population and 19 per cent of the elementary-school pupils, the school board in April voluntarily and peacefully accepted a desegregation program that involved the closing of the only predominantly Negro school and distributing its pupils in other schools. A month after the plan was approved, the president of the board, who had endorsed it, was overwhelmingly reelected, by a vote of 2,952 to 511. Other communities acting to desegregate their schools included Teaneck, N.J.; Manhasset, L.I.; New Haven and Norwalk, Conn.; Sacramento, Cal., and Xenia, Ohio.

But these experiences were the exception. Demonstrations and pupil boycotts against de facto school segregation took place in Boston, Buffalo, Chester, Pa., Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Gary, Kansas City, and New York City. In Cleveland, school demonstrations were held over a period of months, from January through April, with sporadic violence offered predominantly from "Little Italy," adjoining the Negro neighborhood. On April 7, during a demonstration at a school-construction site in a predominantly Negro neighborhood, the Rev. Bruce William Klunder, a 26-year-old Presbyterian minister, was crushed by a bulldozer in a tragic accident. The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce then organized a biracial committee to deal with school problems. In August, after four months of unpublicized meetings, the committee agreed to support a school program by Cleveland's new school superintendent. The committee continued to meet in secret to explore racial issues in the city.
Biracial committees, appointed by city authorities to make proposals on school desegregation, functioned in Denver, Portland, Ore., and St. Paul, with varying degrees of support from civil-rights organizations.

In New York City the Board of Education was almost continuously embroiled in community controversy about school desegregation, a question which was inextricably associated with that of the quality of education. Most middle-class white parents opposed plans to achieve racial balance, believing that these would bring about inferior education; most Negroes insisted on racial balance, knowing that the segregated Negro schools were bad schools. Negro civil-rights organizations called a school boycott on February 3 to protest the Board of Education’s slowness in eliminating *de facto* segregation. Over 464,000 pupils, 45 per cent of the total enrolment, stayed out of school, mostly in Negro and Puerto Rican neighborhoods. A second boycott was called six weeks later, on March 16; 267,000 pupils, 26 per cent, stayed out of school. The first boycott had had the support of all major Negro civil-rights organizations (CORE, NAACP, Urban League, and many local groups), and some Jewish intergroup agencies (the American Jewish Committee’s New York chapter opposed the use of boycott as a tactic to achieve desegregation). But the second boycott, called by the Rev. Milton A. Galamison of Brooklyn, N.Y., over the opposition of most civil-rights leaders, had little community support.

On March 12, in cold and snow, about 15,000 members of Parents and Taxpayers (PAT), an organization formed in 1963 to oppose desegregation and to maintain the neighborhood school, often charged with bigotry, marched in front of City Hall and the Board of Education to demonstrate their determination to fight the busing of pupils out of their neighborhoods. Civil-rights groups organized a countermarch on May 18, but it proved a disastrous failure, rallying only about 4,000 demonstrators.

Meanwhile, the Jewish Education Committee of New York, fearing that Negro pressure might induce the Board of Education to inaugurate a system of widespread and compulsory busing of school children, wrote the board on March 23 urging consideration for the needs of the Jewish afternoon religious schools, attended by nearly 50,000 public-school children. "School attendance," the letter declared, "should be planned so that it does not infringe upon the limited time and energy that our children have available for study of the religious beliefs, ethical precepts, and cultural heritage of our people." A similar position was taken by the New York Board of Rabbis a few days later: "The future of Jewish religious life depends upon this religious program. Any program of transportation which will reduce the afternoon religious school hours will do irreparable damage to the religious life of the New York Jewish community. We therefore urge you to evolve a pupil-transportation plan which will enable the Jewish community to maintain its afternoon religious school program intact."

Early in June the Board of Education published its school-integration pro-

gram, to go into effect September. Some school pairing and busing were foreseen. PAT groups, unsuccessful in preventing the plan from going into operation, called a boycott on the first day of school, September 14. Nearly 276,000 children, 27 per cent of the total enrollment, stayed out, mostly from schools to which pupils had been involuntarily transferred for purposes of integration or from schools that parents feared might in the near future be affected. The next day 233,000 pupils, 23 per cent, stayed out. Thereafter defiance was limited to several small groups, mostly in Queens, where skirmishes with the police ended in the arrests of some 60 parents. In many neighborhoods, private schools, sectarian and nonsectarian, found themselves the reluctant beneficiaries of these tensions, when some parents withdrew their children from the public schools.

School busing became an election issue in some campaigns for election to Congress, the State Assembly, and the City Council in New York, especially in Queens and Brooklyn. The 13th Assembly District in Queens (Glendale-Ridgewood), normally heavily Republican, gave Goldwater a majority of their votes, while electing a Democrat (with Conservative party backing) to the State Assembly, largely because he supported PAT in opposition to busing.

ECONOMIC AID AND COMMUNITY ACTION

In response to a New York Times survey in July among Negroes on key questions affecting them, the largest group of respondents, 54 per cent, said that the biggest problems Negroes had to worry about were economic—jobs, welfare, the high cost of living, low pay. The second largest group, 49 per cent, mentioned bad housing and high rents. Clearly, civil-rights legislation and political action, however vital and necessary, were nevertheless not enough for dealing with the deprivations and hardships that Negroes suffered as a consequence of prejudice and discrimination.

Economic Opportunity Act

The enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, signed into law by President Johnson on August 20, 1964, to carry out a program popularly known as the war on poverty, inaugurated a new approach to these problems. The approach had its origins in Michael Harrington's *The Other America: Poverty in the United States* (New York, 1962) which *inter alia* discussed the special conditions of poverty endured by racial minorities. The Economic Opportunity Act, designed to help all poor people, had particular saliency for Negroes and other color minorities like Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans, who have proportionately more poor than other groups. According to a study of family income in 1963, 16 per cent of white families but 45 per cent of nonwhite families had an income under $3,000. Nonwhites, about a tenth of the population, are a quarter of the poor.

The Economic Opportunity Act provides a variety of youth programs—job corps, training, and work-study programs; community action, with fed-
eral grants to community-action organizations for assisting low-income families in employment, job training, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management, and welfare; programs to combat rural poverty, to provide business-investment and small-business loans, and to strengthen family life; recruitment, training, and placement of volunteers to assist in the war on poverty in a domestic Peace Corps called VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America).

The bill took nearly five months to pass Congress in one of the most partisan political battles waged there. Although it had some Republican support, its passage was clearly a Democratic victory. Considered as a legislative triumph for President Johnson, the passage of the bill was marred by a vicious attack by Southern Democrats on Adam Yarmolinsky, special assistant to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who was said to have been chosen as deputy to Sargent Shriver, director of the anti-poverty program. Yarmolinsky had long been a target of right-wing groups as an alleged Communist (he is not and has not been), because his name sounds Jewish (he is). He was also credited with having written a report for the Defense Department, recommending the end of racial discrimination in towns adjoining military bases. It was said that the North Carolina congressional delegation, headed by Rep. Harold Cooley, and congressmen from two Southern states had demanded, in exchange for their support of this bill, that the President oust Yarmolinsky from the program. At a news conference on August 15, President Johnson, when asked about the reports that Yarmolinsky "had been offered as a sort of sacrifice to the Southerners in exchange for support of the poverty program," replied that Yarmolinsky had not been recommended for any specific position.

Community-action Programs

An addition to the work of long-established Negro self-improvement agencies like the Urban League and the hundreds of social-welfare agencies across the country, new community-action organizations, professional and volunteer, have come into being to help Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other disadvantaged groups overcome disabilities resulting from their heritage of prejudice and discrimination. Some have operated privately, while others have enjoyed extensive Federal and private-foundation financial support. Some programs have shown marked success in relatively brief periods; the effectiveness of others is still being evaluated.

Philadelphia's Opportunities Industrialization Center, a highly successful job-training program, grew out of activities conducted by the Rev. Leon Sullivan, pastor of the Zion Baptist church, in the Negro section of North Philadelphia. It has combined social action (the selective economic boycott to force job openings for Negroes) with vocational training, educational and

tutorial programs, and a variety of self-help activities. It won the support of Philadelphia's mayor and Chamber of Commerce and the cooperation of major industrial companies. Federal agencies (Office of Economic Opportunity, Manpower Administration, Department of Health, Welfare, and Education) have shown an interest in the program and are seeking to expand it with Federal support.

In New York, Haryou-Act (Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited and Associated Community Teams), a project to improve the situation of about 71,000 youths in Harlem, was the recipient of several major federal grants under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act, the Juvenile Delinquency Act, and the anti-poverty program. Haryou-Act's three-year budget amounted to nearly $120 million. Mobilization for Youth, another New York social-action agency, with a multi-million-dollar program, has received funds under the Juvenile Delinquency Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, and various other public and private agencies. It has encouraged the poor and underprivileged among whom it operates to take part in social-protest activities, including rent strikes and civil-rights demonstrations, as part of a program to combat apathy and despair and build leadership and self-reliance. Both groups have encountered difficulties: Haryou-Act has been embroiled in Negro politics and Mobilization for Youth has been under criticism for Communist infiltration.

A self-help program of a different type was started late in 1963 by CORE, when it opened its first community center in Canton, Miss., in a predominantly Negro rural county. In 1964 CORE established more than 15 such centers in the rural South, as part of the Mississippi Freedom Summer Project. Books and facilities for a modest library and study room and for educational, tutorial, and recreational activities were provided.

An outgrowth of NCC's participation in the Mississippi Freedom Summer Project was NCC's Delta Ministry, a long-term interdenominational commitment to end the low economic, health, and social conditions of Mississippi's poor. In some places associated with the civil-rights forces, it is a wholly independent NCC program which formally opened on September 1. The Delta Ministry has undertaken a health program (health education, hygiene, nutrition, and first aid), relief (food and clothing), literacy, community-center programs, and citizenship-education classes.13

Volunteer programs have multiplied during the year elsewhere in the nation. For example, in Indianapolis women's clubs affiliated with the General Federation of Women's Clubs achieved notable success in helping school dropouts and delinquents and in providing study centers and tutorial programs. Many colleges and universities in or near cities with large Negro populations have organized volunteer tutorial and remedial-reading programs. For instance, a University of Chicago program, Student Woodlawn Area Project (SWAP), had 320 tutors in 1964 working with about 350 Negro children in remedial-reading centers.

The National Council of Jewish Women has undertaken a variety of such programs throughout the country. The (Reform) National Federation of Temple Youth organized a Mitzvah Corps for its teenage members to work among underprivileged groups during the summer vacation. Participants in these groups later stimulated other year-round activities. Thus young members of Congregation B’nai Jeshurun in Newark, N.J., undertook to tutor Negro children in school subjects every Saturday morning at their synagogue as part of a program for the “meaningful application of the teachings of Judaism.”

In August, in Philadelphia, YM-YWHA and the B’nai B’rith Vocational Service began a pilot project to deal with the problem of high-school dropouts.

In October 1963 the Urban League of Greater New York and the Metropolitan Council of the American Jewish Congress formed an Interracial Council for Business Opportunity, primarily to encourage the development of Negro-owned and -operated business. By the end of 1964 the group had 160 white businessmen as members, all expert in their fields, as volunteers helping Negroes to start or expand their own small businesses.

VIOLENCE AND INTERGROUP TENSION

Violence was a frequent concomitant of the struggle for civil rights and an index to intergroup tensions in both North and South. In 1964 about 16 people were believed to have been murdered in Southern states as a consequence of race hate and in reaction to civil-rights activities. Hundreds of Negroes and whites were injured in violence erupting from civil-rights demonstrations. In many parts of the South, dozens of Negro churches were bombed and schools burned. Racial violence affected also Northern cities, sometimes as a result of civil-rights activities and sometimes as an expression of urban tensions and Negro-white friction.

Mississippi

Violence, terror, and murder, bombings, burnings, and beatings have long been part of Mississippi’s lawless treatment of its Negroes. Local autonomy has prevailed in law enforcement, particularly in isolated rural towns and villages, and the lack even of a state police force has enhanced the role of the elected local sheriff. “Mississippi,” said James W. Silver, professor of history at the University of Mississippi, in *Mississippi: The Closed Society* (New York, 1964), “is famous for its justice. . . . Mississippi is famous for a past of police brutality, and for the sure harassment, even to death, of those who defy the code” (p. 90). The Mississippi Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, in a report in January 1963, commented that “in general the press is failing to meet its obligation to our society. The people of Mississippi are largely unaware of the extent of illegal official violence and the press is partly to blame.” But no one, in Mississippi or out, was unaware of the murder of three civil-rights workers in the Mississippi Freedom Summer project in June. That murder catapulted Philadelphia,
a town in East Central Mississippi's Neshoba county, with a population of 5,500, into national, indeed international, prominence.

COFO's announcement of the Mississippi Freedom Summer project stimulated KKK activity in Mississippi (see p. 198). In March a poster offering 20 reasons for joining the Klan was dropped on the porch of nearly every white, non-Catholic home in Neshoba County, saying "Either you're for us or you're for the NAACP." 14

Joseph Alsop, in his syndicated column (June 17), had written:

A great storm is gathering—and may break very soon indeed—in the State of Mississippi and some other regions in the South.

The southern half of Mississippi, to be specific, has now been powerfully invaded by the Ku Klux Klan, which was banished from the state many years ago. And the Klan groups have in turn merged with, or adhered to, a new and very ugly organization known as Americans for the Preservation of the White Race.

On June 21 three civil-rights workers set out from Meridian to Philadelphia to investigate the burning of a Negro church there some days earlier. They were Michael Schwerner, a 24-year-old settlement-house worker from Brooklyn, N.Y.; Andrew Goodman, a 20-year-old student from Queens, N.Y.; and James E. Chaney, 21, a Meridian plasterer. Schwerner and Goodman were Jews, Chaney a Negro. Both Schwerner and Chaney were members of a CORE-SNCC civil-rights task force in Mississippi. Schwerner and his wife had been in Mississippi for about six months, having opened CORE's community center in Meridian. Goodman was one of an advance group of student volunteers coming to take part in the Mississippi Freedom Summer project and had arrived in Meridian on June 20.

On June 22 the three workers were reported missing after having been allegedly released from jail in Philadelphia where they had been arrested on a speeding charge. That day the FBI began an inquiry into their whereabouts. Six weeks later, on August 4, FBI agents unearthed their bodies from a newly erected earthen dam in a wooded area six miles southwest of Philadelphia.

According to the FBI agents who patiently and laboriously uncovered the details of the conspiracy to murder the three civil-rights workers, leaders of the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, the Mississippi Klan formed earlier that year, had marked Schwerner for "extermination"—their word—as much as six weeks before the actual murder: he was a Jew, with a beard, unafraid in his comings and goings among Negroes. That Goodman and Chaney happened to be with him that fateful afternoon of June 21 was their tragic accident. The FBI disclosed that at least 50 persons had been in the conspiracy to murder Schwerner, convinced by the Klan that they were facing an invasion by Yankee beatniks, Jews, and other "scum." 15

An illustration of the pervasiveness of hate and bigotry in Philadelphia is the fact that for months after the disclosure of the murder, tacked on the

---

bulletin board of the Neshoba County courthouse in Philadelphia were handbills of the National States' Rights party, a viciously antisemitic and anti-Negro organization centered in Birmingham. One proclaimed: "Jew-Communists Behind Race Mixing," with pictures of Karl Marx and the then acting Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, an Episcopalian whom the racists liked to think of as a Jew.\(^\text{16}\)

On December 4 the FBI arrested 21 men, including the Neshoba county sheriff and his deputy, for the murder of Schwerner, Goodman, and Chaney. Most of those arrested were members and several were leaders of the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in Mississippi; one was a Philadelphia policeman and one a Fundamentalist Baptist minister. On December 10, United States Commissioner Esther Carter, before whom a preliminary hearing was held, ruled an FBI's agent's testimony incompetent and dismissed the charges against 19 of the defendants. The Justice Department subsequently dropped the charges against the other two. On December 29 Federal District Judge W. Harold Cox, in Jackson, at the request of the Justice Department, ordered a Federal grand jury to reconvene early in 1965 to hear charges against the 21.

Northern Summer Riots

On July 16 an off-duty police lieutenant in New York City shot and killed a 15-year-old Negro boy who had allegedly threatened him with a knife. After the shooting about 300 Negro teenagers battled with police with cans and bottles. It had all begun when the superintendent of a building across the street from a summer-session junior high school had allegedly deliberately sprayed water on three boys.

On the night of July 18, during a demonstration in Harlem called by CORE to protest the policeman's slaying of the Negro boy, violence broke out. Rioting and looting lasted four days, intermittently, with varying degrees of intensity, with hundreds of police trying to maintain peace.

On July 21, in Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn's Negro area of even greater density and tension than Harlem, after another CORE rally protesting the shooting of the Negro boy, violence erupted and lasted several days. Thereafter rioting and looting broke out in a series of Northern cities, largely as a result of tension between police and Negroes: Rochester, N.Y.; July 24-25, where Governor Nelson Rockefeller sent National Guardsmen; Jersey City, August 2-4; Elizabeth, N.J., August 11-13; Paterson, N.J., August 11-14; Dixmoor, a Chicago suburb, August 15-17, and Philadelphia, August 28-31.

On July 29, a conference of civil-rights leaders, which had issued also the

\(^{16}\) Racism in the South frequently went hand in hand with antisemitism. In February in New Orleans, the White Citizens Council was promoting telephone recordings—"Dial-a-Message", called "The Voice of Truth" and "The Voice of the White Citizens Council," which attacked Jews as promoters of integration. Nor was racist antisemitism limited only to the uneducated. In December Marvin E. Frankel, a professor of law at Columbia University, sent to every Alabama lawyer a reprint of a Columbia Law Review article he had written, criticizing the official journal of the Alabama bar for publishing only white-supremacist views on civil-rights controversies. In response Frankel received mostly unfavorable mail. One anonymous correspondent wrote: "Frankel, the Civil War is over and the Zionist takeover is complete—what more do you want?" (New York Times, February 7, 1965).
statement calling for a moratorium on mass protests (see p. 177), in a separate statement condemned the rioting that had taken place: “We would like to once again go on record as strongly opposing looting, vandalism, or any type of criminal activities, and urge the cooperation and support of local leaders toward the elimination of this type of activity, which damages both the community and the civil-rights movement.” But it was clear that they were unable to contain or control the Negro masses. This was underlined at a discussion in New York among a group of nationally known Negro writers, artists, and intellectuals, assessing the meaning of the Harlem and Rochester riots. According to the New York Times, July 29, all concluded that the established Negro leadership could not “reach the vast, submerged Negro 'lumpenproletariat'—that floating, unaffiliated, unemployed mass at the bottom of the social and economic order.”

All these disorders reflected the tension between the police and both Negroes and Puerto Ricans, who have charged the police with brutality and bias. Civil-rights leaders have demanded the establishment of civilian review boards to investigate complaints of police brutalities. Such boards exist in Indianapolis, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Trenton, N.J. Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York refused to appoint such a board, though on July 23 his office set up a six-man committee of Negroes and whites to review the Police Department's methods of handling complaints against policemen. On August 14 New York Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy appointed Capt. Lloyd Sealy as the first Negro to command a police precinct in Harlem. Negro civil-rights leaders hailed the appointment, but declared it was only the first step toward easing tensions between Negroes and the police.

On September 26 the FBI issued a report, which was submitted to President Johnson, that there was “no systematic planning or organization underlying the riots.” The mob violence was dominated by youths “variously characterized by responsible people as ‘school dropouts’, ‘young punks’, ‘common hoodlums’, and ‘drunken kids’, and a common characteristic was ‘a senseless attack on all constituted authority without purpose or object.’” The FBI found no evidence that the Communist party was involved, “though its members were observed taking part” in some of the riots.

**Negro-Jewish Tensions**

During the Northern city riots hundreds of stores were looted and damaged. Since most were owned by Jews and their Jewish ownership is often mentioned by Negroes, it has been difficult to determine what part antisemitism played in this display of Negro hostility to whites. A spokesman for the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council reported that during the Bedford-Stuyvesant rioting antisemitic slogans were being shouted (JTA, July 23). In Rochester, CORE headquarters and a Black Muslim mosque were untouched while Jewish-owned stores flanking them were looted and destroyed (JTA, July 27). Elmer Lewis, director of the Jewish Community Council of Rochester, explained that “Jewish businessmen were not the prime target because they were Jews” and that the outbreak was not to “be interpreted
as antisemitism.” Primarily, he said, “the city faced a breakdown of law and order, but the Jews were the principal sufferers.”

In Philadelphia, it was estimated (JTA, August 31) that 80 per cent of the wrecked and looted businesses were owned by Jews and that the losses and damages suffered amounted to several millions of dollars. Though the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia rejected as unwarranted charges that the riots expressed antisemitism, many Jewish businessmen believed that the rioting had a distinctly anti-Jewish flavor, especially since stores displaying signs “this is a Negro store” remained unharmed, while adjoining Jewish-owned stores were wrecked.

In “dismay and disappointment” over Negro wrecking and looting of Jewish stores, Martin Luther King issued a statement in August to the Southern Israelite of Atlanta:

While the outbursts in New York City and Rochester cannot be considered expressions of antisemitism, I am particularly pained to learn that a large percentage of looted stores were owned by our Jewish friends since, as a group, the Jewish citizens of the United States have always stood for freedom, justice, and an end to bigotry. Our Jewish friends have demonstrated their commitment to the principle of tolerance and brotherhood in tangible ways, often at great personal sacrifices.

Can we ever express our appreciation to the rabbis who chose to give moral witness with us in St. Augustine during our recent protest against segregation in that unhappy city? And who will ever forget the sacrifice of two Jewish lives, Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner, in Mississippi this past June?

It would be impossible to record the contribution that the Jewish people have made toward the Negro’s struggle for freedom—it has been so great.

I solemnly pledge to do my utmost to uphold the fair name of the Jews. Not only because we need their friendship, and surely we do, but mainly because bigotry in any form is an affront to us all.

Tension between Negroes and Jews appeared in other situations. On April 21 a group of Negro teenagers, coming from a wake for a murdered friend, passed a Lubavitcher yeshivah in Brooklyn, N.Y., and attacked the younger Jewish children in the school yard. The Negroes yelled antisemitic slogans and shouted, “You don’t belong in this country.” Several students and two rabbis who came to their aid were hurt. Rabbi Samuel Schrage, principal of the yeshivah, was bitter and said that the school had for a long time wanted to move out of the neighborhood. NAACP official John A. Morsell condemned the attack, with the comment that it was “doubly tragic and ironic that the victims of one type of racism should themselves exhibit ethnic bias against another group.” The attack was symptomatic of the tensions between Negroes in Bedford-Stuyvesant and the Jews, who lived mostly in the adjoining neighborhood of Crown Heights. Crime and violence had been increasing and fear engulfed the nearly half million people in the area, about 75 per cent Jewish, with hasidim forming a large sub-community among them. The attack on the yeshivah students was followed in May with an attack and attempted rape by a Negro of a rabbi’s wife.
On May 17 Rabbi Schrage formed a civilian radio-car patrol organization called The Maccabees of the Community, patterned after the self-defense groups which Jews in Tsarist Russia had formed to protect themselves against pogromists. Negroes responded hostilely at first to the Maccabees, for in their experience private-citizen patrols meant vigilantism and were scarcely likely to elicit their approval. Yet once it became clear that the Maccabees' purpose was only to protect their neighborhood against crime and violence, Negroes became receptive to participation in the patrol. According to a report early in June by the New York City Commission on Human Rights, the Maccabees then consisted of 20 hasidic Jews, 50 other Orthodox Jews, 70 non-Orthodox Jews, and 60 Gentiles, 20 of whom were Negroes. On June 11 the Ministers Movement of Brooklyn and Long Island, Negro clergymen representing 72 churches, endorsed the Crown Heights Community Patrols—the Maccabees under a new name. One Negro clergyman admitted: "We recognize the absence of adequate police protection in the area. The people in Crown Heights were the ones who brought it to our attention. Perhaps we ourselves have been somewhat apathetic and lethargic in the past."

On June 22 the Council of Crown Heights was formed, a nondenominational, interracial organization of 35 local civic and religious groups, to provide a broader community base for the civilian patrols and help reduce neighborhood crime.

**Antisemitism Among Negroes**

Antisemitism among Negroes has been an especial Jewish concern partly for its own sake, but even more because of the tragic possibility that in resentment Jews would withdraw from the struggle for Negro equality. In fact, some Negro civil-rights leaders have minimized the extent of antisemitism among Negroes, lest it disrupt the alliance between Negroes and Jews on civil-rights issues. Seven leading Negroes in New York City, asked by the New York *World Telegram and Sun*, August 10, to comment on whether antisemitism was increasing, said it was declining. One, Percy Ellis Sutton, an attorney, said: "The Jew is the landlord. He is the merchant. He is the white man the Negro sees." A similar view was expressed in a press conference on May 21 (New York *Times*, May 24) by Malcolm X, the black nationalist leader who had broken with Elijah Muhammad's Black Muslim movement:

These [Jewish] people conduct their businesses in Harlem but live in other parts of the city. They enjoy good housing. Their children attend good schools and go to colleges. This the Negroes know and resent. These businessmen are seen by the Negroes in Harlem as colonialists, just as the people of Africa and Asia viewed the British, the French, and other businessmen before they achieved their independence.

**Antisemitism** among Negroes is discussed in William Stringfellow's *My People Is the Enemy* (New York, 1964): "A particularly ominous sign of the extremities of Negro animosity is the emergence in the open of Negro anti-
Semitism.” After noting the competition between Negroes and Jews in politics, the economic relations between many Negroes and some Jews, the Negro resentment against the role of Jews in the civil-rights movement, Stringfellow adds that the overriding reason for Negro antisemitism is “some awful emulation of the anti-Semitism so long prevalent and so unyielding among middle- and upper-class white Protestants and Catholics” (pp. 115–116).

**Negro-Catholic Tensions**

In the spring, during the public debate about the civil-rights bill and during the Wallace primaries, it became increasingly apparent that many of the Catholic laity and even some Catholic church leaders did not comport themselves in accordance with their church’s moral and religious teachings on justice and charity. In an editorial condemning such “convenient Catholicism,” the Jesuit weekly *America*, June 13, reported that a Catholic laymen’s association in Michigan had distributed 100,000 leaflets at the doors of 52 churches denouncing the civil-rights bill, after a letter had been read from the pulpits urging support of the bill.

Father Anthony S. Woods, S.J., in a sermon April 26, at the Church of St. Francis Xavier, New York City, warned against Catholic backsliding in race relations. He cited the role of Catholics in the Boston School Committee election of November 1963 against desegregating the public schools, the considerable vote for Wallace in distinctly Catholic areas, and the stoning of a Negro family that had attempted to move into the largely Catholic community of Folcroft, Pa., a Philadelphia suburb. More explicit condemnation of the Philadelphia archdiocese for its inactivity in civil-rights matters was expressed by Dennis Clark, a Philadelphia resident and former official of the Catholic Interracial Council. In *Commonweal*, May 1, he charged the leadership of the Philadelphia archdiocese with procrastination on civil-rights issues and warned that some Negro Catholics had flatly said they would leave the church if there was no change.

Even more severe public criticism was leveled against the leadership of James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, archbishop of Los Angeles, particularly for his failure to speak out against Proposition 14. (On July 28 he said that to take a stand on Proposition 14 would be contrary to archdiocesan policy and show “preference in political matters.”) The controversy within the church reached its high point when Father William H. DuBay, 29 years old, announced on June 11 that he had written Pope Paul VI requesting the removal of Cardinal McIntyre for “inexcusable abuses” of the church’s doctrines on racial equality. Two journals edited by Catholic laymen, the New York weekly *Commonweal* (July 10) and the California monthly *Ramparts* (Summer 1964), devoted major articles to Catholicism in Los Angeles, particularly to racial questions and Cardinal McIntyre’s inaction. A priest writing in this issue of *Ramparts* said: “It is not surprising that our Catholic lay people are just as infected with race prejudice as anyone else because they never hear the Church’s doctrine. The only way Catholics are accustomed to recognizing a doctrine as Catholic is by getting it at least occasionally men-
tioned from the pulpit and this matter of racism is simply not mentioned from the pulpit. Or at most, very rarely.”

John Leo, in *Commonweal*, commented: “As for preaching on race, every priest in the Archdiocese realizes that this directly jeopardizes his career. Some do it... The general pattern, however, is for a priest to be reprimanded and, perhaps, transferred for a sermon on race. Of those who are interested in the topic at all, most have learned not to do it.”

On July 24, after submitting to Cardinal McIntyre, Father DuBay was transferred to another church. In June Father John V. Coffield, for 24 years a priest in the Los Angeles archdiocese, had been ordered to take a five-month enforced vacation because he had spoken against Proposition 14. In November he was ordered to maintain silence on racism. He chose instead “a self-imposed exile from the diocese as a gesture of protest against, and rather than be a part of, the continuing evil of silence” (New York *Journal-American*, December 29). He obtained a three-year leave of absence from the diocese.

(Protestant ministers, too, suffered reprisals when they spoke out on racial matters, and many clergymen in the North and particularly in the South lost their pulpits. An interesting development was the formation in January by Southern Presbyterian clergy and laymen of an organization to help clergymen whose “stand on racial and social issues has put them under critical pressure.”)

**CIVIL-RIGHTS MOVEMENT**

In 1964 the Negro civil-rights organizations underwent considerable internal dissension and friction about their goals, strategies, and tactics. The intensification of nationalist moods among Negro leadership and the radicalization of considerable segments of the civil-rights movement, coupled with increased self-confidence, were the important developments of the year.

**Civil-rights Organizations**

NAACP (executive secretary: Roy Wilkins) remained the largest and most influential Negro civil-rights organization, with a membership of about half a million Negroes and whites in 1,600 local groups. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, a coordinating and service agency working primarily in 16 Southern and border states, does not have a mass-based operation comparable to NAACP’s, but its president Martin Luther King, Jr., is universally acknowledged as the charismatic Negro civil-rights leader. (King won the 1964 Nobel Peace Prize; in presenting the award on December 10, Gunnar Jahn, chairman of the Norwegian parliament’s Nobel committee, said King was the “first person in the Western world to have shown us that a struggle can be waged without violence.”) A more conservative and highly prestigious organization is the National Urban League (executive director: Whitney M. Young), with about 50,000 members in 64 local groups, whose emphasis is on community action and social service in combating discrimination. The youngest and most militant among the four major Negro organizations is CORE (na-
tional director: James Farmer), with a membership of about 65,000 in 118 local groups. Founded in 1942, it achieved national prominence in 1960 with sit-ins in the South and Freedom Rides. The newest organization, making a strong bid for national leadership, is SNCC (popularly known as Snick), formed during the sit-ins in 1960; its northern counterpart is the Northern Student Movement. It has a youthful and aggressive leadership, a shifting membership, and a radical mystique. John Lewis is its chairman and James Forman its executive secretary.

**Activist Pressures**

All five organizations, from the relatively conservative Urban League to the radical SNCC, have been subjected to ideological, strategic, and tactical pressures from Negro nationalist sources, at one extreme, and at the other from clusters of Negro and white radicals (whether pro-Chinese, pro-Cuban, or pro-Russian Communists, or Trotskyite splinters), as well as from the individualistic radical groups sprouting on college campuses, like the Berkeley Free Speech Movement. The nationalist and radical components among the militants in the civil-rights movement are sometimes, but not necessarily, in conflict with each other; often, paradoxically, they reinforce each other, as for instance when three SNCC leaders—Lewis, Forman, and Robert Moses—went to Guinea in September as guests of President Sekou Touré.

In April CORE’s Brooklyn chapter threatened to apply a “stall-in,” that is, create a traffic tie-up on opening day on the approach to the World’s Fair, their purpose being to show that they, the militants, could produce results in the civil-rights struggle by affecting those members of the society who merely passively assent to the evils of discrimination. CORE’s national leadership condemned those “essentially revolutionary” tactics because they would alienate and embitter moderates engaged in civil-rights causes. The controversy was typical of the conflict between the radicals and the established leadership. CORE subsequently briefly suspended the Brooklyn chapter, but its national leadership remains under constant activist pressure.

The Black Muslims and the assorted black nationalists and racists also exerted influence on both the established and radical organizations, at least to the extent that these reflected pervasive Negro nationalist and anti-white feelings. Anti-white feeling at a moderate level exists among those Negro civil-rights leaders who believe that white men should not play directing roles in the Negro movement. As Negroes gain in self-confidence and self-reliance, they have become more assured in their own identity as Negroes and less dependent on whites for support.

Radical ideology and Negro racism coalesced on the subject of the “white liberal,” a term of contempt matched only by the epithet “Uncle Tom.” “White liberal” is intended to signify hypocrisy, applied to one whose acts, if he acts at all, belie his words. The typical “white liberal”—especially in New York, the political and intellectual capital of American Negroes—is more likely than not the urban Jew, long an ally in the struggle for civil rights, active in the labor movement and liberal causes, but increasingly
alienated by the extremism and radicalization of segments of the civil-rights movement and by the intensity of their hatred for all the established institutions of society.

Outlook

With the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and growing realization of the ineffectiveness of the nuisance tactics advocated by some of the radicals, the leadership of the civil-rights movement has been faced with major decisions to be made about the movement's future direction. Current indications suggest that responsible leadership is looking toward a twofold program. (1) Intensified political action, involving voter registration and political education, in an alliance with labor and liberal professional elements in American society. Bayard Rustin, organizer of the March on Washington, August 1963, and of the first New York City school boycott, is the most outspoken advocate of this position, as expressed in his article, "From Protest to Politics: The Future of the Civil-Rights Movement" (Commentary, February 1965). (2) Intensified community- and social-welfare programs among Negroes in the North and South to overcome their social, economic, and cultural disabilities.

LUCY S. DAWIDOWICZ

Rightist Extremism

THE EVENTS and circumstances of the 1964 presidential campaign brought the problem of extremism on the American political scene into sharp focus. An umbrella of respectability was provided to extremists during the campaign which enabled them to blend their efforts with those of legitimate political organizations and to recruit new followers. Propaganda further contributed to the substantial growth of many extremist organizations in the United States in 1964.

As debate raged in the Congress over the civil-rights bill (see p. 156), a coordinated effort to prevent passage of meaningful legislation by racists and extremists—united by their common opposition to civil rights for Negroes—became apparent. Thematically, both decried the use of Federal power to enforce civil rights for Negroes, and they sought to persuade Americans that the civil-rights struggle was part of a Communist conspiracy, extending from street demonstrations to Supreme Court decisions.

1 For the purpose of definition, extremists are those whose activity and program constitute a threat to the democratic process. Some common characteristics are attempts to suppress differences of opinion, impugn the motives of those with whom they disagree, undermine confidence in the government, intimidate, incite to violence, and disturb the peace in furtherance of their objectives. Rightist extremists are also obsessed with domestic Communism and attach great significance to their insistence that America is a republic and not a democracy.
ORGANIZED FORCES

The precise number of right-wing extremist organizations existent in 1964 varied from day to day, mushrooming in response to the stimulus of national and world affairs, and diminishing as the urgency receded. However, tens of millions of Americans were exposed to their propaganda, disseminated by an estimated four to five thousand weekly radio and TV programs; an uncalculated number of Americans were additionally exposed to films, books, pamphlets, magazines, flyers, bumper stickers, “anti-Communism” schools and “lectures,” and editorials and newspaper columns furnished without charge to hundreds of weekly newspapers.

Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms

Spearheading the campaign to prevent passage of the civil-rights bill was the Coordinating Committee for Fundamental American Freedoms (CCFAF), created and financed by various southern state-sovereignty commissions to prevent or delay Negro integration in their states. CCFAF was the coordinating force in marshaling opposition to the civil-rights bill. Incorporated in Delaware in September 1963 and directed by John Satterfield, described by the Washington Post (August 3, 1963) as a “leading segregationist lawyer,” it did not become overtly active until 1964. Before the end of that year, it was formally dissolved.

In the spring of 1964, CCFAF inserted full-page advertisements in more than 200 daily newspapers attacking civil-rights legislation as a “black jack” and a “grasp for executive power.” Additionally it mailed more than a million letters and pamphlets all over the country. In implementing parts of its program, CCFAF was aided and abetted by such extremist groups as the John Birch Society, Manion Forum of Public Opinion, and We The People.

John Birch Society

In 1964 the John Birch Society, founded by Robert Welch, dominated the extremist movement and was by far the most successful of its kind in growth, impact, and financial support. Birch Society leaders sat in positions of power in other extremist organizations, and the grass-roots membership doggedly heeded Welch’s instructions to “keep working on the leaders of the local and regional patriotic and conservative organizations which have members of our required quality to come into the Society and bring the best of their members with them” (John Birch Society Bulletin, July 4, 1963).

Robert Welch was among the foremost denigrators of American democracy, boasting (JBS Bulletin, July 1964) that

...we have awakened hundreds of thousands of formerly complacent Americans to the dangers of a democracy, to the fact that our Founding Fathers themselves —like the really informed Romans of a thousand years before—feared a democ-
racism as the worst of all forms of government, and to what our Supreme Court was doing to convert our constitutional republic into a democracy as a help to the Communists in their insidious efforts to take over our country.

In December 1964 the Birch Society, six years old, ended the most successful year in its history, with income totaling $3.2 million, twice as much as in 1963. With a headquarters staff of 100 working at Belmont, Mass., the largest number of employees in its history, the society began a program of regional expansion, opening offices in White Plains, N.Y.; Houston, Tex.; San Mateo, Calif.; Chicago, Ill., and Washington, D.C. A council of 26 continued to serve as personal advisors to the founder, Welch. The society maintained what it called a research department, a lecture bureau, a monthly magazine, and more than 225 well-dispersed reading rooms or libraries stocked with extremist literature.

The society’s program for 1964, aside from its deep but undeclared involvement in the election campaign as supporters of Barry M. Goldwater, included all-out efforts in support of the House Un-American Activities Committee and for the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren and withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations. By its appeal for sympathy for local police departments, it was able to attract an unknown number of law-enforcement officials. By the end of 1964 policemen in Santa Ana, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa., and Trenton and Newark, N.J., were revealed to be members. There was reason to believe that there were members in many more police departments as well.

Birch Society members were visibly strong in California, with nine identifiable Birkers entering the 1964 California Republican primaries, seven of whom were successful. The extent of Birch Society involvement in the presidential campaign was a matter of conjecture. Society member John Schmitz was elected to the California state senate. Assemblyman Kenneth J. Merkel, another member, was elected to the Wisconsin legislature. Welch proclaimed that a hundred members of the Birch Society had been delegates to the Republican national convention and “in political campaigns this spring all over the country . . . our members, as individuals, in many instances constituted the most important factor in determining the results . . .” (JBS Bulletin, January 1965). One staff member, quoted in the Houston (Texas) Post of July 22, 1964, maintained that the society’s members kept a vigilant eye on the news media, “neutralized those reporters antagonistic to Senator Goldwater,” and “worked in the precincts on door-to-door and telephone campaigns.”

As the campaign progressed, the Birchers launched successful membership drives in such diverse sections of the country as Vermont and Texas, New Jersey and California.

The society’s numerical strength remained a closely-guarded secret. Welch did state, however, that August 1964 was the most successful month for new chapters and members in the history of the society, that September figures were 27 per cent above August, and that October surpassed September by 37 per cent. Responsible sources estimated Birch Society strength at the year’s
end to be between 60 and 80 thousand. At the time of writing the society’s campaign was well underway to improve its “image” from that of a super-secret, cell-structured organization to one consisting of dedicated, patriotic, normal Americans with nothing to hide.

**Manion Forum of Public Opinion**

The Forum’s founder, Clarence Manion, railed against the “confiscatory Marxist income tax,” “wanton foreign-aid squanders,” “socialist public-power destruction of states’ rights,” “Federal aid to education,” and “unrestricted labor bossism.” Based in South Bend, Ind., and supported primarily by industrialists, the Forum sponsored weekly TV and radio programs and published a monthly newspaper, tracts, and special reports.

**We the People**

Founded in 1955 in Chicago, Ill., We The People in 1964 claimed affiliations in over 1,700 communities throughout the United States. It issued home-study kits for the purpose of “educating individuals about the Communist menace in the United States” and published a monthly newspaper, *Free Enterprise*.

**Christian Crusade**

Not associated with CCFAF, but among the most zealous and energetic proponents of the “Save America from Communism” movements, was the Rev. Billy James Hargis’s Christian Crusade. The Christian Crusade in effect was Billy James Hargis. It reached millions of people through radio broadcasts over some 400 stations, public appearances, weekly newspaper columns, a monthly magazine with a claimed circulation of 130,000, books, tracts, pamphlets, sermons, tape recordings, and films. In speech and writing, Hargis ceaselessly preached that the national government was controlled or strongly influenced by Communists, their dupes, or their agents.

At the end of the year Hargis proclaimed that the Christian Crusade had made a financial comeback in 1964 after a serious slump in 1963. As a result of Goldwater’s candidacy, he said, “the whole conservative movement has come alive this year.”

**Southern-Based Organizations**

Continuous pressure by Southern Negroes for an end to second-class citizenship, passage of the Civil Rights Act in June 1964, and the efforts of young Northern civil-rights workers to register potential Negro voters in the deep South during the summer (see p. 174) helped revitalize the old Ku Klux Klan. It also brought about the beginning of a new, independent Klan in Mississippi, for the first time since the immediate post-Civil War period.
KU KLUX KLAN

In the years preceding the active civil-rights struggle, Klan influence in the South appeared to be waning, but in 1964 the Klan made desperate efforts to reestablish its leadership in the segregation movement. It recruited intensely all over the South and in West Virginia, Indiana, Minnesota, Iowa, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and California. Estimates of total Klan membership in 1964 ranged between 60 and 75 thousand which, if accurate, would mean an increase of approximately 20,000 since mid-1963.

The Klan became much more militant in 1964 than in previous years, when isolated outrages or acts of intimidation or violence were usually perpetrated by individual Klansmen acting on their own initiative, rather than in obedience to organizational directives. In 1964 considerable dissension between "moderate" Klansmen and those who openly advocated violence led to new affiliations and exchanges of membership.

The Ku Klux Klan was an overall designation for several autonomous organizations, which had frequently been competitive. In 1964, despite indications of a struggle for power among Klan leaders, there was evidence of some growing cooperation. The most active Klan groups on the scene included:

1. United Klans of America. This relatively new group was born in February 1963, when the then dominant U.S. Klans was badly split by a struggle for leadership. Calvin Craig, the Grand Dragon of Georgia, who first sought, unsuccessfully, to oust Robert Lee ("Wild Bill") Davidson as Imperial Wizard, subsequently left the U.S. Klans and organized a competing group, the United Klans of America. Within a short time Robert Shelton, leader of the then unaffiliated Alabama Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, joined Craig and brought his membership with him.

Shelton, who ultimately became Imperial Wizard of the United Klans, strove for unity, money, and respectability, and made a strong effort to erase the Klan's image as a movement of uneducated ruffians with violence on their minds. At some United Klan meetings, members were turned away for failure to wear a tie and jacket.

Shelton appeared to be successful in bringing together other fragmented Klan groups. The United Klans, originally confined to Georgia and Alabama, in 1964 was generally believed to be the nation's largest Klan, with some representation in North Carolina, South Carolina, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Louisiana, and a total estimated membership of 40 to 50 thousand. There were also reports of branches in some Eastern states and in California, though no identifiable Klan activity was recorded outside the deep South.

Shelton's Klan was antisemitic and anti-Catholic as well as anti-Negro.

2. National Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, Inc. In 1960 a group of independent and splintered Klans organized a loose federation in opposition to the U.S. Klans, under the name of National Knights of the KKK, headquartered...
in Atlanta and directed by a veteran Klansman, an Atlanta lawyer named James Venable. At various times the Dixie Klan of Chattanooga, the Association of South Carolina Klans, the Association of Georgia Klans, the Florida KKK, and other Klans were associated with the National Knights. The United Klans rejected affiliation with the group.

Until 1964 the National Knights was the second largest Klan in the country. However, during the year a serious falling out developed among its leaders. An attempt by the National Knights to rally a million Americans against civil-rights legislation, in cooperation with the American Nazi party, in Washington, D.C., on July 4, was a colossal failure.

3. Mississippi Klan. The rise of integrationist pressures on Mississippi (the summer student “invasion,” the passage of the Civil Rights Act, and court-ordered school desegregation) paralleled the rise of the Klan in Mississippi, until then a state with segregationist roots so deep that it felt no necessity for any formal organization dedicated to preserving the color line by force and violence. With the arrest of Byron de la Beckwith for the murder of NAACP leader Medgar Evers, the Klan became active in Mississippi. In April 1964, during Beckwith’s second trial, numerous crosses were burned in the Jackson, Natchez, and Mississippi Delta areas.

The first Klan inroads were made by the Louisiana-based Original Ku Klux Klan. In turn, its organizing efforts were preempted by the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, indigenous to Mississippi. By May 1964 the White Knights had eclipsed all of its rivals and, with an estimated 4 to 5 thousand members, was believed to be the largest Klan in Mississippi.

The White Knights adapted its Klansmanship to the native task. It was more secretive, more violent, and more aggressive than other Klan groups. White Knight recruiting, which started in Brookhaven, Miss., during February 1964, used a widely distributed leaflet directed at “Jews, Turks, mongrels, Orientals” and the “Jewish-Communist civil-rights movement.”

Because of the suspected implication of the White Knights in the murder of three civil-rights workers (see p. 185), Federal authorities cracked down on this state-wide organization. At the year’s end, the White Knights were largely operating in underground fashion. It was believed that some 3,000 hard-core White Knight Klansmen had formed into quasi-military units with military discipline, a tight table of organization, and a considerable cache of arms and ammunition.

4. Florida Klans. As in other areas of the South, Florida Klans were sharply divided, agreeing only on their hatred of Negroes, Jews, and the “Federal Bureau of Integration.” There were widespread differences in the ranks whether the Klan should be moderate or violent. (The moderates were those who just hated Negroes. Those calling for violence advocated arson and the use of guns and other weapons.)

The Klan claimed 3,000 members in North Florida. However, reliable estimates placed the total number of dues-paying Klansmen at 500. The former
chief of the Jacksonville, Fla., police department's intelligence unit characterized the Florida Klan as "a bunch of professional gunmen spouting off at the mouth, telling people what they are going to accomplish. But where the money goes no one knows" (New York Journal American, July 5, 1964).

5. Louisiana Klan. On January 18, 1964, more than 150 KKK crosses were ignited in southeastern Louisiana. Observers could determine no other reason for the sudden burst of Klan activity than the unexpected victory of the staunch segregationist John J. McKeithen in the Louisiana Democratic runoff primary for governor on January 11. The burning crosses signified, according to one participant, the start of "our fight for constitutional government and Christianity."

In late 1964 the Louisiana Klan was growing rapidly, but it remained a group of competing organizations. One disturbing aspect of the Louisiana Klan was its emphasis on arms and ammunition. Many Klan units in the state were known to be heavily armed.

6. North Carolina Klan. The Klan had been dormant in North Carolina since the 1959 conviction of Klan leader James "Preacher" Cole on a charge of incitement to riot (AJYB, 1959 [Vol. 60], pp. 49-50). In January 1964 the Klan was reactivated; reliable sources reported the existence of several Klaverns with an estimated membership of 650.

7. Texas Klan. On the whole, the Klan was inactive or defunct in Texas, although one Klavern in the southeastern corner of Dallas county showed signs of life. What Klan activity there was in the state originated in Texarkana, Ark., which straddles the state line. The Klan group, based on the Arkansas side, consisted of 30 or 40 Klansmen, half of whom lived in Texas.

OTHER SOUTHERN GROUPS

In addition to the Klans, other segregationist groups were operating in the South, particularly in Mississippi. Among the most active were the following:

White Citizens Councils. Once the strongest segregationist force in Mississippi, if not the entire South, the White Citizens Councils, with a claimed membership of 75 to 100 thousand in Mississippi and a national membership of a million, suffered a sharp decline in membership in 1964. The council, which at one time represented the only effective opposition to compliance with Federal integration decrees, lost influence and membership with the corresponding growth of the Ku Klux Klan. Most of the Citizens Councils' "upper-class members" yielded to the massive "Federal presence" in the South and resigned themselves to what they considered to be the inevitable. The more militant members of the Citizens Councils tended to join more aggressive groups.

With the decline of membership in the South, the Citizens Councils sought to expand their influences to other areas, notably California and Maryland. Organizational efforts were made in both of these states, but without great success.
Americans For The Preservation of the White Race. This totally new segregationist movement came into being in the latter part of 1963. By early 1964 it, too, benefited from the reaction to integrationist pressures on Mississippi and for a short time was successful in signing up recruits. By the middle of summer, it claimed a membership of 500,000 men in 30 chapters. Before the firm foothold established by the White Knights of the Klan, APWR was believed responsible for much of the terrorist activity in Mississippi. By the year's end, competent observers reevaluated its strength and membership and concluded that original claims had been grossly exaggerated; APWR was practically dormant.

National States Rights Party. The National States Rights party (NSRP) was active primarily in and around Birmingham, Ala. Emulating the American Nazi party, it boasted of a uniformed "elite guard." Its principal activity consisted of publishing and distributing a monthly newspaper, The Thunderbolt. Normal circulation varied between 500 and 3,000, a figure far in excess of estimated party membership. The party boasted of units in Georgia, Arkansas, California, Montana, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and the state of Washington, but there was no evidence that these units existed there in anything more substantial than the name. NSRP members J. B. Stoner and the Rev. Connie Lynch, by their inflammatory and demagogic speeches before aroused segregationists in St. Augustine, Fla., contributed greatly to racial unrest as efforts were made to desegregate some of that city's facilities in the spring of 1964. Both of these well-known antisemitic and violently racist agitators functioned as individuals rather than representatives of the party. The party's income, by August 1964 appeared to have declined substantially from 1963 when, according to reports filed with the clerk of the House of Representatives pursuant to the Corrupt Practices Act, total NSRP receipts amounted to $44,201.

Antisemitic Agitators

The impact, effectiveness, and volume of antisemitic propaganda continued to decline in 1964. Under the stimulus of civil-rights activity in the deep South, however, temporary but localized flare-ups occurred. The dormant KKK in its many varieties, Klan-like groups, and terrorist movements circulated antisemitic literature of an inflammatory nature to persuade the uninformed that the civil-rights movement was dominated by Communist Jews. But even where antisemitism was used in the South, it was not of prime importance in stirring up resistance to civil-rights activity. Anti-Negro prejudice was so deep that violent resistance to Negro demands would have taken place in the absence of antisemitism.

Apart from the antisemitic material produced to discredit the Northern students' voter-registration drive in the deep South, the routine propaganda consisted of hackneyed canards of Jewish domination, Jewish "manipulation" of the American Negro, and Jewish incitement of civil-rights activity for the sole purpose of mongrelizing white Christian America. The Jewish influence was seen as being responsible for the liberal pronouncements of Christian
clergymen, and antisemites continued to promote the sale of the discredited but durable Protocols of the Elders of Zion.

Jack Ruby's killing of Lee Harvey Oswald after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy was declared to be part of a Jewish-Communist plot to prevent the self-proclaimed Marxist from revealing incriminating details. The hate press invariably referred to Ruby as Rubinstein, and he continued to receive large quantities of antisemitic mail in his Dallas jail cell.

GEORGE LINCOLN ROCKWELL'S AMERICAN NAZI PARTY

The American Nazi party, based in Alexandria, Va., remained the creature of its Führer, George Lincoln Rockwell. Its meager fortunes continued to be inextricably tied to his personal activity. Membership fluctuated constantly and rarely, if ever, exceeded 175 in the entire nation.

Rockwell continued to enjoy a disproportionate amount of newspaper, magazine, radio, and TV publicity. He sought to enter the New Hampshire presidential primaries but was denied a place on the ballot by state authorities. His most successful area of activity continued to be personal appearances on the college campus. For a variety of reasons, the native Nazi was a much sought-after speaker by student groups, and during the course of the year attracted sizable though generally hostile audiences at Hofstra College, N.Y., and the universities of Minnesota, Michigan, California at Berkeley, Hawaii, and Washington. While his appearances had no significant effect on the students, the resultant publicity and lecture fees did much to keep the American Nazi party alive.

Other Rockwell-conceived ventures, generally executed with an imaginative flair and calculated to generate publicity, were such party activities as a picket line by uniformed storm troopers of the New York production of the controversial drama The Deputy (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 254), a boisterous, antisemitic "welcoming ceremony" for presidential candidate Barry Goldwater (New York Times, July 21, 1964) in the District of Columbia, and the insolent disruption of a hearing in the House Un-American Activities Committee on unauthorized travel to Cuba by a group of American students (September 3, 1964), when a storm trooper physically assaulted a committee witness.

Rockwell sought to organize a huge rally on July 4 in Washington, D.C., to protest against civil-rights legislation. The rally was called by one of his front organizations, the Committee of One Million Caucasians to March on Congress. Fewer than 300, half of whom were hecklers, attended it.

An attempt made to open a West Coast headquarters in Glendale, Calif., was met with firm resistance by city officials. At the year's end, efforts were under way to organize an area headquarters for the party in Dallas, Tex.

GERALD L. K. SMITH'S CHRISTIAN NATIONALIST CRUSADE

Through his Cross and the Flag, with a monthly circulation of 30,831, and 140 additional items of literature, G. L. K. Smith continued to be one of the
most successful antisemitic propagandists. His Christian Nationalist Crusade’s gross receipts for 1964 were expected to total approximately $250,000.

Other nationally distributed antisemitic publications circulating during 1964 included the Winrod Letter, published by Gerald Winrod, son of the late Gordon Winrod, a notorious antisemite before World War II; Kenneth Goff’s Pilgrim Torch, and Common Sense, which continued to appear after the death of its founder Conde McGinley. The circulation of Common Sense, the most widely distributed hate sheet in the postwar period, had declined considerably by the end of the year.

Other Splinter Groups

Other extremist “councils,” “parties,” and the like were the Committee on American-Arab Relations, Congress of Freedom, Conservative Society of America, Constitution Party, Freedom Forum, Liberty Lobby, Minutemen, National Conservative Council, National Renaissance Party, Paul Revere Associated Yeomen, Inc., Soldiers of the Cross, and the White Party of America. (Some were ephemeral.) All took part in the 1964 election campaign.

ELECTION CAMPAIGN

The 1960 presidential campaign had seen anti-Catholic bigotry on a large scale, but the 1964 campaign was the most vicious and divisive within recent memory (see p. 165). For the first time in American political history, paperback books became a chief source of campaign propaganda. About 17 million copies of smear publications written by extremists of the right purported to offer documentation that the Johnson administration was soft on Communism and that the President was a man of little principle. J. Evetts Haley’s A Texan Looks at Lyndon, John A. Stormer’s None Dare Call It Treason, and Phyllis Schlafly’s A Choice, Not An Echo were characterized by many observers as scurrilous. Birch Society members and officials admittedly distributed millions of copies.

The radical rightists apparently interpreted Goldwater’s refusal to repudiate extremist groups and organizations unambiguously as a signal to go ahead. Abusive pamphlets, cartoons, newsletters and flyers with racial and religious overtones cropped up in all parts of the United States. Vilification of public figures and even ordinary citizens known to oppose Goldwater’s candidacy was commonplace. In New York, Philadelphia, and northern New Jersey, citizens were urged to dial a telephone number to hear a recorded message on behalf of “conservative Americanism.” During the week of August 11, dialers heard an anonymous voice attack Senator Jacob Javits (Rep.-N.Y.) as 100 per cent pro-Communist. In Minneapolis-St. Paul, people who had taken a public anti-Goldwater position received hate mail and crank telephone calls in the middle of the night.

Shortly after the Republican convention Robert dePugh, national leader of the small but militant Minutemen, an extremist group which advocated pro-
ficiency in guerilla warfare in order to “repel the Communist invaders,” announced that his group would play an “active, though clandestine role in support of Senator Goldwater during the presidential campaign.” DePugh said that the Minutemen would infiltrate President Lyndon B. Johnson’s campaign headquarters around the country and, he added, “their task will be to sabotage efforts in behalf of the President.” DePugh was further quoted as saying that “it is important to defeat President Johnson because he is a political opportunist who would sell the United States out to the Communists or anyone else” and that “Senator Goldwater is a patriot who will try to stop the drift towards a Socialist police state that has been accelerated under the present administration.”

White Citizens Council support for the Goldwater candidacy was unofficial but prevalent. Richard D. Morphew, public-relations director for the Citizens Councils of America, the coordinating body of all White Citizens councils, endorsed the Republican presidential candidate. Roy B. Harris, formerly a political power in Georgia, publisher of the avidly racist Georgia Tribune, and president of the Citizens Councils of America, was an organizer of a Democrats-for-Goldwater group. Former Georgia Governor Marvin Griffin made frequent appearances before Citizens Council groups, endorsing the Goldwater candidacy. Jack Galloway, president of the Georgia Citizens Council, in commenting on his endorsement of Senator Goldwater, cautioned reporters not to “underestimate the power of the Citizens Councils in the ballot box.”

While some followers of the Christian Crusade, like other extremist elements, had reservations about the extent of Senator Goldwater’s conservatism, they were assured by their director, Billy James Hargis, that Goldwater’s election would be a step in the right direction, that some of his positions on public issues had been modified only for campaign purposes, and that once elected he could be persuaded to move more to the right.

And then there was the worrisome background of Karl Hess, Goldwater’s principal speech writer and author of the provocative statement in Goldwater’s acceptance speech: “I would remind you that extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. And let me remind you, also, that moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue.” Hess had been listed on the masthead of the American Mercury magazine from December 1955 through March 1958—a time when the previously respected Mercury was under the direction of publisher Russell Maguire and was emerging as a patently antisemitic publication. Former Major General Edwin A. Walker, in a speech in August to Hargis’s followers, came out for Goldwater.

The National Conservative Council, a coalition of ultraconservative groups from 21 states, met in Chicago soon after the Republican convention and voted unanimously to support the Goldwater-Miller Republican presidential ticket. Among other things, the Conservative Council sought reversal of the Supreme Court’s decisions on reapportionment of state legislatures and banning school prayers; repeal of the Federal income tax; an end to public housing, urban renewal, disarmament, and coexistence, and a return to religion,
patriotism and morality. It hoped to achieve these objectives by the election of Senator Goldwater. At the Chicago meeting many delegates predicted that defeat in November could come either through the reelection of President Johnson or through the election and capitulation of Senator Goldwater. There were repeated assertions that a failure to reverse "the trend towards collectivism" in this country might ultimately lead to violence.

The antisemites Gerald L. K. Smith and Kenneth Goff backed the Goldwater bandwagon enthusiastically. In August Smith sought to impress upon his followers that the Republican party was a white Christian party and that "anyone of his followers who would disregard Goldwater because of his Jewish background would disregard Saul of Tarsus. . . . Goldwater was raised in a Christian environment and was a confessed Christian all of his life." In the same month Kenneth Goff predicted to his Soldiers of the Cross that the hour of decision was at hand and that those who opposed Goldwater's candidacy were part of a "devil-inspired conspiracy." The numerically small but viciously antisemitic New Orleans-based organization, Paul Revere Associated Yeomen, Inc., proclaimed that the destiny of America was at stake and they should, therefore, "fight like Trojans" to elect Goldwater as president. The racist, antisemitic weekly Jacksonville (Fla.) Chronicle, in announcing its support for Goldwater, predicted that President Johnson's support would come from Jews as well as Negroes and that the election of Barry Goldwater would start America on the "long march out of the political wilderness."

Although official KKK support was not forthcoming, high Klan officials such as Georgia Grand Dragon Craig and the Imperial Wizard of the United Klans of America, Shelton, publicly endorsed Goldwater. Venable, of the National Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, based his endorsement on the fact that Senator Goldwater had not been raised as a Jew and had never worshipped as a Jew.

Kent Courtney, publisher of the Independent American and the head of the Conservative Society of America, organized a "conservative headquarters" in San Francisco from which he promoted pro-Goldwater demonstrations on the Republican convention floor, while gaining notoriety for an extremist attack on Governor William W. Scranton of Pennsylvania. George Thomas, long identified with the Congress of Freedom movement, expressed some reservations about Goldwater but argued that there was no other leader in sight to whom conservatives might turn and urged that he should therefore be supported. Joseph P. Kamp, a veteran extremist pamphleteer whose material in the past had indulged heavily in antisemitic innuendo, emerged from semi-retirement to write a widely distributed pro-Goldwater tract. Liberty Lobby, an extremist pressure group, produced and distributed a considerable quantity of "smear" literature attacking President Johnson.

Such publications as the Dan Smoot Report, Human Events, and Free Enterprise consistently echoed the "traitors in government" theme in order to attack Johnson's candidacy. The Life Line Foundation, the Rev. Carl McIntire's "Christian Beacon," and the Twentieth Century Reformation Hour emphasized the same theme over 600 radio stations.
Allen A. Zoll, whose defunct American Patriots, Inc., was once described as fascist by the U.S. attorney general, and whose record of professional antisemitism dated back to the 1930s, was discovered to be a full-time staff worker in the headquarters of Citizens for Goldwater-Miller in Washington, D.C.

**Third Parties**

In 1964 two of the splinter parties that inevitably emerge on the political scene during every presidential election were racist and antisemitic.

The National States Right party offered the electorate a slate consisting of the racist John Kasper, a former convict, for president and the veteran Klansman and outspoken antisemite J. B. Stoner for vice-president. NSRP appeared on the ballot in Arkansas, Kentucky, and Montana, polling a national total of 6,980 votes. In Montana NSRP ran Jack Gunderson as its candidate for Congress. He polled 644 votes, 125 more than NSRP's national ticket.

The Constitution party, whose various state units consisted of an amalgam of antisemites, rightists, and extremists, ran Joseph B. Lightburn for president and Theodore C. Billings for vice-president. The party, committed to the concept that America is a Christian nation, recorded a total national vote of 5,060.

Goldwater's Jewish antecedents generated less antisemitic literature than might have been reasonably anticipated. Antisemitic attacks on Goldwater were limited, for the most part, to the dissemination of anonymous greeting cards, letters, and post cards, supplemented by literature from professional bigots. Material produced by Rockwell's American Nazi party and the antisemitic NSRP charged him with being a "kosher conservative" and the "Jewish candidate." Greeting cards with the Star of David read: "I am for B. Morris Goldwater," and "a Half Jew in the White House is better than..." A postcard with the slogan "Communism is Jewish" and the message that "Jews hope Barry makes the grade come November," and spurious "Jews For Goldwater" flyers promising that Goldwater could do for the Jews what "Kennedy did for the Catholics and Irish," were other widely distributed items. Other antisemitic anti-Goldwater propaganda pointed out that one of his daughters had spent a summer in an Israeli kibbutz, that he voted for the confirmation of Arthur Goldberg as a Supreme Court judge, and that he had publicly declared Admiral Lewis Strauss a great patriot.

President Johnson was similarly attacked because of his purported friendship with David Dubinsky and sympathy for Israel. A nationally distributed flyer bearing the imprint of "Labor for Goldwater" pointed out support of Johnson by "international bankers" and a businessmen's committee consisting of Sidney Weinberg, Ralph Lazarus, Robert Lehman, and Max Rabb, among others.

**Local Campaigns**

Some primary and local campaigns were marred by racial or religious factors.
In New York anonymous racists distributed a flyer captioned "The Kennedy NAACP Membership Application," and sought to link the senatorial candidate with Negroes on relief, a majority of whom, it implied, were dishonest.

The Committee on American-Arab Relations, a small but strident arm of the Arab propaganda effort, distributed flyers on the streets of New York City attacking Senator Kenneth Keating (Rep.-N.Y.) for his "extremist, pro-Israeli position," which it was alleged, had damaged American prestige in the Middle East. Later in the campaign the same group widely distributed a leaflet with the headline "KKK—Keating and Kennedy for Knesset," and the legend that "each candidate has done his utmost to express his love and devotion to Zionism and Israel, and hatred and opposition to the Arabs."

In a school board election in Dade county, Fla., a Jewish candidate was identified in his opponent's political advertisement as a former vice-president of the American Jewish Congress and was also charged with "still prosecuting lawsuits to ban Bible reading" in the public schools.

In the Maryland Democratic presidential primary, where Alabama's racist Governor George Wallace was an active candidate, a flood of racial and antisemitic mail came into the state in an unsuccessful attempt to turn the tide in his favor. Many Marylanders received a letter from Gerald L. K. Smith, which, after boasting that the Christian Nationalist Crusade had rendered a practical and effective service in the Wisconsin and Indiana primary elections said: "I am confident that my friends in Maryland will be as loyal to my friend Governor Wallace as they were in the two other states."

A newly created racist and antisemitic movement, the White party of America, a splinter from the American Nazi party, urged Wallace to "denounce the Democratic party" and "openly declare himself a candidate of a white man's party."

Several days before November 3, Election Day, an antisemitic newsletter with the imprint of an organization calling itself the Harlem Council For Economic Development pledged its support to a candidate who, the letter said, had been denied the Liberal party's support in a New York judicial election because "Zionists in the Liberal party have joined their ilk" in the reform Democratic clubs to repudiate him. The newsletter accused the Zionists of endorsing an opposition candidate in order to increase their grip on the courts.

A candidate for alderman in Chicago's 49th ward found the windows of his home, which displayed photographs of President Johnson, splattered with eggs and marked with swastikas. In addition, crude swastikas were glued to his doors and his windows.

In Westchester county, N.Y., persons identified in a newspaper as being anti-Goldwater received National Renaissance party "literature" which screamed: "You are being brainwashed by a pro-Communist, Jew-controlled press."
CIVIL RIGHTS

In June the Civil Rights Act was enacted into law over the vote of the Republican candidate for president. The intensity of a heated election campaign exacerbated existing tensions.

The brutal murder of three young civil-rights workers (see p. 185), two of whom where Jews, in the outskirts of Philadelphia, Miss., focused the world’s attention on that state, but bitter resistance was evident in other parts of the deep South as well.

Between the passage of the Civil Rights Act, in June, and the election on November 3, there were at least 109 instances of Negroes being beaten or assaulted; 85 cases of Negroes being actually shot; 87 bombings against premises they occupied or worked in; 89 Negro victims of miscellaneous types of violence, and 858 arrests of proponents of civil rights.

To what extent the radical-right organizations shared culpability with southern extremists for the violence and harassment inflicted upon southern Negroes and northern civil-rights workers was conjectured. But by their wide distribution of intemperate and hysterical propaganda, which labeled the law as “immoral, ungodly, and unconstitutional,” a “huge step forward by the Communists in their sinister schemes and plans for taking over America,” they laid themselves open to blame, if only in part, for the summer’s carnage.

APPRaisal

Almost without exception, extremist groups were enthusiastic and diligent supporters of the Goldwater candidacy. They permeated and penetrated the various ad hoc Goldwater-Miller units that mushroomed into existence in almost every community in the United States. It was often the Bircher or other extremist zealot who rang doorbells, distributed handbills, heckled the opposition, mounted telephone campaigns, and served as a foot soldier in the army of campaign volunteers.

At the end of 1964 there were two and a half to six million people intensely determined to lead and carry on a fight to provide America with rightist leadership locally, in the states, and on the national level. It could be predicted that they would bring to future political activities equal or greater zeal, intensity, and enthusiasm. The John Birch Society promised renewed vigor in its drive to “educate” the people and kept its pledge by a rapid growth whose roots were known to reach into such sensitive agencies as municipal police departments. Post-election harassment by Birchers of libraries and institutions promoting the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) was on the record.

The rightists, dominant in the Democratic party machinery of most southern states, appeared to be still firmly entrenched in the apparatus of the Republican party at various levels. They would not abdicate or yield hard-won influence without a fight. There was talk about the formation of a third po-
political party which would serve as an organ for the right-wing extremists, southern segregationists, racists, and bigots. More political action by the rightist extremists was likely.

Any notion that the Johnson landslide in the 1964 elections had eliminated or even seriously impaired the extremist movement was not warranted.

Milton Ellerin

Church and State

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

The two recent Supreme Court decisions which applied this clause in the First Amendment to strike down a state-prescribed prayer and state-authorized reading from the Bible and recitation of prayers evoked a storm of controversy and hastened a process of searching and reappraisal about the meaning of the enigmatic phrases of the First Amendment and the role of religion in American society. The critical response to the Court's decisions did not come entirely from the Court's unreconstructed Southern opponents or from troglodytic rightists, but also from forward-looking civic and religious leaders and distinguished legal experts, many of whom were reluctant to draw the far-reaching conclusion that the juridical separation of church and state meant an actual separation of religion from society. John C. Bennett expressed this fear of the secularization of public life in an editorial in Christianity and Crisis (June 8, 1964), liberal interdenominational Protestant biweekly, saying "we cannot assume that the best policy for the nation is to establish inhibitions on religious expression in the context of public life."

Most religious institutions believe their function to be broader than providing religious guidance to their own memberships and feel it is their responsibility to inform the society at large with their moral and ethical values. Thus, they have striven to exercise moral authority and persuasion on government and the public at large in great social issues like civil rights and the war against poverty. A position of strict separation if applied to the social reality will, they fear, relegate them to an obscure corner of human life, without impact as a moral or spiritual force in society. Thus, Thomas G. Sanders, professor of religious studies at Brown University, in Protestant Concepts of Church and State (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964; x, 339

American church-state independence . . . is neither co-operation nor separation, but a free functioning of religious groups with which the government does not ordinarily interfere unless the welfare of society, religious freedom, or nonestablishment seem threatened or violated. Whereas no real separation lies between church and state as far as the influence of the churches on the state is concerned, one can genuinely speak of separation, but not a "wall," with respect to the influence on or support of the churches by the state [p. 295].

Instead of citing "separation" as a traditional aspect of church-state relations in America, many Protestants have begun to talk about "separation and interaction."

"Separation and Interaction of Church and State" was indeed the title of a statement of general findings issued by the First National Study Conference on Church and State, convened by the NCC in February in Columbus, Ohio, with delegates from 24 Protestant and Orthodox communions and observers from the Roman Catholic and Jewish faiths. The convocation of this conference was in itself precedent-setting in that the participating groups were prepared to undertake a serious reappraisal of long-held and loyally-defended positions. The conference discussed many problems affecting church and state including those of conscience and resistance to civil authority, religion as an element in civic life and an influence on public policy, and government aid to church-related educational and welfare institutions. The statement of general findings which was issued combined generality with ambiguity, since it attempted to reconcile the most diverse views. Nevertheless consensus was obtained on this reading of the First Amendment:

While it is not the business of government to underwrite religion or to use its coercive powers to sanction or compel acceptance of any religious creed or practice, neither should it sanction or promote secular creeds or ideologies. Government exceeds its proper authority if it shows hostility or even indifference to religion. It may appropriately recognize in its public practice and in its publicly supported educational programs the role of religion in American history and life.

While it is not the business of government to promote or support religion, it is government's role and duty to further religious liberty. The clause of the First Amendment prohibiting an establishment of religion must be balanced against the clause prohibiting interference with the free exercise of religion. These clauses operate in many situations to supplement each other but are sometimes in conflict. Any concept of "neutrality" must take into account the proper balancing of the establishment and free exercise limitations.

A similar interpretation of neutrality in the First Amendment has been advanced by Wilber G. Katz, professor at the University of Wisconsin Law School who is also chairman of the National Commission on Church-State Relations of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and who took part in the study conference. In his book Religion and American Constitutions (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1964; vii, 114 pp.), Katz argued for a
distinction between the concepts of separation and neutrality, citing this passage from Justice Black's opinion in the *Everson* case:

[The First] Amendment requires the state to be neutral in its relations with groups of religious believers and non-believers; it does not require the state to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used so as to handicap religions, than it is to favor them.

According to Katz, "provisions for religious services in the armed forces are not aids to religion which violate the neutrality principle. They are not designed to promote religion, but to protect the religious freedom of those whom the government isolates from civilian life." Under an interpretation of absolute separation, Katz believes, such provisions would be outlawed, as would any incidental aid to religion resulting "from measures which are not designed to promote religion and the benefits of which are not limited to religious groups" (pp. 12-13).

This exploration on the part of religious leaders for a better understanding of the more subtle distinctions between separation and neutrality and of the many-faceted relations between religion and society has drawn on the experience and expertness of various constitutional lawyers. For example, Paul G. Kauper, professor of law at the University of Michigan, has served as an active member of the Commission on Church-State Relations in a Pluralistic Society of the Lutheran Church in America. In *Religion and the Constitution* (Louisiana State University Press, 1964; ix, 137 pp.), he set down three possible interpretations of the First Amendment: (1) the no-aid or strict-separation theory; (2) the neutrality theory as advanced by Philip B. Kurland; ² (3) the accommodation theory (which he favors). Kauper holds that since both clauses of the First Amendment are interrelated, in some situations the government *must* and in some it *may* "accommodate its policies and laws in the furtherance of religious freedom" and in recognition of America's religious pluralism. Kauper's views on the constitutional aspects were clearly influential in the position paper *Church and State, A Lutheran Perspective: The Interaction of Religion and Law in a Pluralistic Society* (New York, 1963; ix, 47 pp.), prepared by the Commission on Church and State Relations in a Pluralistic Society of the Lutheran Church in America. This paper distinguished between institutional church-state separation and what it termed "functional interaction." Areas of functional interaction include church activity in furtherance of civic and political morality and in behalf of civic justice. The state, for its part, must ensure religious liberty for all, must acknowledge that the rights of man are not the creation of the state, and ought to provide "incidental benefits on a non-preferential basis in recognition of the church's civil services which are also of secular benefit to the community" and "financial aid on a non-preferential basis to church agencies.

² In *Religion and the Law: Of Church and State and the Supreme Court* (Chicago, 1962): "The freedom and separation clauses should be read as stating a single precept: that government cannot utilize religion as a standard for action or inaction because these clauses, read together as they should be, prohibit classification in terms of religion either to confer a benefit or to impose a burden" (p. 112).
engaged in the performance of social services which are also of secular benefit to the community.”

The gradually changing climate in Protestant attitudes, particularly toward church-state separation, has been the result of a genuine concern for religious pluralism and the growing recognition that American society must be broad enough to accommodate its diverse religious groups on an equal basis, sharing privileges and obligations equally. Specifically this has meant that most Protestants have come to realize that the public school is no longer their vehicle for Protestant religious culture. The changing climate has also meant a greater acceptance of Catholics and the kinds of institutions they choose to maintain, rather than insistence on civic conformity.

Among Jews, too, some stirrings of a changing attitude have been apparent but by and large Jews still favor a concept of the strictest separation of church from state because states in which the church was dominant in the pre-Hitlerian and pre-Soviet European past were more hostile to Jewish existence than secular states.

The changing temper on church-state questions has manifested itself most clearly in the area of Federal aid to education, where the shift in public opinion appeared to have developed from a national concern to improve education and educational facilities at all levels.

**FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION**

1964 witnessed a significant shift in public opinion in extending Federal aid to pupils in church-related schools and also a remarkable breakthrough in hitherto obstructed programs of Federal aid to education because of the deadlock over aid to church-related schools. Though bills for Federal aid to education have been introduced in every session of Congress since World War II, no important bill had ever been enacted because bills that did not provide for aid to parochial schools were blocked by Catholics, those that did were blocked by separationists and anti-Catholics, and all were obstructed by economy-minded congressmen who, opposing any Federal aid at all, took advantage of the impasse created by the two apparently irreconcilable positions.³ But the concern for the quality of education and the need of financial aid has produced a considerable change in opinion.

**Concern for Education**

On May 1, 1963, Walter Lippman in a television program, “CBS Reports,” advocated Federal aid for all schools, including parochial schools, and declared that a bill for Federal aid to education most urgently needed to be enacted. Parochial schools, he said, were part of the American system of education. Since it was important that they, too, should receive financial assistance, “a way should be found of getting rid of this religious knot we’ve

tied ourselves into.” Similarly, Robert M. Hutchins, president of the Fund for the Republic, at a conference on church-state questions at the University of Chicago on January 9, 1963, argued that “aid to all educational institutions that meet Federal standards would promote religious freedom as well as education. The overriding public purpose would be to improve education, including education under religious auspices.”

The liberal weekly The New Republic, too, on March 2, 1963, urged Federal aid for parochial schools with Federal controls:

The national interest is in better education for all children, regardless of race, creed, or parental income. Nobody needs to send his child to a private school; but millions do. No useful purpose is served if these children grow up knowing less history or less chemistry than children who attend public school. Ignorance, not the Catholic hierarchy, is the enemy.

Educators, too, have manifested growing sympathy for the educational needs of children in parochial schools. The American Federation of Teachers, a union-affiliated organization which for years had opposed Federal aid to nonpublic schools, reversed its position in a statement of its executive council released October 7, declaring that “Federal support must reach the child where he is. It must provide that the child shall have the benefit of such Federal support in any given educational situation where he or his guardians elect to have him.”

**Catholic Parochial Schools**

The growing awareness of the validity of different points of view held by different religious groups about religion and society, referred to earlier, has in some places been coupled with a willingness to take account of these differences in some suitable civic arrangement, specifically some form of constitutionally permissible aid to the Catholic parochial schools.

About 5.5 million Catholic children, 42 per cent of Catholic school children and 12 per cent of all school children in the United States, attend parochial schools. Many Catholic parents believe they unjustly bear a burden of double taxation for education. Some Catholics feel that their schools suffer because they do not enjoy the financial support that public schools receive, even though the parochial schools fulfill a public-welfare function by providing part of the school population with an education which the state would otherwise have to provide. The crisis situation of the parochial schools is generally acknowledged: most parochial schools are overcrowded, inadequately staffed, and financially unable to cope with the modern demands of education. Their financial plight was dramatized in September in the Catholic archdiocese of Cincinnati and its surrounding counties, when Archbishop Karl J. Alter closed the first grade in all parochial primary schools because of their financial inability to recruit qualified teachers. About 10,000 Catholic children were affected, 3,000 in Cincinnati alone where 19 classrooms had to be rented in community buildings and churches to provide for the new pupils in the public schools.
Catholics have insistently requested Federal and state aid for their schools. Citizens for Educational Freedom (CEF), a predominantly Catholic pressure group for Federal aid to parochial schools with a membership of over 30,000, at its fifth annual convention in August, heard assistant commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education, Peter Muirhead, compliment them for "leaving no stone unturned to find an equitable solution to providing equal educational opportunities for all the nation's youth."

**Shared Time**

The predicament of the Catholic schools has prompted educators and some Protestant groups to seek a just, legal, and charitable solution to what has been described as "our cold war in education." The most important proposal that emerged has been the idea of shared time, now more commonly called dual enrolment. Under this plan children would attend the public school for a certain period of time and study a certain portion of the curriculum—mathematics, languages, science, physical training. If their parents so desired, the children would attend a church school for other subjects. (A bill to provide Federal assistance for facilities to be used in shared-time programs was introduced by Congressman Adam C. Powell, Dem., N.Y., in the first session of the 88th Congress. Hearings on it were held during the second session, February and March, but the bill was not reported out and expired with the 88th Congress. The National Education Association submitted a study showing that shared-time programs have actually been in operation for some time in a small proportion of school systems—fewer than 300 out of 7,410, mostly in six states: Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin—and have involved about 18,000 parochial-school pupils. Testifying before the Powell subcommittee, Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, said "there is a definite national need to strengthen and support such essential educational programs.")

The NCC's National Study Conference on Church and State, in February, referred to earlier, reaffirmed the right of parental choice in the selection of schools and the responsibility of the government to support education, concluding: "In recognition of the seriousness of the financial problem of the parochial schools, we propose shared time as the most creative measure for solving this problem and are willing to explore other legal methods for solving it."

On June 4, the NCC's General Board adopted a policy statement, "A Protestant and Orthodox Statement Regarding Dual School Enrollment," which approved further experimentation with dual-school enrolment:

It is our hope that dual school enrollment may prove to be a means of helping our nation to maintain the values of a general system of public education, yet at the same time meeting the needs of those who desire a system of church-re-

---

lated education, while upholding the historic American principle of the separation and interaction of church and state.

A notable relaxation appeared evident in the testimony before the Powell subcommittee of Franklin C. Salisbury, general counsel for Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State (POAU), the arch-separationist organization whose ardent defense of separation is matched only by its anti-Catholicism. He described POAU's attitude toward shared time as "watchful waiting":

... aware of the present financial problems of the parochial and independent schools, we are studying the various experiments in shared time to see if they will develop answers consistent with the needs of education and the freedoms secured by church-state separation.

Christianity and Crisis, in an editorial, May 11, urged experimentation with shared time, careful observation, and evaluation, declaring that the issues constituted "too fundamental a debate to be left to the 'church-staters,' who view all educational developments through the lens of their special interest."

The United Presbyterian Church, at the closing session of its 176th general assembly, May 27, was the first individual Protestant denomination to endorse the shared-time concept of education, as "perhaps the most creative possibility of breaking the legislative stalemate on the urgent and vital issue of Federal aid for public elementary and secondary pupils in the United States."

Jewish organizations have been more critical of shared time because of their deep commitment to the public school and their opposition to any measure that would appear to give government aid to religious institutions. The CCAR submitted a statement to, and the American Jewish Congress testified before the Powell subcommittee against shared time. Back in June 1962 the NCRAC had voted opposition to shared time, with the UOJC abstaining. Other Jewish organizations appeared to take a position of watchful waiting.

Limited Federal Aid to Church-Related Schools

In addition to favoring shared-time programs, several Protestant groups, further modifying their long-held separationist views, have now come to support other types of Federal aid to church-related schools. Thus, the NCC's National Study Conference on Church and State also approved the use of Federal funds for the health and welfare programs of church-supported primary and secondary schools—school lunches and dental and medical care. (It rejected a motion opposing any Federal aid at all to parochial schools.)

In October the 61st General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church adopted a resolution on limited Federal aid to parochial schools which was a significant departure from the position of total opposition to any Federal aid to these schools, held by the church since 1949 and reaffirmed as late as 1961. The 1964 resolution, presented by a Commission on Church-State Relations, headed by Professor Wilber G. Katz, recognized "the propriety of including [private, parochial, or sectarian] ... schools in general
public-health and public-welfare programs, such as, among others, the provision of standard text-books and of equal bus transportation."

Even among Baptists and Fundamentalists, for whom the principle of church-state separation has been their historic guarantee of freedom and whose anti-Catholicism arises out of a long history of persecution and suppression in Europe, some shift in opinion has been discernible, especially regarding the advantages to their own educational institutions in accepting Federal aid. Thus, W. E. Price, Jr., president of the general board of the North Carolina Baptist Convention, at the convention's annual meeting in November, advocated the acceptance by Baptist colleges of Federal funds for construction. A year earlier he had opposed accepting such funds for new construction of the Baptist Hospital of Winston-Salem. Nonetheless the convention rejected the request which the Baptist college presidents favored and wanted badly. One of the consequences was widespread student protests and demonstrations at Wake Forest College where students flaunted "To hell with the Baptists" banners.

Jews are less prepared than Protestants to find some accommodation for the Catholic schools, largely because of their European experiences with established churches, and particularly with the Roman Catholic Church. Even today many Jews are suspicious and mistrustful of the instruction which pupils in Catholic parochial schools may receive about Jews and Judaism. But confronted with the problems of the growing number of Jewish day schools and their financial predicament, some Jewish groups have begun to have more sympathy for the Catholic position. Thus, self-interest and a growing perception of Catholic-school needs have had the effect of breaking down the seemingly monolithic Jewish position against any aid to nonpublic schools. A survey made in 1963 of the views of principals and directors of Jewish day schools affiliated with the National Association of Hebrew Day-School Parent-Teacher Associations showed them overwhelmingly in favor of Federal aid to day and parochial schools. (Under provisions of the National Defense Education Act, 32 Hebrew day schools have received $479,500, besides aid through school-lunch programs and purchase of surplus property.)

The UOJC has been bitterly divided over the question of Federal aid. At its 66th biennial convention in November, a resolution advocating Federal aid to day schools passed by one vote, with many abstentions. But a motion to reconsider was subsequently adopted. The Union planned to submit the question to referendum among its member congregations.

Enactment of Federal Aid

The deadlock in Federal aid to education was broken in 1963 when several bills providing aid for specific types of educational programs were enacted, the more significant being the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-204), providing grants and loans to public and nonpublic colleges for constructing and improving academic facilities; the Vocational Education Act of 1963 (Public Law 88-210), expanding the 1958 National Defense Education Act, vocational-training programs and aid to projects in

These laws, so successfully maneuvered through Congress that President Johnson characterized the first session of the 88th Congress as one that would go down in history as the “Education Congress of 1963,” were a heritage of proposals made by the late President Kennedy’s first education task force, appointed when he was president-elect, with Francis Keppel as its head. Keppel, then dean of Harvard’s Graduate School of Education, became U.S. commissioner of education in 1962 and has remained President Johnson’s chief education advisor. Also John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corporation, has advised the President on educational matters, having chaired the 1964 presidential task force on education. By approaching specific educational problems and directing aid specifically to pockets of educational poverty, economically depressed areas, and dense concentrations of population, the first major breakthrough in Federal aid to education was accomplished. A lesser, though equally notable, innovation was provision of some Federal aid to church-related institutions of higher education with a minimum of public controversy.

The second session of the 88th Congress in 1964 continued this impressive legislative record, enacting a series of major and minor laws providing Federal aid to education. Two were of considerable scope: the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), popularly known as the “anti-poverty law,” and Amendments to the National Defense Education Act, Impact School Aid (Public Law 88-665), a three-year extension of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, a one-year extension of its impacted-area legislation, and a considerable expansion of the total program.

The Economic Opportunity Act, signed by President Johnson, August 20, 1964, embraces a variety of educational programs: Title I (Youth Programs) provides for basic education and vocational training for young people, 16 to 21, in conservation camps and residential training centers and for work-training and work-study programs. Title II (Urban and Rural Community Action Programs) grants $340,000,000 “to provide stimulation and incentive for urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty through community-action programs.” Education was one such program.

During the hearings on the bill before the House Committee on Education and Labor, representatives of Protestant, Jewish, and nonsectarian civic organizations were particularly disquieted about a provision in Title II for general aid to education in all schools on the ground that “no child shall be denied the benefit of such a program because he is not regularly enrolled in the public schools.” (The National Catholic Welfare Conference, on the other hand, had expressed regret that the bill did not provide for “the full utilization of all the educational resources of this nation in the war against poverty.”) The House Committee amended the bill before reporting it to the Senate on July 21, by replacing that provision with a stipulation against gen-
eral aid for elementary or secondary education in any school or school system. Instead, remedial reading and noncurricular educational assistance for the poor were specified as programs eligible for aid.

Church-related institutions or students in such institutions are eligible for Federal aid under the law and may take part in community-action programs. Both the work-training and work-study programs of Title I stipulate, however, that no Federal funds shall be used to assist enrollees or students on projects involving "the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facilities used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship."

On December 16 the Office of Economic Opportunity, which administers the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, announced grants to parochial schools for programs under Title II in New Haven, Pittsburgh, and Detroit. The activities included remedial-reading centers, tutorial programs, prekindergarten programs, and supervised play and study centers. Conditions attached to grants going to church-related schools of school systems specify that none of the grant funds shall be used for the teaching of religion or religious proselytization; that the program shall be made available to all residents in the area; that participation in the community-action program shall not be used to induce participation in sectarian or religious activities or institutions; that textbooks shall be devoid of religious or sectarian content, and that facilities shall be devoid of religious or sectarian symbols and decorations. Grant funds shall not be used to release funds regularly expended by the school.

The NDEA, as amended in 1964 and signed into law by President Johnson on October 16, broadened the act to give aid to the improvement and strengthening of instruction in history, civics, geography, English, and reading. (NDEA aid had previously been limited to mathematics, the sciences, and foreign languages.) Assistance in these fields is extended, as in earlier NDEA aid, to both public and private nonprofit educational institutions, including church-related schools. The act provides for loans to students, including those in private schools; loans to schools, including private nonprofit schools, for equipment in the instruction of the specified fields; graduate fellowships and stipends, with the restriction that no fellowship be awarded for study at a divinity school for training in the ministry or any other religious vocation; aid for testing and guidance counseling available through the states to public and private schools; aid for the establishment of centers for language research and studies; aid to teachers in both public and private schools who wish to participate in advanced training institutes.

STATE AID TO EDUCATION

On November 30 hearings began in Annapolis, Md., on what is expected to become an epoch-making case in church-state educational questions. A year earlier the Horace Mann League, an organization whose primary objective is to foster and strengthen the public school and increase the esteem in which it is held, brought suit to enjoin the state of Maryland from appropriating
$2.5 million dollars to four church-related colleges for construction of facilities: $750,000 each to Notre Dame, Baltimore, and St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Catholic colleges operated by religious orders, for science buildings; $500,000 to Western Maryland College (Methodist-related), Westminster, for a science building and dining hall, and $500,000 to Hood College (United Church of Christ), Frederick, for a dormitory.

Since the early days of the republic, Maryland has been allocating state funds to private educational institutions, regardless of religious affiliation, on the ground that they performed public functions. The colleges themselves contended in these hearings that their purposes were educational, not religious. The Horace Mann League has claimed that the state grant of funds violated the First Amendment because it "established" religion and the Fourteenth Amendment because it deprived taxpayers of their property without due process of law. The first witness for the defense, Manning M. Patillo, associate director of the Danforth Foundation, testified that 817 of the 1,189 private colleges and universities in the United States were church-related in some degree. The trial will continue into 1965. Leo Pfeffer, general counsel for the American Jewish Congress and chief counsel for the Horace Mann League, has predicted that the case will be argued before the Supreme Court. Obviously it will have the widest repercussions on the entire system of higher education, for church-related colleges and universities have been receiving Federal funds for a variety of specific purposes (designated as "categorical aid"), including the construction of science and research facilities.

Bus Transportation

In August, Dover, N.H., city attorney T. Casey Mohr ruled that the decision of the Dover School Committee to provide public bus transportation to students of a Catholic parochial high school was legal. Opposition to the city's provision of such service had been expressed by the Dover Ministers' Association.

In the general election, November 3, Anne Arundel county, Md. (county seat Annapolis), voted 27,648 to 21,604 in a referendum to repeal a 1963 state law providing for the use of public-school buses by children attending parochial schools in the county. POAU and the Maryland Baptist were influential in the repeal campaign. The county is largely Methodist and Baptist. (It voted also to repeal the state law forbidding discrimination in public accommodations; see p. 161.)

Religion in the Public School

Despite the Supreme Court's decisions outlawing Bible reading and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in the public schools as well as the recitation of the New York State Regents nonsectarian prayer, a variety of these and other practices continued in many schools.

In Miami, on January 29, a Florida Supreme Court for the second time upheld a state law requiring Bible reading in public schools and permitting
religious programs in graduation exercises and religious holiday observances in schools, despite the fact that the Supreme Court had returned the case for further consideration in the light of the *Schempp-Murray* decision (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 53-54). The following month, four parents of Miami schoolchildren appealed the case once again. On June 1, the Supreme Court, without hearing argument, reversed the Florida Supreme Court decision 8 to 1, citing the *Schempp-Murray* decision. The complaints about other school religious practices were dismissed on the ground that the plaintiffs had no standing to raise these issues.

Florida's state school superintendent Thomas Bailey provided the schools with the state attorney general's legal interpretation of what could and could not be done in the schools under the Supreme Court's decision. A report on school practices (Miami *Herald*, October 25, 1964) showed that compliance with the Supreme Court's ruling had been left largely to local authorities. In Dade county, where the case had originated, a period of meditation and the reading of inspirational and patriotic materials had been substituted for prayer and Bible reading. School boards in St. Lucie and Walton counties voted to continue prayer and Bible reading.

Surveys of practices in school districts in Indiana and in Kentucky similarly showed that prevailing local autonomy led to widespread disregard of the Supreme Court's rulings and that many schools and/or teachers encouraged "voluntary" or "spontaneous" prayers or Bible readings.

In Moscow, Idaho, a three-judge Federal court ruled in August, on the complaint of 35 Protestants, to "halt the practice of religious indoctrination," that a section of the Idaho code requiring compulsory daily Bible reading in the public schools was unconstitutional.

In two widely separated communities, Pueblo, Colo., and Olean, N.Y., the boards of education had agreed to accept Gideon Bibles for distribution upon request of the pupils' parents, but when challenged on the constitutionality of the practice, both school boards, in November, rescinded their approval.

**Teaching About Religion**

In writing the opinion for the majority in the *Abington v. Schempp* case, Justice Tom Clark said:

It might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities. Nothing we have said here indicates that such study of the Bible or of religion, when presented objectively as part of a secular program of education, may not be effected consistent with the First Amendment.

Though there was no widespread rush to introduce the study of religion in the school curriculum (a UPI survey, New York *Times*, September 1964, showed considerable reluctance on the part of school administrators to introduce into the curriculum a subject calculated to affect many sensibilities), many educators and religious leaders expressed interest in the idea.
The Cincinnati Board of Education, late in 1964, approved a policy governing the interaction of religion and education in the public schools, which permitted certain practices, in connection with Christmas for instance, that it believed had become part of the community’s cultural heritage, and provided for instruction about the role of religion in history and culture. In June 1964 the Maine Board of Education issued a policy statement permitting the public schools to use the Bible in literature and history courses. Pennsylvania’s State Department of Public Instruction retained a tri-faith panel of five scholars to recommend a Bible course to be given in the public schools. Religious Education (November-December 1964) published a symposium “Religion in the Public Schools,” to which 19 religious and educational leaders contributed, nearly all of whom favored an objective course of study about religion in the public schools (two of four Jewish participants disapproved).

A report by the Commission on Religion in the Public Schools of the American Association of School Administrators, Religion in the Public Schools (Washington, D.C., 1964; vi, 67 pp.), supported the idea of teaching about religion: “The Commission believes that the public school curriculum must give suitable attention to the religious influences in man’s development.” The commission strongly favored the production of high-quality material on the history of religion and of comparative religion suitable for use at the secondary level that would accent the role of religion in America’s cultural heritage. The commission further expressed its belief that public schools should help develop “worthy moral and ethical values,” and must take cognizance of the religious pluralism that is America. (In accepting religious pluralism, the commission also recommended that the public schools adopt a policy that “encourages reasonable recognition of Christmas” in the “spirit of exposition of the differing rites and customs of families, cultures, and creeds—each with deep meaning for its adherents, and in sum revealing the many different religious, philosophical, and cultural practices and beliefs held by Americans.”)

The National Conference of Christians and Jews was working under a grant from the Ford Foundation to develop materials for the public-school curriculum dealing with the religious heritage. One study under way was being prepared in cooperation with the Pittsburgh school system, concerning material on the role of religion to be introduced in the social-studies curriculum of the Pittsburgh senior high schools.

Campaign for a Constitutional Amendment

From the start of the 88th Congress in January 1963, a number of congressmen had introduced resolutions to amend the Constitution so as to permit prayer in the public schools. These resolutions reflected the emotional response of many Americans that the court was somehow depriving them of their religion, indeed, of their traditional way of life. Because Rep. Emanuel Celler (Dem., N.Y.), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, had scheduled no hearings on these resolutions, Rep. Frank J. Becker (Rep.,
N.Y.), a most vigorous advocate of a constitutional amendment who had proposed the first such resolution in the 88th Congress (and also a later amended version), filed a discharge petition on behalf of his proposal to take it out of the Judiciary Committee and bring it directly before the House. Becker had obtained only 167 of the 218 signatures required for discharge, but the enormous flow of mail to congressmen on behalf of an amendment made it appear likely that the pressure from their constituencies would induce others to sign Becker’s discharge petition. At this point, with 146 resolutions filed by 110 congressmen, Celler scheduled Committee hearings.

In advance of the hearings the Committee on the Judiciary issued a staff study of the proposed amendments. The study found that there were 35 versions of amendments among the 146, differing in language and scope, which could be classified in seven types:

1. To permit prayers in public schools (5 resolutions);
2. To permit prayers in public schools and other public places (19);
3. To permit prayers and Bible reading in public schools (12);
4. To permit prayers and Bible reading in public schools and other public places (30);
5. To authorize any state to permit the Regents prayer, declared unconstitutional in the Engel decision, to be offered in public schools and other public places (1);
6. To permit “any reference to belief in or reliance upon God” in any government or public document, proceeding, or ceremony or upon currency and coinage (1);
7. To permit prayers, Bible reading, and references to belief in God in public schools, other public places, and in governmental matters (78).

Congressman Becker’s second resolution (H.J. Res. 693) was in this last category; 60 Congressmen filed the identical text in individual resolutions.

After the Committee hearings began, several Congressmen continued to file resolutions. In all, 117 Congressmen filed resolutions to amend the Constitution. Several filed two resolutions and Congressman Robert W. Hemphill (Dem., S.C.) filed three. 65 were Republicans, 52 Democrats. The South provided the largest single bloc of 43; the Northeast 36, the North Central states 24, and the West 14.

An analysis in Report from the Capital, a bulletin published by the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs in March gave the religious identity of the


6 H.J. Res. 693 reads:

“Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit the offering, reading from or listening to prayers or biblical Scriptures, if participation therein is on a voluntary basis, in any governmental or public school, institution, or place.

“Nothing in this Constitution shall be deemed to prohibit making reference to belief in, reliance upon, or invoking the aid of God or a Supreme Being in any governmental or public document, proceeding, activity, ceremony, school, institution, or place, or upon any coinage, currency, or obligation of the United States.

“Nothing in this article shall constitute an establishment of religion.”
then 110 sponsors of amending resolutions: 95 Protestants (25 Presbyterians, 21 Methodists, 16 Baptists, 8 Episcopalians, 7 Congregational Christians, 3 Lutherans, 2 each of the Christian Church and the Evangelical Free Church of America; one each of the following denominations: Apostolic Christian Church, Church of Christ, Evangelical and United Brethren, Latter-day Saints, Schwenkfelder, 6 unspecified “Protestants”), 13 Roman Catholics, one Jew (Congressman Charles S. Joelson, Dem., N.J.), and one Unitarian.

Public Opinion

A Gallup poll released August 1963 showed that 70 per cent of the respondents disapproved of the Supreme Court’s decision against prayer and Bible reading in the public schools (24 per cent approved and six per cent had no opinion). A poll by Louis Harris taken in the closing days of the presidential election campaign (New York Post, October 30, 1964) showed that 88 per cent of the voters interviewed supported Barry Goldwater’s position that prayers in the public schools should be restored. The Minnesota Poll (Minneapolis Tribune, June 28, 1964) showed 61 per cent of Minnesotan respondents favoring a constitutional amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. (Nevertheless, 77 per cent believed that even if the amendment were passed, it would not make much difference in the United States.)

The mail campaign on this question overwhelmingly favored a constitutional amendment by even larger margins than the public-opinion polls. A spot check of congressional offices, according to Congressional Quarterly, May 1, 1964, showed record amounts of mail pouring in, nearly all of it favoring a constitutional amendment. Some of the mail was nationally solicited, but much seemed to be locally stimulated or spontaneously conceived.

Pros and Cons

The House Committee on the Judiciary held hearings on school prayers from April 22, 1964, to June 3, 1964. A long line of witnesses appeared to testify for and against the proposed amendments and an enormous quantity of opinion was entered in the record.

Leading constitutional lawyers appeared to testify against a prayer amendment. Many taught at outstanding American law schools and included highly respected Protestant and Catholic lay leaders, like William B. Ball, prominent New York and Pennsylvania lawyer and Catholic layman; Paul A. Freund, Harvard University; Wilber G. Katz, University of Wisconsin; Paul G. Kauper, University of Michigan Law School; Rev. William J. Kennedy, S.J., Boston College Law School; Philip B. Kurland, University of Chicago Law School. Erwin N. Griswold, dean of Harvard Law School, who had bitterly

7 Congressman Joelson’s proposal differed from H.J. Res. 693 in one respect. It specified “listening to nonsectarian or nondenominational prayers or such Biblical Scriptures.” He was, presumably, concerned to exclude Christological matter that would be offensive to Jews.

8 U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Committee on the Judiciary, Hearings on Proposed Amendments to the Constitution Relating to Prayers and Bible Reading in the Public Schools (Washington, D.C., 1964).
criticized the court’s position as “absolutist” on church-state questions,9 wrote the committee opposing the constitutional amendments.

The division between proponents and opponents of a prayer amendment was political rather than religious. To some, adoption of a constitutional amendment symbolized an assault on the Supreme Court, a means of curbing its authority, and a retribution for its decisions on civil rights. Others favored a constitutional amendment perhaps only because it would enact into law, and force compliance with, a code of behavior that appeared to be vanishing. Like Fundamentalist Protestants a half century ago who enacted state and local Bible-reading and anti-evolution laws to enforce Protestant morality, many Fundamentalist Protestants and like-minded Catholics saw in a possible constitutional amendment an opportunity to use the authoritative power of government to enforce an old-fashioned kind of religious morality that they believed was unfortunately passing from our society.

This campaign for a prayer amendment showed the compatibility between religious and political conservatism. The 1964 Republican party platform—the most conservative and controversial in many years—supported a constitutional amendment permitting those individuals and groups who choose to do so to exercise their religion freely in public places, provided religious exercises are not prepared or prescribed by the state or political subdivision thereof and no person’s participation therein is coerced, thus preserving the traditional separation of church and state.

The Democratic party platform did not mention the subject at all. Its silence was criticized as “utter disregard for God” by Republican presidential candidate Barry M. Goldwater in a campaign speech at the Salt Lake City Mormon Tabernacle on October 10.

Civic groups favoring a constitutional amendment included the Catholic War Veterans, U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, American Farm Bureau Federation, local branches of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, General Federation of Women’s Clubs, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion. Ad hoc citizens groups like the Constitutional Prayer Foundation (Baltimore, Md.), Massachusetts Citizens for Public Prayer, Committee for the Preservation of Prayer and Bible Reading (St. Petersburg, Fla.), and Project Prayer (Los Angeles), which came into being to stimulate and organize public pressure on behalf of a prayer amendment, appeared to be rightist. Sam Cavnar, executive director of Project Prayer, according to his own testimony at the hearings, had been executive director for Project Alert, a West Coast anticommunism school, one of whose lecturers had once declared that Chief Justice Earl Warren ought to be hanged. Charles W. Winegarner, who testified for an amendment on behalf of a Citizens Congressional Committee (Los Angeles), has been on Gerald L. K. Smith’s staff. Governor George C. Wallace of Ala-

bama, too, testified before the Judiciary Committee, inveighing against the Supreme Court's decision ruling out prayer as "part of the philosophy of socialism elevated to the dignity of law" and "part of the deliberate design to subordinate the American people, their faith, their customs, and their religious traditions to a godless state." (Robert E. Van Deuren, public-relations secretary of the National Lutheran Council, in his monthly Washington Memorandum to Lutheran church leaders, April 1964, had characterized the advocates for an amendment as more strongly motivated against the growth of federal power and the intervention of the Federal government in civil rights than by concern for the religious aspects of American culture.)

Religious Groups

Only a minority of religious groups and religious leaders favored a prayer amendment, though a substantial number had disagreed with the Supreme Court's ruling and held that it would have been preferable had the Court not ruled at all on matters they felt best left to local consensus or agreement.

Protestants

Nearly all major Protestant denominations and their influential leaders opposed a prayer amendment and testified against it: Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists (including the Southern Baptist Convention), Lutherans (including the conservative Missouri Synod), Methodists, Disciples, and Seventh-Day Adventists. Few nationally known Protestant church leaders favored a prayer amendment, the most notable being Daniel A. Poling, editor of the conservative nondenominational Christian Herald, and Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, president of the World Methodist Council.

Only three segments of Protestants could be identified as favoring an amendment:

1. The Eastern churches—the largest and most outspoken being the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America, headed by Archbishop Iakovos—coming out of a tradition of a close interrelation of church and state and originating in countries where political leaders were closely aligned with ecclesiastical authorities and changes in civil government were followed by comparable changes in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The criticism by these Eastern churches of the principle of separation of church and state in America is largely a consequence of their close ties with the mother churches overseas and the fact that, as an immigrant religion, they are still in a fairly early stage of American acculturation.

2. The theologically more conservative Fundamentalists and evangelicals affiliated with the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE). The NAE itself, founded in 1941 because its members thought the NCC was too liberal theologically and politically, early in January issued an official policy statement endorsing a prayer amendment, and its former president Robert A. Cook, chairman of its Evangelical Action Commission, testified for an amendment before the Judiciary Committee. The National Holiness Association, 14 evangelist denominations affiliated with NAE, adopted a resolution at its an-
nual convention in April, urging its affiliates to "bring all possible pressure to bear upon Congress" in favor of a prayer amendment. Also some individual Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Baptist churches belonging to NCC-affiliated denominations but maintaining their own NAE membership because they find its theology and politics more compatible than NCC's, testified or submitted statements favoring an amendment.

Yet, even the NAE conservatives were divided. Christianity Today editorialized, on June 19, against the Becker amendment because it threatened the First Amendment whose "precise definition of church-state separation stands as a unique American contribution to government, basic to our most precious liberties and worthy of being preserved intact." Billy Graham, too, failed to testify on behalf of the Becker amendment, even though he had once expressed support for it.

3. Carl McIntire, president of the International Council of Christian Churches, Collingswood, N.J., one of the earliest and perhaps the most adamant foe of liberal Protestantism, as well as the NCC's most vitriolic critic, testified in favor of a prayer amendment. McIntire, who considers the NCC communist and subversive, also holds that the NAE is too liberal. His son, Carl Thomas McIntire, is national chairman of International Christian Youth in the United States of America, which is actually the youth commission of his father's International Council of Christian Churches. This group sponsored Project America, a national petition campaign to "return the Bible to the schools," and claimed to have collected a million signatures asking for a constitutional amendment. At Judiciary Committee hearings, Larry Miller, Project America's national director, stated that his undertaking was not the same as a Project America sponsored by Liberty Lobby, a right-wing organization dedicated to abolishing the income tax by constitutional amendment, which coincidentally also supported a constitutional prayer amendment.

Catholics

Though Catholics had been vociferous in condemning the Supreme Court decisions and three out of five Catholic cardinals had loudly voiced their disagreement with the Court's rulings on religion in the schools (Richard Cardinal Cushing, Francis Cardinal Spellman, and James Francis Cardinal McIntyre), no leading Catholic ecclesiastic supported a constitutional amendment. The only ranking church leader who appeared before the Judiciary Committee was Bishop Fulton J. Sheen, who testified in support of school prayer but did not actually endorse an amendment. As a matter of fact he said he believed "our first amendment and ninth amendment presently are preferred [to H.J. Res. 693 or any of the other proposed amendments] and would preserve prayer in school and the liberties of the people of the United States."

America, the Jesuit weekly, had long opposed amending the First Amendment; an editorial on April 18 adduced a new argument: that a prayer amendment would not solve questions affecting the relationship between religion and education—specifically Federal aid to parochial schools—and "might freeze the court's Church-State doctrine as it now stands." Ave Maria (June
6, 1964), a national Catholic weekly, surveying the views of editors of Catholic publications, found that 35 of 48 opposed a prayer amendment. The editors gave the following reasons for their opposition: “Reluctance to resort to constitutional amendment, concern over weakening of chances for aid to parochial schools should the amendment be enacted; the view that public school devotions with proper concern for all involved are a practical impossibility; and the fear that many parents would consider public school prayers as adequate religious instruction for their children.”

On June 16, nearly two weeks after the Judiciary Committee’s hearings had ended, the legal department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference urged caution on amending the Constitution: “The department continues to believe the present clauses in the Constitution are of incalculable benefit to religion. . . . In combination, the ‘free exercise’ and ‘no establishment’ clauses are guarantees too vital to be tampered with lightly.” This statement so infuriated Becker that he charged the NCWC did not speak for the Roman Catholics of the United States. He then undertook to poll the 229 Catholic bishops, but apparently received too few replies to publicize them.

Jews

Jews were practically unanimous in opposing Becker’s amendment and others like it. Rabbi Menachem M. Schneerson, the Lubavitcher rabbi who favored nondenominational school prayer like the Regents prayer, opposed sectarian prayer and Bible reading, and sent a statement to this effect to the committee. Major national Jewish organizations testified or submitted statements against the proposed prayer amendments: the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, Anti-Defamation League, Synagogue Council of America, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and National Community Relations Advisory Council.

The Outcome

While the hearings were still under way, public opinion reversed itself. Mail to Congressmen began to run heavily against the amendments. After the hearings the Judiciary Committee took no further action on any of the amendments, and Becker was unable to obtain more signatures for his discharge petition. All amendments died with the 88th Congress.

CHURCH AND STATE AT THE VATICAN COUNCIL

On September 14, the third session of the Second Vatican Council convened. High on the agenda was a draft declaration on religious liberty which had been prepared for the previous session by the Vatican Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity, headed by Augustin Cardinal Bea, with the participation of John Courtney Murray, S.J., Catholic philosopher and foremost American Catholic authority on church-state relations. The draft declaration stressed that religious liberty must be recognized and respected by all, that
it is unlawful for the state to discriminate against religion, and that it must protect and encourage religious liberty. The debate was launched on September 23 by Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, in his first speech since the Council opened in 1962. Saying that he spoke for "practically all the bishops of the United States," he declared that "the church must become the champion of religious freedom. We must insist on this declaration because it is so important for all nations. . . . It is something the Catholic world and non-Catholic world alike have been waiting for." Opposition to the declaration came from some of the Italian and Spanish prelates, particularly from the conservative wing led by Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, secretary of the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office.

On November 17 the document on religious liberty was distributed to the members of the Council with the promise that it would be voted on the 19th, but on that morning Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Dean of the Sacred College, announced that the vote would be delayed (the Council was to close within 48 hours). That announcement precipitated an extraordinary reaction among the Council Fathers, particularly the Americans to whom this declaration, like the one on the Jews, had become of the utmost actual and symbolic importance. Commotion broke out on the Council floor, with people milling around. Albert Cardinal Meyer, Archbishop of Chicago, began to remonstrate with Cardinal Tisserant. Then, Bishop Francis Reh, rector of the North American College in Rome, asked for paper. He, with Cardinal Meyer, Joseph Cardinal Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis, and Paul-Emile Cardinal Léger of Montreal, hastily drew up a petition to present to the Pope, asking him to reverse this ruling "lest the confidence of the world, both Christian and non-Christian, be lost." Within an hour, they had over 800 signatures and eventually about 1,400, more than half of the Council Fathers. But to no avail. F. E. Cartus, a pseudonymous Catholic observer at the Council, wrote in Commentary, January, 1965, that the prevailing disillusion over the maneuvers to set aside the declaration on religious liberty forced the conservatives to allow the declaration on the Jews to come to a vote on November 20, even though they had intended to block its passage too (see pp. 126–27). It was expected that at the final session of the Vatican Council in 1965 the discussion on religious liberty would be resumed, and the declaration which the overwhelming majority clearly favored would most likely be adopted.

**Government Aid to Church Schools**

On November 17 Cardinal Spellman opened the debate on a draft declaration on Christian education in which he proposed the following amendment:

Parents should be free to choose the schools they wish for their children. They should not in consequence of their choice be subject to unjust economic burdens which would infringe upon this freedom of choice. Since it is the function of the state to facilitate civil freedoms, justice and equity demand that a due measure of public aid be available to parents in support of the schools they select for their children.
Moreover, if these schools serve the public purpose of popular education, the fact that they may be religious in their orientation should not exclude them from a rightful measure of public support.

Cardinal Ritter, on the other hand, said that the problem of government aid to church schools was complicated by the "relationship of church and state in each country, a delicate matter better solved country by country."

**SUNDAY CLOSING LAWS**

Numerous local and state ordinances and laws affecting Sunday closing were enacted, repealed, appealed, criticized and debated. Most problems arose over questions of economic competition and confusing contradictions in the regulations, while only few related to questions of religious conscience.

In March, the Massachusetts Legislature passed a measure permitting a person solely in control of a business to operate it on Sunday if for religious reasons he cannot do so on Saturday. The bill was supported by the Massachusetts Council of Churches, the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston, and the Boston Rabbinical Association.

**CHURCH-STATE BITTER-ENDERS**

Extremists on either side of the church-state question continued to try to force their points of view upon the community. Thus, Mrs. Madalyn Murray, a militant atheist whose suit against the Baltimore school board had resulted in the elimination of the recitation of prayer in the schools, demanded in April that the Baltimore Board of Education delete the reference "under God" from the pledge of allegiance. (The board refused.) A suit challenging the inclusion of "under God" in the pledge as a violation of the Constitution had been brought in 1956 in New York on behalf of the Freethinkers of America; on June 10 the Court of Appeals, New York's highest court, sustained previous lower court decisions upholding the pledge's inclusion of "under God." The Freethinkers of America nevertheless carried the case to the Supreme Court which, on November 23, unanimously refused to review the New York ruling.

At the other extreme, Fundamentalists in several parts of the country challenged the teaching of evolution as a deprivation of their religious freedom, nearly 40 years after the Scopes trial had made a laughing stock of William Jennings Bryan's defense of Fundamentalist beliefs about the origin of the world. Two housewives in Orange county, Calif., backed by Fundamentalist organizations, demanded that at least the textbooks should be edited to contain statements that evolution was only a "theory." (The California State Board of Education refused.) Rev. Aubrey L. Moore, a Fundamentalist Baptist minister in Phoenix, Ariz., had petitioned the Arizona State School Board to eliminate the teaching of evolution. After his petition was denied, he tried, unsuccessfully, to collect signatures to bring the issue to a public referendum. In May, 43 Methodist ministers and the president of the
Phoenix Rabbinical Council issued a statement urging people not to support Moore's initiative petition. (Moore responded: "It was the Jews who crucified Christ. Jews don't believe in the Bible. And neither do those hypocritical Methodist ministers"—Arizona Republic, Phoenix, May 23, 1964.)

In Houston, Tex., Fundamentalists belonging to several denominations started a drive in August against the use of several standard biology textbooks whose preparation had been sponsored by the National Science Foundation, but in November the Texas State Board of Education voted 14 to 6 to adopt them for use in the public schools. The New Mexico State Education Department in December also recommended these books despite the opposition of the New Mexico (Southern) Baptist Convention to the teaching of evolution "as a fact rather than a theory."

Early in November, Mayor John F. Knowlan of Hasbrouck Heights, N.J., authorized the flying of a pennant with the motto "One nation under God" under the American flag outside the town's municipal building. The suggestion had come from a local Knights of Columbus council and a Holy Name Society. In a short while, the pennants became a center of community controversy in several New Jersey and Connecticut towns, the pro-pennant side regarding the display of pennants as a symbol that religion had not been outlawed from public life and the anti-pennant side regarding the display of the pennants as a sign of defiance against the Supreme Court decisions.

Lucy S. Dawidowicz
Jewish Communal Services: Programs and Finances

Many types of Jewish communal services are provided under organized Jewish sponsorship. They are designed to meet those needs of Jews which are not exclusively individual or governmental responsibilities. Although the aim is to serve Jewish community needs, Jewish services may be made available to the total community where the nature of the service permits such extension.

Most services are provided at the geographic point of need, although their financing may be secured from a wider area: nationally or internationally. Geographic classification of services (local, national, overseas) relates to areas of operation. A more fundamental classification would be in terms of types of services provided or needs met, regardless of geography. On this basis, Jewish communal services would encompass:

1. Economic aid—furnished mainly overseas, since this is largely a function of government in the United States.

2. Migration aid—a global function, involving movement between countries, mainly to Israel, but also to the United States in substantial magnitude at particular periods.

3. Absorption and resettlement of migrants—another global function, involving economic aid, housing, job placement or retraining, and social adjustment. The complexity of the task is related to the size of movement, the background of migrants, and the economic and social viability or absorptive potential of the communities in which resettlement takes place.

4. Health needs—met mainly in general hospitals, some specialized hospitals, and out-patient clinics in larger cities in the United States, including facilities for the chronically ill aged. This also includes health facilities in Israel and, to a lesser extent, in Europe.

5. Welfare services—provided primarily through family counseling, child care, and care of the aged. Some of these services are maintained on a regional, as well as a local basis. They are rarely organized on a national
basis except for coordinating and clearance services. Child care and care for the aged are also major activities in Israel.

6. Recreational services—furnished mainly in Jewish centers, summer camps, Hillel units on campuses, and other youth services furnished by B'na'i B'rith.

7. Community-relations functions—maintained by a network of local agencies and a series of national agencies, some of which also operate on regional and local bases. Some national agencies also seek to provide aid to overseas communities in relation to civil rights.

8. Religious agencies—local congregations, national groups of congregations, and associated rabbinical bodies.

9. Jewish education—provided through congregational and other bureaus of Jewish education, specialized national agencies, yeshivot, teacher-training schools, and theological seminaries.

10. Vocational services—provided in larger communities in the United States through specialized agencies (Jewish Vocational Services and Vocational Service of B'na'i B'rith), in sheltered workshops, and sometimes as part of family agencies; overseas in the form of vocational education programs conducted by ORT and other agencies.

11. Cultural agencies—mainly specialized national agencies designed to make for more effective clearance of activities in each field of service among national and local agencies.

The cohesive elements in planning and financing these services are mainly federations and welfare funds, for local services, and federations together with national and overseas agencies, for nonlocal services.

Federations conduct annual fund-raising campaigns. Their planning function is related to the budgeting responsibility. After review of programs and finances, each federation distributes its campaign proceeds to those local, national, and overseas beneficiary organizations which are generally accepted as broad Jewish responsibilities.

INCOME AND COSTS OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES

Estimated income and costs of Jewish communal services can be expressed only incompletely, with exceptions noted where data are not available.

On this basis the “gross national product” for Jewish communal services was almost $625 million in 1963. Most endowment income of federations and local agencies, all local capital-fund campaigns, and all internal congregational operating expense are excluded. Cost of Jewish education may also be understated in this total. This sum covers the major source of income: annual campaigns for contributions, service payments, and public tax funds.

There have been major increases in service payments and in tax funds, with moderate changes in contributed income in the last decade. If data for 1963 are compared with data for 1953, the following major changes are indicated:
1. Federations provided $10 million more in annual campaigns. (Book values of endowment funds increased $37 million for large cities, market values $13 million.)

2. Nonlocal agencies raised $35 million more, including $7.7 million more for Brandeis University; $11 million more for the three major seminary drives; $4 million more for the City of Hope and National Jewish Hospital; $3.7 million more for three institutions of higher education in Israel; $1.6 million more for B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal, and about $1 million more each for ORT, Hadassah, the American Jewish Committee, and the Anti-Defamation League.

3. Other noncontributed income (earnings, investments, service payments, government grants, etc.) rose more than $37 million, of which $27 million was accounted for by Brandeis and Yeshiva universities.

4. Grants by community chests for local Jewish services rose $6 million.

5. Hospital income rose about $155 million—about 90 percent from service payments and most of the remainder from public funds.

6. Care for the aged income rose about $17 million—about 70 percent from service payments and almost all of the remainder from public funds. Some service payments resulted from public welfare programs.

7. Center income rose about $10 million, mainly from internal services (membership and activities fees).

While there are gaps in some of the data (mainly for congregational income and local capital-fund campaigns), the data summarized above indicate that income and costs of Jewish communal services rose at least $270 million from 1953 to 1963.

Results of Jewish Federated Fund Raising

Almost $2.7 billion was raised by the central Jewish community organizations of the United States in their annual campaigns in the 26-year period 1939 through 1964.¹ This period coincides with the organization of UJA, which received over $1.5 billion, mainly from welfare funds. The annual totals for campaign proceeds for this period show the following major changes:

1. From 1939 through 1942 annual levels ranged from about $27 to $29 million.

2. From 1943 through 1945 there were annual rises of over $10 million, so that a level of $57 million was reached by the end of World War II.

3. From 1946 through 1948, the period of the massive post-war DP problem and the effort related to the creation of the State of Israel, fund raising reached its peak of over $200 million in 1948.

4. From 1949 through 1955 the impact of these historic events diminished. As a result, there were successive declines until the level of $107 to $110 million was reached in 1954 and 1955.

5. From 1956 through 1964 campaign results ranged from a high of $138

¹ UJA partners raised funds jointly in 1934 and 1935 but independently before 1934 and in 1936 through 1938; JDC has raised funds since 1914, Keren Hayesod since 1920, and JNF since 1910.
million in 1957 to a low of $123 million in 1958, with results in the last six years within a narrower range of $125 to $130 million. Most of these year-to-year changes reflected the introduction of special-fund efforts to supplement regular campaigns. If these special-fund efforts are excluded, regular campaigns ranged from $109 to $115 million in the five-year period 1956–60 and from $120 to $125 million in the three succeeding years.

These campaigns include only maintenance and operating needs, with minor exceptions. They exclude funds raised in capital-fund or endowment drives conducted by federations alone or together with local Jewish agencies for local hospitals, homes for the aged, centers, and other structures. By con-

TABLE 1. AMOUNTS RAISED IN CENTRAL JEWISH COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS 1939–1964

(Estimates in millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total*</th>
<th>NYUJA</th>
<th>FJPNY</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$ 28.469</td>
<td>$ 6.644</td>
<td>$ 6.000</td>
<td>$ 12.644</td>
<td>$ 15.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>26.911</td>
<td>5.188</td>
<td>6.064</td>
<td>11.252</td>
<td>15.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>29.249</td>
<td>4.671</td>
<td>7.074</td>
<td>11.745</td>
<td>17.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>34.935</td>
<td>6.950</td>
<td>6.628</td>
<td>13.578</td>
<td>21.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>131.421</td>
<td>32.500</td>
<td>11.773</td>
<td>44.273</td>
<td>87.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>156.589</td>
<td>37.000</td>
<td>13.227</td>
<td>50.227</td>
<td>106.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>200.721</td>
<td>52.000</td>
<td>13.157</td>
<td>65.157</td>
<td>135.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>159.330</td>
<td>40.250</td>
<td>12.118</td>
<td>52.368</td>
<td>106.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>142.191</td>
<td>36.660</td>
<td>13.544</td>
<td>50.204</td>
<td>91.987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>136.035</td>
<td>34.562</td>
<td>13.625</td>
<td>48.187</td>
<td>87.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>121.173</td>
<td>29.737</td>
<td>13.339</td>
<td>43.076</td>
<td>78.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>115.266</td>
<td>26.237</td>
<td>13.509</td>
<td>39.746</td>
<td>75.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>110.127</td>
<td>25.200</td>
<td>15.332</td>
<td>40.532</td>
<td>69.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>130.493</td>
<td>32.300</td>
<td>15.584</td>
<td>47.884</td>
<td>82.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>138.078</td>
<td>33.000</td>
<td>15.197</td>
<td>48.197</td>
<td>89.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>123.328</td>
<td>28.078</td>
<td>16.891</td>
<td>44.969</td>
<td>78.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>130.702</td>
<td>30.000</td>
<td>17.211</td>
<td>47.211</td>
<td>83.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>125.613</td>
<td>28.054</td>
<td>17.705</td>
<td>45.759</td>
<td>79.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>129.436</td>
<td>27.905</td>
<td>17.304</td>
<td>45.209</td>
<td>84.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>125.160</td>
<td>27.000</td>
<td>17.184</td>
<td>44.184</td>
<td>80.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>126.000b</td>
<td>44.000b</td>
<td>82.000b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1939–1964 $2,787.953 $986.439 $1,801.514

* Total excludes amounts raised annually in smaller cities having no welfare funds but includes multiple-city gifts which are duplications as between New York City and the rest of the country. Excludes capital fund campaigns of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York: $3 million in 1943, $14.264 million in 1945, $11 million in 1949, and about $100 million in 1961–64, including government grants. Also excludes major capital funds raised by federations for local agencies.

b Provisional estimate based on incomplete results.
Welfare funds raised about $125 million in 1963. Preliminary data for 1964 indicate that results may approximate $126 million (Table 1).

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York has obtained about $100 million in pledges and government grants (Mitchell-Lama and Hill-Burton funds) since 1961 toward a building-fund goal originally set at $104.4 million but later successively revised to $180 million. The campaign is to continue at least through 1967. The largest gift was $4 million, with 15 gifts exceeding $1 million each, and 250 exceeding $50,000 each. Foundations provided $17 million. The plan encompasses about 300 projects, including a proposed affiliation of Montefiore Hospital with the Einstein College of Medicine and the organization of a medical school at Mt. Sinai Hospital. Earlier campaigns for capital purposes had raised $11 million in 1949, $14 million in 1945, and $3 million in 1943.

Although systematic data on local capital-fund raising are not available on an annual basis because of the long-term nature of these efforts, partial figures indicate their magnitude. They are largely conducted by federations outside their annual campaigns. In 1964 alone there were partial reports of plans and drives for community centers in 12 cities, with an estimated construction cost of over $12 million. Hospitals and medical centers in 8 cities were to cost about $30 million. New homes for the aged (some including hospital facilities) in 12 cities were planned at a cost of about $28 million. Thirteen new facilities for Jewish education had goals of $9 million. Some 16 synagogues had goals of $14 million. Many of these efforts were begun before 1964 and were to continue for three to five years afterward, with anticipated substantial noncontributed income (matching federal funds, proceeds of sale of old structures, mortgage loans, etc.). This was exclusive of the drive of the New York federation for $180 million, of Philadelphia for $15 million, and of Chicago for $8.5 million.

Reports on growth of restricted and unrestricted endowment funds of the 12 largest federations, including some but not all capital funds indicate that the total book value (market values are higher) of assets was $22 million in 1948 and rose in succeeding five-year periods to $32 million in 1953, $45 million in 1958, and $70 million in 1963. In 1963 alone these assets grew by $7 million.

Reports from cities with a total Jewish population of 2.5 million listed

---

2 Pledges and collections as of June 30, 1964, were about $68 million. The remainder was for subsequent pledges, for anticipated government grants, some funds held by beneficiary agencies, and sale of buildings to be replaced.
3 See 1964 issues of JTA Community News Reporter. Since coverage is not complete, figures cited are understatements.
4 Capital funds reserved for agency building purposes were excluded.
5 Rudi Walter and Henry L. Zucker, "Endowment Fund Programs of Twelve Large City Federations" (Cleveland, Jewish Community Federation, Third Report, April 1964).
535,000 individual gifts and this excluded tens of thousands of individuals who contributed to organization gifts, Yiddish-newspaper gifts, and the like, especially in the largest cities. Since these cities comprise about 40 per cent of the Jewish population in the United States, the number of givers may be estimated to exceed one million.

The per-capita gift in most federated campaigns in 1963 outside New York City was over $35 (equivalent to a family gift of over $100), if campaign totals are related to total Jewish population in the respective areas. Per-capita gifts are affected by the relative size of the largest gifts in specific cities. Over half of the amounts raised are in the form of gifts of over $1,000 in many federation campaigns, particularly in the larger communities, but over three-quarters of individual gifts are under $100.

The amounts raised by federations are augmented by funds provided by nonsectarian united funds and community chests for local Jewish services. These grants totaled $17.5 million in 1963 to federated agencies and about $8 million to nonfederated agencies. Outside New York City, chests provided $15.3 million to federations, which raised about $81 million. Among the largest cities, only Baltimore and Boston did not receive chest funds. Most larger and middle-sized cities received such support, but the smallest federations tended to receive less in chest funds.

Cities with Jewish populations of the same size frequently raised varying amounts in their federated campaigns and received widely different amounts of chest support. This was related to the relative fund-raising success of particular chest campaigns, to the stage of development of local services in specific communities, to the levels and sources of internal income of local Jewish agencies, and to the prevailing relationships among Jewish federations, Jewish local agencies, and chests.

Independent Campaigns

Each federation determines for itself which beneficiary agencies it will support through allocations. There are 25 nonlocal appeals which are included by most federated campaigns. In general, a beneficiary agency agrees to waive independent fund raising in localities where it receives an allocation from the federation, except where the federation specifically agrees to some form of limited independent fund raising. Agencies raise funds directly in cities where they are not included by federations, generally getting clearance on timing and other aspects of the campaign with the federation. In some cases, maintenance needs of agencies are met by federations while independent solicitations are conducted by the same agencies for capital needs.

In 1963, some 70 agencies raised $68.4 million independently, in addition to the allocations they received from welfare funds.

The New York UJA includes only the national UJA, JWB, and UHS; other nonlocal agencies raise funds independently in New York City. While no accurate estimates are available regarding the totals raised in New York City, partial information suggests that over two-fifths of the $68.4 million raised independently in the United States comes from New York.
Of $22.3 million raised independently by overseas agencies in 1963, Hadassah raised $8.0 million through membership efforts, while the other three women's organizations—Women's American ORT, National Council of Jewish Women, and Pioneer Women—raised $1.4 million, $0.6 million, and $1.0 million, respectively. The three institutions of higher learning in Israel (Technion, Weizmann Inst. and Hebrew Univ.) raised over $5.3 million, mainly in New York City, with a substantial portion earmarked for building funds. The JNF continued its traditional appeal and raised $2.4 million. The other major effort was that of Histadrut, which raised $1.6 million, mainly from Labor Zionist sources in cities where it received no welfare fund allocations.

Most of the total of $5.2 million raised independently in the community-relations field was accounted for by the efforts of the Am. Jewish Com. and ADL in New York City and Chicago and by supplementary efforts in cities where welfare-fund grants were conditioned upon a waiver of separate fund raising or upon clearance of such efforts with the specific welfare funds affected.

A total of $9.3 million was raised by hospitals, mainly City of Hope (Duarte, Calif.) and National Jewish Hospital (Denver, Colo.). Most of these agencies no longer have wide acceptance as welfare fund beneficiaries and are consequently free to conduct vigorous independent efforts.

In the cultural field the major independent fund drives are conducted by Brandeis University ($9.2 million), which does not seek welfare-fund support, and B'nai B'rith Nat. Youth Service Appeal, which raises about $2.8 million, mainly from members of B'nai B'rith.

While $18.4 million was raised independently by religious agencies, the major amounts were for the Einstein medical school of Yeshiva University (over $5.9 million, the greatest portion of which was raised in New York City); the Combined Reform Campaign, $4.4 million, most of which was raised within its membership) and the Jewish Theological Seminary, ($4.2 million, most of which came from supporters of Conservative Judaism).

How much will be raised independently by specific agencies depends on the effectiveness of campaign techniques, attractiveness of the nature of the appeal, effective organization of supporting groups, and, especially the response in New York City. The major efforts are sponsored by groups which neither appeal to welfare funds nor receive significant welfare-fund support (Brandeis University, national health appeals, membership drives of ORT and B'nai B'rith, JNF, Weizmann Institute, American Red Mogen Dovid); agencies which receive allocations for operations but not for capital or special purposes (Hebrew University, Technion, Yeshiva University), and agencies which rely mainly on their own membership for funds and receive only supplemented welfare fund support (Reform campaign, JTS, Hadassah, National Council of Jewish Women, Pioneer Women). The agencies in these

6 In addition Brandeis raised about $58.7 million in pledges as of October 1964 toward a three-year academic development campaign; a major share of the total was secured in New York City.
three categories accounted for about 80 per cent of all funds raised independently in 1963.

A comparison of independent drives in 1963 and in 1953 indicates that there were 17 fund-raising efforts which independently raised more than $1 million annually. This group of agencies increased their independent proceeds from $26.4 million to $59.0 million. However, $23 million of the rise of $33 million was attributable to the six major fund-raising efforts (Brandeis, Yeshiva, Reform campaign, JTS, Am. Friends of the Hebrew Univ. and City of Hope).

Restricted independent fund raising for local agencies (generally arranged by agreement with federations) provides smaller sums for operating purposes. Local hospitals received about $5 million in contributions, while centers, family agencies, child care agencies, and homes for the aged continued to raise over $3 million independently in 1963. These were supplementary contributions; the major share of income was derived from Jewish federations and community chests. These amounts do not include the proceeds from capital-fund campaigns and endowment income (bequests, etc.) received by local agencies.

**Distribution of Funds**

Federation campaigns are conducted on a pledge basis with payments made in installments, except for the smallest gifts. Most campaigns are conducted in the spring of the year. Possibly a third of cash collections on pledges for a given campaign year are paid in succeeding years. As a result, an allowance for "shrinkage," averaging 4.3 per cent, was made in 1963 for the difference between cash and pledges.\(^7\)

Cost of administering federations, including costs of fund raising, budgeting, planning, and other central functions, averaged 13.8 per cent.

These major elements explain the difference in the figures shown for amounts raised (Table 1) and for amounts distributed (Table 3). Amounts distributed also include over $2 million outside New York City from sources other than current campaigns: investment earnings, bequests, and the like.

About 59 per cent of amounts budgeted for 1962 by welfare funds were applied to overseas needs, four per cent to national agencies, and almost 37 per cent to local services.\(^8\) The major shift in 1963 was a decrease of about two per cent in the UJA share outside New York City and an increase of almost two per cent for local services—a decrease of about $2 million for UJA and an increase of about $0.3 million for local services.

The UJA share (included in "Overseas") rose from 58 per cent in 1955 to 65 per cent in 1957 and leveled off at 56 to 60 per cent from 1958 to

---

\(^7\) One hundred and seven federations which raised $72.2 million in 1963 (outside New York City) provided for shrinkage allowances of $3.1 million and set aside $9.9 million for central administration, planning, budgeting and fund raising.

\(^8\) Note that amounts raised are generally larger than amounts budgeted to the extent of shrinkage allowances and costs of operating federations. Therefore percentages of amounts raised will be lower than percentages of amounts budgeted.
1961. In 1963 the UJA share was 54.9 per cent, with the prospect that this might change slightly in 1964.

Overseas agencies other than UJA continued to receive under three per cent of totals budgeted. Together with national agencies all nonlocal, non-UJA agencies continued to receive about seven per cent of the totals budgeted.

A major factor affecting the distribution of funds is the existence of Jewish hospitals in almost all of the large centers of Jewish population. This is reflected in higher shares of funds for local Jewish services and lower nonlocal shares in the very largest cities. Thus, nonlocal agencies received 59 per cent of funds budgeted in 1963 in cities with Jewish populations of 40,000 and over. The smallest communities (Jewish populations of under 5,000), with the least developed networks of local Jewish services, continued to give nonlocal agencies 82 per cent of their budgeted funds. Middle-sized cities gave nonlocal agencies about 71 to 74 per cent of budgeted funds.

Local services received, for operating purposes, about $37.3 million annually in 1962 and 1963. While the total dollar amount remained stable, the local percentage rose because of the decrease in total funds budgeted. Increases were shared by most local fields of service, but there were declines for hospitals and employment services. Income for Jewish local services from community chests rose three per cent in 1963. This was almost equivalent to the rise in the total costs of services eligible for chest support (health, family and child care, recreation, and care for the aged). Federation allocations rose almost one per cent, but this was affected mainly by increased allocations for Jewish education (based on reports from 132 cities in 1963).

There was little change in allocations for local capital purposes in 1963. Such allocations did not exceed 1.4 per cent of the total nationally or 2.0 per cent outside New York City, but those federations which included local capital funds allocated 3.2 per cent of their total funds budgeted for this purpose. Local capital funds are frequently excluded from the annual maintenance campaigns. The amount shown for allocations for capital-fund purposes by federations relates only to minor funds provided for these purposes in the annual campaigns.

Local services receiving the most widespread federation support in communities of all sizes were community centers and Jewish education. They received a greater proportion of the funds in smaller than in larger communities.

There are important variations in the local services included by federations, even among cities more or less equal in Jewish population or campaign results. Federations do not receive community-chest support for Jewish education, local community relations, and local refugee-aid programs. Federations which do support these programs provided seven per cent of their total funds budgeted to Jewish education, 1.7 per cent to local community relations, and 1.4 per cent to local refugee programs.

---

9 This resulted from the transfer to nonsectarian auspices of one local Jewish vocational-service agency.
While community chests provided support for other local services in most of the larger cities, they did not provide such aid in all cities to services which are theoretically eligible for such support. The table below indicates the percentage of total funds budgeted by federations out of their own campaign proceeds for allocations to various local fields of service, where federations were the sole central communal source of support and where there was a sharing of federation and chest support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field of Service</th>
<th>Where Federation is Exclusive Support</th>
<th>Where Support is Shared Federation</th>
<th>Chest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational (centers)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for Aged</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Vocational</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data exclude five major cities where lump-sum arrangements between federations and chests do not require earmarking of chest funds for specific local services.

In making intercity comparisons of allocations for specific fields of service, it is important to note whether the federations being compared have the same inclusion pattern, and if they do not, the approximate percentage value of services excluded by one community but included by another.

The pattern of fund distribution described above is based on budget review by allocations committees of federations and welfare funds. This involves study of agency programs and finances, utilization of factual reports and intercommunity statistical comparisons prepared by CJFWF, and consideration of recommendations by the Large City Budgeting Conference, comprising representatives of 23 of the largest communities. LCBC recommendations deal with 14 nonlocal agencies which receive about three-fifths of all nonlocal federation allocations, exclusive of UJA.

UIA and major UJA agencies (the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., and JDC) participated in "a process of budget information and consultation" with CJFWF in 1963 and 1964.

**AID TO ISRAEL AND OTHER OVERSEAS AREAS**

Aid to Israel by Jews in the United States is channeled through UJA and other overseas agencies and through the Israel Bond Drive. From 1948 through 1964 UJA provided about $740 million for the Jewish Agency for
Israel (through UIA, which also transmitted $115 million to JNF, mainly between 1948 and 1952). JDC used UJA funds for its program in Israel, as part of its ramified overseas services, to the extent of over $140 million. Hadassah raised over $140 million in this period. Sales of Israel bonds were over $627 million in the United States.

United States governmental assistance and reparations and restitution payments from Germany are the other major external sources of aid to Israel. United States government aid to Israel through 1963 was about $780 million, German reparations payments totaled $730 million, or 90 per cent of total reparations due.

There was a rise in foreign currency balances of $113 million in 1963 which resulted in a record balance of $618 million (or $490 million after deduction of short-term debt). This was more than offset by foreign-currency liabilities, mainly loans (Israel bonds, $475 million; export-import bank loan, over $80 million; other long- and medium-term loans, almost $170 million).

Israel's own earnings are largely in the form of exports of goods and services, supplemented by foreign investment and private transfers of funds. Exports reached $336 million in 1963, or about 52 per cent of imports of $649 million. Preliminary data for 1964 indicate exports of about $350 million in 1964, or about 44 per cent of imports of about $790 million. The annual trade deficits ranged from $224 million to $337 million from the creation of the State of Israel through 1963, but the 1964 deficit reached a peak of $440 million.

These figures deal with trade in commodities only. If services are included (tourism, transport, debt service, unspecified government costs), the deficit was $455 million in 1962, $407 million in 1963, and about $525 million in 1964. These deficits were partially offset in 1963 by $350 million and in 1962 by $331 million in "unrequited transfers" consisting mainly of restitution and reparations, campaign proceeds in United States and other countries, personal transfers and United States government aid.

The deficit in trade and services was reduced by $48 million in 1963. The gain was mainly in citrus and diamond exports. This experience was reversed in 1964, with a decline in income from citrus exports and a rise in governmental imports.

**Philanthropic Programs for Israel**

Philanthropic funds continue to be an important source of income for Israel's economy. Although these funds have been for welfare programs, the foreign currency thus made available to the economy through the exchange of dollars for pounds was helpful to the country in earlier years. With the rise of foreign-currency reserves since 1959, this no longer was significant.

---

11 This was included in total receipts of JDC of over $500 million from 1948 through 1964. Total JDC receipts in the 51-year period 1914 through 1964, from all sources, was over $800 million.

12 Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1964, p. 860. The most recent annual rate was $48 million.

American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to CJFWF had available for overseas purposes about $96.6 million in 1962, compared with about $91.1 million in 1963. About 80 per cent of these funds were for Israel. Campaigns in other countries also provided funds for programs in Israel (about $11.3 million in 1963-64). The Bank of Israel reported transmissions of about $85 million to Israel in 1963.

A major development in the Israeli programs supported by philanthropic funds was the resumption of large-scale immigration between 1954 and 1957. Total immigration increased to 55,000 in 1956 and 70,000 in 1957, but averaged under 25,000 annually in 1958, 1959, and 1960. Immigration in the four-year period 1961 through 1964 was 250,000; total immigration for the 16 years of the State of Israel was reported to be 1,139,000.

**Bond Sales for Israel**

Four Israeli bond issues have been floated since 1951: Independence Issue, Development Issue, Second Development Issue and Third Development Issue. Sales of the Third Development Issue began on March 1, 1964.

Flotation of the Independence Issue for a three-year period, from May 1951 to May 1954, resulted in sales of $145.5 million. The second issue, the Development Issue, was floated for a five-year period from 1954 to 1959 and resulted in sales of $234.1 million. Sales of the third issue were $293.7 million in 1964, the end of the five-year period of flotation. Sales of the fourth issue began on March 1, 1964; at the end of 1964 $72.8 million of this issue had been sold. Total sales for all bonds issued were $746.3 million at the end of 1964.

At the end of November 1964 there were outstanding in the hands of the public $446.6 million in Israeli bonds, consisting of $51.0 million in the Independence Issue, $128.1 million in the Development Issue, $216.2 million in the Second Development Issue, and $51.2 million in the Third Development Issue.

From the inception of sales of bonds, in May 1951, through November 1964, $61.0 million worth of the bonds were surrendered in Israel for pounds by the Jewish Agency for Israel. In 1964, $5.2 million worth of bonds were received by UJA in payment of individual pledges. This was a decrease from the 1963 bond "turn-ins" of $6.7 million.

The Third Development Issue provides that a bond must be held for a period of at least two years before a charitable institution may surrender it in Israel for Israeli pounds. As a result, these bonds may not be used in payment of pledges during this two-year period.

Redemption of the Twelve Year Dollar Savings Bonds of the Independence Issue began on May 1, 1963, and redemption of the Ten Year Dollar Savings Bonds of the Development Issue began on April 1, 1964. The appreciated value of bonds of both issues maturing from May 1, 1963, to the end of 1964 is $66.8 million. This amount includes $29.5 million of Independence Issue Bonds which matured during 1964, and $13.6 million Development Issue Bonds which matured during 1964.
The appreciated value of the Savings Bonds which will mature during 1965 is $43.5 million—the same level as in 1964. This consists of $21.9 million of Independence Issue Savings Bonds issued during 1953, and $21.6 million of Development Issue Bonds issued during 1955.

Bond sales in the United States totaled $70.3 million in 1964—an increase of about 27 per cent over the 1963 figure of $55.5 million. Increased sales to individuals together with sharply increased sales to banks and other fiduciaries such as pension funds and employee benefit funds, accounted for a major portion of the increase in sales in 1964. Worldwide sales in 1964 amounted to $85.4 million, the largest amount of Bonds ever sold in any one year and the largest increase over any preceding year.

A substantial portion of the monies received by bond holders upon redemption of their matured bonds was reinvested in State of Israel bonds sold in 1963 and later years.

The proceeds of Bond sales are used for agriculture, industry, power and fuel, housing and educational construction, and transportation and communication.

Reparations and Restitution Funds

Foreign-currency income for individual restitution payments from Germany constituted the largest single source of foreign currency for Israel in 1963. This totaled $139 million in 1963, compared with $134 million in 1962.

Payments from Germany under the reparations agreement were $28 million in 1963 and had reached $730 million, or 90 per cent of the total of $821 million due.

In March 1964 CJMCAG made the eleventh and last yearly allocation of funds put at its disposal by Israel from reparations payments. This was in addition to reparations funds used directly by the Israeli government. Of $10.6 million allocated for the victims of Nazism outside of Israel, $8.2 million was granted for relief and rehabilitation, including about $7.5 million for JDC for programs in Europe and Australia and $375,000 for UHS.13 There were also grants for cultural and educational reconstruction in Europe and the United States. About $10 to $11 million annually has gone for relief programs in Israel in recent years, with the Jewish Agency as the major beneficiary.

A total of $111 million was distributed in 11 years, of which $86 million was for use in Europe, mainly by JDC. No further annual allocations were available after 1964, but a memorial foundation for Jewish culture was established in that year; it was to have available $10 million from Claims Conference funds.

With the end of annual Claims Conference allocations in 1964, there was a loss of income in 1965 for the major beneficiary agencies: the Jewish Agency, JDC, and UHS.

13 Later increased by $50,000.
Overseas Agencies

American Jewish financial support for needs in Israel and other overseas areas is provided mainly through federation allocations to the UJA and about a dozen other overseas agencies. UJA continued to receive about 95 per cent of the overseas allocations of welfare funds. Other overseas agencies raised the major portion of their funds independently.

Total income in 1963 of all overseas agencies was $91.1 million, with $22.3 million raised outside the federations. The largest of these independent fund-raising activities (accounting for over $18 million of this total) were conducted by Hadassah, which raised $8.0 million through membership activities; Hebrew University and Technion, which raised $4.3 million through their building- and special-fund drives; the National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer Women, which raised $2.6 million for Histadrut's welfare activities in Israel; the JNF which raised $2.4 million in its campaign for "traditional income," and the Weizmann Institute, which raised $1.0 million.

United Jewish Appeal

The United Jewish Appeal is a partnership of the United Israel Appeal and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee for joint fund raising. Over 90 per cent of UJA income is received from federations. The remainder, about $4 million, is secured in hundreds of small nonfederated communities, where UJA enlists the cooperation of community leaders in conducting local campaigns for the UJA or joint appeals of which UJA is the major beneficiary. From its inception in 1939, through 1963, UJA received about $1.496 billion and distributed $813 million to UIA; $529 million to JDC, and $84 million to United Service for New Americans, New York Association for New Americans, and UHS.

UJA provides general campaign services to communities (publicity, speakers, and the like) and seeks to secure from welfare funds a maximum share of funds collected. It does not operate any service programs directly. These are conducted by the agencies which share in its proceeds: UIA (actually by the Jewish Agency in Israel), JDC, NYANA, and UHS, which receives most of its income from sources other than UJA.

The distribution of UJA funds in 1963 was in accordance with a formula which has remained unchanged since 1951 and is effective through 1968. This provides that, after deduction of campaign expenses and allocations to NYANA, UIA receives 67 per cent and JDC 33 per cent of the first $55 million raised each year. Beyond $55 million, UIA receives 87.5 per cent and JDC 12.5 per cent. This formula is not applied to the proceeds of "special" campaigns. For 1961, proceeds exceeding $50 million were treated as though they were special funds.

UJA initiated its Israel Education Fund in September 1964. The objective

14 The UJA share of all funds budgeted was 55 per cent in 1963. Its share of gross pledges was 45 per cent (48 per cent outside of New York City).
is to conduct a five-year capital-fund campaign to provide $127.6 million for high-school buildings, teacher-training programs, student scholarships, and related centers, equipment, and facilities. This effort is separate from the annual UJA campaign. Large gifts are to be sought: $100,000 and over payable within five years with no diminution of the gift from the same source to the welfare fund which provides support for the UJA annual campaign and with consultation with local welfare funds in order to avoid conflict with other solicitation efforts. JDC will not share in this fund. The proceeds will be turned over to the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., which will "own, manage and operate the schools and related institutions" to be built with the donated funds; the Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem) will serve as operating agent in Israel. The government of Israel will cooperate by providing land for construction, exempting the institution from taxes, and providing funds toward the cost of maintenance. It will not make similar arrangements with other similar efforts without prior consultation with UJA and JAFI, Inc.

**UJA Special Funds**

From 1956 on, UJA has received "special" funds designed to augment the proceeds of its "regular" funds each year (except—1961). On a pledge basis, UJA income was $62 million in 1963. The 1964 pledge total was estimated at about the same level on a preliminary basis. On a cash basis, UJA had receipts of $60.7 million in 1964 and $60.6 million in 1963. These were the cash amounts received each year regardless of years in which the pledges were made.

UJA seeks agreements with federations in advance of campaigns to maximize its share of campaign proceeds. In 1964 UJA allocation proceeds of about $62 million compared with gross campaign proceeds of about $126 million.

**UJA Special Loans**

In 1961 UJA undertook a ten-year debt-liquidation program which consolidated prior debts of UJA and the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., totaling $65 million. The debts were to be repaid at the rate of ten per cent each year, with renewal of the remainder of the loan at two-year intervals. A two-year postponement of repayment of installments of principal was arranged with the banks and with participating federations during 1964. As a result, resumption of principal repayment was scheduled for May 1966, and the term of the loan was extended to 12 years. The loans were arranged by federations and local banks and underwritten nationally by UJA.

In April 1965 the loan was again refinanced for $50 million for a 15-year period with a group of 11 insurance companies, borrowed by JAFI, Inc., and guaranteed by UJA, and the prior outstanding loans to 97 banks for $45.2 million (including interest) were repaid with the proceeds of the new loan.

UJA had borrowed $64.8 million through federations in 1954. These funds were transmitted to the then Jewish Agency for Israel (by way of UIA) and
resulted in an equivalent credit in Israeli pounds for use in carrying out the welfare activities of the Jewish Agency in Israel (immigration, absorption, and land settlement). Major new borrowing took place in subsequent years. As federations repaid loan installments and interest to local banks, UJA credited such amounts against community allocations to UJA. Such repayments were considered as UIA income in lieu of cash on account of its share of UJA proceeds. Installment repayments were deferred for two years beginning June 1964.

UJA loans have exceeded $45 million for most of the last decade. The amounts outstanding at the end of each year and the new long-term borrowing during each year is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Millions</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/31/55</td>
<td>$39.1</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/56</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/57</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/58</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/59</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/60</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/61</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/62</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/63</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/64</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem borrowed £410 million in medium- and long-term loans and repaid £275 million in principal and interest in the four fiscal years ending March 31, 1964. JAFI, Inc., has no legal responsibility for loans made outside the United States.

**United Israel Appeal**

UJA funds destined for the JAFI, Inc., are disbursed through UIA which is one of the two official partners in UJA. The use of this channel was not affected as a result of the reorganization of the Jewish Agency (see below).

UIA receipts were $38.4 million in 1963 and were estimated at almost $38.0 million in 1964. This compared with peak receipts of about $55 million in 1957 and the lowest annual receipts of about $35 million in 1954 and 1955. While the peak year of UJA fund raising was 1948, the UIA received a lower share from UJA in that year ($37 million) than in more recent years when the JDC share of UJA funds declined.

**Jewish National Fund**

JNF, under the UJA agreement, is permitted to raise $1.8 million annually from “traditional collections” in the United States, after deduction of expenses.

15 Reports to 26th Zionist Congress in Jerusalem (Jewish Agency Jerusalem, November 1964), Appendix 1.
not exceeding $300,000. Its total United States income, including traditional income, bequests, and other income, was about $2.4 million in 1962-63. In addition, JNF receives annual allocations in Israel directly from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). This was about $1.2 million in 1963-64 and about $1.3 million in 1962-63. JAFI, Inc., turned over the financing responsibility to the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) in 1962-63.

In the four fiscal years ending March 31, 1964, JNF had global income of almost £102 million, or an annual average of $8.5 million at current rates of exchange. Most of the funds were used for land reclamation, afforestation, road-laying, and drainage.

Reorganization of the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc.

The Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., was reorganized in 1960 as an autonomous American body. It is administered by a board of 26 Americans and one Israeli. The Jerusalem Jewish Agency maintains a separate branch in the United States (Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.) for activities which are not financed through UJA. The governing board of the JAFI, Inc., consists of 18 designees of UIA and nine designees of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem.

Complete responsibility for the use of American Jewish philanthropic funds provided by federations to UJA for needs in Israel is centered in America. The tax-exempt and tax-deductible status of these contributions remains impaired since American control of funds conforms with policies developed by the Internal Revenue Service for all agencies providing funds for use overseas.

The reorganized JAFI, Inc., utilizes an American staff (stationed in Israel) appointed by and responsible to itself for review of the budget of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem in order to assure American control of the specific programs and costs of resettlement, absorption of immigrants, and related services for which it assumes financial responsibility. The operating agency continues to be the Jerusalem Jewish Agency, with which JAFI, Inc., contracts for the financing and operation of specific agreed-upon projects in Israel.

Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem)

Sources of Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) income are primarily JAFI, Inc., earmarked grants from the United States; the major share of Keren Ha-yesod campaigns in Jewish communities outside the United States; counterpart income flowing from the German reparations agreements; grants and loans by the Israeli government for costs of agricultural settlement, and earmarked contributions for Youth Aliyah.

16 There are three Jewish Agencies for Israel, as follows:
a. Jewish Agency for Israel, in Jerusalem—the operating agency within Israel.
b. The Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.—its branch in the United States.
c. The Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc.—the domestic agency which shares in UJA proceeds (through UIA) and which determines how such funds are to be spent for it by the operating agency in Israel.
In the 17 years 1948 through 1964 the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) received UJA funds of over $600 million. (In earlier years JNF had received an additional $115 million.)

About 80 per cent of contribution income generally comes from the United States. Contributions in 1963–64 accounted for almost $42.9 million transmitted to Israel and almost $9.8 million paid in debt service in the United States. This was well over half of total income (net of repayment of loans). Over $25 million was derived from new loans (net of repayment). Israeli government grants for agriculture and remaining receipts (mainly from reparations—almost $10 million in 1963–64—and earmarked funds) covered the balance of income.

The Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) spent $122.6 million in the year ended March 31, 1964, including loan repayment of principal and interest of $33.2 million. New loans received in that year totaled $58.7 million.

The largest single area of functional expenditures in 1963–64 continued to be for agricultural settlement; $25.2 million. This was partially offset by Israeli government funds of $1.8 million. The objective has been eventual self-support for the newcomer. Aid is provided for the founding of new settlements, irrigation projects, citriculture, equipment, seed, instruction, supplementary employment, and long-term loans. Some 470 villages received Jewish Agency assistance, most of them founded since 1948. The Jewish Agency has been transferring settlers’ agreements to repay Jewish Agency loans to the government in consideration of government grants for agricultural settlement.

The costs of permanent immigrant housing were $27.2 million. Immigration, transportation, and initial reception of immigrants required $24.1 million.

Youth Aliyah programs for the maintenance and education of immigrant and other youth (aged 6 to 17) cost about $4.6 million in 1963–64. Hadassah and other women’s organizations, in the United States and abroad, bore a major share of these costs. Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) and JAFI, Inc., carried the remainder.

Other Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) expenditures included grants totaling $1.8 million for institutions of higher learning in Israel (Weizmann Institute, Technion Hebrew, Bar Ilan, and Tel Aviv universities); allocations of $1.2 million to JNF, and allocations on account of German reparations, organization and information activities and general administrative expenses within and outside Israel.

JAFI, Inc., provided financing toward specific agreed-upon projects conducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) but not by its American Section, the American Zionist Council, or the World Zionist Organization.

Programs Financed by Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc.

In 1963–64 the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., provided over $27.2 million toward costs of $87.3 million for programs operated by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). These expenditures were based upon an agreement that Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) would make specific expenditures on behalf and in ac-
cordance with the instructions of JAFI, Inc. In addition, JAFI, Inc., repaid $6.9 million in loans and $2.8 million in interest in the United States. In 1962–63 JAFI, Inc.'s share of costs amounted to $28.5 million out of $66.4 million.

The programs which received the highest shares of JAFI, Inc., financing were for initial immigrant care, including immigration, transportation, and absorption.

Other non-UJA sources of income were available to the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) for particular programs. These were funds provided by the government for agricultural settlement and by Hadassah and other groups for Youth Aliyah. In each case, JAFI, Inc., earmarked its funds for specific programs.

**FINANCING OF JEWISH AGENCY PROGRAMS 1963–64 AND 1962–63**

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Expenditures by Jewish Agency (Jerusalem)</th>
<th>Contributed by JAFI, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Transportation</td>
<td>$13,007 $17,655</td>
<td>$10,655 $11,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absorption</td>
<td>5,927 6,487</td>
<td>4,800 5,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Settlement</td>
<td>24,891 25,218</td>
<td>5,720 3,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>13,187 27,200</td>
<td>3,646 3,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Aliyah</td>
<td>4,279 5,139</td>
<td>1,017 1,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations to Higher Education</td>
<td>1,933 1,764</td>
<td>1,251 1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Allocations</td>
<td>1,618 1,617</td>
<td>511 —</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1,551 2,213</td>
<td>862 862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66,393</strong></td>
<td><strong>$87,293</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Exchange rate was $1.00 = £ 3.00.

b In addition, the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) spent $13.3 million for debt service in 1962–63 and $33.2 million in 1963–64 in which JAFI, Inc., did not participate. Other expenditures for which JAFI, Inc., did not allocate funds amounted to $2.1 million in 1963–64 and $2.7 million in 1962–63.

**American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee**

JDC maintains a worldwide program of aid to Jews. It assisted 264,000 persons in 1963, of whom 86,400 were in Israel (including ORT and yeshivah students), 83,000 in Europe, 89,500 in Moslem areas, and about 5,600 in other areas.

JDC had two major sources of income until 1965, UJA and CJMCAG. In 1963 JDC had cash receipts of $27.0 million, of which $17.8 million was from UJA and $7.6 million from CJMCAG and other types of restitution.
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income, and $0.9 million from campaigns abroad. These receipts were $0.5 million less than the total of $27.5 million in 1962. JDC spent $25.7 million in 1963, compared with $27.4 million in 1962.

The JDC Malben program of service to sick, aged and handicapped immigrants in Israel continued to account for the largest single share of its appropriations: $7.4 million, or over 25 per cent of the 1963 total. This represented a reduction of $0.3 million. An additional $0.8 million was provided for aid to 110 yeshivot and other traditional institutions in Israel. Malben provided services to 48,910 persons in 1963, including care of the aged in institutions and in their own homes and medical services. Malben accounted for the greatest portion of the almost $140 million spent by JDC in Israel from 1950 through 1963.

Relief, health, and educational programs in Moslem countries, mainly North Africa, have expanded since 1955. In Morocco 55,465 Jews received JDC assistance in 1963, and in Tunisia and Iran 31,000. JDC appropriated $6.2 million in 1963 for work in these areas. Its assistance is channeled through such agencies as OSE in health, the Alliance Israelite Universelle, Otzar Ha-torah, and Lubavitcher schools in education, and ORT in vocational training fields.

JDC programs operated in about a dozen European countries. The largest numbers, 51,000, were assisted in France, recipients including a high proportion of Algerian refugees. The JDC assistance program was aiding 12,000 of the 25,000 Jews in Poland.

ORT and Vocational Education

Vocational training overseas is provided by ORT, which operates in Western Europe, Moslem countries, and Israel. Vocational education in Israel is also offered by Histadrut, Hadassah, Youth Aliyah, and Technion, and by the Israeli government and municipalities.

The global expenditures of the World ORT Union were at an annual level of over $8.3 million in 1963 and 1964. Total ORT trainees in 1963 were 38,000, of whom 19,000 were in Israel, 6,830 in Moslem countries, and the rest mainly in Europe.

American Jewish support of the ORT program is channeled in two ways: through the JDC grant to ORT ($1.95 million in 1964), derived from JDC participation in UJA, and through membership contributions of ORT in the United States. Women's American ORT raised $1.4 million in 1963 and almost $1.5 million in 1964. The agreement between ORT and JDC permits ORT to recruit members at annual dues not to exceed $25.

Migration Services

United Hias Service provides a worldwide service designed to enable Jews to migrate to countries where they can make an economic and social adjustment. UHS assisted about 9,660 Jewish immigrants to migrate in 1964 (including 2,160 to the United States), compared with 5,194 in 1963.

A large proportion of the Jewish immigrants arriving in the United States
remain in New York City. Hence, the financing of the program of the New York Association for New Americans is considered to be a national responsibility, reflected in the continued inclusion of NYANA as a direct beneficiary of national UJA. Jewish immigration to the United States in 1964 was estimated at 8,000 by NYANA; it included immigrants aided by agencies and those arriving independently. Of the immigrants who settled in New York City in 1964 or earlier, about 5,000 received aid from NYANA in 1964. UJA grants to NYANA in 1964 were about $0.7 million compared with $0.866 million in 1963.

**Hadassah**

Hadassah had the largest income of any overseas service agency except UJA: $10.3 million in 1963. Its major projects are for medical services and Youth Aliyah. The new 500-bed Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center on the outskirts of Jerusalem was opened in 1961 at a cost of about $24 million. Medical services in Israel are also provided by the Kuppat Holim of the Histadrut, by governmental departments, and by the Malben program of JDC. Hadassah was planning to effect transfer of some of its health stations to governmental agencies.

The Youth Aliyah program for maintenance and training of immigrant youth (in the earliest years orphaned, now mainly with families in Israel) is maintained by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem); its cost was about $5.1 million in the fiscal year 1963–64. Hadassah’s transmission to Youth Aliyah was about $1.6 million in the fiscal year 1962–63. Other women’s groups in the United States and overseas provide smaller supplementary funds for Youth Aliyah, toward a total income of almost $2.9 million. The number of children cared for at the end of March 1964 was 12,000, including 2,000 in day centers.

**Higher Education in Israel**

Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, and Technion had income in America of about $9.3 million in 1963, mainly in contributions. In addition, all three institutions received grants from the Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc., a beneficiary of UJA, from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), and from the government of Israel. While Weizmann Institute income in the United States is derived from an annual fund-raising dinner and from an investment program, Hebrew University and Technion received over $0.63 million annually from federations in recent years. Their building- and special-fund campaign proceeds were at the $4.3 million level in 1963. The maintenance appeals of the

---

17 All hospital beds in Israel (public, voluntary and private) total about 15,600 and provide about 5.5 million days’ care annually.

18 Government support to higher education in Israel was almost $13 million annually.

19 Of $1.225 million earmarked for higher education by JAFI, Inc., in 1963–64, Weizmann Institute received $859,000, Hebrew University $233,000, Technion $67,000, Bar-Ilan University $30,000, and Tel-Aviv University $33,000. This level was continued in fiscal 1964–65.
two institutions were combined, but their capital fund drives were conducted separately. Both institutions have had marked enrolment increases in recent years, with 9,350 students registered at Hebrew University and about 3,552 at Technion in 1963–64. Hebrew University includes schools of humanities, social sciences, education, social work, physical sciences, agriculture, law, medicine, dentistry and pharmacy. Technion includes schools in various branches of engineering, architecture, and industrial sciences, as well as a technical high school. The Tel-Aviv School of Law and Economics was merged with Hebrew University in 1959.

Bar-Ilan University, founded in 1955 by the American Mizrahi, had a student enrolment of 1,373 in four faculties in 1963–64: Jewish studies, natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, and languages and literature. In accordance with conditions set by the Jewish Agency committee on control and authorization of campaigns, fund raising in the United States has been largely restricted to Mizrahi membership groups and friends.

Tel-Aviv University, affiliated to the municipality, was reorganized as an independent agency and sought public financial support for capital needs on a limited basis beginning in 1964. There were 1,672 students enrolled in 1962–63 in the humanities and natural sciences and in graduate medical courses.

The Haifa municipality plans to initiate university courses in 1964–65 at its own cost but with academic responsibility assigned to Hebrew University.

Religious and Cultural Programs in Israel

There were over 14,000 students in attendance in 1964 in 109 yeshivot receiving JDC support and almost 1,500 students in 39 other yeshivot. Many of these yeshivot set no age limits for their students, although most students are between 14 and 17. They are termed traditional institutions because of their roots in the traditional religious life of Eastern Europe.

Many of the yeshivot receive support from JDC ($0.754 million in 1963). Some of these, and others, receive support from the Federated Council of Israel Institutions ($0.15 million raised in 1963), but a great number also seek funds separately in the United States through collectors (meshullahim) and mail appeals. There are no comprehensive records of the extent of these appeals or their support in Israel, but 1961 receipts of yeshivot in Israel were reported at $7.0 million, of which about a third came from contributions in Israel and about a third from other contributions.

Cultural programs in Israel were supported in the United States through the America-Israel Cultural Foundation ($1.6 million in 1963), which included some 60 agencies in Israel in its appeal. These were mainly agencies in the fields of music, theater, dance, art and literature. Building funds are sought by AICF in addition to funds for maintenance. The major current capital project is for a new structure to house the National Museum at a cost of $6.0 million.

---

20 Aaron Greenbaum, The AJDC and the Yeshivot in Israel (Jerusalem, AJDC, October 1964).
Other Overseas Agencies

While UJA received almost all its income through welfare funds and joint community appeals, other overseas agencies received a smaller share of their total contributions from welfare funds.

The other agencies which received the highest proportion of their income from federations were Federated Council of Israel Institutions, UHS, and AICF.

Hadassah, Pioneer Women, and National Council of Jewish Women have traditionally raised most of their funds through membership activities. National Committee for Labor Israel has raised funds independently in the largest communities, where its membership strength is centered, while seeking federation allocations in smaller and middle-sized communities. American Friends of the Hebrew University and American Technion Society have concentrated their independent appeals on their building and special funds, while seeking federation support for maintenance needs.

Almost all of these agencies were authorized to conduct campaigns for Israel by the Jewish Agency committee on control and authorization of campaigns under conditions set by that committee. The objective of the committee is to help assure the primacy of UJA among appeals for Israel through the cooperation of other authorized campaigns and by avoiding a multiplicity of campaigns.

Fourteen overseas agencies, other than UJA agencies, had income of $26.0 million in 1963, compared with $28.1 million in 1962.

UHS and AICF participated in the cooperative budget review process of the LCBC.

The Labor Zionist effort in the United States is channeled through the National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer Women, which raise funds for Histadrut activities in Israel in education, vocational training, health, and immigrant welfare.

The Jewish Telegraphic Agency is a worldwide news service reporting news affecting the Jewish people. It was reorganized in 1962 and sought, with LCBC approval, to secure direct federation allocations. Such allocations rose from about $36,000 in 1961 to about $145,000 in 1964, including New York UJA.

There are agencies which center their activities in other areas but include limited overseas programs: the National Council of Jewish Women contributes funds for social work and education scholarships and for activities related to the department of secondary and higher education at the Hebrew Univer-

---

21 Authorized agencies in recent years were: American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science (annual fund-raising dinner only); American Friends of the Hebrew University; America-Israel Cultural Foundation; American Red Mogen Dovid for Israel (membership campaign only, no application to welfare funds); American Technion Society; Federated Council of Israel Institutions; Hadassah; Jewish National Fund (traditional collections only—no application to welfare funds); Pioneer Women; and Women's League for Israel (New York area).
sity; the Jewish Labor Committee aids political and labor refugees in Europe and Israel.

Overseas concerns are also shared by some domestic agencies. The American Jewish Committee, the AJCongress, the American Section of WJC, B’nai B’rith, JWV, and the Jewish Labor Committee are such agencies.

**NATIONAL AGENCIES AND SERVICES**

National agencies deal with the continuing needs of American Jews in civil rights, health, education (both religious and secular), youth services, culture, and the like. In some communities there are local service agencies which function in one or another of these areas, and the task of serving total needs may be said to be divided between national and local agencies. This is true particularly in community relations, Jewish education, health, and vocational services. Because some agencies operate in more than one field of service, there are selective multiple references to specific agencies in the sections which follow.

The local federation and welfare fund provides a link between local, national, and overseas services by means of centralized fund raising, federation review of agency programs in the process of budgeting funds, and planning (and sometimes operating) local services.

The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds serves local central community organizations by helping to strengthen fund raising, budgeting, planning and coordination of services, public relations, intercity and national-local relations, and overseas services. It provides specialized consultation in such fields as family service, child care, care of the aged, and health services, and in basic community organization.

**Community Relations**

Response to threats to the status of Jews in other countries was an important factor in the creation of modern Jewish community relations agencies. The major current emphasis is on improvement of domestic group relations.

Each of the five major national Jewish community relations agencies serves a membership: directly in the case of the Am. Jewish Com., AJCongress, and JWV; indirectly in the case of ADL (for B’nai B’rith membership) and the Jewish Labor Committee (for trade-union membership). Some of them also conduct foreign-affairs activities and cultural programs and issue publications of interest to circles wider than their own membership.

The Am. Jewish Com. and the ADL utilize mass media (radio, TV, movies, press, magazines, etc.) and conduct specialized programs such as interfaith and intercultural education, the improvement of racial relations and work among business and industry, labor, veterans, youth, and ethnic minorities. Both maintain regional offices as two-way channels for the integration of their national and local programs.

The other three agencies concentrate on more specialized approaches: AJCongress on legal and legislative activities, Jewish Labor Committee on work
with labor unions, and JWV on work with veterans' groups. Interfaith and other community-relations activities are also conducted by congregational associations, although these concentrate on aid to the religious programs of affiliated congregations.

After the Joint Defense Appeal fund-raising arrangement was terminated at the end of 1962, both the Am. Jewish Com. and the ADL conducted separate campaigns for funds. Both increased their gross receipts from their independent New York City and Chicago campaigns, while welfare fund support, in the aggregate, was close to the previous JDA level.

The National Community Relations Advisory Council serves as the coordinating and clearance agency for the AJCongress, Jewish Labor Committee, JWV and the three congregational associations, and for 74 local and regional community-relations councils. (ADL agreed to rejoin NCRAC early in 1965.)

The NCRAC, AJCongress, Jewish Labor Committee and JWV participate in the cooperative budget review of the LCBC. The ADL began to participate in 1963.

The five national operating agencies and NCRAC received $9.4 million in 1963 compared with $8.4 million in 1962. Most of the increase was secured from independent fund raising in New York City by the former JDA agencies.

Health

Living conditions of Jews arriving in the United States at the close of the last century made for a high incidence of tuberculosis and impelled the creation between 1899 and 1914 of three national tuberculosis hospitals, a sanitarium, and a home for children of TB patients (as well as a specialized arthritis hospital). An additional motivation was the theory that the climate of areas like Denver and Southern California was helpful in TB cases.

These institutions came into existence before many of the present local Jewish hospitals were organized. Improvement in the health of Jews and medical advances in recent years in TB therapy led to a shift in emphasis by the TB hospitals to problems relating to the heart, cancer, and research and treatment of asthma in adults. However, TB still continued to represent a major share of days' care provided for all ailments.

Most fund raising by these agencies is conducted independently. Income from federations amounts to about one-half of one per cent of the institutions' total income.

Income of the six agencies in 1963 was $13.7 million compared with $12.5 million in 1962, with almost all of the increase going to the City of Hope near Los Angeles. Two of the agencies (City of Hope and National Jewish Hospital in Denver) accounted for 80 per cent of the total.

The Albert Einstein College of Medicine, under the sponsorship of Yeshiva University in New York City, began functioning in 1955. Its receipts in 1963 were $19.4 million out of a total of $25.2 million for the university. Its student enrolment in 1963–64 was 366. It awarded 85 M.D. degrees in 1963.
Service Agencies

Basic services in many program areas are provided by local service agencies, financed in large measure by federations and (in some fields) community chests and united funds. These local agencies utilize national services which bring to them the experience of other communities and the results of national program planning. There are five national organizations that serve local Jewish community centers, Jewish personnel in the Armed Forces, education, religion, and vocational guidance. These agencies serve as coordinating and consultative bodies for their respective fields.

The National Jewish Welfare Board is the largest of these agencies. JWB received $1.438 million in 1963 out of a total of $1.784 million for the five agencies. In addition to the assistance it provides to Jewish community centers, JWB conducts a program of service to Jews in the Armed Forces and sponsors a number of Jewish cultural projects. JWB adopted a financial plan in 1961 which was related to federation income for its Armed Services program and community-center budgets for its center services program. Since federations frequently provide funds to centers (as do community chests), JWB continues to look to federations for support of both of its basic programs. JWB support from United Service Organizations for programs for the Armed Forces was sharply reduced after April 1964 as a result of a general reorganization of USO. The annual level of JWB-USO operations was reduced from $.355 million in 1963 to $.131 million for 1965.

The American Association for Jewish Education serves local communities with studies and consultation in educational trends, stimulation of student enrolment, recruitment and placement of teachers, and pedagogic materials. It also aids the professional organization of school administrators, through its National Council of Jewish Education.

Other national service agencies are the Jewish Occupational Council, which serves local JVS agencies and national agencies concerned with Jewish occupational adjustment; the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, which serves as a forum for exchange of experience of professional workers in all fields of Jewish communal service, and the Synagogue Council of America, which represents its affiliated Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbinical and congregational associations and fosters cooperation with Christian bodies and make representations to governmental agencies.

NCRAC provides service to 74 affiliated local community relations agencies.

Jewish Culture

A CJWF survey of national Jewish cultural programs published in November 1959 (AJYB, 1960 [vol. 61], pp. 149–164) recommended the establishment of a Jewish Cultural Foundation “to serve as the focus of the national cultural effort” and the establishment of a Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies related to the foundation. The foundation was established in 1960 as an autonomous corporation, with an associated Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies in which are represented 16 participating agencies.
Specific activities undertaken in the first five years included a program of awards to scholars for research, earmarked grants to existing cultural agencies for high-priority projects, information on the Jewish cultural field, aid to the Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies for interagency consultation, and information on cultural agencies to welfare funds.

The cultural field includes many small agencies. Although 16 agencies had income of $24.2 million in 1963, Brandeis University accounted for 70 percent; B'nai B'rith Nat. Youth Service Appeal for 15 percent; and ZOA and Delaware Valley College for four percent each of the total. The remaining 12 agencies received $1.7 million in 1963.

Four of the agencies are institutions of higher learning: Brandeis University, Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture, Dropsie College, and Jewish Teachers' Seminary and People's University. In addition, Yeshiva University includes university courses in the arts and sciences as well as a medical school and a theological seminary.

Research and scholarly publication programs are conducted by YIVO Institute for Jewish Research; by the Conference on Jewish Social Studies; by the American Academy for Jewish Research; by the American Jewish Historical Society, the American Jewish Archives, and the American Jewish History Center, and the Jewish Museum of the Jewish Theological Seminary, and by Histadruth Ivrit and Bitzaron. Population studies are conducted mainly by the CJFWF and the Jewish Welfare Board. Both of these agencies were planning to expand their research programs in 1965.

The Jewish Publication Society specializes in publishing books of Jewish interest. The National Conference of Jewish Communal Service publishes a journal dealing with social work developments. Dropsie College publishes the Jewish Quarterly Review. CJFWF issues research reports on community organization, health and welfare planning, campaigning and budgeting, as well as studies of specific local service agencies.

Reference yearbooks are published in a number of fields. They include the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK (published jointly by the American Jewish Committee and JPS), the Yearbook of Jewish Social Service (published by CJFWF, and the JWB Center Yearbook. CJFWF also publishes an annual summary of major program and financial developments in all fields of Jewish communal service for which data are available ("Jewish Communal Services: Programs and Finances"). JWB conducts activities designed to stimulate interest in Jewish books and music and operates a Jewish lecture bureau.

B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal (Hillel Foundations, B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, and B'nai B'rith Vocational Service), and Jewish Chautauqua Society emphasize youth activities. BBNYSA agencies conduct local operations, coordinated on a regional and national level.

Religion

National religious agencies provide training for rabbis, cantors, Jewish educators, shohatim and other religious functionaries, assist programs of religious
congregations, including elementary Jewish education, and encourage the enlistment of religiously unaffiliated members of the Jewish population.

Each of the three religious wings has its own rabbinical association and congregational association, with affiliated national associations of sisterhoods, men's clubs and youth groups. Nationally they attempt to help organize new congregations and publish ritual and educational materials. The three wings are represented in the Synagogue Council of America. In 1964 the Reform and Conservative congregations had enrolled well over 200,000 families each, exclusive of ancillary sisterhoods, brotherhoods, men's clubs, youth groups, and nonmember users of synagogues. Data on Orthodox and unaffiliated families were not available (see "Orthodoxy in American Jewish Life," p. 21).

The major seminaries rely extensively on associated congregations for their financial support, sometimes through per capita arrangements, but also receive federation support. They generally campaign independently in larger cities and in communities where federations believe that such programs should be completely a congregational responsibility.

The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion prepares religious functionaries for Reform Judaism; the Jewish Theological Seminary for Conservative Judaism, and Yeshiva University and several smaller institutions for Orthodox Judaism. Some of the programs conducted by the major seminaries involve interfaith activities designed to promote better understanding between Jews and Christians. Yeshiva University combines a theological seminary and a school for Jewish educators with a liberal-arts college, a medical school, and other graduate schools, including a social-work school.

Aid to religious day schools is a major function of the various Orthodox organizations. (See pp. 72-75 and passim.)

Twenty-two national religious agencies received $42.6 million in 1963, compared with $33.8 million in 1962. Most of the rise was accounted for by the Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University, whose income increased by $5.6 million in 1963. There were also substantial rises in income for the Combined Campaign for Reform Judaism and JTS.

LOCAL SERVICES

Central communal sources (Jewish federations and chest-united funds) provided about $57 million for local Jewish services in 1963.

Jewish federations supplied about $38.7 million in 1963 (and the same amount in 1962) to local Jewish services in health, family and child care, refugee aid, Jewish centers, Jewish education, care of the aged, vocational services, and community relations. Federations constituted the major source of contributed income for local Jewish agencies.

Nonsectarian community chests and united funds provided an additional estimated $18.3 million in 1963, in most cases through Jewish federations, but in some cases directly to Jewish service agencies. Of this sum, $11.8

22 Includes Greater New York Fund and NYC United Hospital Fund.
million was received in the 13 largest cities in which 75 per cent of the Jewish population resides. Community chests generally restrict their support to agencies for health, family and child care, care of the aged, and Jewish centers. In 109 communities, community-chest financing was provided to 76 centers, 57 family and child-care agencies, 17 homes for aged, and 14 hospitals. A substantial share of contributed communal income even in these fields comes from Jewish federations, particularly for health and care of the aged services. Federations have, in addition, the exclusive responsibility for sectarian activities in the fields of refugee care, Jewish education, and community relations.

The pattern of financing in these 109 communities is tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Federation Alone</th>
<th>Chest Alone</th>
<th>Both Federation and Chest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Child Care</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment, Guidance</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available data for 132 communities for 1963 and 1962 show how central communal funds (federation and chest income) were distributed among various fields of local service (Table 5). Federations continued to provide roughly three-fifths and community chests two-fifths of central communal funds received by local agencies in these communities, but these totals include many fields of service and agencies which receive no chest support. The rise in funds in 1963 was 1.8 per cent. Total dollar allocations by Jewish federations for local services have risen since 1954.

Rises from 2.4 to 6.7 per cent in central community grants were experienced in 1963 in recreation, care of the aged, family and child care, Jewish education, and local community relations. There were decreases in grants for employment and vocational guidance (3.0 per cent) because of the transfer of one agency to nonsectarian sponsorship, and for hospitals (4.9 per cent).

The major sources of funds for local service agencies other than central funds are payments for service by users and public tax funds. Funds from these sources have risen more than community funds. Between 1958 and 1963 a group of 33 general hospitals received increases of about $74 million in patient fees and about $13 million in public tax funds, while grants from central community funds rose by $0.7 million.23 Such grants accounted for 4.8 per cent of receipts of general hospitals in 1963.

A group of about 47 homes for the aged increased their income from service payments by about $4 million in this period. Family agencies doubled

23 The same agencies obtained $122 million more from service payments and $16 million more from tax funds in 1963 than in 1953.
their income from service payments in this period (from $0.4 million to $0.9 million). Child-care agencies showed little change in income from service payments (about $1.1 million) in this period, while income from tax funds more than doubled (from $2.8 million to $6.7 million).24

An analysis of allocations for local services by 97 communities over a five-year span (1959–1963) indicates significant changes: Both chest and federation grants rose at the same rate, 14 per cent. The federation share of allocations was stabilized at about 60 per cent in 1959–1963. Allocations for care of the aged and recreational services rose 21 to 25 per cent. Allocations for Jewish education rose 19 per cent, while family, child-care, and vocational services rose 15 per cent. Hospital allocations rose least of all (4 per cent) while refugee care allocations fell 13 per cent. A similar analysis for the decade 1954–63 indicates that chest grants rose 39 per cent, while federation grants rose 29 per cent. The sharpest rises in the decade were for care of the aged, 79 per cent; employment services, 68 per cent; centers, 59 per cent; Jewish education, 52 per cent; family and child-care services, 44 per cent, and local community relations, 37 per cent. Allocations for refugee care fell 62 per cent.

Health Programs

Most local Jewish hospitals are in the largest centers of Jewish population. Fifteen of the 16 cities with more than 40,000 Jewish population in the United States and Canada have local Jewish hospitals;25 in the 15,000 to 40,000 population group, eight of 16 cities have local Jewish hospitals, with only three hospitals in smaller cities. As a result of this concentration of health services in the largest centers of Jewish population, local health allocations continued to average almost 30 per cent of total local allocations in this group of cities.

In 1963 there were 20,047 beds in 62 general and special hospitals under local Jewish sponsorship. Federations and chests provided $13.4 million for 49 of these local hospitals in 26 cities: 21 hospitals (mainly in New York City, where $5.9 million of this combined total was provided—$5.0 million by federation and $0.9 million by chests)26 received funds from both sources, but the greater portion of funds was secured from federations; 10 received funds from neither, 16 received $2.2 million from federations alone, and 12 received $1.0 million from chests alone.27

A total of 6.2 million days’ care was provided in 1963 by 63 local (general and special) Jewish hospitals. Non-Jewish patients constituted 68 per cent of hospital admissions in 1963.

"Third party" payments for service (Blue Cross, public tax money) have

24 Statistics cited for local services are for comparable agencies, wherever possible, for which data were available in both years. They do not include all agencies in the respective fields.
25 The exception is Washington, D.C.
26 In other cities, eight hospitals received $2.8 million from federations and $1.2 million from chests; $0.4 million was unspecified in one city.
27 Yearbook of Jewish Social Services, 1964, Tables H-III and H-V. Reports for 1963 are incomplete; 1962 reports indicate an additional 1,141 beds in eight hospitals.
furnished the major share of increases in recent years while central grants from federations have been rising moderately in some communities and declining in others. Together with chest grants, these accounted for less than five per cent of operating receipts. In 57 hospitals payments for service (individual fees, Blue Cross insurance, and tax support) rose to $238 million (or about 86 per cent of operating receipts) in 1963.

**Family and Child Care**

Family service agencies provide personal and family counseling, family-life education, psychiatric services, and a limited amount of economic aid. These activities are frequently conducted jointly with child-care and refugee agencies. Specialized Jewish casework agencies exist in most cities of over 5,000 Jewish population. As with health programs, most services are provided locally, although there are several regional programs and one national home for asthmatic children.

In 1963, 86 family agencies reported a total of 65,469 open cases on their rolls. Although refugee cases constituted 19 per cent of all cases receiving financial assistance, they accounted for only six per cent of all active cases. Refugee cases accounted for 34 per cent of financial assistance, with average monthly allowances of about $131 per case.

A total of 8,028 children were under care during 1963 in 52 child-care agencies for which data were available. About 32 per cent of children under care at the end of the year were in foster homes and 27 per cent were in institutions; most of the remainder lived at home or with relatives.

Central communal allocations by federations and community chests for family and child-care services rose 3.9 per cent in 1963. Such allocations continued to account for about 79 per cent of total receipts for family agencies and 26 per cent of the receipts of child-care agencies. For child-care agencies, an additional 49 per cent was provided by public tax funds.

**Refugees**

Refugee services in communities are financed locally, although they may be considered as extensions of an overseas problem. Postwar immigration to the United States began in volume late in 1946, reached its peak in 1949, and has declined since then except for brief upturns in 1951, 1957, and 1962. There was a parallel decline in local refugee costs for most of these years, except 1962 when there was a rise. While refugee costs accounted for 6.6 per cent of local allocations in 1954, they accounted for only 1.9 per cent in 1963.

Because well over half of the immigrants tend to settle in New York City, the largest share of refugee costs are incurred by NYANA, financed by the national UJA. UHS seeks to encourage resettlement in other communities, where the prospects for adjustment and self-support may be better than in New York City. When immigrants arrive in these cities, economic aid and

28 Reports for these agencies include refugee services which may account for about 8 per cent of allocations to family and child-care agencies (see relative proportions in Table 5).
counseling are provided through local refugee programs, generally administered by the Jewish family agencies. In such arrangements local agencies share overhead costs.

Recreation

According to JWB, there were some 340 Jewish community centers with a membership of about 687,000 in 1962. About 33 per cent of members were under 14, 17 per cent were 14 to 24, and half were 25 years or older.

Estimated total community center expenditures in 1962 were about $28.7 million, compared with $27 million in 1961, exclusive of separate camping agencies. A decade earlier, in 1952, these expenditures had been $14 million, while the 1945 level was $7.2 million for a smaller network of centers. Federation and chest allocations to centers and other recreational facilities rose 4.0 per cent in 1963 and 21 per cent in the five-year period 1959–1963 (a rise of 59 per cent since 1954).

Although center fees tend to be kept at a level judged low enough to admit all who seek to use the facilities, the share of center income derived from fees, memberships, and other internal sources has increased in recent years. They rose from 50 per cent of center receipts in 1952 to 61 per cent in 1962, reflecting higher dues in new centers. Central community support from federations and community chests provided the balance of finances. In New York City there is minor chest support; in Baltimore, Boston, and six other important cities, none; and in five other major cities lump-sum grants from chests do not earmark center funds. However, in most cities chests generally provide greater support than federations (48 out of 72, the remaining 24 receiving more federation support).

Both sources of financing accounted for $9.5 million in 132 communities outside New York City. Lump-sum arrangements in which chest funds were not earmarked for specific local Jewish services accounted for $2.2 million of this total, cities with exclusive federation support received over $0.9 million, and cities with exclusive chest support over $0.6 million, while the greatest number of cities had support of almost $4.9 million from both sources.

Homes for the Aged

There were 73 homes for the aged, which reported 13,289 beds. They cared for 16,024 residents, who received 4.4 million days' care during 1963. This was a rise of 341 residents over 1962. Federations and chests provided 12 per cent of receipts, and 79 per cent was secured from payments for service, including public funds. Federation allocations to homes for the aged rose about 25 per cent between 1959 and 1963 (79 per cent since 1954), increasing steadily as the proportion of aged in the population continued to grow.

Receipts of $30.3 million were reported for 1963 by 57 of the homes, with payments for service accounting for $18.3 million and public funds for $5.6 million. Federations and chests reported channeling $3.7 million (including over $2.8 million outside New York City) to 46 homes. There were 11 homes which received support from neither source.
Jewish Education

There is an estimated enrolment of close to 600,000 students—over 90 per cent of them in congregational schools, less than eight per cent in all-day schools, and the balance in afternoon and Sunday communal classes. Recent estimates of costs and major sources of income are not available.

The AAJE national study of Jewish education (AJYB, 1960 [Vol. 61], pp. 127–149) issued in 1959 estimated that the cost of educating 553,600 students in 1958 was “over $60 million.” This figure was derived from an estimate of average costs in a number of cities coming to $46.5 million in 1956, and took into account “general cost increases” and building-maintenance costs for congregational schools, which had not been included in estimates of costs in cities other than New York City.

The exact extent of the rise in cost since 1958 is not known. However, enrolment rose at least six per cent by 1962. The consumer price index rose another five per cent, and estimates for New York City of $17.2 million for 1956 (or 37 per cent of the gross, unadjusted total for that year), increased to about $27.7 million in 1962–63. On the basis of these indicators, the cost of Jewish education since 1958, when it was about $60 million, may have risen more than $10 million, for a total of over $70 million. This rough estimate is advanced only in the absence of more reliable data.

The major sources of support are congregational and parental. The scale of tuition fees is frequently dependent on congregational membership and includes “scholarship” arrangements to avoid barring students from low-income homes. Financing of Jewish education is almost inseparable from congregational financing because of joint housing, joint staffing, and the pivotal role played by bar mitzvah preparation in Jewish education.

Jewish federations provide over $5 million annually for Jewish education. Allocations to local Jewish schools and bureaus of Jewish education, reported by Jewish federations, were $4.7 million outside New York City in 1963, which was 2.4 per cent more than a year earlier. There has been a gradual, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education: they were 19 per cent higher in 1963 than in 1959 and 52 per cent higher than in 1954. As with hospitals and (to a lesser extent) community centers, major reliance for financing services is placed on service payments by users.

Community Relations

Organized programs designed to improve intergroup relations and deal with specific instances of antisemitism exist primarily in the large and intermediate communities. The local activities financed by federations received about $.88 million in 1963, a rise of 11 per cent since 1959 and 37 per cent since 1954. Allocations in 1963 rose three per cent. In some areas, local and regional community-relations programs are financed by national agencies as part of a national network of regional offices.

Employment and Vocational Services

These programs are designed to assist Jews in finding employment and to guide Jewish youth and others in the selection of trades and professions, mainly by workshops and retraining services. Jewish vocational agencies or departments of Jewish family services operate mostly in the larger cities. Federations provided $1.3 million in 1963, while substantial and growing supplementary income was received from government sources and service payments. Almost $3 million in noncontributed income was identified. A complementary program is provided by a network of vocational service bureaus financed by the B'nai B'rith Nat. Youth Service Appeal.

Local allocations for vocational programs decreased by 3.0 per cent in 1963, primarily as a result of the transfer of one Jewish agency to nonsectarian auspices. The gain since 1958 was 15 per cent.

Changes in Financing Since 1954

The major changes which took place in federation and chest support of local Jewish services in the ten-year period 1954–1963 are briefly noted. Only refugee costs fell—$1.1 million, while the major rises were for:

1. Recreational services, almost $3.4 million; 2. Family and child care services, over $2.4 million; 3. Jewish education, almost $1.6 million; 4. Aged care, almost $1.3 million; 5. Hospitals, almost $0.3 million; 6. Employment and vocational service, $0.5 million. Local community-relations and chest grants for federation administration increased by over $0.2 million each.

Of total rises of about $9.0 million since 1954, chests provided about $4.1 million, and federations $4.9 million.

S. P. Goldberg
TABLE 1A. ESTIMATED ANNUAL LEVEL OF INCOME AND COSTS IN 1963 OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES IN U.S.

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welfare Fund Contributions (excluding capital funds)</td>
<td>$125.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grants by United Funds and Community Chests</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other Contributions to National and Overseas Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including capital funds)</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Income of National and Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hospital Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>243.8e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Family Service Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Child Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jewish Vocational Service (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>3.0e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Aged Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Center Income (excluding 1 and 2)a</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Jewish Education Income (excluding 1 and 2)b</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**                                                      | $624.3  |

[Total excludes endowment income in most communities; local capital fund campaigns, etc., and internal congregational operating expense.]

a Based on JWB estimate that 61 per cent of income comes from internal sources and that cost of all centers approximates $28.7 million.
b Based on revision of estimate in National Study of Jewish Education, less welfare fund allocations. See text.
c Understated: excludes some nonreporting hospitals and local vocational services.

TABLE 2. SALE OF STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS, 1951–1964

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cash Sales Incl. Conversions</th>
<th>Sales in United States</th>
<th>Sales Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951a (May 1–Dec. 31)</td>
<td>$52,647</td>
<td>$52,506</td>
<td>$141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>47,521</td>
<td>46,516</td>
<td>1,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>36,861</td>
<td>31,551</td>
<td>5,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>40,406</td>
<td>34,361</td>
<td>6,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>43,507</td>
<td>36,681</td>
<td>6,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>54,525</td>
<td>45,699</td>
<td>8,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>49,854</td>
<td>40,696</td>
<td>9,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>46,541</td>
<td>37,763</td>
<td>8,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>52,265</td>
<td>42,628</td>
<td>9,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>51,965</td>
<td>41,390</td>
<td>10,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>57,405</td>
<td>45,287</td>
<td>12,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>58,125</td>
<td>46,396</td>
<td>11,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>69,221</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>13,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>85,460</td>
<td>70,356</td>
<td>15,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**                                                      | $746,303 | $627,330 | $118,973 |

a Redemption of 12-year bonds issued in 1951 to 1955 began on May 1, 1963.
### TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION TO FIELDS OF SERVICE OF FUNDS RAISED BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS,* 1962 AND 1963

(Estimates in millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Amount Budgeted To</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$101,730</td>
<td>$105,481</td>
<td>$32,437</td>
<td>$33,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overseas Agencies</strong></td>
<td>58,651</td>
<td>62,390</td>
<td>17,348</td>
<td>17,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>United Jewish Appeal</strong></td>
<td>55,897</td>
<td>59,437</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Overseas</strong></td>
<td>2,754</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Agencies</strong></td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>4,425</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Relations</strong></td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Welfare</strong></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural</strong></td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious</strong></td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Agencies</strong></td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Operating Needs</strong></td>
<td>36,585</td>
<td>36,570</td>
<td>14,741</td>
<td>15,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Refugee Care</strong></td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Capital Needs</strong></td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on experience of communities which are currently CJFWF members and some smaller cities which are not CJFWF members but which had been included in the base group of communities used in 1948 when this statistical series was started. Minor differences in amounts and percentages due to rounding (generally less than 0.1 per cent). (Community chest support excluded from this table but included in Tables 5, 6.)

b Figures for New York include New York UJA and Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. Local refugee costs in New York City are borne by NYANA, a direct beneficiary of UJA nationally. Most overseas and domestic agencies which are normally included in welfare funds in other cities conduct their own campaigns in New York. The New York UJA included the following beneficiaries (in addition to the National UJA): UHS and JWB. Data for New York UJA based on estimates of distribution of 1963 and 1962 campaign proceeds, regardless of year in which cash was received.

c The difference between this amount and total raised in Table 1 represents mainly "shrinkage" allowance for non-payment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, elimination of duplicating multiple-city gifts, and contingency or other reserves.

d Includes small undistributed amounts in "total" and "other cities" columns.

e NYANA is included in UJA totals.

f Less than .05 of one per cent.
### TABLE 3-A. DISTRIBUTION TO FIELDS OF SERVICE OF (Excludes Total Under 5,000*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Amount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budgeted</strong></td>
<td>$69,293,091</td>
<td>$72,251,076</td>
<td>$7,710,533</td>
<td>$8,133,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>41,303,182</td>
<td>44,532,204</td>
<td>5,802,346</td>
<td>6,228,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>38,897,142</td>
<td>41,937,406</td>
<td>5,522,255</td>
<td>5,939,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>2,406,040</td>
<td>2,594,798</td>
<td>280,091</td>
<td>289,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,015,405</td>
<td>4,067,317</td>
<td>538,510</td>
<td>519,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,356,927</td>
<td>2,359,088</td>
<td>220,468</td>
<td>204,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>49,542</td>
<td>51,059</td>
<td>26,816</td>
<td>26,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>470,242</td>
<td>483,056</td>
<td>67,968</td>
<td>68,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>300,424</td>
<td>314,251</td>
<td>139,476</td>
<td>137,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>838,270</td>
<td>859,863</td>
<td>83,782</td>
<td>82,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>21,843,508</td>
<td>21,556,491</td>
<td>1,271,842</td>
<td>1,272,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>728,355</td>
<td>727,838</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>4,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,399,907</td>
<td>1,363,259</td>
<td>91,889</td>
<td>105,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent</strong></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The difference between totals budgeted for beneficiaries and gross budgeted for all purposes represents "shrinkage" allowance for nonpayment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses and contingency or other reserves. The difference between what a community may budget for all purposes (its gross budget) and totals raised may also reflect the extent that the budgeted amounts may include funds on hand from previous campaigns (reserves, etc.). Minor differences in amounts and percentages because of rounding (generally less than 0.1 per cent).

* Jewish population.
## FUNDS RAISED BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS

### New York City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Raised</th>
<th>5,000–15,000*</th>
<th>15,000–40,000*</th>
<th>40,000 and Over*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$11,387,371</td>
<td>$11,732,899</td>
<td>$9,090,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>7,643,917</td>
<td>8,003,674</td>
<td>5,890,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>7,193,482</td>
<td>7,510,882</td>
<td>5,422,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>450,435</td>
<td>492,792</td>
<td>467,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2,462,175</td>
<td>2,403,203</td>
<td>2,285,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2,462,175</td>
<td>2,403,203</td>
<td>2,285,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,966,644</td>
<td>23,705,115</td>
<td>20,758,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>41,104,469</td>
<td>42,704,406</td>
<td>1,207,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>41,104,469</td>
<td>42,704,406</td>
<td>1,207,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,145,926</td>
<td>2,169,535</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,386,935</td>
<td>1,397,979</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,525</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266,627</td>
<td>262,477</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,920</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,920</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>15,823,960</td>
<td>15,731,581</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,823,960</td>
<td>15,731,581</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>534,900</td>
<td>504,275</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>478,919</td>
<td>496,059</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 50,000 and Over*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Raised</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>$41,104,469</td>
<td>$42,704,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>15,823,960</td>
<td>15,731,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Includes small undistributed amounts.

**Percentage details may not add to sub-totals and totals, because of rounding.

Less than .05 per cent.
TABLE 4. ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION AND CHEST ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL SERVICES IN 1963a

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>$12.9</td>
<td>$ 5.5</td>
<td>$ 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services (incl. Free Loan)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Aid</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capitald</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$55.1</td>
<td>$17.0</td>
<td>$38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Federations</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Chests</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong>a</td>
<td>$55.1</td>
<td>$17.0</td>
<td>$38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Excludes Chest funds of $0.4 million in New York City (mainly United Hospital Fund) and $.4 million mainly in Washington, D.C. and smaller cities; also excludes over $1.2 million in smaller cities provided by Federations.

b Provided by NYANA, financed by UJA.
c Provided mainly by national agencies.
d Most capital campaigns excluded because conducted apart from annual campaign.
### TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) (INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 132 COMMUNITIES, 1962, 1963
(Excludes New York City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1962</th>
<th></th>
<th>1963</th>
<th></th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,827,827</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>$7,444,644</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>- 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service</td>
<td>7,890,798</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>8,198,893</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>+ 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Culture</td>
<td>9,181,234</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>9,552,065</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>+ 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,818,632</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>3,007,221</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>+ 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1,307,041</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1,267,296</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>- 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,577,679</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4,689,226</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>+ 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>673,591</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>677,171</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>+ 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>855,682</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>881,334</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>+ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>456,344</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>486,660</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>+ 6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Administration</td>
<td>466,784</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>484,351</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>+ 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$36,055,612</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$36,688,861</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+ 1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1962</th>
<th></th>
<th>1963</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$21,641,225</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>$21,806,004</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>+ 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>14,414,387</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>14,882,857</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>+ 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Includes Chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of total administrative and fund-raising costs ($9,917,925 in 1962 and $10,258,750 in 1963) reported for these 132 cities. Federation allocations for administration of local services are not shown in this table because administrative and fund-raising costs cannot be segregated between local and non-local programs.
### TABLE 5-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS, a INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS, FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 132 COMMUNITIES 1962, 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (132)</strong></td>
<td>$36,055,612</td>
<td>$36,688,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under 5,000</strong></td>
<td>$1,363,426</td>
<td>$1,380,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5,000-15,000</strong></td>
<td>$4,681,517</td>
<td>$4,870,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15,000-40,000</strong></td>
<td>$4,843,281</td>
<td>$5,037,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40,000 and Over</strong></td>
<td>$25,167,388</td>
<td>$25,399,711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table includes Chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of administrative and fund raising costs ($9,917,925 in 1962 and $10,258,750 in 1963) reported for these 132 cities. Federation allocations towards administration of local services are not shown in this table because administrative and fund raising costs cannot be segregated between local and non-local programs.*

###註

- a: 註明
- b: 理由
- c: 無

### TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Admin. &amp; Fund Raising Costs</strong></td>
<td>$9,917,925</td>
<td>$10,258,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under 5,000</strong></td>
<td>662,121</td>
<td>689,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5,000-15,000</strong></td>
<td>1,649,101</td>
<td>1,697,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15,000-40,000</strong></td>
<td>1,427,140</td>
<td>1,475,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40,000 &amp; Over</strong></td>
<td>6,179,583</td>
<td>6,416,156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Jewish population.*

*Excludes New York City.*
TABLE 5-B. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 132
COMMUNITIES, 1962, 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Total (132)</th>
<th>(66) Under 5000(^b)</th>
<th>(40) 5,000–15,000(^b)</th>
<th>(14) 15,000–40,000(^b)</th>
<th>(12) 40,000 and Over(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Services</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Cultural</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. for Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Income</th>
<th>Total (132)</th>
<th>(66) Under 5000(^b)</th>
<th>(40) 5,000–15,000(^b)</th>
<th>(14) 15,000–40,000(^b)</th>
<th>(12) 40,000 and Over(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) See Table 5-A, note \(^a\).
\(^b\) Jewish population.
\(^c\) Slight difference because of rounding.
\(^d\) Less than .05 per cent.
### TABLE 6. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 97 COMMUNITIES, 1959 THROUGH 1963

*(Amounts in millions of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1959</th>
<th></th>
<th>1960</th>
<th></th>
<th>1961</th>
<th></th>
<th>1962</th>
<th></th>
<th>1963</th>
<th></th>
<th>Index of Change^b&gt; 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>1959 = 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$ 7.147</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>$ 7.417</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>$ 7.492</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>$ 7.812</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>$ 7.430</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>104.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>6.991</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>7.232</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>7.410</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7.743</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>8.033</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>114.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>7.437</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>7.936</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>8.464</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>8.690</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>9.025</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>121.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2.339</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.518</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.752</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.724</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.916</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>124.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>114.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>3.894</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.135</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>4.298</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4.520</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4.632</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>119.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>111.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration^c&gt;</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>112.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong>(^d)</td>
<td><strong>$31.394</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32.807</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$33.930</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25.206</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35.791</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>114.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$18.734</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>$19.479</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>$20.247</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>$21.164</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>$21.306</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>113.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Chests</td>
<td>12.660</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>13.328</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>13.683</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>14.042</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>14.486</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>114.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Includes both Federation and Community Chest Funds; excludes New York City.

\(^b\) During this period the United States consumer price index rose by 5.1 per cent.

\(^c\) Administrative costs of Federations are not segregated between local and non-local programs. The total Chest participation in these costs represents about 5.0 per cent of total administrative costs for these cities.

\(^d\) Slight differences due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>1959</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>$3,893,649</td>
<td>$4,632,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>$770,793</td>
<td>$673,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>$785,617</td>
<td>$874,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$506,347</td>
<td>$469,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration</td>
<td>$419,474</td>
<td>$471,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,394,223</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,791,360</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS**

For Local Services in 97 Communities, 1959, 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>1959</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>$7,146,523</td>
<td>$7,429,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family and Child Services</strong></td>
<td>$6,990,629</td>
<td>$8,033,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation and Culture</strong></td>
<td>$7,437,365</td>
<td>$9,024,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aged Care</strong></td>
<td>$2,338,590</td>
<td>$2,915,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment and Guidance</strong></td>
<td>$1,105,236</td>
<td>$1,267,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jewish Education</strong></td>
<td>$3,893,649</td>
<td>$4,632,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refugee Care</strong></td>
<td>$770,793</td>
<td>$673,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Relations</strong></td>
<td>$785,617</td>
<td>$874,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>$506,347</td>
<td>$469,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chest to Fed. Local Administration</strong></td>
<td>$419,474</td>
<td>$471,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,394,223</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,791,360</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Income</th>
<th>1959</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federations</strong></td>
<td>$18,734,450</td>
<td>$21,305,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Chests</strong></td>
<td>$12,659,773</td>
<td>$14,485,830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes both Federation and Community Chest funds; excludes New York City.

Jewish population.

* See Table 6, note *.
TABLE 6-B. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS* FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 97 COMMUNITIES, 1959, 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Total (97)</th>
<th>Under 5,000b</th>
<th>5,000–15,000b</th>
<th>15,000–40,000b</th>
<th>40,000 and Overb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Admin.d</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

| Federations                  | 59.7  | 59.5  | 64.2  | 61.5  | 47.3  | 46.8  | 48.5  | 46.9  | 63.7  | 64.1  |
| Community Chests             | 40.3  | 40.5  | 35.8  | 38.5  | 52.7  | 53.2  | 51.5  | 53.1  | 36.3  | 35.9  |

---

* Includes both Federation and Community Chest funds; excludes New York City.

b Jewish Population.

c Less than .05 per cent.

d See Table 6, note e.

* Slight difference because of rounding.
### TABLE 6–C. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS* FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 94 COMMUNITIES, 1954, 1963

*(In millions of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index of Change&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954 = 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7.159</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>$7.430</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Services</td>
<td>5.604</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>8.077</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>144.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Culture</td>
<td>5.741</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>9.104</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>158.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>1.654</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>2.966</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>179.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>167.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>3.048</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.639</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>152.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>.641</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>136.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>116.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>207.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$27.030</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$35.979</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>133.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

- **Federations** .......... $16.524 61.1 $21.351 59.3 129.2
- **Community Chests** ...... 10.506 38.9 14.628 40.7 139.2

---

<sup>a</sup> Includes both Federation and Community Chest funds; excludes New York City.

<sup>b</sup> During this period the United States consumer price index rose by 14 per cent.

<sup>c</sup> Administrative costs of Federations are not segregated between local and non-local programs. The total Chest participation in these costs represents about 5 per cent of total administrative costs for these cities.

<sup>d</sup> Slight difference because of rounding.
| TABLE 7. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR OVERSEAS PROGRAMS |  |
| FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1963 and 1962 |  |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Federations and Welfare Funds** | **Other Contributions** | **Other Income** | **Total** |
| **United Jewish Appeal & Beneficiary Agencies** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| United Jewish Appeal | $60,288,384 | $63,755,873 | $— | $— | $758,300 | $506,100 | $758,300 | $506,100 |
| Committee | — | — | — | — | 1,550 | 30,636 | 1,550 | 30,636 |
| Jewish National Fund | — | — | — | — | 2,430,942 | 2,804,048 | 2,430,942 | 2,804,048 |
| New York Association for New Americans | — | — | — | — | 31,825 | 21,593 | 31,825 | 21,593 |
| ORT—Women’s Division | — | — | — | — | 1,370,256 | 1,226,596 | 1,370,256 | 1,226,596 |
| —American ORT Federation | — | — | — | — | 6,083 | — | 6,083 | — |
| **TOTAL UJA AND BENEFICIARIES** | $60,288,384 | $63,755,873 | $3,802,281 | $4,030,644 | $1,058,723 | $719,332 | $65,154,388 | $68,505,849 |
| **Other Overseas Agencies** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science | $— | $— | $— | $— | $1,035,361 | $2,515,073 | $1,348,397 | $1,101,547 |
| American Red Mogen David | — | — | — | — | 195,685 | 218,829 | 195,685 | 218,829 |
| University-Technion Joint Maintenance Appeal | 632,000 | 642,000 | $2,724,606 | $2,354,109 | 219,176 | 438,211 | 2,943,782 | 2,792,320 |
| American Friends of the Hebrew University | 6,801 | 8,666 | 15,437 | 20,342 | 8,028,489 | 7,416,767 | 1,713,218 | 2,668,495 |
| American Technion Society | 100,731 | 101,611 | 45,369 | 20,946 | 1,342,938 | 1,288,559 | 4,367 | 13,699 |
| America-Israel Cultural Foundation | 241,396 | 238,142 | 1,543,275 | 1,167,330 | 531,384 | 1,060,540 | 2,074,659 | 2,227,870 |
| Ezra's Torah Fund | 532,698 | 570,000 | 5,801 | 8,666 | 1,342,938 | 1,288,559 | 4,367 | 13,699 |
| 100,731 | 101,611 | 45,369 | 20,946 | 1,342,938 | 1,288,559 | 4,367 | 13,699 |
| Hadassah | 255,550 | 275,496 | 1,592,104 | 1,695,013 | 1,342,938 | 1,288,559 | 4,367 | 13,699 |
| National Committee for Labor Israel | 25,000 | 25,000 | 593,682 | 564,169 | 260,491 | 252,993 | 829,173 | 842,162 |
| National Council of Jewish Women | 21,000 | 21,000 | 970,639 | 1,149,202 | 148,212 | 135,798 | 1,319,851 | 1,306,000 |
| Pioneer Women Organization | 952,729 | 1,030,920 | 143,659 | 151,934 | 438,417 | 692,961 | 1,534,805 | 1,875,815 |
| World Jewish Congress | 1,515 | — | 78,653 | 61,231 | — | — | 80,168 | 61,231 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | $2,771,420 | $2,912,835 | $18,514,092 | $18,815,251 | $4,674,177 | $6,379,711 | $25,959,689 | $28,107,979 |
| **TOTAL OVERSEAS** | $63,059,804 | $66,668,708 | $22,321,373 | $22,845,895 | $5,732,900 | $7,099,043 | $91,114,077 | $96,613,646 |

*a* Includes joint community appeals.  
*b* Cash received in each calendar year.  
*c* Excludes Income from UJA, and from campaigns abroad, intergovernmental agencies, and reparations.  
*d* Traditional collections in the United States exclusive of Jewish Agency grants to JNF in Israel.  
*e* Excludes contributions and earnings of investment fund.  
*f* Income from welfare funds is estimated.  
*g* Includes Swope Endowment Fund.  
*h* Excludes grants from other organizations.  
'i' Welfare-fund income estimated by CJWF in 1962; amounts raised for JNF are excluded. Hadassah “other income” includes membership dues, shekel and Zionist youth funds.  
*J* Excludes overseas income and income from CJMCAG, but includes UHJS income from N.Y.UJA.  
*o* Excludes overseas income.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Defense Appeal</td>
<td>$460,000a</td>
<td>$1,940,029b</td>
<td>$693,362</td>
<td>$2,702,453</td>
<td>$548,083</td>
<td>$504,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Committee</td>
<td>621,466b</td>
<td>610,105</td>
<td>1,498,208e</td>
<td>650,143</td>
<td>416,105</td>
<td>237,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Defamation League</td>
<td>644,926b</td>
<td>348,612</td>
<td>1,663,435e</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>482,845</td>
<td>107,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Congress</td>
<td>407,622</td>
<td>388,572</td>
<td>192,624</td>
<td>172,237</td>
<td>27,033</td>
<td>27,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Labor Committee</td>
<td>206,517</td>
<td>255,268</td>
<td>233,377</td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>250,729</td>
<td>237,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish War Veterans</td>
<td>129,414</td>
<td>138,360</td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>250,729</td>
<td>237,533</td>
<td>382,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Community Relations</td>
<td>163,835</td>
<td>166,959</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>29,612g</td>
<td>25,953h</td>
<td>199,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,633,830</td>
<td>$2,938,675</td>
<td>$5,202,779</td>
<td>$4,210,135</td>
<td>$1,548,458</td>
<td>$1,293,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Welfare Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Center at</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>514,576</td>
<td>520,467</td>
<td>555,796</td>
<td>655,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hope</td>
<td>6,626</td>
<td>8,746</td>
<td>4,997,370</td>
<td>4,350,888</td>
<td>2,141,616</td>
<td>1,633,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Patients Sanitarium</td>
<td>3,374</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>89,805</td>
<td>87,218</td>
<td>4,712</td>
<td>43,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>43,058</td>
<td>45,796</td>
<td>228,624</td>
<td>200,007</td>
<td>276,921</td>
<td>279,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Home for</td>
<td>7,843</td>
<td>7,696</td>
<td>759,472</td>
<td>673,892</td>
<td>323,764</td>
<td>192,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthmatic Children</td>
<td>24,141</td>
<td>29,812</td>
<td>2,726,120</td>
<td>2,698,713</td>
<td>998,537</td>
<td>1,083,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Children's Asthma Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute and Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$86,642</td>
<td>$98,016</td>
<td>$9,315,967</td>
<td>$8,531,185</td>
<td>$4,301,136</td>
<td>$3,889,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Service Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for</td>
<td>$90,121</td>
<td>89,540</td>
<td>57,675</td>
<td>64,493</td>
<td>67,112</td>
<td>60,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>20,391</td>
<td>19,238</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of</td>
<td>8,580</td>
<td>9,180</td>
<td>9,530</td>
<td>7,078</td>
<td>20,958</td>
<td>23,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare</td>
<td>1,220,000</td>
<td>1,188,952</td>
<td>43,157</td>
<td>33,475</td>
<td>175,277</td>
<td>174,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
<td>13,504</td>
<td>14,337</td>
<td>49,748</td>
<td>63,307</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>6,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,352,596</td>
<td>$1,321,247</td>
<td>$161,405</td>
<td>$170,202</td>
<td>$270,262</td>
<td>$264,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Jewish</td>
<td>3,809</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>22,391</td>
<td>12,171</td>
<td>4,489</td>
<td>3,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>9,637</td>
<td>9,764</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>89,750</td>
<td>1,188,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Historical</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>10,051</td>
<td>9,792</td>
<td>15,479</td>
<td>16,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nai B'rith National Youth</td>
<td>505,670</td>
<td>502,255</td>
<td>2,807,773m</td>
<td>2,618,493m</td>
<td>279,935</td>
<td>240,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>9,163,200</td>
<td>7,413,935</td>
<td>7,911,353</td>
<td>6,521,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Social</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>9,229</td>
<td>9,563</td>
<td>5,066</td>
<td>4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference on Jewish Social</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>9,229</td>
<td>9,563</td>
<td>5,066</td>
<td>4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Valley College of</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>9,144</td>
<td>22,924</td>
<td>892,409</td>
<td>858,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsee College</td>
<td>43,696</td>
<td>43,083</td>
<td>38,609</td>
<td>41,176</td>
<td>97,071</td>
<td>64,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histadruth Ivrit</td>
<td>19,258</td>
<td>19,706</td>
<td>110,925</td>
<td>11,419</td>
<td>97,991</td>
<td>87,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Braille Institute</td>
<td>12,940</td>
<td>12,814</td>
<td>67,771</td>
<td>75,607</td>
<td>29,117</td>
<td>26,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>8,868</td>
<td>222,256</td>
<td>213,044</td>
<td>10,967</td>
<td>23,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>Ame</td>
<td>Oth</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Publication Society</td>
<td>15,976</td>
<td>15,853</td>
<td>26,584</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>396,117</td>
<td>445,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers’ Seminary and People’s University</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>45,999</td>
<td>35,398</td>
<td>19,274</td>
<td>23,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Jewish Culture</td>
<td>86,738</td>
<td>71,221</td>
<td>39,447</td>
<td>35,715</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIVO*</td>
<td>40,707</td>
<td>35,176</td>
<td>101,464</td>
<td>82,058</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>11,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionist Organization of America</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>350,096</td>
<td>322,744</td>
<td>494,171</td>
<td>570,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$781,005</td>
<td>$755,690</td>
<td>$13,028,855</td>
<td>$11,413,571</td>
<td>$10,344,949</td>
<td>$10,086,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religious Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Jew</th>
<th>Ame</th>
<th>Oth</th>
<th>Dom</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary†</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>76,375</td>
<td>51,508</td>
<td>2,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Medrash Govoha</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>3,664</td>
<td>586,799</td>
<td>377,944</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Campaign for Reform Judaism, Hebraic Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion†</td>
<td>105,187</td>
<td>112,501</td>
<td>957,958</td>
<td>935,230</td>
<td>1,139,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
<td>91,341</td>
<td>96,534</td>
<td>4,090,466</td>
<td>3,311,253</td>
<td>980,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>27,770</td>
<td>26,440</td>
<td>250,683</td>
<td>357,549</td>
<td>145,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union of America</td>
<td>6,830</td>
<td>7,099</td>
<td>168,556</td>
<td>157,947</td>
<td>58,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrzer Yeshiva Central Institute†</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>4,653</td>
<td>223,251</td>
<td>190,250</td>
<td>66,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirzachi Haqel Hamizrachi National Council for Torah Education</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>22,741</td>
<td>24,272</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ner Israel Rabbinical College†</td>
<td>7,680</td>
<td>8,943</td>
<td>238,704</td>
<td>210,476</td>
<td>209,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College of Jerusalem</td>
<td>11,336</td>
<td>9,891</td>
<td>147,019</td>
<td>133,691</td>
<td>119,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College of Telsh†</td>
<td>6,866</td>
<td>6,881</td>
<td>478,589</td>
<td>333,344</td>
<td>295,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America</td>
<td>14,240</td>
<td>13,022</td>
<td>142,372</td>
<td>142,362</td>
<td>205,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological Seminary Yeshivah</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>65,534</td>
<td>70,374</td>
<td>7,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chachney Lubin</td>
<td>5,035</td>
<td>4,603</td>
<td>120,478</td>
<td>118,193</td>
<td>26,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Union of America</td>
<td>17,756</td>
<td>12,690</td>
<td>607,905</td>
<td>377,236</td>
<td>402,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>148,645</td>
<td>134,810</td>
<td>527,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Lubavitch Yeshiva†</td>
<td>7,127</td>
<td>7,228</td>
<td>464,740</td>
<td>422,658</td>
<td>66,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Sokol Table†</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>193,108</td>
<td>175,041</td>
<td>35,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University-Medical School†</td>
<td>81,525</td>
<td>76,021</td>
<td>5,266,354</td>
<td>5,539,149</td>
<td>19,260,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$400,134</td>
<td>$398,247</td>
<td>$18,433,346</td>
<td>$16,193,854</td>
<td>$23,727,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Domestic</strong></td>
<td>$5,254,207</td>
<td>$5,511,875</td>
<td>$46,142,352</td>
<td>$40,120,177</td>
<td>$40,192,591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Overseas and Domestic**

- $68,314,011 $72,180,583 $68,463,752 $66,607,072 $45,925,491 $39,836,958 $182,703,227 $174,983,613

---

* 1963 data are based on 40 percent of AJC and ADL receipts from JDA to allocations from welfare funds.
* Includes about $200,000 in cash receipts for University of California project in 1963.
* National Foundation for Jewish Culture: excludes $200,000 in 1962 and $170,000 in 1963 from ADL, to avoid double counting.
* Excludes special funds; reports unavailable.
* Excludes grants from other national agencies to avoid double counting.
* Includes Bible fund.
* Excludes gross sales of religious education publications.
* Excludes fire insurance proceeds.
* Includes building fund.
* Includes national Jewish agencies.
* Includes in government funds in 1962.

**Federation income includes income from centers.**

---

* Excludes grants from CJMCA and from National Foundation for Jewish Culture.
* Excludes income from allocations from N.Y.U.A.
* Excludes overseas income.
* Represents dues from national agencies.
* Derived from reports filed with N.Y. State Department of Social Welfare.

---

* Excludes grants from other national agencies to avoid double counting.
* Includes in government funds in 1962.
Adult Jewish Education

Since the end of World War II, adult Jewish education has emerged as an important part of the American Jewish educational scene. Given evidence of more widespread AJE activity than in any previous period in American Jewish history, the American Association for Jewish Education in 1964 conducted the first national study of the subject in ten years. The Adult Jewish Education Activities of the American Jewish Community: Highlights and Insights analyzed the problems and needs of this new field and offered recommendations for future development. This article is based upon data and materials developed during the course of that study.2

Definition

As a relatively new category of Jewish educational activity, AJE can only be defined operationally. Three meanings are currently attached to the phrase. In its broadest meaning, it describes a process—the process of adults learning about things Jewish. In this sense, it encompasses virtually every form of learning, formal and informal, that results in new knowledge, understandings, skills, attitudes, interests, or values. In the literature on AJE, this process is referred to as the “Jewish education of adults.”

In its more technical meaning, AJE describes a set of organized activities conducted by a wide variety of Jewish groups for the achievement of Jewish educational objectives. In this sense, it encompasses organized classes, lectures, forums, symposiums, discussion and study groups, exhibits, conferences, workshops and seminars, and the like. These activities are referred to as the “program of AJE.”

A third meaning combines these processes and activities into the idea of a field or movement. In this sense, it brings together into a single conceptual framework the individuals, program, and groups concerned with the Jewish education of adults. This whole is called the “field of AJE.”3 Here we are concerned with the development of the programs and field of AJE.

History

The Jewish education of adults, in principle and practice, has its origins in biblical commands. It is the Jewish tradition that study and learning are lifelong obligations. The very essence of Jewish religious belief and observance

1 Often referred to in this article as AJE.
2 The analysis and working statement of the study were prepared by the author. Additional data for this article were obtained in connection with his forthcoming doctoral dissertation at the graduate school of education, Yeshiva University.
always was intimately related to knowledge of Judaism’s classical texts. In almost every generation from the time of the Bible to that of the 19th-century shtetl, the major emphasis in Jewish education was on adult learning.

Jewish communal life in the United States began to take shape under the influence of this tradition in the latter part of the 19th century and the early 20th. The formal Jewish education of adults was centered in the synagogue, the focal point of all Jewish activity.

Historians have noted the fluctuations in the Jewish community that have occurred during the 20th century, and the changing role of the synagogue. From the secularization of the 20’s and 30’s to the so-called “Jewish revival” of the 40’s and 50’s, the state of Judaism in the United States underwent many transformations. Different approaches to Jewish education reflected these transformations in the character and composition of American Jewry and their identification and survival patterns.

The milestone and turning point in American Jewish education was the decade that witnessed the destruction of 6 million Jews in the Nazi holocaust and the subsequent establishment of the State of Israel. This era resulted in reaffirmed Jewish identification, increased interest in Jewish education on all levels, and record synagogue enrolments. Indeed, the whole pattern of American Jewish education changed. Alexander M. Dushkin and Uriah Z. Engelman reported that between 1948 and 1958 the enrolment increase in Jewish schools was 131.2 per cent—twice as large as in non-Jewish religious schools, and substantially higher than the estimated Jewish population increase (AJYB, 1960 [Vol. 61], p. 128). During that decade, also, Jewish education evolved from a “weapon against ignorant assimilation” to a means for “creative intellectual, artistic and spiritual expression and self-fulfillment.”

On the adult level there were increasing numbers seeking guidance and resources to help them understand themselves better as Jews, participate in the affairs of the Jewish community, and find self-fulfilment in their Judaism. The pronounced acceleration and professionalization of the general adult-education field during this period, together with the rising educational level of the nation, provided the climate for AJE. The increasing leisure enjoyed by ever more adults provided the time. And the move to the suburbs during the 40’s and 50’s, accompanied by the construction of new synagogues, provided the place.

National Jewish organizations and agencies reacted to the strong trend toward AJE by establishing special AJE departments and stepping up their AJE activity to such an extent that they became the single most important factor in the operational development of this field.

It was these historical and sociological factors, as well as the new-found receptivity to Judaism and things Jewish, that influenced the development and expansion of organized programs for adult Jewish study.

EARLY RESEARCH

There has been little research in AJE. Seven doctoral dissertations have been published, and one is now in preparation. In 1932 Markowitz studied the interests and concerns of a Reform Jewish congregation in a small midwestern city and constructed a curriculum of instruction based on them. In 1952 Poupko traced the history and status of Jewish religious adult education, analyzing the various emphases in curriculum of the three major religious ideologies. In the same year Wadler traced the historical development of AJE in New York City. In 1953 Freeman appraised the growth of adult-education programs within the unique framework and philosophy of the Jewish community center. In 1954 Elkin traced the history and evaluated the status of AJE nationally.

Two doctoral dissertations were completed in 1958. Atzmon studied the impact of educational programs on the acculturation of Jewish immigrants in Detroit. Tadmor studied the effect of major social changes, particularly mass immigration, upon various facilities for adult education in the State of Israel. The dissertation now being prepared by Samuel I. Cohen deals with the development of AJE programs under the auspices of selected national Jewish organizations.

From 1952 to 1958 five master’s theses, all of which proposed curriculums for improved AJE instruction, were completed by Blinder, Mintz, Salkowitz, Starr, and Sundheim.

There have also been surveys by Essrig in 1950, Duker in 1951, and UAHC in 1953, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1962. However, between Elkin’s study in

8 Samuel D. Freeman, Adult Education in the Jewish Community Center (unpublished doctoral thesis, Teachers’ College, Columbia University, 1953).
1954 and the American Association for Jewish Education study of 1964 no attempt was made to assess the growth of the field as a whole, the scope and character of the various AJE programs, or the problems faced by their sponsors.

AAJE SURVEY

The 1964 AAJE study, *The Adult Jewish Education Activities of the American Jewish Community: Highlights and Insights*, represented that organization's formal recognition of AJE as an important field of Jewish education.

While it was not a survey in depth, it does offer a national picture. It was based upon 123 responses to the American Association for Jewish Education's questionnaires by 20 directors of bureaus of Jewish education, 55 federation or community-council executives, 39 rabbis representing large Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox congregations, and 9 directors of AJE departments of national Jewish agencies. The questionnaires reached a substantial majority of those professionally involved with AJE and the respondents represented the full range of Jewish communal interests—those with and without direct AJE experience, large cities, suburban areas, small towns, and groups with a wide range of ideological and educational commitment. Consequently, the study reflected the views and judgments of a substantial and representative sample of professional leadership in American Jewish communal life.

Twenty-eight of the 35 bureaus of education in the United States and Canada were polled, and twenty (71 per cent) responded; 12 out of the 20 respondents (60 per cent) reported that their bureaus conducted regular community-wide AJE programs.

One hundred twenty-eight questionnaires were sent to a sampling of federations representing large cities and small towns throughout the United States. Of the 55 (43 per cent) responding, 43 (78 per cent) indicated that their communities did not have local AJE communal programs.

Questionnaires were sent to 102 rabbis known to be associated with varying forms of AJE activity. Thirty-nine (38 per cent) responded. Of these, six were Orthodox, 23 Conservative, and 10 Reform.

Although most of the 24 major national Jewish organizations sponsored AJE activities in one or another form, only nine had formal AJE departments. The AJE directors of these organizations were members of the American Association for Jewish Education's advisory committee on AJE. The questionnaires were sent to these nine directors.

The study was concerned with educational objectives, methodology, budgets, administration, extent of participation, community cooperation, instructional materials, evaluation, promotion, and the needs of the various pro-

---

14 American Jewish Committee, AJCongress, B’nai B’rith, Hadassah, Herzl Institute, JWB, UAHC, United Synagogue of America, Yeshiva University.
grams, and the respondents' analyses of both local and national programs. It focused on the "aims and purposes" and "methodology" of the various AJE programs and established that there was a great diversity in these aims and purposes, as presented, and, in many instances, great confusion. It also established that the respective groups of respondents—national agencies, bureaus, federations, and congregations—had differing objectives.

The diverse perspectives of these programs were reflected in the variety of content, format, and approach. Apparently, because of the newness of the field, there were no generally accepted "AJE methods of instruction." Broadly, AJE was sponsored nationally by mass-membership organizations, synagogue groups, and a variety of other agencies, and locally by education bureaus, federations, and congregations.

**NATIONAL AJE PROGRAMS**

Although programs sponsored by national organizations had in common a liberal definition of Jewish education, concern with the contemporary aspects of Judaism, and minimum emphasis on formal instruction, there were basic differences in their objectives and methods.  

**Mass-membership Organizations**

Mass-membership organizations like the American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, and Hadassah were concerned with informal dissemination of nonpartisan Jewish knowledge. They tended to sponsor a liberal definition of Jewish education; their programs were concerned with the contemporary aspects of Judaism and gave little emphasis to formal instruction.

In 1953 B'nai B'rith, the largest national Jewish organization, launched a professional AJE department and urged local units throughout the country to conduct their own AJE programs, mainly in the form of discussion groups centered on current Jewish issues. The program has enjoyed consistent and dramatic growth. In 1964 its AJE department conducted 18 annual institutes throughout the United States, published the fifth volume in the "B'nai B'rith Books" series, sponsored its third annual Flying Institute to Israel, and held its first National Institute of Judaism. Over 300 local lodges conducted regular "living-room learning" study and discussion groups. In the same year B'nai B'rith sponsored its third annual visiting lecturer, with Pastor Paul Borchsenius of Denmark delivering 37 lectures in 33 cities. (Previous visiting lecturers were Cecil Roth and Louis Jacobs of England.) The AJE department's 1964 budget was $95,278 exclusive of a special fund for the publication of its series of books. It provided B'nai B'rith's 2,200 lodges and chapters

---

15 The definition of a national organization is a loose one, and those considered in the study were chosen because of their membership in the American Association for Jewish Education's advisory committee on AJE. Admittedly, certain other national agencies with AJE programs should have been included.
with program guidance and field services and published a monthly, *Time For Torah*, and the quarterly *Jewish Heritage*.

The American Jewish Committee's department of Jewish communal affairs had as its goal "to promote among Jews wholesome self-understanding and self-acceptance." Its program sought to perpetuate "the richness of Jewish religious and cultural values" and provided consultant services to communal, educational, and religious leaders. The department prepared bibliographies and pamphlets, as well as studies concerned with attitudes towards Jewish survival and identity in various communities. It encouraged its 60 affiliated chapters to conduct programs focusing on contemporary Jewish problems.

The AJCongress's commission on Jewish affairs formulated and projected AJE programs for its 400 chapters. It sponsored five conferences on Jewish values between November 1960 and November 1962, a conference on intermarriage in December 1963, and one on the Vatican schema on Jews in November 1964. Congress also sponsored an "Israel dialogue" every summer from 1962 to 1964. The commission's 1964 budget of $25,000 provided for the publication of discussion guides and program guidance and the operation of a department that formulated and projected programs in Jewish affairs.

Hadassah's education department provided 1,700 affiliated chapters with an extensive array of program guides designed to stimulate and develop Zionist-oriented education programs.

Other national organizations not included in the study but offering a variety of AJE activity include the National Council of Jewish Women, the Labor Zionist Organization of America, and the Zionist Organization of America.

**Synagogue Groups**

Each of the three major synagogue organizations had its own emphasis. Synagogue organizations, like the (Reform) Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the (Conservative) United Synagogue of America, and institutions like Yeshiva University projected programs aimed at increased and enhanced synagogue participation. They emphasized formal curricula and intensive study.

The commission on Jewish education of UAHC and the Central Conference of American Rabbis established a special AJE department in 1948 which now provided services, counseling, texts, study guides, and program guidance to 667 member congregations, 456 of which had standing AJE committees. The department surpassed all other similar agencies in the volume and caliber of its AJE publications, its 1964 catalogue listing 166 individual publications and instructional materials. The most recent of its periodic surveys to evaluate local programs revealed that in 1962, 60,000 adults participated in its programs. Other recent reports indicated, further, that local programmers were gradually replacing multi-subject lecture series by regular AJE classes.

The United Synagogue's National Academy for Adult Jewish Studies served 774 member congregations with a large variety of services. Founded in 1940, the academy's purpose was to promote and encourage adult learning, both formal and informal, in affiliated synagogues and in the general community.
It prepared and published textbooks, pamphlets, syllabi, and study courses for the guidance of congregations, adult institutes, and home-study and discussion groups. Its monthly publication, *Adult Jewish Education*, ranked as the leading journal in the field. The academy's 1964 budget was $40,000.

Yeshiva University's department of adult education, founded in 1955 by the university's Community Services Division, helped with programs in 210 affiliated congregations. It provided these congregations with curriculum direction and guidance, conducted regional seminars, supervised the accreditation of courses, and awarded certificates of achievement to students. The 1964 enrolment records indicated that the average student attended courses for three years and that 852 students were accredited in 1964. Since 1955 the department has enjoyed a steady increase in congregational participation and student enrolment.

Not included in the study were three Orthodox synagogue groups that also conducted adult-education programs.

The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, although it maintained no special department for this activity, reported that almost all of its member congregations had local programs. Its national convention in Washington in December 1964 called for the formulation of a nationally organized and centrally serviced Torah study program. (At its annual convention during the same month, the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada adopted a resolution calling upon its 600 members "to intensify their AJE educational programs in their respective synagogues and . . . communities.")

The National Council of Young Israel was the only one of the three groups that offered a central institutional program. Its Institute of Jewish Studies, founded in 1948, offered 14 weekly courses in Hebrew, Bible, and laws and customs and four biweekly lectures (with an enrolment of 300 students). As a pioneer in formal AJE, the institute attracted 1,200 students in 1954, when local synagogues offered no programs of their own. A 1964 survey indicated that almost all of Young Israel's 100 branch synagogues maintained individual AJE programs.

In cooperation with Young Israel, the National Association of Hebrew Day School PTA's of Torah Umesorah sponsored regional programs and two regular annual courses for parents of day-school students.

Other National Agencies

The two other national agencies which responded to the questionnaire, the Theodore Herzl Institute and the National Jewish Welfare Board, encouraged the widest diversity in subject and approach.

The Herzl Institute conducted a year-round program of adult education that included lectures on Zionism, Israel, Hebrew, Talmud, and the Jewish creative arts, and regular symposia on contemporary Jewish issues. JWB's Jewish Center Lecture Bureau provided programs for 375 Jewish community centers.
COMMUNITY AJE PROGRAMS

Education Bureaus

In 1953 the Jewish Education Committee, New York City’s central communal agency for Jewish education, responded to the growing need for AJE with the establishment of a department and engaged a full-time professional to direct its activities. The study revealed that by 1964 at least 12 other community bureaus of Jewish education were conducting regular AJE programs. But almost all of these considered AJE to be less important than their primary obligation, which was to elementary and secondary Jewish education. Bureau AJE programs served only small portions of their communities. The programs had a communal orientation; subjects were traditional and instruction was conventional. Severe shortages of qualified personnel seemed to leave AJE programs in the hands of the bureau directors themselves, who, in any case, evinced only token interest in training AJE personnel. Generally, according to the study, the bureaus devoted little attention to AJE needs in their communities.

Federations

Although only 12 of the federations that answered the questionnaire said that they helped to sponsor local AJE, most of the others—35—indicated that they felt there was a need for AJE councils in their communities. Their expressions of concern were in accord with the trend of federations to look beyond their primary function of fund raising and allocation and become more involved in the planning and sponsorship of communal and educational activity.

Significantly, each of the 12 communities with federation support for AJE activity had a Jewish populations of fewer than 15,000. None of the metropolitan federations, such as those of Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, or New York, provided funds for AJE councils or programs.

The 12 federation-supported councils conducted programs reflecting broad communal interests, and were in the main ideologically neutral. Although the programs varied with the type of sponsorship (in some instances this meant the federation and a half-dozen local groups, in others the federation and local synagogues), on the whole they sought to be nonpartisan. The study indicated that federation executives were interested in AJE planning, but that local communal cooperation was limited.

Congregations

Although estimates of the number of congregations in the United States vary, there are certainly several thousand more than the 39 that received questionnaires; but 39 were carefully selected as a representative sample.

The 39 rabbis (10 Reform, 23 Conservative, and 6 Orthodox) participating in the study reported that their congregations maintained regular AJE
programs; these were synagogue-oriented, formal, and emphasized content. The stress was on basic Judaism, and classical texts were used in most instances as a fundamental source. Little consideration was given to contemporary subjects, issues, or problems. Significantly, the areas of concentration were generally the same in all three ideological groups.

Thirty-six (92 per cent) of the respondents were concerned with intellectual objectives; they wished to instill in their members a literate awareness of the Jewish past and heritage, and to acquaint them with Jewish learning and doctrine. The study revealed a departure from the traditional role and character of the synagogue, with a surprising lack of emphasis on belief and practice or on fostering religiosity.

Unfortunately, the study did not review the conventional classes in Bible, Talmud, and halakhah conducted daily in traditional synagogues in conjunction with religious services. For semantic reasons these escape classification as adult Jewish education. For the same reasons the Institute of Jewish Studies of the National Council of Young Israel and the parent-education program of Torah Umesorah (discussed above) fall outside the scope of the AJE study.

CONCLUSIONS

The study confirmed that AJE has grown into an effort of major proportions and national impact. It revealed that the formulation of educational objectives is a primary need both locally and nationally, and that much of the planning for adult Jewish education is ad hoc. Practical considerations often obscure goals. To a great extent programs are based on their sponsors' projections rather than the actual needs and interests of their constituencies.

Methodologies

There has been no crystallization of conventional, modified, or progressive methodologies and no consensus as to whether instruction should be student- or subject-centered. Even the preparation of formal texts or other special material has been the exception rather than the rule.

The five most frequent activities were the lecture, formal class, study group, discussion group, and forum; but there was a consensus that these were not truly efficacious. The study revealed a great need for new and effective methods related to specific objectives and participants, and for the development of appropriate instruction techniques.

Personnel

Adult Jewish education, the study revealed, is a hybrid field manned by a wide variety of personnel. The national programs of the national agencies are formulated and directed by professional personnel, while their local programs are administered by volunteers, who invite the participation of rabbis, educators, and lecturers. Bureau programs are directed and conducted by the bureau directors, professional Jewish educators primarily interested in ele-
mentary instruction. Congregational programs enjoy rabbinic direction and instruction, involve laity on administrative levels, and use AJE personnel.

Almost all programs except the congregational suffer from a critical shortage of qualified personnel. The study recommended that local and national agencies take action to develop the profession of adult Jewish educator.

Recruitment and Promotion

Participants in AJE programs are voluntary in the fullest sense. Recruitment efforts, at present highly impersonal, rely largely on correspondence, publicity releases, pulpit announcements, and bulletins. Few groups conduct recruiting campaigns comparable to their membership, fund raising, or Talmud Torah-enrolment campaigns.

Finances

The study did not produce sufficient data to allow an estimate to be made of total national expenditures for AJE, but it revealed dramatic differences in financial commitments among AJE sponsors, and areas of glaring financial need.

Of the nine national organizations that responded to the questionnaire, five provided budget statements indicating a total expenditure for AJE of over $200,000. (These are AJCongress, B'nai B'rith, Herzl Institute, United Synagogue of America, and UAHC.) Most of the budgets being in the vicinity of $35,000, the AJE budgets of the nine national agencies which responded to the questionnaire should total about $315,000.

These figures represent central administrative costs and do not include local allocations for lecturers, instructors, facilities, or promotion. It is therefore significant that the United Synagogue's National Academy estimates that its affiliated synagogues spent about $400,000 in 1964 for such items, and that if rabbis' salaries and the cost of synagogue facilities were included, the figure would "probably run [to] $2 to $3 million." If the cost of all adult Jewish education in the United States were no higher than this, it would be substantial. But the figure is probably a fraction of what it is for all the national agencies, bureaus, federations, congregations, and other programs not even considered in the study.

Bureau AJE budgets, it is true, were nominal, ranging from $300 to $7,500, and what federation allocations there were, were of a token nature—all below $2,500. Congregations made their greatest financial commitments locally, and even there, AJE budgets usually did not exceed $10,000 (excluding, of course, staff salaries and costs of synagogue facilities).

Evaluation

The sore spot of contemporary adult Jewish education is in evaluation. The study revealed that attempts of evaluation were largely sporadic, fragmentary, and superficial, with most efforts based upon attendance records. Few programs involved professional Jewish education personnel in these
efforts, and only token evaluation was made of curricula, methodology, personnel, instructional materials, and participants' reactions. Meaningful evaluation was hampered by the virtual absence of reliable information on attendance, continuity, and the dropout rate. The study revealed that such records are required on almost all levels of AJE activity.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study defined ten basic tasks confronting the field of adult Jewish education:

1. Formulation of objectives.
2. Determination of the needs and interests of specific constituencies.
3. Exploration and introduction of more effective methods.
5. Increased involvement of lay leadership in planning and evaluating programs.
6. Action programs to stimulate greater interest in adult study.
7. Evaluation procedures.
8. Employment of more and better-qualified professional personnel.
9. Greater communal cooperation and coordination.
10. Greater financial support from local and national groups.

The study also recommended the establishment of more local AJE councils and a national AJE council to stimulate and guide, establish standards, and assist in the development of methods for instruction and evaluation.

POST-STUDY CONFERENCE

As an outgrowth of its study, the American Association for Jewish Education organized the first national conference on AJE in February 1965, which was attended by 300 professional and lay representatives of 20 national Jewish organizations and local bureaus of Jewish education. The participants included virtually all of the professionals in AJE and a sampling of representatives from rabbinical organizations and local federations.

There seemed to be general agreement on the following:

1. Growth in size of constituency. While there is no doubt that the number of participants in AJE programs has grown tremendously during the period under review, there are no available records to document this.
2. Change in the constituency's character. The last few generations of American Jewry have undergone radical changes in economic status, political outlook, demography, communal orientation, educational level, and religious value.
3. Expansion of institutional sponsorship. Almost none of the national Jewish organizations maintained special AJE programs before the 1940's. It was only then that national Jewish service organizations and community-relations agencies committed themselves to Jewish-education programs.
4. **Shifts in program emphasis.** The curriculum of AJE has undergone many variations. Traditionally, subject matter that was religious in content and conventional in approach was considered to fulfill the needs of AJE. Later, programs were broadened to encompass the creative arts, contemporary issues, and communal concerns. In recent years, there has been a tendency towards direct text-oriented instruction centered on the Jewish classics.

5. **The development of new knowledge and methods.** The recent accelerated growth of adult education in the United States and the accompanying growing body of research have brought to the fore a wide variety of new methods for teaching adults. These have not been used by AJE to any great extent.

6. **The development of professionalism.** Some 20 universities offer graduate programs in adult education. Among them are HUC-JIR, JTS, and Yeshiva University's graduate school of education. Directors of a dozen national AJE programs, members of the AJE advisory committee of the AAJE, meet regularly to share experiences and coordinate activities. There is a growing number of Jewish educators whose primary concern is with adult education, and it now appears both logical and predictable that some kind of organizational structure will be formed for the association of all professional adult Jewish educators, broadening the constituency and scope of the present ad hoc advisory committee on AJE.

7. **The development of a unified field.** The first attempt to establish communication and a sense of unity between the various segments of AJE was the American Association for Jewish Education's sponsorship of the advisory committee and the subsequent conference in 1964. Further steps in this direction will have to be taken as AJE seeks to realize its potentiality.

**Samuel I. Cohen**

## The Jewish Military Chaplaincy

The Jewish military chaplaincy is here to stay as a permanent agency on the American scene. The military and the Jewish communities have made this decision. This article dwells on the Jewish military chaplaincy service in recent years, but a few historical facts are pertinent.

### Background

On July 17, 1862, Abraham Lincoln signed into law an act of Congress which stated that a regularly ordained minister of any religious denomination may be commissioned as a chaplain. Until then the law had required that a clergy-
man ministering to the military must be of the Christian faith. All told, three Jewish chaplains were commissioned under the law during the Civil War.

During World War I, 23 rabbis served their country as chaplains in uniform. Between 1918 and 1940 a small number of rabbis maintained reserve commissions but none served on extended active duty. In August 1940, just before the Second World War, some of these reserve Jewish chaplains were called to active duty. It was then that JWB established a Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy.

The Department of Defense grants a chaplaincy commission only when a religious endorsing agency certifies a candidate to be a properly ordained clergyman and a fit representative of his denomination, and a chaplain holds his commission only as long as he continues to have the endorsement of his denomination. The Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy was designed to be the recruiting, endorsing, and service agency for the Jewish religion. It parallels the (Catholic) Military Ordinariate, the (Protestant) General Commission on Chaplains, and about 30 other Protestant endorsing agencies.

By the end of World War II, 311 rabbis had been commissioned and had served in the armed forces (AJYB, 1945-1946 [Vol. 47], pp. 173-200). Many retained their reserve commissions, but at the outbreak of war in Korea in 1950, only 18 were on active duty.

The outbreak of the Korean War in late 1950 presaged the expansion of the military establishment to approximately three million men. It was anticipated that about 100 Jewish chaplains would be required to service the Jews among them, and the three major rabbinic bodies (CCAR [Reform], Rabbinical Assembly [Conservative], and RCA [Orthodox]) accepted the responsibility for meeting this requirement. The Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy was designated to coordinate and administer the undertaking and in August 1950 it called an extraordinary session to launch the program. Rabbi Solomon B. Freehof, chairman of the commission, enunciated the commission's policy:

The American Jewish community is anxious and ready to do everything within its power to aid our government to combat and overthrow those world forces which are seeking to destroy the democratic way of life. Jewish soldiers, sailors, and airmen are serving side by side with brave men of all faiths to achieve this common objective. As in World War I and II, the rabbis of America may be counted on to respond quickly and generously to the need for additional Jewish military chaplains. Wherever our men are summoned to fight and, if need be, to die, there, God willing, our chaplains shall go with them.

INTERDENOMINATIONAL COOPERATION

There is fundamental harmony in the operation of the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy, but no uniformity of faith or ritual is imposed upon chaplains. The commission includes outstanding leaders of the three rabbinic bodies, who, without compromising the positions they represent, have managed to work out a modus vivendi on the basis of respect for each other's views. Often agreement is achieved even in areas where the three groups are seem-
ingly far apart and maintain their differences in civilian life. This cooperative spirit stems from an agreement that it is the purpose of Jewish chaplains to meet the religious needs of servicemen, not the chaplain's or his denomination's. Rabbis are no more free to impose their particular brand of Judaism on their military congregants than Christian chaplains theirs. Concomitant to a chaplain's right to observe the Jewish religion according to his convictions is his duty to help Jewish servicemen observe and strengthen theirs. Most chaplains have accepted this concept and their guiding principle has been unity amid diversity.

In the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy itself, the three rabbinical groups exercise common sense and ordinary courtesy in the interest of fulfilling their joint task. There is so little ideological bickering that a visitor to a meeting would have difficulty identifying the affiliation of those present.

The following are examples of activities in which seemingly irreconcilable views have been resolved:

**Responsa**

Religious practices under military conditions would seem to raise questions on which the three groups would be hopelessly divided. But the following quotation from the preface to the booklet, "Responsa In War Time," published by the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy in December, 1947, is still valid.

Although in many aspects of Jewish life in America the achievement of unity of action has been difficult, here harmony was achieved on religious practices, the most controversial of all subjects in Jewish life. The dictum, *Ellu we-ellu divre Elokim hayyim,* was used not only to acknowledge respect for the view of others but also to go on from there to a common decision which would be helpful to the men under arms in each particular circumstance of war. It is to the glory of the American rabbinate that without the power and approval of an established ecclesiastical hierarchy, it was able to create such a set of responsa. The final decision was always based on *Halakhah* but the interpretation was broad enough to permit the word of God to be truly *hayyim,* "living," and livable even under war conditions.

Agreement was reached for responsa to such a variety of situations as the saying of Kaddish without a *minyan* at an isolated station overseas, burial in a national cemetery, determination of the Sabbath in Arctic and Antarctic regions in seasons of total daylight or total darkness, loss of a Sabbath or holy day when crossing the international date line, use of a paper scroll of the Torah in areas where parchment tends to rot, and solutions to problems of kashrut and Sabbath observance.

**Prayer Books**

It would be impossible to run separate services in the military for Orthodox, Conservative and Reform personnel, each with a different prayer book. In recognition of the realities of military life, a single Jewish prayer book was published in 1941 by JWB which met the needs of each group and violated
the conscience of none. It is used in a different manner by each chaplain and his congregation and has won the complete approval of all segments of the Jewish religious community.

Religious Publications

Though the Jews are the People of the Book, the Christians seem to be the people of the missionary pamphlet. Religious literature of all faiths abounds in the military establishment. The Jewish community has a twofold obligation in filling its section of the literature racks: to provide inspirational material for Jewish personnel and to provide information about Jews and Judaism to interested non-Jews.

The preparation of the Jewish pamphlets, therefore, has been another challenge to the ingenuity and integrity of the various Jewish religious groups. Pamphlets dealing with Jewish history are comparatively easy to prepare, as are those on the subject of Jewish ethics. Dealing with the Sabbath, the holy days, and the festivals is more difficult, but was successfully accomplished by a publication committee representing the rabbinic groups. These publications have proved useful to Jewish personnel and have served as excellent expositions of Judaism for non-Jews.

Self-imposed Draft of Rabbis

The three rabbinic bodies agreed that they would assign the armed forces priority on rabbinical manpower. They voted to impose a form of "selective service" on all members who met the military age requirements of, and had not already served in, the armed forces, and on all seminary students upon graduation. Each of the three groups agreed to furnish an equal number of rabbis to meet military quotas. Each rabbi would be expected to serve for a minimum of two years before being replaced. Most draftees responded with enthusiasm. A Jewish chaplains' conference in February 1952 sent "warmest greetings" to their "civilian colleagues":

We want them to know that we have found in our chaplaincy service a meaningful extension of our rabbinic service. We have found that our ministrations are answering a critical need in the lives of the men we serve. The importance of this work in all its emotional and intellectual significance can be clear only to those who are now serving as chaplains or who have so served previously.

Almost 15 years have passed since the self-imposed draft was instituted. Year in and year out, with few exceptions, the requisite number of Jewish chaplains has been made available to serve Jews in the armed forces the world over. A total of 399 chaplains entered service between August 1950 and June 1964.

When quotas were not met, it was for one or more of the following reasons. Sometimes it was due to an insufficient number of ordinations. Sometimes it was because not enough graduates met physical requirements. Often, newly ordained rabbis were nationals of other countries, or had had previous military service, or were exempted for other weighty reasons.
When the military establishment expanded suddenly, as at the time of the Berlin and Cuban crises, some rabbis in the reserves were recalled to duty; when the crises passed, they returned to civilian life.

THE CHAPLAIN

Areas of Service

Jewish military personnel are dispersed throughout the world at more than a thousand stations. It is not possible to assign a Jewish chaplain to every installation where there are Jewish personnel, but they are assigned to all reception centers and large training centers having a considerable concentration of Jews. They are also assigned to cover Jewish personnel dispersed among the three services over large geographic areas overseas. For example, a Navy Jewish chaplain in Hawaii serves Jews in the three forces there, an Air Force Jewish chaplain in Turkey serves all Jewish personnel there, and since 1964 an Army chaplain has had a similar responsibility in South Vietnam. Some of the areas are very large. One chaplain stationed in France covers American bases in Spain, Morocco, and Libya. Jewish chaplains in Germany have served installations in Italy. From the Philippines they cover Taiwan and used to fly into Vietnam before a Jewish chaplain was assigned there full time. Almost all chaplains overseas ride a circuit. They are itinerants, meeting with their far-flung congregations as often as is humanly possible. In the United States the efforts of the full-time chaplains are supplemented by those of a dedicated group of 250 civilian part-time chaplains. They serve approximately 600 installations, including Veterans Administration hospitals. More than 800 civilian rabbis have served as part-time chaplains during the past 20 years.

Although this report is primarily concerned with the military chaplaincy, at least passing reference should be made to the extensive and important work Jewish chaplains perform in connection with nonmilitary Federal agencies. VA has an active chaplaincy program at all of its 155 hospitals in every state of the Union; full-time or part-time chaplains serve every such hospital. (The present director of the chaplaincy service for the entire VA is Rabbi Morris A. Sandhaus, the first rabbi in American history to serve as chief of chaplains in a branch of the Federal government.) The commission also provides chaplains to every United States Public Health Service hospital, to St. Elizabeth’s, the Federal mental hospital in the District of Columbia, and to the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, L.I., N.Y.

Activities

Basically, the chaplaincy serves as a microcosm of the multitudinous functions performed by the agencies of Jewish civilian communities. Jewish military community life revolves around the chapel. It provides religious services, Jewish education for children and adults, social events for married and bachelor personnel, and Jewish cultural programs. The chaplain himself serves as
a counselor, moral leader, character builder, and food processor. On Passover he runs billets and mess halls, solves transportation problems, arranges for leaves, and concerns himself with making available the right food for the entire eight days. He may teach women how to bake hallot and bagels in the States or overseas. He builds a sukkah and electrifies an outdoor menorah. He organizes sisterhoods and inspires their loyalty and support. He trains a choir as well as teachers for his religious school. He celebrates the joyous occasions in the serviceman’s family such as births, bar mitzvahs, confirmations, and marriages. He is also there for the tragic events—accidents, ill health, and death. He counsels on marriage, intermarriage, divorce, home problems, adjustment to military life, broken home ties, court martial offenses, questions of faith, accusations of antisemitism, etc. He interviews Jewish GIs as they come on post and as they leave the post. He represents the Jewish community at command functions and at chaplains’ meetings. Along with the non-Jewish chaplains, he gives character-guidance lectures to the entire command and conducts orientation lectures. He requisitions religious supplies, attends to the beautification of the chapel, raises funds for social and religious programs, and conducts year-round special events. He also finds time to prepare sermons and talks, to attend chaplaincy and rabbinic conferences, and to spend time with his family.

**Resources**

To help him he has the many military resources which are available to all chaplains. These include well-equipped chapels, religious-school facilities, meeting rooms, clerical assistance, etc. The JWB provides him with many specifically Jewish items, such as canned kosher foods for personnel who observe the dietary laws, Torah Scrolls, megillot for Purim, shofarot for the High Holy Days, etrogim and lulavim for Sukkot, pamphlets and greeting cards for the holidays, tracts on subjects of general Jewish interest, program materials for discussions, bulletins, procedure guides for handling Passover problems, kashrut, publicity, attendance. The Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy provides guidance through orientation sessions, field visits, correspondence, training conferences, newsletters, overseas retreats and Torah convocations. The Women’s Organizations’ Services of JWB helps establish sisterhoods and provides gifts for children and GIs on various holidays, as well as pictures and books for the chaplain’s office and the chapel library.

In the United States the chaplain receives further aid locally from scores of JWB Armed Forces and Veterans Service committees in communities near military installations, which make available every possible community resource. He is also assisted by local communities. Jewish community-center and synagogue facilities are made available to the Jewish serviceman, as is home hospitality, on appropriate occasions. Servicemen are invited to concerts, lectures, and other special events off the post, and provided with entertainment, refreshment, and—that indispensable element in the life of happy and contented young men—the opportunity to meet girls on post.

The more the chaplain draws upon the resources made available to him
by the military, JWB, and the Jewish communities, the richer the content of his program and the more successful his ministry.

Reactions to Chaplaincy Experience

In 1964 the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy sent 400 questionnaires to Jewish chaplains on active duty and to civilian rabbis who had served in uniform since 1950 to obtain their reactions to the chaplaincy experience. One hundred and ninety-three replies were received, an unusually high response to a one-time mailing. The questions were deliberately slanted against the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy. To insure a thoroughly objective response, signatures were not required. Replies were analyzed by a study group composed of the presidents and recruiting chairmen of the three rabbinic organizations and the officers of the commission. Rabbi Max D. Davidson, of Perth Amboy, N.J., former commission chairman and former SCA president, was chairman. The study revealed that:

1. An overwhelming majority considered that their chaplaincy experiences compensated for the physical risks, the separation from families, and the financial sacrifice involved.
2. Patriotism furnished the primary motive for entering the chaplaincy. Other reasons were, in that order, respect for the requirements of the chaplaincy draft, responsiveness to the needs of Jewish servicemen, and recognition of opportunity for new experience.
3. Respondents were in agreement that the service performed by full-time Jewish military chaplains in uniform could not be handled by civilian rabbis making periodic visits to the posts.
4. Respondents would unanimously advise their younger colleagues and students at seminaries to enter the chaplaincy.
5. The chief objections to entering the chaplaincy were that it caused delay in beginning civilian rabbinical careers and offered relatively low pay. Some respondents had reservations because of the separation from family that was entailed and the opposition of wife and family.
6. Almost all respondents felt “better,” not “worse off because of . . . service in the chaplaincy.”

Effect of Service

The two or three years which rabbis spend in the service immediately after ordination serve as a valuable internship for the rabbinate. They give young graduates the opportunity to learn administrative procedures and subtle personnel skills that are not taught in the seminaries and are normally acquired only after long years of experience. Moreover, newly graduated rabbis, educated in the philosophy of one particular group, often get their first real opportunity to meet representatives of other rabbinical groups and thereby gain an insight into different philosophies of Jewish life. In addition, young rabbis, often reared in all-Jewish environments and sometimes quite ignorant about the various Christian denominations, are confronted with
the need and opportunity to learn about Christian thought and practices and to relate to Christian colleagues. This is obviously good preparation for establishing proper interreligious relationships in the civilian communities in which they will later serve.

The military experience has offered rabbis a good opportunity to observe Jewish youth and the effect of the synagogues' religious training programs upon them. (They have found that in military congregations, at least, most Jews are not committed to Orthodox, Conservative, or Reform Judaism, as such, but consider themselves to be simply Jews, without any denominational label, and that most of these unlabeled Jews know very little about Judaism. But this is beyond the scope of this article.)

The chaplaincy experience leaves its mark on the rabbi when he returns to civilian life. Former chaplains of different schools of thought get along better with each other than other rabbis and tend to be less deeply involved in denominational conflicts.

CURRENT PROBLEMS

There are a number of day-to-day problems which the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy has not yet solved and which, perhaps, may never be solved satisfactorily.

Career Chaplaincy

Through its self-imposed draft system, the commission has furnished the Armed Forces with enough rabbis to meet annual military quotas. However, most of the men thus drafted serve for only two or three years and then return to civilian pulpits, leaving an insufficient number of career chaplains to insure proportionate Jewish representation in the higher ranks. There are simply not enough Jewish chaplains with rank, maturity, and experience to serve as faculty members of the chaplain school and on high-command levels at strategic headquarters the world over.

Although many rabbis have relished the chaplaincy experience and have been encouraged by the military as well as the commission to remain on duty, most have rejected a career. Two reasons are cited most frequently: the limited possibilities for providing children with an adequate Jewish education and the comparatively low salaries offered by the Armed Forces—several thousand dollars a year less than what civilian rabbis often receive. While the salary problem is not insoluble, the possibility of providing children of Jewish chaplains with a proper Jewish education and a Jewish milieu seems remote.

Jewish Education for Children

In 1965 half of all military personnel were married. Even a minimal Jewish educational program for the children of these servicemen was a rarity. Where there are full-time Jewish chaplains, they manage, in most
instances, to organize and supervise satisfactory religious schools. But at
domestic installations having no full-time chaplains, particularly those
which are removed from established Jewish communities, and overseas,
especially if there is no Jewish chaplain, there simply are no Jewish edu-
cational facilities.

To help remedy this situation, the Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy in
September 1964 published a unified Jewish curriculum, which the military
distributes to installations throughout the world. Jewish chaplains make
periodic visits to all installations to urge parents to establish religious schools
and to train teachers. As a consequence, scores of schools have been set up
and dedicated parents and other interested individuals study manuals, books,
and teachers' guides in the interest of their children. Many technical, ad-
ministrative, and financial difficulties have been encountered, but the program
is gaining ground.

The Women's Organizations' Services of the JWB has helped organize
military sisterhoods to support this program, furnishes holiday gifts for the
children, and provides information and publications explaining holiday and
other traditional practices.

Dispersion of Jewish Personnel

The blessings of integration have not been unmixed. Jewish personnel are
dispersed in military installations around the world. Groups of 10 or 15 men
at weather stations, radar sites, and small depots, aboard ships and in special
task forces, etc., need service even more than those at large installations
boasting full Jewish programs of activities. A complicated and costly Jewish
"logistical" system is employed to maintain communications with such iso-
lated personnel. The commission provides guidance and furnishes religious
supplies to non-Jewish chaplains and selected Jewish officers and enlisted
men to help them serve their religious needs. An intense effort is made to
reach everyone on Passover and the High Holy Days, but, given the limita-
tions of JWB resources, there are undoubtedly many who are missed.

CONCLUSION

Judaism is one of the three major faiths in the United States. In the military
this recognition is more clearly translated into positive terms than anywhere
else on the American scene.

Military chapels are non-denominational and thus available to all faiths.
Military hymnals contain sections of hymns and music for each of the major
faiths. Bibles, prepared especially for each of the three faiths, are provided.
Religious educational facilities and supplies are made available to all. No
missionary efforts are countenanced. Each faith is respected. More than that,
each chaplain is concerned that each man in his unit is afforded the oppor-
portunity to worship, or even not to worship, according to the dictates of his
conscience. Antisemitism is just not tolerated in the military. A man can ruin
his career and even be court-martialed for such an offense. Far more than in
civilian life, the Jew is considered as an absolute equal.

The chaplain school offers a unique experience for clergymen of all faiths.
Chaplains reared in their own denominational seminaries, each of which
stresses the differences between religious groupings and emphasizes its own
favor with God, wear the same uniform, eat, sleep, study, and train together,
and separate only for religious worship. Mutual respect develops; friendships
are formed across denominational lines and appreciation of the spiritual
chain which binds them all comes to the fore. During and since World War
II, at least 15,000 American clergymen have shared this experience, and
Jewish chaplain-school students have been effective representatives of Judaism
to them.

All of this augurs well for the Jewish community of America. The rab-
binate long ago acknowledged the importance of the military chaplaincy by
giving it first call on rabbinic manpower. The Jewish community itself does
not yet sufficiently appreciate the contributions made by the chaplaincy to
the welfare of Jewry in America, but future historians undoubtedly will.

ARYEH LEV

The United States, Israel, and the Middle East

THE PERENNIAL political wrangling among the Arab states and
their irreconcilable hostility toward Israel dominated two major summit con-
ferences. The 13 leaders of the Arab League convened in Cairo and again in
Alexandria to evolve a program of action directed at Israel's contemplated
Jordan water project and to provide a moratorium on the differences be-
tween the Nasserist republican revolutionary forces and the remaining mon-
archies.

ARAB STATES AND ISRAEL

Cairo Summit Meeting

Although details of the decisions at Cairo were not immediately revealed,
it was known that the five-day conference in mid-January approved plans to
divert the two main sources of the Jordan River—the Hasbani in Lebanon
(see p. 466) and the Banyas in Syria; that it allocated $1.75 million for this
purpose, and agreed to set up a unified military command to make the armies
of Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan strong enough to back up the diversion plan.

The relatively mild resolution passed at the end of the conference was
merely an expression of Arab unity and of anti-Israel policy. It indicated that
UAR President Gamal Abdul Nasser had intended to use the conference to isolate Syria in its demand for military action against Israel over the Jordan diversion plan. He succeeded in having the Arab leaders reject any immediate military adventure in favor of moderation. Indeed, Dana Adams Schmidt, in the New York Times of January 13, interpreted Nasser's intentions as a challenge to the Arab leaders "to share not so much a plan for action against Israel, as responsibility for inaction, at least for now."

Nasser's strong bid for Arab unity at the parley reflected a complete reversal of his previous role as a revolutionary seeking to overthrow the remaining monarchies in the Near East. He now posed as the advocate of coexistence between the republican and monarchial regimes. After he met with Jordan's King Hussein, relations were resumed between the UAR and Jordan. They had been severed in 1958 when Cairo recognized the new Iraqi regime that had overthrown Hussein's cousin, King Faisal, and Nasser had attacked Hussein as a fascist for backing Saudi Arabia and Yemen's royalists. Nasser also conferred with King Saud of Saudi Arabia about ending the indecisive Yemen civil war. The feud between King Hassan of Morocco and President Ahmed ben Bella of Algeria was also resolved at the conference, and Hassan promised to resume diplomatic relations with President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia, broken in 1960.

Nasser's major quarrel was with Amin el-Hafez, premier of republican Syria, whose Baathist government refused to accept Nasser's hegemony over a contemplated federation of Egypt, Iraq, and Syria. In October Iraq and Egypt announced the creation of a joint political agency that was to take practical measures to achieve constitutional unity within two years.

Reactions of U.S.A. to Cairo Conference

The United States did not react directly to the decisions of the conference to divert the sources of the Jordan River and to form a unified Arab military command. However, Deputy Undersecretary of State Alexis Johnson, in an address in January to the conference of the Citizens Committee on American Policy in the Near East (a pro-Arab group of Americans, many of whom are also active in the anti-Israel Friends of the Middle East) said: "... the leaders of the Arab states and Israel know that the administration of President Johnson intends no fundamental changes in our Near Eastern policies ... the main lines of policy followed in the past several years will continue to be our guide." Johnson further stressed that the United States seeks to avoid "taking sides in regional disputes," but inferred that the United States guaranteed the security of both Israel and the Arab countries, and that "any intended victim of any would-be aggressor can count on our support." Special importance was attached to this statement because it was the first authoritative declaration of American Middle East policy since President Johnson had taken office and because it followed on the heels of the Cairo conference.

The Arab world reacted strongly against the Alexis Johnson pronouncement, and the United States embassy at Beirut saw fit to explain on January 26 that Johnson's remarks merely reiterated Washington's opposition to ag-
gression, and were not directed at any particular parties; that is, it was not intended as an answer to the Arab summit conference.

**Conferences of Organization of African Unity (OAU) and Non-aligned Nations**

At the Cairo conference the Arab leaders expressed the hope that other African and Asian states would support the Arab struggle against “Zionist imperialist dangers.” Cairo subsequently played host to the conferences of OAU and the non-aligned nations at which this support was to be sought.

The leaders of the 34 African states of OAU met in the beginning of July to reavow their determination to liberate Africans in white-dominated South Africa, Portuguese Mozambique, and Angola. An attempt was made to inject the Israel issue into the proceedings of the conference. However, just as at its first meeting at Addis Ababa in May 1963, OAU again rejected the Arab-Israel problems as extraneous to the Africa-for-Africans guidelines for the conferrees.

But the geographical rationale for excluding the Israel problem from the OAU conference did not prevail at the October meeting of 57 non-aligned Afro-Asian nations. President Nasser opened this conference with sharp denunciations of British and Portuguese colonialism in Africa and in the Middle East. Comparing Israel to Rhodesia, he declared that “imperialism is concealing herself behind the Zionist movement in order to expropriate an area from the very heart of the Arab nation after the expulsion of the people that dwelt in it. Zionism has created an armed base threatening the aspirations of the Arabs to freedom, unity and progress.” This time the Arabs succeeded in getting support for a resolution affirming the right of the Palestinian Arabs to return to their homeland. Israel was somewhat dismayed by the adoption of this resolution, for it reflected the growing Arab influence within the relatively neutralist Afro-Asian world.

**Alexandria Conference**

In May, when the first water flowed through Israel’s pipeline from the Sea of Galilee to the Negev, Israel issued a statement explaining that this was merely a test of the pumping and canal system, and assured the United States that the water withdrawals would not exceed her share under the American-sponsored regional plan for the waters’ division among Israel, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon (AJYB, 1955 [Vol. 56], p. 288; 1956 [Vol. 57], p. 287; 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 451).

Not until September was there a reaction from the Arab nations. Then, at their second summit conference, in Alexandria, they called for the immediate implementation of a military and technical program to prevent Israel’s further use of the Jordan River water. It was still not clear what would be done and precisely when, but there could be no doubt of their intent to build dams and canals to divert for their exclusive use the headwaters of the Jordan River rising on Arab soil. Israel reiterated in September that she would draw water
from the Sea of Galilee within the quantities allotted to her in the unified plan and that she would "oppose unilateral and illegal measures by Arab countries and will act to preserve her vital rights."

Potentially, the most serious threat to peace was the approval in Alexandria of the formation of a Palestinian army composed of Arab refugees. The Arab leaders also endorsed a new "liberation" organization, headed by Ahmed Shukairy, as the legal representative of a million Palestinian refugees. However, despite urging from Lieutenant General Amin el-Hafez of Syria that this organization be given sovereignty and land, the heads of the Arab states refrained from elevating Shukairy's organization to the status of a Palestinian government-in-exile.

**UAR-Saudi Arabia Accord on Yemen**

The Alexandria conference, like the one in Cairo, sought to create greater accommodation between the adherents of the established monarchies and the revolutionary movements represented by Nasser. Two days after the summit conference, Prince Faisal, who later succeeded King Saud as the ruler of Saudi Arabia, signed an accord for full cooperation regarding military disputes over Yemen. A joint communiqué said the Egyptians and the Saudi Arabians would "undertake necessary contacts with parties involved for peaceful settlement of the two-year-old civil war." This agreement was especially welcome to the United States government, which had sought in vain to resolve through diplomatic channels the issue of Yemen and to end the Saudi-Egyptian war (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 146-7).

In November the Egyptian and Saudi governments announced a cease-fire agreement, reached at a conference of Yemeni republican and royalist representatives attended by Egyptian and Saudi officials. This cease-fire was generally considered as a victory for King Faisal, for it meant that President Nasser had to give de facto recognition to the Yemeni royalists—a tacit admission that the Egyptian army could not subdue them. However, by the end of 1964 none of the major problems had been solved: Nasser continued to maintain a force of 40,000 men in Yemen.

**UNITED NATIONS AND ISRAEL**

United Nations Secretary General U Thant's statement on Arab-Israeli relations in January 1964, proved to be prophetic. Referring particularly to the Arab-Israeli border conflict, he declared: "I am very much afraid that there will be more than one occasion in 1964 when Middle Eastern problems will engage the attention of the United Nations."

On November 13 there was a violent outbreak of hostilities on the Israel-Syrian border. The Security Council met on November 16, at the request of both Syria and Israel. During the debate the Syrian representative Rafik Asha accused Israel of having deliberately provoked the incident as a pretext for a large-scale air attack on Syrian territory. Michael S. Comay, the Israeli representative, said that the sole purpose of the Israel air strike, begun when
Syrian military positions fired on normal Israeli activities across the border, was to destroy the Syrian positions from which the attacks on Israel were launched.

In his report to U Thant, General Odd Bull, head of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), declared that the incident began with firing on an Israeli military patrol in the Tel el-Qadi area from Syria. From the outset, firing was heavy on both sides and additional Syrian positions joined in the bombardment. The report concluded that the suspicion and bitterness existing between the two countries were caused to a considerable extent by "Israel's firm refusal to recognize any locus standi to Syria in the demilitarized zone, the greater part of which is now in point of fact controlled by Israel" and to "Syria's steadfast refusal to seek an end to its conflict with Israel."

On December 17 the Security Council rejected a Moroccan resolution which would have condemned Israel for the clash. The United States and Great Britain submitted a resolution deploring the clashes and recommending that Israel and Syria cooperate with UN efforts to maintain peace and to complete a survey to mark the border line. This resolution, as expected, was vetoed by the Soviet Union, which had earlier supported Morocco.

Serious clashes also occurred on December 23, between Israel and Jordan. Jordanian soldiers shot and wounded three Israeli sentries posted in the demilitarized zone on Mt. Scopus. This had been preceded by an earlier incident on December 8, when an Israeli farmer was killed and another wounded near the settlement of Yad Hannah. The border clashes between Jordan and Israel were believed to reflect an emergent militancy on the part of Jordan, caused by her rapport with Nasser at the summit conference.

**Arab Refugees**

The Arab-refugee issue was discussed by Laurence Michelmore, commissioner general of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA), in a report for the period from July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964. He noted that the Arab "host" governments—Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon—and the refugees themselves had not cooperated with UNRWA in its efforts to obtain reliable statistics on the extent of the need among the refugees. Of the 1,246,585 refugees on the UNRWA registration rolls, "the destitute and near-destitute, may at present constitute some 40 to 50 per cent . . . the partially self-supporting—who are nevertheless still in need of help from UNRWA—may be some 30 to 40 per cent, . . . and . . . those who now appear to be securely established may represent 10 to 20 per cent."

Michelmore further informed the Assembly that "no discernible progress has been made toward a solution of the Palestine refugee problem." Referring to the expiration on June 30, 1965, of UNRWA's current mandate, he reminded the Assembly that it must decide whether UNRWA was to continue and, if not, what other form Arab-refugee care would take. He asked for a 1965 budget totaling $37 million, an increase of $100,000 above the estimated expenditures for 1964. The figures indicated that since 1950 UNRWA had
received a total of more than $482 million of which more than $340 million came from the United States.

The Arab issue, in general, and the Arab-refugee issue, in particular, were not on the agenda of the General Assembly before its adjournment in 1964. In view of the presentations made by nine Arab speakers in the general debate, the Arab countries were expected to seek to win UN recognition of the new liberation organization and the liberation army of Palestinian refugees decided upon at the Alexandria conference.

Abba Eban, Israel's deputy premier, in a speech before the General Assembly on December 22, charged that the Arabs considered the refugees as a force of hostility and possible aggression against Israel. He quoted the spokesman for Kuwait's assertion that the Arabs' interest was "not in assisting the refugees, but liberating their homeland."

**UNITED STATES AND THE ARAB STATES**

A major factor in determining the relationship between the United States and the Arab world was not the Israel-Arab conflict, but rather developments in Cyprus, Congo, and Indonesia that found the Arabs generally critical of the United States. This was especially true of the UAR, whose relations with the United States had undergone a sharp deterioration by the end of 1964.

**United Arab Republic**

American policy with regard to the UAR continued to be based on the position that the United States, through its economic-aid program, could keep Nasser safely out of the Soviet orbit. In June 1963 Secretary of State Dean Rusk voiced this view before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "The Soviet presence, prestige, and influence in the Arab world diminished to its lowest point in years, with a resulting shift westward in UAR trade, training, and cultural contacts. The UAR has adopted a non-alignment policy increasingly more compatible with free-world interests."

This was seen to be wishful thinking after the visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to Cairo. At Aswan on May 13, Khrushchev and Nasser joined in a ceremony ending the first phase of the construction of the Aswan high dam, and the week-long visit culminated in the announcement that the Soviet Union had agreed to grant Nasser an additional loan of $275 million. Besides these concrete measures of Soviet assistance, Khrushchev promised support to the "Arab peoples and their struggle for their legitimate rights," and condemned Israel as the "hireling of imperialism."

The removal of Khrushchev as Soviet premier did not diminish the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Egypt. On the contrary, Soviet Deputy Premier Alexander Shelepin, during a short visit to Egypt at the end of December, stressed that Moscow's friendship for Egypt "is stronger than ever" and declared that the Soviet Union supports the just struggle of Egypt and other Arab countries against the imperialists that exploit the Palestine question as an instrument for
increasing their penetration into the Middle East. . . . It is important to solve as soon as possible the return of legal rights of the Arabs of Palestine.

Shelepín, like Khrushchev, was concerned with the Sino-Soviet ideological conflict and was seeking Egypt's support to obtain an invitation to the March 1965 conference of Afro-Asian countries in Algeria. (Communist China was opposed to Soviet participation, ostensibly because Russia was a European power.)

By the end of 1964 a marked deterioration in relations between Egypt and the United States had become apparent. Illustrative of this deterioration were the burning on Thanksgiving night of the United States embassy library in Cairo by Egyptian mobs as a reaction to the American-Belgian rescue operation of captive civilians in the Congo; the shooting down of an American oil company's plane on a routine flight from Jordan to Libya on December 19; a pre-Christmas speech by Nasser suggesting that the United States could go "jump in the lake with its aid" if it did not like Egyptian actions; a pointed omission by Nasser of the United States and some West European powers in his New Year's greeting list, while the Soviet Union got top billing among 45 Communist and neutralist nations, and the recruitment of soldiers and shipment of arms to Congo rebels in defiance of a UN resolution.

The Johnson administration muted its protest as it sought an apology and compensation for the burning of the embassy and the shooting down of the plane. Contrary to rumors that the administration, annoyed at Nasser's anti-American attitude, would withhold food shipments, the United States decided to ship to the UAR nearly $17 million in farm surpluses, besides the annual $140 million in such aid.

(Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations committee, generally opposed to limitation of economic aid to Egypt, stated early in January, 1965, that consideration should be given to cutting off aid to countries that failed to prevent mob attacks on United States libraries. In his State of the Union message later that month, President Johnson warned that the United States would not be indifferent to acts injuring American interests, citizens, or establishments abroad. The State Department, however, continued to incline toward a longer-range policy of keeping on talking terms with Cairo so as to be able to exercise a moderating, pro-Western influence on the Nasser government.)

**Jordan**

Far smoother relations existed between the United States and Jordan, highlighted by the visit of King Hussein in April. President Johnson, in a welcoming address to Hussein, expressed his pleasure over the improvement of relations among the Arab nations and Hussein's prominent role in that development. Mr. Johnson also declared: "We are proud to have been able to assist Jordan in the past and we stand ready to continue our assistance in such a great undertaking." (American assistance to Jordan consisted of $34 million
in budgetary support, $7 million in development grants, and $4 million in military assistance.)

King Hussein stirred up considerable controversy when, in a speech before the Citizens Committee on American Policy in the Near East, he urged the United States to "take a fresh look" at its Middle East policies and called upon American Jews "to make an agonizing reappraisal" of their attitude towards Zionism and Israel. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee issued a statement denouncing Hussein's "abuse of hospitality of the United States while here as a guest of the President, to malign the Zionist movement, to insult the great majority of the American Jewish community who strongly support Israel, to misrepresent the facts about Israel, and to distort objectives of United States policy." This was followed by a statement by the Conference of Presidents of American Jewish Organizations, condemning King Hussein for his lecture to American Jews about "their deep affection and affinity for the people of Israel."

In Jordan, too, the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union became evident. Jordanian diplomats informed the United States in August that the Soviet Union had offered Jordan modern arms, including supersonic planes. They indicated that Jordan preferred to use American equipment, but might turn to the USSR if Washington failed to act.

U.S. RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL

A direct channel of communication between Washington and Jerusalem was established with the visit of Prime Minister Levi Eshkol to the United States in June. A joint communiqué, issued after two days of talks took particular note of United States support of "the territorial integrity and political independence of all countries in the Near East." President Johnson emphasized firm United States opposition to aggression and the use or threat of force against any country. The Eshkol-Johnson communiqué's expression of regret that the region's resources were being spent on unproductive armament was viewed as a criticism of Khrushchev's policy of supplying arms to the Arabs, and as an implied appeal to the Soviet leadership to change its stand on arms shipments.

The communiqué also approved "the agreement reached to undertake joint studies on problems of desalination." Official action on this project was initiated in October, when the United States and Israel signed an agreement providing for a detailed study of the feasibility of implementing in Israel a joint program using nuclear energy for the desalination of sea water. President Johnson hailed the agreement as "a second step toward the solution of Israel's critical water needs."

Economic Aid to Israel

According to a statement in January by David Bell, director of the Agency for International Development, before a Senate committee, American aid to Israel would include development loans totaling $20 million, in addition to
the more than $20 million in the sale of surplus agricultural commodities for local currency. This assistance was within the framework of an existing United States-Israel three-year agreement. Replying to Senator Allen J. El- lender's (Dem.-La.) objection to what he called “too easy” terms of grants made to Israel, Bell stated that, in view of the rapid improvement of the country's economy, the Israelis had agreed that the United States should be in the process of terminating economic aid to their country. He noted that grants to Israel had already been terminated and terms for developing loans had been stiffened, having gone up by stages from .75 per cent in 1962 to 2 per cent in 1963 and 3.25 per cent in 1964.

Other economic aid to Israel came in the form of research grants totaling $334,000 from the United States Department of Agriculture to Technion, Hebrew University, Weizmann Institute of Science, and the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics.

U.S. ELECTIONS AND ISRAEL

Republicans

During the last presidential election year, as in previous elections, the Israel-Arab conflict was injected into the campaign by both the Republican and Democratic parties. The Republican party, meeting in July, adopted a brief Middle East plank which, for the first time since 1944, made no reference to Israel or Jewish aspirations in the Middle East. "Respecting the Middle East," the plank read, "and in addition to our reaffirmed pledges of 1960 concerning this area, we will so direct our economic and military assistance as to help maintain stability in this region and prevent an imbalance of arms."

The platform committee did not incorporate into the platform a statement submitted earlier that month by 32 Republican representatives and senators asking for direct negotiations of the differences between the Arab states and Israel and assailing the opposition of the United States delegation to the UN to the resolution of December 1961, which had called for Arab-Israel peace negotiations at the UN. The statement also advocated support of Israel's water development program, condemnation of Egypt for its anti-Israel hostilities and its acquisition of Soviet arms, and American efforts to end Arab boycotts and blockades against Israel.

Representative Seymour Halpern of New York, speaking for the committee of 32 Republicans, requested immediate cessation of aid to Egypt as provided in the Gruening-Javits amendment, now part of the Aid law, which had not been implemented by the administration (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 153).

Democrats

The Democratic party, meeting at the end of August, adopted a draft statement guaranteeing Arab-Israel borders and pledged the Democratic party to
work for the attainment of peace in the Near East as an urgent goal, using our best efforts to prevent a military imbalance, to encourage arms reductions and the use of national resources for internal development and to encourage the resettlement of Arab refugees in lands where there is room and opportunity. The problems of political adjustment between Israel and the Arab countries can and must be peacefully resolved and the territorial integrity of every nation respected.

Harold B. Minor, appearing for the Citizens Committee on American Policy in the Near East before the Democratic platform committee, contended that the 1960 Democratic platform had contained “preferential policies” and that, as he already had stated before the Republican platform committee, political platforms had been written to win support from Jewish voters. He called for party platforms “based on the American national interest instead of on the illusive and imaginary theory of a bloc vote by a minority group” and for an end to “parties playing domestic politics with important policy issues in the Arab world.”

Minor’s statement was challenged by Representative Harris B. McDowell of Delaware. The Democratic platform committee, he said, directs itself to any problem of foreign policy and the American people whose constitutional right it was to participate in any function of its government, had been concerned about the Middle East over the last decade.

**Johnson-Goldwater**

The Arab-Israel problem was neutralized during the campaign as both President Johnson and Senator Barry Goldwater made firm pledges to safeguard the territorial and political integrity of Israel as well as of all Middle East states. Messages to this effect were sent by both candidates to the 67th annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America, in October.

**Keating-Kennedy**

At the ZOA convention Emmanuel Neumann emphasized that the organization was politically uncommitted and that it had always sought and found bipartisan support. This emphasis on the organization’s nonpartisan position came during the contest between Senator Kenneth B. Keating and former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy for the seat of senator from New York.

Both Kennedy and Keating reaffirmed their support of Israel. Both sent messages to the annual convention of ZOA’s Manhattan Region, in September. Senator Keating advocated the admission of Israel to NATO as the “practical implementation of the principle of collective security—an attack on Israel would be considered an attack on all.” Mr. Kennedy cited his role in the Kennedy Administration’s decisions “to send Hawk missiles to Israel, to increase economic aid, and to help develop the plan to use the Jordan River.”
An anti-Israel mural in the Jordanian pavilion at the New York World's Fair showed an Arab refugee youth and his mother appealing to the world to help "the millions of us wasting our lives in exiled misery waiting to go home." Officials of the American-Israel pavilion protested the mural to Robert Moses, president of the World's Fair, asserting that "such propaganda runs counter to the spirit of the Fair, expressed in its theme 'Peace through understanding.'" Moses replied that "the Fair cannot censure the mural you refer to, even though it is political in nature and subject to misinterpretation."

In May, twelve officers of AJCongress were arrested for disorderly conduct when they picketed the Jordanian pavilion. At the trial in July, Judge Bernard Dubin ruled that picketing was an exercise of the participants' constitutional rights under the First Amendment. Judge Dubin's opinion rebuked the fair's management for not making "some effort, whether legally bound or not, to have the offensive mural removed."

### Arab Boycott

The Arab economic boycott of Israeli commodities and the services of all enterprises which trade with or help Israel economically was intensified in 1964. The Arabs announced in July that to the already blacklisted 167 United States companies had been added the Chase Manhattan bank—the world's second-largest bank, with 102 offices overseas—because it dealt with Israeli bonds. In answer, Chase Manhattan issued a statement that it had been acting "as fiscal agent for Israel bonds held by investors in the United States and abroad" since 1951 and that since then "there has been no change in its functions with Israel." The Arabs gave the bank until the end of the year to cut off relations with Israel. ARAMCO and other American companies were said to be especially concerned and to be wondering whether to sever their relations with the bank so as not to endanger their position in Arab countries.

Discrimination against Jews by Arab governments also affected the United States armed forces. Upon receipt of information from a Jewish airman stationed at Wheelus Air Force Base in Tripoli, Libya, that the United States Air Force had deleted references to Judaism and Jews from its radio and television programs for the base, Senator Jacob K. Javits asked the Air Force to end this practice. In October the Air Force officially confirmed that it had indeed deleted such references, as part of a "self-imposed policy" of removing from its programs any items that might be "objectionable" to a host country.

Concern over Arab activities in the United States was expressed by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee. In September he charged that Arab and pro-Arab agencies in this country had spent a total of $1.75 million on anti-Israel propaganda among all segments of the American people, including university campuses. In 1964 the Arab Information Center admittedly spent $146,000 to "disseminate factual information on events in Israel and the Middle East." Rabbi Bernstein added
that the American Friends of the Middle East, working in business circles, on the campuses, and in Washington, "provides Arab students for indoctrination in the colleges and universities of the land."

In February Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton, in a letter to Congressman Leonard Farbstein (Dem.-N.Y.), expressed the government's continued opposition to the Arab boycott of American firms doing business with Israel. The United States, he wrote, had repeatedly informed the Arab governments of its attitude and was prepared to continue "to make every effort consistent with over-all United States policy in the Near East to relieve the firm from the impediments to its business activities posed by the boycott" at the specific request, or with the consent, of the individual American firms.

AMERICAN JEWS AND ISRAEL

The issue of the role of religion in Israeli public affairs troubled a large segment of the American Jewish community. Seven major Jewish organizations (American Jewish Committee, AJCongress, B'nai B'rith, CCAR, Rabbinical Assembly, UAHC, and United Synagogue) cabled Prime Minister Eshkol on March 5 urging him to stand firm against the demands of American and Israeli Orthodox Jews for Israeli laws to restrict religious freedom. The organizations stated that the overwhelming majority of American Jews supported the principle of separation of church and state and full religious freedom, and that American Jews reject the attempt of the extremist religious elements to polarize the American Jewish community into two opposing groups—religious and secularist—and their claims that they and they alone represent the Jewish religious community . . . we abhor any attempt by governmental authority . . . to interfere with the expression of religion in all its aspects.

This cable called forth a strong rebuff by the American Orthodox community. On March 10, UOJC accused the seven organizations of "communal irresponsibility" and declared that "the government of Israel must be considered duty-bound to adhere to policies conformable with respect for Jewish religious law and traditional heritage in the public life of the Jewish state." At the same time RCA also denounced the cable as "a scurrilous attack and a complete fabrication" and demanded a retraction. On March 26, the Religious Zionists of America (Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi) withdrew from AJCongress, accusing it of having committed an "act of bad faith" in signing "without prior consultation . . . a document dealing with so crucial a religious matter." AJCongress President Joachim Prinz explained his organization's position in a statement on April 14: "What we think is right and just in our own country must be just and right in Israel. What we find wanting in America—the imperfections of democracy that we recognize and seek to correct—must also be considered faulty and in need of correction in Israel." On April 13, in Israel, Prime Minister Eshkol interpreted the cable "as not an intervention by an alien body, but an indication that the Jewish world lives Israel's
problems—what affects Israel affects them. I see nothing wrong in an expression of opinion on these matters.”

Zionism

The Zionist movement directed its attention to the problem of the “vanishing Jew,” the major preoccupation of American Jewry during 1964. On the eve of the World Zionist Congress’s convention, in December, Nahum Goldmann, said:

We have become part and parcel of the life of the other peoples, and with that we have lost the main basis of our separate existence . . . the result is that . . . a very large part of our people, especially the young generation, is threatened by an anonymous process of erosion, of disintegration, not as a theory or as a conscientious ideology but by the fact of this day-to-day life.

In line with his projected program of restructuring WZO, Dr. Goldmann also called upon the delegates to elect non-Zionists to the movement’s executive bodies to help them carry out the new program for Jewish survival. The first step in this direction had already been taken by the presence among the 540 Congress delegates of 72 representatives of youth organizations and delegates of 26 Jewish communities and major organizations not affiliated with the Zionist movement. The United States, with 145 delegates, had the largest contingent except for Israel, whose 190 delegates were apportioned according to their party representation in the Kneset.

Although the congress dealt largely with the survival of the Jews in the Diaspora, considerable stress was laid on the survival requirements for Israel, in the form of Western immigration. The Jewish Agency report on immigration indicated that 250,000 immigrants had entered Israel since the last congress, in 1960—about 30,000 from North and South America and Western Europe. Earlier, in May, S. Z. Shragai, head of the Jewish Agency’s immigration department, reported that 5,000 American and Canadian Jews had settled in Israel in 1963. He noted that, whereas in the past the emphasis had been on bringing Jews from lands of oppression, the immigration department would now concentrate on immigration from the countries of the free world. He called for skilled workers and scientists to help the industrial development of Israel.

At its convention in early October, ZOA passed a resolution urging that immigration of middle-class American Jews be encouraged. To promote such immigration, ZOA proposed a program of creating Israeli housing projects for American settlers, in cooperation with Israeli authorities. Abraham Cygiel, director of the Jewish Agency’s absorption department, announced the projected construction of a large housing project of 20,000 new apartments.

The theme of aliyah, dissociated from the traditional halutz connotations integral to “Ben-Gurionism,” was emphasized in the greeting sent to the ZOA convention by Prime Minister Eshkol, who stated that increased immigration to Israel from the United States would provide the “strongest link between Israel and the American Jewish community.”
Interest in the settlement of American Jews in Israel was also reflected in the announcement in November by Joseph Rattner, chairman of the economic and religious department of the Religious Zionists of America, that a new city, Kiryat Herzog, would be built at a cost of $23 million to provide housing and employment for 10,000 people.

The American Section of the Jewish Agency began the publication in November of Aliyah, a periodical giving information on settlement possibilities in Israel for Americans.

LOUIS SHUB

American Response to Soviet Anti-Jewish Policies

In the period under review (October 1963 to December 1964) the plight of Soviet Jewry was a matter of general concern. Continuing anti-Jewish policies and practices in the Soviet Union—corroborated by reports from many sources, including the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the International Commission of Jurists, the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, the United States Department of State, and an international socialist study group, all within a twelve-month period—had at last aroused public opinion in the free world. Appeals were made by Bertrand Russell and there were editorial comments in Jewish, Christian, and secular periodicals. Documentation by the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and B'nai B'rith International were widely circulated in Jewish communities and organizations. Concern for the plight of Soviet Jewry was even expressed by Communist parties in western countries.

With few exceptions, notably the Jewish defense organizations in the United States (American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, National Community Relations Advisory Council), Jewish opinion had previously remained unconvinced of the special nature of anti-Jewish discrimination in the USSR. Most Jewish organizations in the United States had been content to employ "quiet diplomacy" and to restrict their activities to meeting with low-echelon Soviet officials who assured them that there was no Jewish problem in the USSR. In a few instances Soviet officials in the United States and Canada had conceded the existence of what they called isolated local problems, but there was no evidence that the remedies they promised were ever implemented.

By mid-1963 it was clear that no fundamental changes in Jewish policy had been initiated in the USSR. Jewish cultural institutions, forcibly padlocked by the Stalin regime, remained closed more than a decade after destalinization had become fashionable. Unlike other ethnic and national minorities in the
Soviet Union, Jews remained deprived of schools, publications, and theaters. Synagogues were being closed, the ban on the production of religious articles continued, baking and distributing matzot were forbidden or hampered, and the training of religious leaders was made impossible.

It had become increasingly apparent that opportunities for Jews in higher education and in certain fields of employment were being curtailed. In addition, Jews were being used as scapegoats for the Soviet Union's economic problems. A discriminatory application of heavy penalties, including death, for alleged economic crimes was bolstered by a propaganda campaign in the party, provincial, and national press, to vilify Jews, Judaism, and the synagogue, and exacerbate popular antisemitism.

It was against this background that representatives of the major Jewish organizations in the United States met on October 7, 1963, in New York City, under the leadership of Rabbi Uri Miller, president of the Synagogue Council of America, and Professor Abraham Joshua Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary. The representatives expressed agreement that all Jewish groups should cooperate in marshalling resources for public action, nationally and internationally, and launch a massive public-education campaign toward alleviating the plight of the nearly 3 million Jews in the Soviet Union. The presidents of the three major Jewish coordinating bodies in the United States—NCRAC, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish organizations, and Synagogue Council of America—and of the American Jewish Committee, which is not affiliated with any of these bodies, agreed to work out a program which would be submitted to the major Jewish agencies for consideration. Eventually, their proposals were to lead to the first national conference convened by Jewish organizations to deal specifically with this problem.

Shortly afterward, on October 21, an all-day Conference on the Status of Soviet Jews was held at the Carnegie International Center in New York. The conference was sponsored by Associate Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Senator Herbert H. Lehman, Episcopal Bishop James A. Pike, United Automobile Workers President Walter Reuther, Norman Thomas, and the author Robert Penn Warren. Attended by more than a hundred civic, religious, cultural, and intellectual leaders, it was the first major public undertaking in the United States to give expression to general concern over the deprivation of Jewish rights in the USSR. Previously such broad expressions had originated exclusively in Jewish organizations, like the American Jewish Committee, whose public appeal to Nikita S. Khrushchev in December 1962 had been endorsed by leading clergymen from every major religious group in the United States. Main speakers included the playwright Arthur Miller; Max Hayward of Oxford University; Bishop Pike, and Professor Lewis Feuer of the University of California. "An Appeal of Conscience for the Jews of the Soviet Union," together with a seven-point protest, was directed to Soviet authorities. The appeal called for the extension of full religious and cultural rights to Soviet Jewry as a matter of "urgency and elementary decency," urged a "vigorous educational campaign against
anti-Semitism," and called for "the elimination of the anti-Jewish character that so strongly colors the official campaign against economic crimes."

In an apparent effort to counteract mounting indignation, the Soviet Union sent a so-called Jewish spokesman to the United States to present its version of the situation of Soviet Jewry. On November 12, 1963, a cultural delegation began an unofficial three-week tour of the United States. The group of intellectuals, academicians, and writers included Aaron Alterovich Vergelis (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 77), editor of the Yiddish magazine Sovetish Heymland ("Soviet Homeland"), who was depicted as the representative of Soviet Jewry. (The office of Sovetish Heymland was the only secular address of the Jews in the USSR.) The delegation visited New York, Washington, D.C., Cleveland, Denver, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, but most Jewish groups and communities refused to deal with Vergelis.

ANTISEMITIC TRACT

On February 24, 1964, a decidedly antisemitic tract, Judaism Without Embellishment by Trofim Korneyevich Kichko, published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, was brought to the attention of the West by Morris B. Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee and then member of the United Nations Sub-commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. Americans and many others in the western world were outraged. Every major American newspaper commented on the Nazi-like, antisemitic character of the book, especially its "art" work, during the two months which followed its disclosure.

The Vochenblatt, Yiddish Communist weekly in Toronto, denounced the brochure on March 19. Three days later the Yiddish (Communist) Morning Freiheit of New York published an editorial which condemned the "antisemitic cartoons" and demanded punishment for the culprits. Rejecting a March 15 explanation by Professor Petr E. Nedbailo, the Ukrainian member of the UN Commission on Human Rights, as "inadequate," Freiheit referred to the distress of "people in the U.S.A., especially Jewish people" about grievances concerning Soviet Jews. It asked Soviet authorities not "to dismiss all these... as mere cold-war propaganda."

Public indignation spread to Italy, France, Great Britain, the Scandinavian countries, Israel, and Australia—to name a few—eliciting sharp responses from Communist ideologists and Soviet sympathizers. The widespread criticism forced an official Soviet reaction. A Novosti Press Agency dispatch on March 25 carried a book review reprinted from Radianska Kultura, organ of the Ukrainian ministry of culture, which was mildly critical of Judaism Without Embellishment. Pravda (April 4, 1964) published a partially critical report by the ideological commission of the Soviet Communist party, and the government newspaper Izvestia (April 5, 1964) attempted to minimize "several of the faults" of the book.

Soviet authorities ordered the book recalled and copies destroyed, but not all Communists were satisfied. Recalling his newspaper's criticism of similar
anti-Jewish manifestations in the past, *Morning Freiheit* editor Paul Novick said that the fault lay in the “harmful approach that has permeated anti-religious propaganda in the USSR.” He reminded Soviet authorities that there are “clergymen, rabbis, and priests who are for coexistence and oppose the cold war” and suggested that better knowledge of Jews in the United States “as well as the American masses generally” might convince them that the anti-Kichko “noise” was fully justified.

In its June issue, *Political Affairs*, the theoretical organ of the Communist party in the United States, openly declared that “the book’s appearance reflects the continued existence of antisemitic ideas and influences” in the USSR.

**PUBLIC PROTESTS**

On April 5 and 6, as reactions to the Kichko book mounted, over 500 representatives of the 24 major American Jewish organizations,¹ gathered in Washington, D.C., as an American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry to express their increasing concern for Soviet Jewry. Among the speakers were Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg and Senator Abraham J. Ribicoff (Dem., Conn.) and Jacob K. Javits (Rep., New York).

The conference had been planned before the promises concerning the provision of matzot in the Soviet Union had been broken and before disclosure of the publication of *Judaism Without Embellishment*. If there had been any lingering doubts in the minds of some delegates about the need for vigorous action, these events removed them.

A unanimous resolution protested the denial to Soviet Jews of their religious and cultural rights as a religious minority and as a Soviet nationality. A statement was issued listing 18 minimum requirements for giving the Jews in the Soviet Union equal status with other Soviet minorities. The conference also adopted a series of recommendations for the mobilization of American opinion, and especially that of the Jewish communities, toward the end of increasing public pressure on Soviet authorities. Delegates thought that such a campaign would be the most effective means of bringing about an amelioration of the plight of Soviet Jews.

The first move was an agreement by the sponsoring organizations to continue their efforts through an ongoing *ad hoc* American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry (AJCSJ). Such a conference would develop the means of

---

coordinating the public activities of the 24 national organizations and their local affiliates. A delegation of eight appointed by the conference met on April 6 with President Lyndon B. Johnson, McGeorge Bundy, his adviser, and other presidential aides. The conferees agreed that the problem of antisemitism in the Soviet Union should not become a political issue in the "cold war." On April 7 the same delegation met with Secretary of State Dean Rusk and other high-level State Department officials, who reaffirmed United States concern over the denial of Jewish rights in the Soviet Union.

On June 15 a steering committee of eight held its first meeting under the chairmanship of George Maislen, president of the United Synagogue of America. He was assisted by three professional coordinators: Jack Baker, ADL; Jerry Goodman, American Jewish Committee, and Yehuda Hellman, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. AJCSJ and other interested parties mounted a campaign throughout the country, and community organizations, churches, unions, and civic bodies, elected officials, and intellectual leaders joined in the protest.

In a television interview in Los Angeles on April 26, Dr. Linus Pauling, twice a Nobel prize winner, urged direct action similar to the peace marches and civil-rights demonstrations. In an address to the American Jewish Committee on April 30, Secretary of State Dean Rusk remarked upon "reports of a recrudescence of antisemitism in the Soviet Union." He assured his audience that the United States government was "aware of the problems of Soviet Jewry" and would "continue to make known [its] interest . . . because human rights [are] indivisible."

On May 1, a traditional workers' holiday in many countries and an official one in others, nearly a thousand students from colleges and universities in the New York City area gathered near the headquarters of the Soviet mission to the United Nations to appeal for the restoration of the fundamental rights of Soviet Jews. During the month of May over 7,000 students and faculty members at Harvard, Radcliffe, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology signed a petition protesting anti-Jewish discrimination in the USSR which was forwarded to Soviet authorities.

Nearly 15 urban centers, including Boston, Los Angeles, Louisville, Cincinnati, San Francisco, Lexington (Ky.), and Levittown, N.Y., held mass demonstrations involving thousands of people. Several delegations made attempts to deliver documented petitions of protest to the Soviet embassy in Washington, but these were rejected by the Soviet authorities.

Labor was particularly active—state federations, international unions, and central labor councils, representing the vast majority of the American labor movement. In many instances the Jewish Labor Committee, on behalf of AJCSJ, helped initiate such resolutions and provided background material for use by the labor groups. Statements and resolutions came from, among others, the parent American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations; AFL-CIO federations in Minnesota, New Hampshire, Maine, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New York, and California; the International Union of Electrical Workers, the United Auto Workers, the Amalgamated
Clothing Workers, the Textile Workers, the American Federation of Musicians, the American Federation of Teachers, and the United Rubber Workers. Meeting from April 25 to May 8 in Pittsburgh, the General Conference of The Methodist Church adopted a resolution on Soviet antisemitism. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders in Wilmington, Del., joined in a letter of protest to Premier Khrushchev on April 30. Over two thousand clergymen approved a “Letter of Conscience” sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League, released in July, and signed by three cardinals—Archbishops Francis J. Spellman, Richard Cushing, and Joseph Ritter—of the Roman Catholic church, bishops of the Protestant Episcopal church, presidents of Catholic and Protestant universities and seminars, and the heads of seven major Protestant denominations. The executive committee of the Council of Churches of Greater Tulsa, Okla., unanimously passed a resolution on November 16.

The nationwide effort culminated in two major demonstrations in New York City. On October 28, 2,500 persons representing local affiliates of the national Jewish organizations in the Greater New York area, gathered at Hunter College for a New York Conference on Soviet Jewry. Incumbent Senator Kenneth B. Keating (Rep., New York) and former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy joined the rostrum of Jewish leaders who addressed the conference. The documentary film *The Price of Silence*, produced by the Jewish Chautauqua Society, was premiered. After a statement of conscience, by Professor Abraham J. Heschel of the Jewish Theological Seminary and a reading by the actor Theodore Bikel, the meeting ended with a “procession of protest” to the Soviet mission to the United Nations. A conference delegation was turned away, but a bill of particulars was left at the building.

President Johnson addressed a telegram to the conference which said that

... the position of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union is a matter of deep... concern. ... We cannot ignore the existence of religious or racial persecution anywhere in the world. ... The official actions available to us must be reinforced by the pressure of an aroused world public opinion. It is my hope that citizens and organizations of all faiths will join in an overwhelming expression of moral concern for the Jews of the Soviet Union. ... 

On November 30, in response to calls for such actions, over 500 rabbis demonstrated near United Nations headquarters.

On the eve of Hanukkah, representatives of the major national Jewish youth organizations met in New York City and agreed to form an American Jewish Youth Conference for Soviet Jewry to coordinate their public efforts. A call to the Jewish youth of America “to act in behalf of your brethren, young and old, in the Soviet Union” was issued on December 6, and was answered by a meeting of representatives from 21 youth organizations in the New York area, on December 20.

---

2 American Zionist Youth Council, Atid College-Age Organization, Betar (Brit Trumpeldor of America), B'nei Akiva of North America, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations, B'nai B'rith Youth Organization, Dror Hechalutz Hatzair, Hashomer Hatzair, Ichud Habonim Labor Zionist Youth, Junior Hadassah, Leaders Training
United States Government

A Department of State memorandum on the "Situation of Jews in the Soviet Union" was entered into the Congressional Record by Senator Keating on February 26. It pointed out that Soviet pressures against minority groups had kept Jews from "the normal maintenance and development of their religious, social, and cultural life," noting that "antisemitic prejudices persist" in the USSR and that Soviet Jews suffer serious hardships, whether regarded as a religious sect or a nationality. "Unlike those of other national groups," it continued, their "distinctive language activities and community institutions have now been reduced almost to zero." In view of the limitations on official United States activity on behalf of Soviet Jewry, the memorandum urged "a united appeal of private organizations" since "the fate of Soviet Jewry is of concern to the world community."

The major forum for United States reaction to Soviet anti-Jewish practices continued to be the United Nations. In January Morris B. Abram, as United States expert member of the United Nations Sub-commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, submitted a draft for an international declaration on religious intolerance to the 16th session of the sub-commission. In the ensuing debate, as well as discussions on a draft convention on racial discrimination, Abram implicitly criticized Soviet anti-Jewish practices. This evoked hostile denials from Communist countries. At a meeting of the Commission on Human Rights on March 12, the United States delegate, Mrs. Marietta Tree, denounced antisemitism and deplored the denials of religious and cultural rights of Jews "in some states." Mrs. Tree followed the accepted practice of not identifying states by name, but the speech was clearly aimed at the Soviet Union.

Perhaps because it was more closely attuned to the mounting expressions of concern, Congress took more direct action. Reports from the Soviet Union about the near-impossibility of Jews obtaining matzot for the 1964 Passover season elicited a strong reaction. On March 23 joint resolutions were introduced in the House of Representatives and the Senate, calling upon President Johnson to use government facilities to help insure a supply of matzot to Soviet Jews. The resolutions also asked the Soviet authorities, "in the cause of peace," for "an immediate cessation of all measures which deny to members of the Jewish faith the free, devotional, and historic observance of the feast of Passover."

In April, in keeping with House procedure, resolutions were introduced by individual congressmen on behalf of "the free exercise of religion and pursuit of culture by Jews and all others. . . ."

On August 10 hearings began in the Senate Committee on Foreign Rela-
tions on SR 204. This resolution on Soviet antisemitism, introduced by Senator Ribicoff in September 1963, was sponsored by 64 other senators as well. Witnesses included Senators Ribicoff and Javits, both of whom spoke for the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, and Senator Keating. Special statements were also submitted by Senators Thomas Dodd (Dem., Conn.) and Hugh Scott (Dem., Pa.), the American Jewish Committee, and the B'nai B'rith International Council.

The resolution was introduced on September 24, 1964, as Amendment #1218 to a foreign-aid bill. In a record vote of 60 to 1, the Senate approved Senator Ribicoff's amendment, entitled "Religious Persecution by the Soviet Union." Twenty-two other senators later endorsed the amendment, which recorded "the sense of the Congress that the United States" condemned the "persecution of any persons because of their religion" in the Soviet Union. The USSR was asked to "cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses and fully permit the free exercise of religion, and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others. . . ." It was anticipated that at the next session of Congress, in 1965, a similar, concurrent resolution would be passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Jerry Goodman
Canada

PRIME MINISTER LESTER PEARSON'S Liberal party, in office since the general elections of April 1963, lacked a majority and needed the support of either the New Democratic or Social Credit party to govern.

As a result, important legislation was frequently delayed by long drawn out debates. Much of the government's attention was devoted to questions of federal-provincial relations and to matters involving the forms of Canadian independence. In both cases, relations between the French Canadians of Quebec and the English-speaking majorities of the other provinces were involved.

Discussions between federal and provincial governments over financial questions and over the method of amending Canada's constitution, the British North America Act, took place over a period of several months. Agreement was reached on the return to the provinces of an additional 4 per cent of the revenue from shared taxes and the establishment of a national pension system to which provincial adherence was voluntary; only Quebec opted out. On the constitutional question the government sought to find a formula for change which would eliminate the anomalous requirement of an act of the British parliament. The major obstacle had been the fear of some provinces, especially Quebec, that "repatriating" the constitution would deprive them of protection against unitary rule from Ottawa. The atmosphere for agreement was improved by the existence of Liberal governments in both Ottawa and Quebec, and in October a federal-provincial conference arrived at a formula by which amendment would be possible in some fields by the vote of seven of the ten provinces. In others—essentially those involving the division of power between federal and provincial governments and those affecting linguistic and religious matters—consent of all provinces was to be required. The agreement was widely criticized by many outside of Quebec as representing a complete capitulation to Quebec particularism. But since custom gave Quebec an effective veto over any change in the British North America Act, no new system could be adopted without that province's consent. At the end of the year, Parliament had the proposals under consideration, but no final action had been taken.

Although the financial and constitutional proposals were of basic significance, they engendered less political heat than matters affecting the symbols
of nationhood. In May the government proposed the adoption of "O Canada" as the national anthem and the replacement of the Canadian Ensign by a new Canadian flag bearing a maple leaf. The proposal for a new national anthem, retaining "God Save the Queen" for ceremonial purposes, aroused relatively little controversy, but the flag question was heatedly debated inside Parliament and in the press for several months. In September it was referred to a special parliamentary committee, which reported favorably by a 10 to 4 vote early in October. This, however, did not settle the question; it was only after another 33 days of debate that the House of Commons finally approved the new flag in December, by a vote of 163 to 78. A third government proposal, changing the country's name from "Dominion" to "Federal State," was rejected by Parliament in August.

The number of Jewish members of parliament rose to five, the largest number ever to serve at one time, when Max Saltsman, an active Jewish community leader in Galt, Ont., won a by-election in November. Three of the five were Liberals and two belonged to the New Democratic (Labor) party.

In May Sam Asbell became the first Jew ever elected to the Saskatchewan provincial legislature. In a by-election in September, Maitland Steinkopf was reelected as member of the Manitoba provincial legislature and was reappointed minister of public utilities in the Conservative government of that province.

In 1964 there were Jewish members in the provincial legislatures of five of the ten Canadian provinces: Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan.

**Jewish Population**

The percentage of native-born Jews in the Canadian Jewish community of 267,000 had shown a consistent increase since the beginning of the 20th century. It was 36.8 in 1911, 40.3 in 1921, 43.8 in 1931, 51.0 in 1941, 57.3 in 1951, and 58.8 in 1961.¹

Percentages varied from one province to another, ranging from 70.4 per cent in Nova Scotia down to 50.2 per cent in Newfoundland. In Quebec and Ontario, with the major Jewish communities of Montreal and Toronto, a smaller percentage of Jews were Canadian-born than in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the Atlantic provinces, which had much smaller Jewish communities. After World War II most of the Jewish immigrants to Canada settled in Montreal and Toronto, where opportunities for employment were greater and Jewish community facilities for religious observance, education, and social welfare were more developed.

In 1961 Jews born in Poland formed 13.4 per cent of the total Jewish popu-

¹ Population and intermarriage statistics are from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, immigration statistics from the Canadian Government Immigration Department, and percentages and analyses from the research department of the Canadian Jewish Congress.
lation; 9.8 per cent were born in Russia, 2.9 per cent in Rumania, 2.8 per cent in the United States, 2.7 per cent in Hungary, 2.6 per cent in Great Britain, and 7.0 per cent in all other countries.

Immigration

The number of Jewish immigrants admitted to Canada increased from 1,840 in 1962 to 2,180 in 1963, but remained lower than in any year from 1956 through 1960.

From 1946 through 1963 there were 66,858 Jewish immigrants, almost 38 per cent of the total Jewish population of Canada in 1946. The number of Jewish immigrants to Canada decreased in each five-year period after 1950, and the trend seemed likely to continue in the period from 1961 to 1965.

The largest number of Jewish immigrants from the end of World War II to 1951 came from Poland, and from 1951 to 1963 the largest number—somewhat over a fourth of the total—from Israel. From 1946 to 1963, 18.0 per cent came from Poland, 16.1 per cent from Israel, 15.4 per cent from the United States, 12.2 per cent from Great Britain, and 8.8 per cent from French-speaking countries (2,675 from France, 1,016 from Belgium, and 2,199 from North Africa). There were only 58 Jewish immigrants from North Africa before 1951, but 2,141 from 1951 to 1963.

In response to a request by the Canadian Jewish Congress (CJC) and Jewish Immigrant Aid Services (JIAS), the Canadian immigration department sent a special mission to Morocco and Tunisia in the fall of 1963 to examine Jewish applicants who wished to enter Canada under the regulations permitting the immigration of persons with special skills and occupations. Most of those approved by this mission arrived in Canada in 1964. A second mission was sent to North Africa in 1964 to act on the applications of 270 families (about 1,050 persons), most of them from Morocco, some from Tunisia. Under the “close relatives plan” another 350 applications were submitted. At the time of writing, about 30 of these immigrants were employed as French teachers and specialists by the Protestant public-school board of Montreal.

The “Loan Cassas” established in 1959 by CJC in cooperation with the Jewish Colonization Association (ICA) reported in January 1964 that of 69 loans to immigrants, 32 had already been repaid in full, and regular payments were being received on the others. Of the $195,000 in housing loans granted to immigrants in the Toronto area by the Toronto Hebrew Re-establishment Services (subsidized and guaranteed by the United Jewish Relief Agencies of CJC and JIAS), $158,000 had been repaid by 1964.

Interrmarriage

The annual number of marriages among Jews decreased 6.6 per cent from 1941 to 1963, and the marriage rate per 1,000 fell from 12.1 to 6.4. This was the lowest rate since 1921. The marriage rate of the total Canadian population decreased from 10.6 per cent in 1941 to 7.0 in 1961.

Interrmarriages increased steadily from 3.8 per cent in 1931 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 165) to 18.5 per cent in 1963. The rate was lowest in the province
TABLE 1. COUNTRY OF LAST PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF JEWISH IMMIGRANTS TO CANADA, 1946 TO 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Last Permanent Residence</th>
<th>1946-50</th>
<th>1951-55</th>
<th>1956-60</th>
<th>1961-63</th>
<th>Total 1946-63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>9,168</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>12,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>4,138</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>11,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2,814</td>
<td>2,926</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>10,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>2,808</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>8,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America, N.E.S. (c)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa, N.E.S.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British West Indies</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia and New</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zealand</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia, N.E.S.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near East countries, N.E.S.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European countries, N.E.S.</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Jewish immigrants 23,260 20,054 17,481 6,063 66,858

(a) included in North Africa in 1946-50.
(b) " in Near East countries or N.E.S. in 1946-55.
(c) N.E.S.—not elsewhere stated.
of Quebec, where there was comparatively little social contact between the French-speaking Catholic majority, the English-speaking Protestants, and the Jews, and where civil marriage was not recognized. It was higher in Ontario and Manitoba, still higher in the small Jewish communities of the Atlantic provinces, and highest in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia.

CIVIC AND POLITICAL STATUS

The major concerns of the Jewish community were outlined in a brief submitted by a CJC delegation in October to the government. It voiced strong objection to the phrase “two founding races” in an official Order in Council instructing the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturism: “to recommend steps to develop Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races.” The brief emphasized that “in recent years the word ‘race’ had acquired a sinister aspect and evoked many bitter memories, particularly among other ethnic groups,” and suggested that the instructions be amended to read “to develop the new Canadian Confederation in full recognition of the two linguistic and cultural foundations of Canadian society, English and French.”

The CJC brief also asked the government to persuade West Germany not to allow a statute of limitations on Nazi crimes, and to intervene with the Soviet government on behalf of Russian Jewry. The delegation also thanked the government for action taken at CJC’s request to give more favorable income-tax treatment to indemnification from West Germany received by victims of Nazi persecution.

A Canadian television opinion poll in November showed that 69 per cent of respondents favored legislation making dissemination of hate literature a criminal offense, 26 per cent opposed it, and 5 per cent had no opinion. Many of those opposed thought that it would impose censorship, limiting freedom of speech and of the press.

Leonard W. Brockington, rector of Queen’s University, and Charles Hendry, director of the school of social work at the University of Toronto, told a parliamentary committee that proposed legislation against “hate propaganda” represented unnecessary threats to freedom of speech, and that education was a better antidote to hate propaganda than legislation.

CJC obtained opinions from two prominent legal experts stating that the Canadian Criminal Code sections dealing with criminal libel, defamatory libel, and obscene and scurrilous statements were inadequate to control hate-mongers. The attorney general of Ontario declared that he could not under the existing law prosecute antisemitic and anti-Negro hate propaganda with any reasonable hope of success. CJC’s campaign to amend the Canadian Criminal Code to make the dissemination of hate propaganda a criminal offense was supported by resolutions of the Canadian Legion (the war veterans’ organization), Canadian Labor Congress, Manitoba Bar Association, Canadian Federation of University Women, Canadian Baptist Federation, and by numerous distinguished individuals and important Canadian newspapers.
In November Justice Minister Guy Favreau announced the appointment of a small informal committee of experts "to study effective means of combating hate literature, and recommend as quickly as possible concrete steps the government might take." Among those appointed to this committee were two Jews, Dean Maxwell Cohen of McGill University law school as chairman, and Saul Hayes, CJC executive vice-president.

Quebec

In June CJC submitted a brief to the Quebec legislative committee on the constitution, requesting a provincial bill of rights as an integral feature of any change in provincial-federal relations. It also urged the Quebec provincial government to obtain amendments to those clauses in the British North America Act which excluded Jews from membership on tax-supported dissentient school boards in Quebec, although Jews were obligated to pay taxes to the Protestant school boards.

In January CJC had followed up its 1963 representations to the Royal Commission on Education in Quebec (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 167-68), with a brief to the Quebec Royal Commission on Taxation. This brief requested that provincial government grants, given since 1963 on a per-capita basis for children attending approved Jewish day high schools, be extended to include residents of Montreal suburbs and to pupils in Montreal Jewish elementary day schools. In the same month Professor David N. Solomon was elected by acclamation as the first Jewish member of the Protestant board of school commissioners of Westmount, a suburb of Montreal, and in June 1964 Harold Schneider was elected to a second three-year term on the Protestant school board of Greater St. Martin.

In February the Quebec provincial legislature passed an act setting up a provincial ministry of education. One clause of the act extended the payment of tuition grants of $200 annually to parents of Jewish children in Montreal suburbs attending Jewish day high schools.

In September Professor Perry Meyer, a member of the national executive of CJC, was appointed by the Quebec provincial government to its Superior Council of Education, an advisory body set up by the new education act.

In November the Protestant school board of Greater Montreal gave CJC and YM and YWHA of Montreal representation on an advisory committee on school planning.

Employment Status

Under the Ontario Provincial Human Rights Code, applicants for employment could not be required to furnish information on their race, creed, color, or nationality. The Ontario Human Rights Commission interpreted this to mean that photographs of applicants for employment could not be required. (Some Ontario tourist resort operators indicated that they would defy this regulation, but an ADL survey of discrimination in hotels in February found that the number of discriminatory Canadian hotels had decreased from 28.7 per cent of all hotels in 1957 to 14 per cent in 1963.) In April the commission
announced that an agreement had been signed by the Association of Professional Placement Agencies and Consultants and its 15 member agencies pledging cooperation. In July the Quebec provincial legislature passed an act prohibiting discrimination in employment. In October the Canadian parliament ratified the International Labor Organization convention against discrimination in employment.

ANTISEMITISM

With the outbreak of World War II, and the enforcement of defense regulations, some of the leading antisemitic propagandists were arrested and interned, and their activities dwindled. Sporadic distribution of anti-Jewish literature was resumed in 1949. The incidence of antisemitic smearings increased in 1963 and reached a new peak in 1964.

In January 1964 a large number of antisemitic pamphlets bearing the imprint of George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi party, together with back issues of Common Sense, were mailed from Montreal to Jewish students at McGill University and Loyola College. The addresses were presumably obtained from student directories.

In February many synagogues and Jewish organizations and persons in Toronto received pamphlets and printed circulars mailed in that city, demanding the 'arrest of all Jews involved in Communist or Zionist plots, public trials, and executions, and the sterilization of all other Jews.' The envelopes bore the return address of Canadian Action, Post Office Box 431, Scarborough (a suburb of Toronto), Ont.; the sender was found to be a 19-year-old youth who had been involved in the race riots in Birmingham, Ala., in September 1963. In March a large number of antisemitic pamphlets were distributed through the mails in Victoria, B.C., from the same address in Scarborough, and in May similar material, including reprints from 1934 issues of Julius Streicher's Stürmer, was mailed by a Birmingham, Ala. organization, World Service, to many Jews in Montreal, Toronto, and Ottawa.

In July the postmaster general of Canada banned the use of the mails by the National States Rights party of Birmingham, Ala., publishers of the antisemitic and anti-Negro paper Thunderbolt. In November the party appealed the ban. David Stanley, who had once pleaded guilty in Birmingham to assault with a weapon, and John Ross Taylor, a fascist and antisemitic propagandist who had been interned for 53 months during World War II under the Defense of Canada regulations, appeared before a board headed by Judge Dalton Wells of the Ontario court of appeals. The decision of the board was pending at the end of 1964.

In August a weekly publication in Ottawa published extracts from the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, and on the eve of Rosh Ha-shanah many Jews in Toronto, Hamilton, and other Ontario cities received New Year "greeting cards" bearing a swastika, the caricature of a Jew, and the inscription "with the best wishes from the Canadian Nazis."

On October 25 the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, owned and oper-
ated by the government, broadcast over its national network a television inter-
view with Rockwell, prefacing the program with the statement that CBC’s ob-
ject was “to expose extremism in its monstrosity.” CJC President Michael Garber protested against the broadcast, declaring that CBC, by glamorizing a self-confessed follower of Hitler and preacher of genocide, had acted against the public interest. The so-called public exposure of the Nazi, he said, could not justify the attendant publicity afforded Rockwell. The broadcast, said Garber, was an obvious quest for sensationalism, which wholly disregarded ideas, the public interest, and human sensibilities. The broadcast was also condemned in parliament by John Diefenbaker, Conservative party leader, by several Liberal and New Democratic party MP’s, and by the most impor-
tant newspapers.

In December the Canadian Youth Corps, a right-wing Toronto organiza-
tion which attacked Jews and Negroes and boasted of having “guts to stand up to the destroyers of our society,” issued a pamphlet for the recruitment of storm troopers, aged 14 to 21. Candidates were offered “training in propa-
ganda, infiltration of subversive organizations, self-defense and survival tech-
niques, demonstrations and breaking up of meetings, use of weapons and marksmanship, and preparation of basic explosives in demolitions.”

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

In Montreal the annual joint campaign of the Combined Jewish Appeal and the United Israel Appeal for local, overseas, and Israel needs, raised $4,154,900 in 1964, an increase of $154,000 over 1963. Ten years earlier the campaign raised $2,355,564. The 1964 figure did not include the funds raised separately by the various Montreal Jewish schools to meet deficits in their annual budgets. About 70 per cent of the total raised came from two per cent of the contributors. The United Jewish Appeal in Toronto raised $2,645,000 in 1964, an increase of $40,000 over 1963.

**Jewish Education**

The Bureau of Jewish Education in Toronto celebrated its 15th anniver-
sary in November. It reported that of approximately 10,000 pupils in Jewish schools, 2,650 attended day schools; about 1,500, ten-hour-a-week afternoon schools; 1,600, Sunday schools, and about 4,300, congregational afternoon schools. Eighteen schools in Metropolitan Toronto, with an enrolment of 4,000, were subsidized by the local Jewish Welfare Fund through the Bureau of Jewish Education. The bureau also administered a community senior day high school, established by the United Jewish Welfare Fund.

A survey by CJC’s Toronto education director of 35 Jewish schools in 28 smaller Ontario communities showed 1,432 children 7 to 13 years old attending Jewish afternoon schools. In Ottawa 566 children received a Jewish edu-
cation: 330 in Jewish day schools, 193 in afternoon classes, and 43 in the Hebrew Academy (30 in kindergarten and 13 in grades 1 and 2).

The Peretz school in Winnipeg and the Jewish People’s school in Montreal
celebrated their 50th year of continuous operation and growth. In December the Jewish People's school announced a $250,000 campaign to add more classrooms, a nursery, a library and science rooms to its modern school building.

In the Montreal suburb of Chomedey, the United Talmud Torahs completed a new 16-classroom school building, with a library, lunchrooms, assembly hall, combined gymnasium and auditorium, and a wing for a preschool department, at a cost of $485,000. The school accommodated 1,200 pupils, half in the elementary all-day school and half in supplementary afternoon classes. The United Talmud Torahs had erected four new school buildings in Montreal and its suburbs during the previous seven years.

In October the United Jewish Teachers' Seminary, maintained in Montreal by CIC, announced an enrolment of 43 students for the academic year 1964-65. From 1960 to 1964 the seminary graduated 68 teachers with interim diplomas. In addition, it granted 45 permanent teacher's diplomas to graduates who later completed two years of successful teaching in recognized schools. In 1964 the seminary instituted a diploma course for graduates of Jewish day high schools who were attending McGill University, and a special teachers' training course for girl graduates of the Beth Jacob Hebrew high school. The diploma course had an enrolment of 14 students.

A course in "The Development of the Jewish Tradition" counting towards the Bachelor of Arts degree, was instituted by McGill University in 1964, under David Rome. Rome was chief librarian of the Montreal Jewish Public Library and a member of the arts council of the Quebec ministry of cultural affairs.

An Institute of Jewish Studies, offering diploma courses in Bible, Jewish religion and philosophy, contemporary Yiddish literature, Hellenistic Jewish culture, Jewish writers in the French language, and the psychology of prejudice, established by the YM and YWHA in Montreal in 1963, completed its first year of operation. In honor of their mother, Saidye Bronfman, the children of Samuel Bronfman announced in December 1964 that they would cover the cost of construction and equipment of a new YM and YWHA building to house the institute and make a grant of $100,000 to insure adequate programing and administrative service in the institute's formative years.

Religious Activity

The number of synagogues in new suburban areas throughout Canada continued to increase. In Montreal five Orthodox congregations in the old area of Jewish settlement amalgamated and built the new Tifereth Beth David Jerusalem synagogue in Côte St. Luc. The Shaar Shalom Conservative congregation in the new Chomedey suburb of Montreal built a new synagogue for 800 families. The Orthodox Beth Hillel congregation erected a new synagogue adjoining the suburb of Hampstead. An Orthodox congregation was formed in Dollard des Ormeaux; a Reconstructionist congregation was founded with regular Saturday services in rented premises, and an Orthodox Sephardi congregation was established in Montreal in December by French-
speaking Jewish immigrants. New synagogues were built by the Orthodox Shaarei Shomayim congregation for 1,000 people, and by the “Men of England” Orthodox congregation for 2,000 persons in the new residential suburbs of Toronto. In Vancouver the Orthodox Shaarei Zedek congregation completed a new building containing an auditorium and classrooms.

Delegates from nine Reform congregations met in Toronto in December at the second biennial conference of the Canadian Council of Reform Congregations. In 1954 there were only three Reform congregations in Canada; by 1962, when the first biennial conference was held, the number had increased to six.

Following a custom established in 1960, CJC sent a shipment of matzot and Passover supplies to the Adath Israel congregation in Cuba for the Jews of that country.

Cultural Activity

The Canadian Jewish Historical Society was reactivated by CJC, with Alton Goldbloom, professor emeritus at McGill University, as chairman. Its inaugural meeting in June heard papers by Professor Michel Brunet, director of the department of history at the University of Montreal, on the “French Canadian Interpretation of Canadian History” and by Louis Rosenberg, research director of CJC, on “Jews in Canada Prior to 1768.”

The Jewish Public Library of Montreal, founded in 1914, had about 100,000 volumes in its main collection: 25,000 in Yiddish, 5,000 in Hebrew, and the rest in English and other languages. Besides the main library, it operated three branch libraries in the suburbs, and its annual book circulation was more than 60,000. Maintained by the Montreal Jewish community, it also received annual grants from the Quebec provincial government and the city of Montreal.

The Canadian Jewish Chronicle, the oldest Anglo-Jewish weekly in Canada, was sold in January by its publisher Max Wolofsky to a group consisting of Max Melamet, former executive vice-president of the Zionist Organization of Canada; Bernard Bernstein; Stanley R. Shenkman, and David Novek. It continued publication uninterruptedly with Melamet as editor.

Among the books by Canadian Jewish authors published in 1964 were Terror in the Name of God, the story of the Sons of Freedom Doukhobors, by Simma Holt; Storm the Gates of Jericho, an autobiography by Rabbi Abraham L. Feinberg; More Loves Than One and America Is Different by Stuart Rosenberg; Old Markets, New World, by Adele Wiseman, drawings by Joe Rosenthal, and a collection of poems entitled Advice Not Judgment, by David Weiss.

CJC presented the H. M. Caiserman Award for 1964 to Benjamin G. Sack for his outstanding contribution to Canadian Jewish history and awarded grants to Israel Medres for his book Tzvishn Tzvey Velt Milkhomes (“Between Two World Wars”); to Joseph Kage for his book Chapter One; Sketches of Canadian Life Under the French Regime, and to Henry Biberfeld for his book David, King of Israel.
Arnold Belkin, a Canadian painter living in Mexico, had a painting accepted for the Fourth Guggenheim International Award Exhibition and was commissioned to paint a mural by the Mexican government.

The Beth Tzedec congregation of Toronto purchased Cecil Roth's collection of Jewish art and antiquities for its museum.

In September the city of Saskatoon opened its new Mendel Art Center and Civic Conservatory, named in honor of Fred Mendel, a former German Jewish refugee who lived in Saskatoon. Mendel had contributed a third of the cost of the project, and the Saskatchewan provincial government and the city of Saskatoon contributed the rest.

**Social Services**

The Montreal Jewish General Hospital celebrated its 30th anniversary in October. It had expanded from 185 beds in 1934 to 400 in 1964; in December it began construction of new buildings as part of a $7-million program to increase bed capacity to more than 650 and enlarge its nurses' training school, research facilities, and outpatient department. The Mount Sinai Sanatorium in Ste. Agathe, a constituent agency of the Montreal Federation of Jewish Community Services, opened a new diagnostic and treatment wing as a memorial to its late president, Dr. Louis S. Eidinger. The new Maimonides Hospital and Home for the Aged in Côte St. Luc, built at a cost of $4,562,000, was opened in November with facilities for 248 residents and 75 day-care patients. It included a hospital wing, a synagogue, and equipment for occupational therapy.

The $5-million expansion of the Jewish Home for the Aged and Baycrest Hospital in the suburbs of Toronto was completed. The new building was to be solely a residence for the aged, while the older building, on an adjoining site, was converted into a hospital for the aged and chronically ill. The capacity of the home was increased from 200 to 355, and hospital accommodations from 87 to 180 beds.

In October construction began of Hillel Lodge in Ottawa, a $500,000 home for 25 elderly persons. In Chomedey, a suburb of Montreal, a new 110-bed Jewish convalescent hospital to cost $1,350,000 was being erected.

**Zionism and Relations with Israel**

The Zionist Organization of Canada (ZOC) reported in February that there were 1,500 Canadian Jews in Israel. Of 242 Canadian Jews who settled in Israel in 1963, 45 per cent were born in Canada.

State of Israel bonds to the value of $5,105,650 were sold in 1964.

In July the Montreal Jewish Music Council, together with Les Jeunesses Musicales de Canada and Amitiés Culturelles Canada-Français-Israel, arranged for a choral ensemble to visit Israel and take part in the Zimriah World Assembly of Choirs in July. The French Canadian group, Les Chanteurs de Québec-Chorale Folklorique, comprised 66 vocalists chosen by Les Jeunesses Musicales de Canada from French-speaking folklore groups and
included a number of Jews, English-speaking Canadians, Canadian Indians, and Eskimos. The choral group received a special grant from the Quebec ministry of cultural affairs for the project. It was conducted by Professor Fernand Gratton of the University of Montreal and directed by Wilfred Pelletier, representing the Quebec provincial government.

At the 15th annual meeting of shareholders of Canpal Canadian-Israel Trading Company held in July, it was reported that since its formation Canpal had granted $13,247,396 in loans and credits to Israeli enterprises and had been active in stimulating trade with Israel.

During the year trouble developed in Supersol Ltd., a Canadian company operating supermarkets in Israel. In June it became known that there was a shortage in the company’s accounts, estimated at over a million dollars. Israeli authorities undertook an investigation, but in July a fire destroyed the company’s records. At the end of that month Israel arrested the managing director, a former Detroiter named Alan Finberg, on charges of forgery, embezzlement, and arson. In October Charles Bronfman, Canadian chairman of the board of directors, announced the dismissal of the company’s president, Bertram Loeb, for refusing to cooperate with the investigation or go to Israel to testify.

In August ZOC announced arrangements with the General Mortgage bank in Tel-Aviv for mortgage loans to Canadian Jews settling in Israel of up to $4,800, repayable over 15 years, with no payments on principal required for the first three years.

In October the six-story Canada building of the chemistry faculty of Technion was completed in Haifa at a cost of $1 million, with funds raised by the Canadian Technion Society.

The Knesseth Israel Chevra Mishnayoth congregation of Winnipeg, whose members had moved to new suburban areas and whose 49-year-old synagogue was demolished to make room for a municipal housing development, contributed the proceeds of the sale of the old synagogue site for a synagogue to serve new immigrants in the Negev. The congregation also gave the Negev synagogue, which assumed the same name, four of its Torah scrolls.

**Personalia**

McGill University announced in December the appointments of Samuel Bronfman and Bernard M. Alexander as members of its board of governors, the first Jews on that body. Sir George Williams University in Montreal named Allan Bronfman to its board of governors. Sydney Hermant, a former senate member of the University of Toronto, became a member of its board of governors. Max Wyman was named vice-president of the University of Alberta.

The Canadian government appointed Mrs. Saul Hayes, past president of the National Council of Jewish Women of Canada, as a member of the Canadian delegation to the United Nations. Max Wershof of the government’s department of external affairs was also a member of the delegation.

Air Commodore Maurice Lipton was promoted to the rank of air vice-
marshall of the Royal Canadian Air Force and assigned to the North American air defense command in August.

The Canadian Labor Congress appointed Carl Goldenberg as permanent arbitrator of jurisdictional disputes between its affiliates. The nonoperating railway workers unions appointed David Lewis as their representative on the conciliation board set up by the government to settle a dispute with the railroad companies. The government appointed Judge Nathan T. Nemetz as an arbitrator between the Fisheries and United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union and the fish-canning and -processing companies.

Kenneth D. Sobell, an active member of the Toronto Jewish community, was appointed by the Ontario provincial government as chairman of the Housing Corporation.

George Simon, mayor of Alexandria, Ont., from 1914 to 1929 and from 1933 until his death, died in February at 77. In March Israel Rabinovitch, editor-in-chief of the Montreal Jewish Daily Eagle for 40 years and a well-known musicologist, died at 69; Dr. Maxwell Rady, well-known Winnipeg physician and active communal worker, died at 70, and John Adaskin, internationally known musician and executive secretary of the Canadian Music Center, died at 55. Egmont Frankel, steel and construction executive, who was the first president of the central region of CJC in 1934, died in Toronto in May at 71. Louis Benjamin, lawyer, journalist, and author in Yiddish, English, and French, died in Montreal in June at 74. Robert Soren, Zionist leader and business executive, died in Toronto in July at 67. Israel Medres, author and member of the editorial staff of the Jewish Daily Eagle for 40 years, died in Montreal in August at the age of 70. In September Jack Steinberg, executive director of the Histadrut campaign in Winnipeg, past president of the Winnipeg Council of CJC, and founder and past president of the Canadian Unity Council and of the Winnipeg Jewish Community Choir and Orchestra, died at 68; Ben Sheps, a founder of the CJC, member of its board of governors, and active in many phases of Jewish community life in Winnipeg, died at 84, and Abe W. Miller, lawyer, former alderman of the city of Edmonton, and member of the Alberta provincial legislature from 1955 to 1959, died at 67.

Isaac Cohen, pioneer member of the Jewish community in Kingston, Ont., former member of the Kingston board of education and city council, and active in Jewish community affairs for many years, also died in September at 91. David Korman, several times mayor of the town of Englehart in Northern Ontario, died in November at 84, as did Menahem Kraicer, director of the Ontario region of JIAS of Canada for 10 years and director of the UHS office in Israel since 1951, in Tel-Aviv at 62.

Louis Rosenberg
Argentina

President Arturo U. Illia spent his first year in office trying to gain support for his moderate political and economic program. Although there seemed to be greater political stability in 1964 than in previous years, the government continued to face major unsolved problems and widespread opposition.

Deep divisions in the government and among the various political parties continued to plague Illia and his People's Radical party. Political life remained under the shadow of ex-dictator Juan D. Perón, who still had appreciable influence in the Confederación General del Trabajo (CGT; General Labor Confederation) and middle class. During the visit of French President Charles de Gaulle in October, the Peronists organized frenzied demonstrations for their leader's return, which Perón had promised would be in 1964. Perón sought to identify French foreign policy with his own doctrine of a "third position" between capitalism and Communism.

The greatest opposition to Illia's government came from CGT, which conducted a plan de lucha ("plan of combat") against government policies. The wave of protests included a slowdown on the railways, directed against economy measures taken by the government; a go-slow strike by 45,000 postal workers, which held up some 12 million pieces of mail; a 48-hour walkout by Ministry of Health doctors protesting the government's failure to pay promised salary increases and against hospital conditions in general; a week-long butchers' strike directed against price controls, and a nationwide strike by administrative employees in state universities, which was joined by university students. The students protested because less than 10 per cent of the proposed 1965 budget was for education, compared with more than 40 per cent for defense. Although the universities were not officially closed, students supported the strike with public protest meetings and marches and held classes in coffee shops.

The serious economic problems inherited by the Illia government were no nearer to solution in 1964 than in previous years. The printing of currency to cover public expenditures resulted in a tremendous inflation. From October
1963 to October 1964 the cost of living rose 40 per cent. When the government stepped in to fix prices, the articles affected disappeared from the market. Thus some cuts of meat rose 85 per cent in the period mentioned, and found their way to the black market. Argentina, once the greatest meat-consuming and exporting country in the world, began a period of meatless Mondays and Tuesdays.

In December 1963 Illia signed a bill annulling the contracts signed by former President Arturo Frondizi with foreign oil companies. The 13 companies involved fought the abrogation in the Argentine courts, and it was still not known how the government would find the funds to pay indemnification.

The economic crisis and the conflict over the political role of the Peronists created the danger that military and other conservative forces might again seek to impose their own political and economic solutions by force.

In August a delegation of eight members of the American Jewish Committee, headed by its president, Morris B. Abram, visited Buenos Aires and other South American capitals on a good-will tour. They discussed the Arab League's anti-Zionist campaign with the Argentinian president, vice president, and other leading national figures. They also conferred with Jewish leaders on problems of Jewish identity, intergroup relations, the preservation of Jewish values, and possible areas of further collaboration.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Almost 80 per cent of Argentina's estimated Jewish population of 450,000 lived in Buenos Aires, and the rest were scattered throughout 500 different cities and towns. One hundred twenty communities were members of the Wa'ad Ha-kehilot (Federación de Comunidades Israelitas), the national organization of Jewish communities which dealt with educational, cultural, religious, and social problems. Seventy of these communities were quite ineffective, especially in education and religion.

About 20 per cent of the population was of Sephardi origin. In October the first Sephardi Argentine convention, meeting in Buenos Aires, proposed the unification of and mutual assistance between all Sephardi communities. This convention also took the first step towards bringing the Sephardi groups into the Wa'ad Ha-kehilot as a single body. The Wa'ad previously consisted principally of Ashkenazim.

Internal Jewish affairs were primarily organized according to Israeli party allegiances. Thus the official spokesmen for the Jewish community were members of Mapai. At the annual convention of the Po'ale Zion-Hitahadut Mapai in October, the problem of internal unity of the community was stressed. Gregorio Fainguersh, president of AMIA (Asociación Mutual Israelita Argentina; AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 178) and a leading Mapai member, spoke of two "dangers" that threatened community unity: the formation and organization of the Sephardi communities as an entity apart from the Ashkenazi AMIA, and the emergence of the Reform and Conservative movements which "seek to root themselves artificially in our midst." He added that
the “anti-Zionists” in the Conservative movement presented the greatest danger to the preservation of the community's identity. The charge of anti-Zionism was emphatically denied by those attacked. Other observers saw greater danger to the community in the facts that most Jews took no part in any type of Jewish life whatsoever, that the majority of Jewish university students were members of leftist political parties, and that there was a noticeable lag in Jewish education.

The seventy-fifth anniversary of Jewish colonization in Argentina was celebrated by the entire community in August. In 1889, 836 Russian Jewish immigrants founded the first Jewish agricultural settlement in the Province of Santa Fé, later called Moisesville. Baron Maurice de Hirsch responded to the suffering and poverty of these first settlers by establishing the Jewish Colonization Association. In the intervening 75 years, 20 colonies were founded, and some 650,000 hectares (over 1.6 million acres) were cultivated. This represented two per cent of the land under cultivation in Argentina; Jews were also two per cent of the entire population of the republic. The Jewish colonies played a major role in the formation of the Argentine cooperative movement.

AMIA, with about 50,000 families, was the largest organized Jewish community in the world. One of its important functions was its distribution of funds for social welfare. This was twice as high in the first three months of 1964 as in the corresponding period of 1963. AMIA issued a call to the annual convention of the Wa’ad Ha-kehilot in July for the centralization of all social services to insure greater efficacy. In January AMIA held its first leaders’ seminar with the aim of organizing and strengthening youth leadership. One hundred young people from all over the country participated. The faculty was composed of social scientists, university professors, and scholars of Judaica.

Cultural Activities

The Center of Jewish Documentation began to function in conjunction with the School of Institutional Leadership, under the joint sponsorship of the American Jewish Committee and the Sociedad Hebraica (a cultural and sports center with 20,000 members). The center gathered printed materials on Jewish themes for use by community leaders and researchers. The American Jewish Committee also organized a graphic display of its work on human relations, antisemitism, and civil rights. A Hebrew center for biblical studies was organized in the capital in connection with the visit of Hayyim Gevaryahu of the Center for Biblical Studies in Jerusalem.

Editorial Paidós, the leading publishing house in sociology and psychology, began publication of a new series in Spanish entitled the “Library of the History and Science of Religion,” under the direction of Rabbi Marshall T. Meyer. Its first titles were Leo Baeck’s The Essence of Judaism and Leo Schwarz’s Great Ages and Ideas of the Jewish People. The Instituto Judío Argentino de Cultura e Información published several pamphlets about the Jewish religion, Nazi genocide, and the Ecumenical Council and the Jews.
The annual book fair sponsored by AMIA sold some 20,000 volumes, of which 70 per cent were in Spanish. AMIA also sponsored a weekly television program, and the Israeli embassy and the Makhon le-tarbut Israel produced several weekly radio programs with Israeli music, news, and Hebrew lessons.

Although the number of Yiddish publications and Yiddish-speaking people declined, Buenos Aires remained one of the most important centers of Yiddish culture. The Diario Israelita, a Yiddish daily, celebrated its 50th anniversary. This newspaper was in the vanguard of Jewish life and Yiddish culture, not only in Argentina but throughout all South America. Davar, a cultural bimonthly journal in Spanish under the auspices of the Sociedad Hebraica Argentina, published its 100th issue since its inception in July 1945. Comentario, the 12-years-old quarterly of the Instituto Judío de Cultura e Información, reached a significant number of intellectuals in Latin America. Other publications included Maj'shavot (Mahashavot), a Spanish quarterly dedicated to Jewish thought, edited by the Latin American office of the World Council of Synagogues.

Education

The Central Organization for Hebrew Education (Wa'ad Ha-hinnukh) reported 8,400 students in the primary grades (up to the 6th grade) in 60 schools in Buenos Aires. There were 2,200 students in the lower grades (1st and 2nd) but only 400 in the sixth grade, indicating a high drop-out rate. Of the total number of students, "3,000 studied on a good educational level, 3,000 on an adequate level, while 2,400 students attended classes on a deplorable educational level," according to Mordejai Onik, president of the Wa'ad Ha-hinnukh.

In the interior of the country some 4,800 pupils attended 53 primary schools. A total of 1,050 students were enrolled in Jewish secondary schools throughout the country. Thus only a small fraction of the school-age Jewish population received Jewish education, and most of these did not advance beyond the third grade. In past years, Jewish kindergarten enrolment had increased by about 1,000 pupils per year. Between 1963 and 1964 it remained static. In general, Jewish education suffered the lack of proper teachers' education, coordination between schools, and modern pedagogical methods. Improvement of the situation depended upon greater cooperation among day schools, despite conflicting ideologies, and between Ashkenazi and Sephardi schools; the merger of small schools, and the establishment of new and modern schools.

There were plans to expand existing nursery schools and increase their enrolment to 10,000 pupils. This would require special training for more teachers. It was urged that by thus increasing the kindergarten enrolment, adding another hour to all sessions, and developing a more intensive program for the five-year-olds, increased primary-school enrolment would be assured. Other plans included one to establish a central psychopedagogic board for consultation by all schools and another to offer graduate courses for all teachers. At the time of writing, only graduates of the Midrasha Ha-'Ivrit were
eligible to teach in the secondary schools. This AMIA-sponsored teacher's seminary had an enrolment of 130.

There were several encouraging developments. One was the organization of Horim, a federation of Hebrew-school parents' groups, in March. Horim was nonpolitical; it sought to increase enrolment, aid in the financing of the schools, and further interest in Jewish culture among parents. Another was the addition in the same month of a high-school department to Tarbut, the youngest and most modern of the day schools, where English was among the subjects taught.

In general, Argentine Jewish education had an almost totally secularist approach.

Zionism and Relations with Israel

AMIA President Fainguersh stated at the Wa'ad Ha-kehilot convention in July that "we constitute a community based on the Zionist ideal and our orientation is towards the State of Israel." Although there was a sharp decline in the rate of 'aliyah as compared with the previous year, Zionist activity and allegiance continued to be very strong.

The Israeli office of tourism sponsored a promotion week called "Learn about Israel." The intensive program included a city-wide Israeli folk-song and dance festival, radio broadcasts, issuance of special publications, and special meetings. Among the long list of important Israelis to visit Argentina were Arieh Kubovy, chairman of Yad Washem (Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Authority); Katriel Katz, Israeli Consul General in New York, and Finance Minister Phinehas Sappir. Friends of the Hebrew University, of the Weizmann Institute, and of Technion were active in sponsoring cultural events throughout the capital. The Instituto Argentino de Cultura Hebreah (Argentine Institute of Hebrew Culture) sponsored a pilgrimage to Israel to further its aim of promoting the Hebrew language and Israeli culture. There were many Hebrew-speaking circles throughout the city, and the Hebrew language was stressed in most Jewish day schools. Argentina's two Hebrew weeklies, Darom and Ha-tzohar, merged in May. The publication, now called Tzohar Ha-darom has, however, not appeared since November.

In most Jewish institutions, Zionism and the State of Israel were the key factors in programing, and furnished their basic ideologies. Those who did not adhere to an active Zionist program were singled out for sharp criticism. The Jewish community fought against any attempt to distinguish Zionism from Judaism.

Religion

The growing inroads made by the Conservative movement marked a new stage in Argentine Jewish religious life. Although looked upon with distrust and openly denounced by several community leaders, the movement had some far-reaching effects. By far the most significant event in religion, for example, was the official inauguration in August of the (Conservative) Seminario Rabínico Latinoamericano, the first modern rabbinical seminary on the continent,
which was founded in 1962 by the World Council of Synagogues and CENTRA (Asociación de Comunidades y Organizaciones Israelitas en Latinoamérica). Its 22 students included young men from Perú, Uruguay, and Paraguay, all of whom were concurrently enrolled at the University of Buenos Aires. The inauguration had wide press and television coverage and was attended by the vice-president of the republic, other high government and church officials, and representatives of Jewish communities from all over the continent. Rabbi Marshall T. Meyer was rector, and Professor Seymour Siegel of the Jewish Theological Seminary continued as guest lecturer for a third year. All of the students served as rabbis for the High Holy Days in congregations throughout the country and continent. Seven upperclass students left for an intensive three-month study course in Israel, under the direction of Vice-Rector Marcos Edery. The World Council of Synagogues and the Seminario conducted other activities, as well, which reached previously unReached elements in the community. In July Rabbi Gerald Zelizer, a graduate of JTS, accepted the position of co-rabbi with Rabbi Meyer in the Bet El synagogue in Buenos Aires.

The first two students to be graduated from the AMIA-sponsored (Orthodox) Escuela Superior Teológica Seminario Rabínico were sent to Israel to complete their rabbinical studies.

In December Rabbi Haim Asa, director of the Argentine office of the World Union for Progressive Judaism, inaugurated a Reform synagogue in a suburb of Buenos Aires.

Argentina's 450,000 Jews had only about 15 trained rabbis in 1964.

Antisemitism

Both DAIA (Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas), under the presidency of Isaac Goldenberg, and responsible government leaders held that antisemitism in Argentina was not the problem of the Jews, but rather a national problem. Minister of Defense Leopoldo Suárez said in a speech in March:

Once and for all the line must be drawn between those in this country who want to continue living in freedom under democratic and republican institutions, and those who will confess that they want to change the system in order to enter into a new phase of fascism, which has brought so much pain, anguish, and mourning into the world.

But on the whole the nation remained indifferent to the problem. During President Illía's first year in office, there were over 300 antisemitic attacks. At the height of this campaign, Foreign Minister Zavala Ortiz stated in Washington that antisemitism in Argentina was highly exaggerated.

Along with the well-known Tacuara and Guardia Restauradora Nacionalista fascist-type movements (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 183), the Arab League intensified its activities against the State of Israel and against the local Jewish community. Headed by Hussein Triki, an admitted Nazi sympathizer, the Arab League had connections with many influential circles. Its voice was the
*Nación Arabe*, a magazine that stressed the bogey of Jewish “dual allegiance” and asserted that “rich Jewish capitalists” sent all their money to Israel. It urged an economic and political boycott of Israel, acknowledged contact with illegal Nazi groups in Argentina, and, under the guise of anti-Zionism, conducted an intense anti-Jewish campaign. To combat these activities, DAIA made continuous representations to all high government officials and all political parties. In Rosario an Arab-Jewish League was organized to improve relations between the two groups. In September Triki was recalled to Egypt and was replaced by General Esam Helmy El Masry. In August *Nación Arabe* ceased publication. It was replaced in September by another magazine, *Patria Bárabara*, which closed down three months later.

Antisemitic manifestations included synagogue bombings, tar-bomb explosions at Jewish institutions in Buenos Aires and the interior, the murder of a young Jew in the capital, hundreds of telephone and mail threats, and smears on walls all over the country. In June the Federal police arrested two minors responsible for 148 antisemitic acts in three months. On Argentine Flag Day, an army colonel addressed a Nazi-uniformed audience of youths and adults in the Santa Maria church in Buenos Aires. In July, during a session of the House of Representatives, Deputy Cornejo Linares of the Unión Popular party demanded an official investigation into the “anti-Argentine activities of Zionism.” At a press conference Linares stated that there was “a dangerous conspiracy of an international-type organism, that was acting against the very principles of our nation.” Anti-Jewish manifestations were attributed to the governor of the province of Catamarca, who publicly denied them later. Retired Air Force Brigadier Oliva sent a letter to the general press and DAIA in June containing antisemitic attacks.

DAIA played a major role in bringing these facts before the general public and high government officials. By letters to the press, paid advertisements, the publication and distribution of pamphlets and bulletins, periodic meetings with the president, ministers, police and army officers, and leading intellectuals, DAIA helped to contain what might possibly have been a very explosive situation.

The Instituto Judío de Cultura e Información also played a vital role in the development of public relations and intergroup relations to strengthen civic harmony and curb bigotry. One of its techniques was the use of a special press service, SICU, that supplied accurate information on the Jewish community to more than 300 newspapers throughout the country.

**Personalia**

The Jewish community mourned the loss of Jacobo Botosansky, a noted Yiddish writer and journalist, and of Rabbi Michael Molho, who in 1950 immigrated from Salonika and was active among the Sephardim circles as spiritual leader and scholar.
Brazil

The crisis which started with the resignation of President Jânio da Silva Quadros in August 1961 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 184) culminated on March 31, 1964, with the ousting of President João ("Jango") Goulart by combined military and civilian forces.

In his New Year's message for 1964, Goulart said that "within the existing structure" it was no longer possible to check the inflationary avalanche. He sought increasingly to concentrate power in his own hands, on the ground that only thus could essential reforms be put into effect. Although the economic situation continued to deteriorate, Goulart's position remained strong as long as he retained the support of the armed forces. Large sections of these had originally opposed his accession to the presidency after the resignation of Quadros, but he had used his powers of appointment and promotion to strengthen his influence over the military services. A poll taken among the officers he had promoted to higher commands showed that about 90 per cent of them agreed with his ideas of land reform. But the efforts of Goulart's followers to organize political support among the noncommissioned officers and rank and file of the armed forces created increasing resentment among the military leaders. This came to a head when Goulart refused to support the navy command in suppressing a strike of marines in March 1964 thus undermining the foundation of military authority and discipline. The final impetus to the revolt came from mass demonstrations, known as "marches with God for family and freedom," first organized in São Paulo on March 19 and later in other cities, in response to a mass meeting in Rio de Janeiro called by Goulart on March 13, which marked his break with constitutional government.

The military leaders, including both those who had always wanted to bar Goulart from the presidency and some who had previously supported the preservation of normal constitutional processes, then joined forces with such anti-Goulart politicians as Governors Carlos Lacerda of Guanabara, Adhemar de Barros of São Paulo, and Magalhães Pinto of Minas Gerais.

April 1 was set for a revolt which began on March 31 in Juiz de Fora, an industrial city in Minas Gerais. Officers loyal to Goulart were imprisoned or fled. Short and sporadic resistance broke down, and on April 2 Congress declared the presidency vacant. As provided by the constitution, Congress President Ranieri Mazilli took over. On April 4 Goulart sought asylum in Uruguay.

The "high command of the revolution" suspended a number of constitutional rights and assumed the authority to deprive individuals of political rights for 10 years, under an "institutional act" (a decree giving the high command special powers and setting aside normal constitutional procedures). Under this decree the political rights of hundreds of Brazilians were sus-
pended, chief among them Goulart and former Presidents Juscelino Kubitschek and Quadros. Some sought asylum, some were imprisoned, and special military political investigations were initiated.

On April 9 Congress elected Marshal Humberto de Alencar Castelo Branco to the presidency for nine months and in July his term of office was extended to January 1967.

The leaders declared that the revolution was directed against Communism, corruption, incompetent administration, and inflation and rising prices. On none of these issues, however, was there agreement on interpretation or on effective remedies among the revolutionary authorities.

Inflation continued, although at a somewhat slower pace. The dollar, officially quoted at 620 cruzeiros at the end of 1963 (unofficially 1,225), reached an official price of 1,850 at the end of December 1964 (with about the same price in the black market). The worst drought in 70 years added to the difficulties, especially in electrical energy. Foreign investors showed increased interest after March, but few concrete projects were registered.

Population was growing at a rate of 3.6 per cent a year, while total national income rose only 2 per cent in 1963 and probably less in 1964. Thus the standard of living, already extremely low for most of the population, was falling even further.

In accordance with Brazilian tradition, nothing even slightly pejorative to Jews or Judaism was said or done, even in the midst of upheaval. Some Jews were active in opposing Goulart. Others, including many intellectuals, were among his supporters or were active in leftist groups. There were some 70 Jewish officers in the army, and they took part in the events which led to the change of government. Thus, a certain number of Jews were involved in the purge. However, the word “Jew” was mentioned only in the case of the editor of a leftist Jewish paper in São Paulo, Nossa Voz (“Our Voice”). The paper itself ceased circulation. The Folkshaus (House of the People) in São Paulo, a center of progressive Jewish—or rather Yiddish—activities, was investigated; but when the Jewish Federation of São Paulo assumed responsibility, no further steps were taken.

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE DELEGATION

In August a delegation of the American Jewish Committee headed by its president Morris B. Abram visited Brazil, on the invitation of the Instituto Brasileiro Judaico de Cultura a Divulgação (Brazilian Jewish Institute of Culture and Information; AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 189). The delegation spent August 2 and 3 in Brasília, August 3 to 9 in Rio de Janeiro, and August 9 to 11 in São Paulo.

In Brasília they were received by President Castelo Branco. In reply to a statement by the delegation, President Branco declared: “... I gave special attention to the part in which the speaker condemned totalitarianism. I think we should all, on any occasion, manifest our revulsion, our condemnation to
any type of totalitarianism. . . ." The delegation was also received by the Federal Supreme Court Presiding Justice Alvaro Moutinho Ribeiro da Costa, Senate President Auro de Moura Andrade, Chamber of Deputies President Paschoal Rainieri Mazzini, and Deputy Antonio Cunha Bueno.

The delegation made contact with and offered encouragement to the new Jewish community in Brasília. In Rio de Janeiro the delegation visited Jaime Cardinal de Barros Câmara, who declared that he agreed with the statement made in May by Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York, condemning anti-semitism. They also met with United States Ambassador Lincoln Gordon and Israeli Minister Avigdor Shoham.

In São Paulo Archbishop Antonio de Siqueira received members of the delegation and, in answer to a memorandum handed to him, made a declaration similar to that of the Rio cardinal. At the same time other members of the delegation visited the São Paulo University faculty of philosophy, science, and letters and made a donation of books to the department of oriental languages.

In Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo the delegation met with authors and intellectual friends of the Portuguese-language quarterly Comentário and attended official receptions by the community leadership. In São Paulo the president of the Jewish Confederation of Brazil, Moysés Kauffmann, greeted the guests warmly. They also met Israeli Consul-General Leon Feffer and former Brazilian Foreign Minister Horácio Lafer.

Everywhere the delegation gave collective and individual interviews which were widely covered by newspapers, radio, and television.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Brazil's population reached 80 million at the end of 1964. Official figures for the Jewish population, estimated at 130,000, were not available. Most lived in the three largest cities: about 50,000 in Rio de Janeiro, 55,000 in São Paulo, and 12,000 in Porto Alegre. A private study in four small communities yielded the following near-exact figures: Belém (Pará) 1,200 (300 families), Curitiba (Paraná) 2,300 (250 families), Recife (Pernambuco) 1,200 (350 families), and Salvador (Bahia) 1,000 (225 families). The remaining 7,300 lived mainly in the South. Jews were represented in practically all branches of state and city administration and taught at the institutions of higher education. Thus a leader of the Belém do Pará Jewish community reported: "As an old community with several generations of native-born Brazilians, we take an active part in the general community—as vice-mayor, secretary of state, deputies, etc. All our people are highly respected in the most varied sectors. The intellectual level is high."

In the great cities such as São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro it was impossible to know the number of Jews in public life, especially in administrative and educational functions, but their participation was unquestionably substantial.
Immigration

Political and economic uncertainties diminished Brazil’s attractiveness to newcomers. Immigration was practically nonexistent in spite of the government’s unaltered liberal policy. Of 262 Jewish United Hias Service-aided immigrants to Latin America in 1964, 92 settled in Brazil, most of them in São Paulo.

As a result of the great decline in immigration, the American Joint Distribution Committee and UHS reduced their offices in São Paulo to skeleton staffs. The São Paulo community institutions assumed responsibility for the local services previously rendered by these organizations. In particular, the "open workshop" for elderly people, initiated by UHS, became the responsibility of the Liga Feminina Israelita do Brasil (Jewish Women’s League of Brazil). UHS retained only its Rio de Janeiro office in full force to serve the whole of Latin America.

There were no figures available on total Jewish emigration from Brazil, but 408 Jews were known to have left for Israel up to August (compared with 380 in 1963).

Communal Activities

The Confederação Israelita do Brasil (Jewish Confederation of Brazil—formerly the Confederation of Representative Bodies of the Jewish Communities of Brazil—CERCIB) (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 185) consolidated its influence on Jewish life, although its financial basis remained very weak.

The confederation was one of 11 Brazilian organizations enumerated in a December law creating a national youth foundation. It was the first time that the confederation was officially recognized as a representative of Brazilian Jewry.

As a constituent member of the World Jewish Congress and a fraternal organization of the World Zionist Organization, the confederation was represented at WJC regional and international meetings in Buenos Aires, Geneva, and Jerusalem, and at WZO executive-committee meetings. It sent four delegates to the 26th World Zionist Congress in Jerusalem in December.

In response to an appeal from the confederation, the Jewish community contributed to a campaign Ouro para o bem do Brasil ("gold for the good of Brazil") in April. Organizations gave token contributions and asked their members to give.

When Castelo Branco became president, the confederation sent him a message to which he replied with thanks. On the occasion of General Charles de Gaulle’s visit to Brazil in October the confederation delivered a letter to the French embassy welcoming the hero of the French resistance and friend of Israel. Other prominent visitors to Brazil were Union of American Hebrew Congregations President Maurice Eisendrath, in February, and David Kessler, publisher of the London Jewish Chronicle, who visited São Paulo and Rio in March and gave interviews to the general press. Kessler was officially received by the Jewish Confederation in São Paulo, and by the local branch

In October a five-day convention of CENTRA (Asociación de Comunidades y Organizaciones Israelitas en Latinoamérica; AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 191) in São Paulo was attended by 40 delegates from seven Latin American countries. Professor Fritz Bamberger of Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion was guest speaker.

Four South American countries were represented at the first general meeting of Latin American organizations affiliated to the International Council of Jewish Women, held in São Paulo in November.

CJMCAG allocated 15,747,500 cruzeiros to six organizations in São Paulo and one in Porto Alegre, including 4,597,500 cruzeiros in currency adjustments paid during 1964 for allocations in 1963 and in the first half of 1964.

In São Paulo a new building for the oldest Jewish welfare organization, EZRA, was opened in March. The country-club-like Hebraica maintained a 13-acre camp; it had 5,000 affiliated families and 1,500 individual members, altogether about 18,000, by far the largest membership of any Jewish organization in Brazil.

In Rio de Janeiro a four-story building of the Centro Cultural Esportivo e Recreativo (Sports and Recreation Cultural Center) Monte Sinai was opened in March. The old people's hostel celebrated its silver jubilee in November.

In the newly-built capital, Brasília, a new community sprang into being with a social structure completely different from the traditional one; most of the approximately 150 Jews belonged to the professional class or were in government service.

In Belém (Pará) a home for the indigent was opened.

Community life as a whole was restrained by the events of March, although no legal restrictions were imposed. Nevertheless, internal activities remained unchanged; projects were continued and completed. Because of the political situation, the confederation recommended that the Zionist parties refrain from holding elections to the 26th Congress.

On April 9 the Warsaw Ghetto uprising was commemorated, although on a much smaller scale than previously. On the occasion of Israel Independence Day, all Jewish papers printed special editions, and three dailies in Rio and São Paulo published supplements on Israel. Various state and city legislative bodies heard speakers of all parties pay tribute to Israel.

Communal Relations

The newspapers and journals gave surprisingly broad coverage to Jewish life. The big newspapers of the major cities published series of articles on Israel, the Auschwitz trial, and Nazi war criminals, always from a sympathetic point of view. Illustrated articles describing Jewish rituals and religious customs were widely published. Around the High Holidays rabbis were interviewed and services photographed.
Rabbis Henrique Lemle and M. M. Masliah in Rio and Chief Rabbi Fritz Pinkuss in São Paulo were officially invited to the memorial services for the Brazilian war dead.

In March a street in São Paulo leading to the future Albert Einstein Jewish hospital was named Avenida Albert Einstein. In December a street in the coffee port of Santos was named Estado de Israel (State of Israel).

In June Rio de Janeiro followed São Paulo's example in founding a Conselho de Fraternidade Cristão-Judaica (Council for Christian-Jewish Brotherhood). The rabbinical representatives to the councils were Rabbis Lemle and Masliah in Rio, and Rabbi Menahem Diesendruck in São Paulo, succeeding Chief Rabbi Fritz Pinkuss. Both councils organized various meetings; the São Paulo council arranged a public celebration of Human Rights' Day.

At the suggestion of the American Jewish Committee the highest Catholic authorities of Brazil were approached in February and March on matters concerning the third session of the Ecumenical Council, including Cardinals Dom Carlos de Vasconcellos Motta, then Archbishop of São Paulo, and Augusto Álvaro da Silva, then Archbishop of Bahia.

In February the Brazilian minister of education and the rector of the University of Rio de Janeiro accepted invitations to join the national committee for the Third International Bible Contest. Local committees were set up in all state capitals.

Human Rights

In April Deputy Cunha Bueno introduced a bill to institute a "Day of the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Man"; the Chamber of Deputies approved this bill at the end of the year, which still needed the consent of the Senate. The São Paulo legislature approved a bill introduced by State Deputy Jacó Salvador Zveibil making "Human Rights' Day" obligatory in São Paulo state schools. A measure sponsored by City Councilor Hélio Dejtiar, making the same provision for municipal schools, was passed by the São Paulo city council in July. In Congress a Council for the Defense of the Rights of the Human Being was approved in March.

The Instituto Brasileiro Judaico de Cultura a Divulgação in Rio de Janeiro was instrumental in organizing a special session of the Brazilian Academy of Letters dedicated to Jewish culture in June. Among the speakers was the president of the Instituto, Joseph Eskenazi-Pernidji.

In January the Rio Instituto awarded the then Brazilian foreign minister, João Araujo Castro, its annual citation to a Brazilian for outstanding service on behalf of human rights.

Religious Activities

The number of congregations remained unchanged. In June the Centro Israelita Brasileiro Bne Herzl in Rio de Janeiro laid the foundation for Beth El synagogue, to seat 516 people.

In São Paulo the Congregação e Beneficiencia Israelita Sefaradi Paulista (known as the Alepinos, or Jews from Aleppo) opened a beautiful synagogue
in the residential district of Consolação, rua Bela Cintra, with Rabbi Diesendruck as its spiritual head. Diesendruck had formerly been with the Congregação Israelita Paulista, which, after his resignation, secured the services of Rabbi Michael Leipziger, a Brazilian-educated Jewish Theological Seminary graduate, working with Chief Rabbi Pinkuss.

Of the smaller communities, only Belo Horizonte had a rabbi. Rabbis Pinkuss and Lemle tried to maintain religious life in the other communities by occasional visits. In a new development, five communities in the north of Brazil named Rabbi Lemle their permanent religious adviser.

**Education**

In São Paulo, 3,714 pupils attended Jewish schools, including 1,760 in the Jardins de Infância. The school with the biggest attendance, Ginásio Renascença, was being enlarged to accommodate 2,350 pupils. Of the 14 schools in the city of São Paulo, three had college character. An Escola Normal Brasil-Israel was being organized in Rio de Janeiro.

It was estimated, on the basis of private studies, that one of every six Jewish young people of school age attended Jewish schools. In smaller communities the percentage was much higher: in Recife there were 270 students, or about 90 per cent of the total; in Curitiba 210, or about 80 per cent; in Salvador 70, about 98 per cent. These studies indicated, however, that attending Jewish schools did not interfere with the youths' participation in the life of the general community. As a matter of fact, a study of 1,736 children of school age, made by the United Zionist Organization of Brazil, showed that only 21 per cent of those born in Brazil spoke Yiddish.

The Conselho Educativo (Educational Council) of the Federation in São Paulo (a constituent organization of CERCIB) sought more active participation of the Zionist organization's school department in educational work and particularly in the activation and reconstruction of the Hebrew Seminary in São Paulo, which was under heavy criticism.

**Youth**

The general structure of Jewish youth organizations remained unchanged (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 191). There was hardly a Jewish community, no matter how small, without at least one or two youth groups. Some of them were only local; others were connected with the Conselho Juvenil Judaico do Brasil (Council of Jewish Youth in Brazil) and the Brazilian Jewish Youth Front, associated with CENTRA (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 191). Recife, with 1,200 Jews, had three youth groups with 170 members; Curitiba, with 2,300 Jews, had four youth groups with 405 members; Salvador, with 1,000 Jews, had one youth group with 60 members.

The week-long fourth national seminar of the Youth Council took place in July in Teresópolis, with 50 delegates from all over Brazil. The main topic was the study and preservation of the traditions of Brazilian Jews. Another seminar of the same council, with delegates from São Paulo, Rio, Porto Alegre, Curitiba and Belo Horizonte, was held in Rio in November. The Brazilian
Jewish Youth Front met in Linha Imperial, near Porto Alegre, in July. It had groups in São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Porto Alegre, Belo Horizonte, and Pelotas, with a total of 1,390 members. It had largely solved its leadership problem by having Brazilian youth trained in Israel. Six such young people were already active. The Front's importance was recognized by WZO, which invited it to send an observer to the 26th congress in Jerusalem.

Community Survey

Professors Gabriel Bolaffi and Heinrich Rattner of São Paulo University completed the first scientific survey on the attitude of Jewish students towards Jewish questions, under the sponsorship of the American Jewish Committee and with the assistance of the Committee's Latin American director and its São Paulo representative. The study was based on a sampling of Jewish students at the University of São Paulo, the (Protestant) Mackenzie University, the (Catholic) Pontifical University, and several other university institutes in São Paulo. It indicated that 90 per cent of the Jewish university students in São Paulo were Brazilian born, but only 8 per cent had Brazilian-born fathers. Jewish students were less observant than their fathers: 50 per cent of them kept Yom Kippur, compared with 76 per cent of the fathers; only one per cent kept the Sabbath laws, compared with 7 per cent of the fathers; 27 per cent of the sons never went to synagogue, compared with 20 per cent of the fathers. Twelve per cent of both sons and fathers observed no Jewish religious tradition. Sixty-three per cent of the students had received some Jewish education, but only 29 per cent had attended Jewish schools. For 19 per cent Israel had no special significance, while 81 per cent felt some links with Israel. Thirty-four per cent declared themselves Zionists, 59 per cent non-Zionists, and 7 per cent had no definite opinion. All replies stressed the tremendous need for spiritual leadership in the religious and educational field, which could not be satisfied with the existing Brazilian Jewish personnel. The study was being published as a monograph in Portuguese and was to be translated into English.

The Instituto Brasileiro Judáico invited community leaders in São Paulo to participate in a round-table discussion of the implications of the survey for Jewish education and cultural initiatives, in June.

An unidentified Rio rabbi reported that of 262 marriages performed by him, 16 per cent were mixed. Two-thirds of these had a Sefardi partner and one-third had an Ashkenazi partner.

Cultural Activities

Under the auspices of the Jewish Confederation of Brazil, the Biblioteca Judaica Popular published Portuguese translations of several books: *A História do Alef Bet* ("The Story of the Aleph Beth") by David Diringer, *Dois Caminhos; O Judaísmo e o Advento do Cristianismo* ("The Parting of the Ways; Judaism and the Rise of Christianity") by Abraham Cohen, and *Uma Introdução ao Comentário Judaico da Biblia* ("An Introduction to Jewish Bible Commentary") by Bernard M. Casper.
The Fritz Pinkuss Foundation (of the Congregação Israelita Paulista in São Paulo; AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 190) continued its publication program with the issuance of the third and last volume of Cecil Roth's *Short History of the Jewish People* together with a special study of Jewish history in Brazil, *História dos Judeus no Brasil*, by Salomon Serebrenick of Rio de Janeiro.

The Instituto Brasileiro Judaico de Cultura a Divulgação published a translation of Kay Boyle's *Breaking the Silence* into Portuguese (*Relembrando a História*), which was widely distributed, especially among young people and through schools. Other books by Jewish authors included Jacob Guinsburg's *Motivos*, essays about literary subjects; Clarice Lispector's *A Legião Estrangeira* ("The Foreign Legion"), a book of short stories, and *A Paixão Segundo G. H.* ("Passion According to G. H."), a novel; Paulo Rónai's *Homens contra Babel* ("Men Against Babel"), essays about artificial languages; Boris Schnaiderman's *Guerra em Surdina* ("Quiet War"), a fictional account of Brazilian participation in World War II, and Pedro Bloch's *Criança diz cada uma* ("A Child Tells . . .").


In June Tsevi Caspi, cultural attaché at the Israeli consulate in São Paulo, became the first recipient of the degree of doctor in Hebrew letters from the department of Hebrew language and culture at São Paulo State University. (The department was headed by Chief Rabbi Pinkuss.) His thesis was on a comparative study of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible.

The distribution of 100 copies of *Comentário* to secondary schools in São Paulo was financed through the initiative of State Deputy Zveibil, then director of the Federal Savings Bank in São Paulo.

The Conjunto Folclórico Chinani (a youth group for dance, song, and orchestra) was officially invited to take part in two folklore festivals, one in Curitiba in July, and one in Brasília in August; they won high praise.

*A Midsummer Night's Dream* was performed in August in the new and beautiful Hebraica theater as part of the Shakespeare Festival.

In June the Brazilian writer Herman Lima received the first Brazil-Israel prize, created by the Centro Cultural Brasil-Israel in São Paulo, for his book *História da Caricatura no Brasil* ("History of Caricature in Brazil").

In the second half of the year two new Portuguese-language periodicals started publication in São Paulo, at irregular intervals: *Folha da Coletividade* ("Community Page") and *Mandamentos do Judaísmo* ("The Commandments of Judaism"). The other Jewish papers continued circulation.

**Zionism and Relations with Israel**

Relations between Brazil and Israel remained markedly friendly. In March Ambassador Arieh Eshel left Brazil, Minister Avigdor Shoham acting as
chargé d'affaires. The new ambassador, Joseph Nahmias, presented his credentials in Brasília on August 20. He made an official visit to São Paulo on October 6, and he purchased a plot for a new Israeli embassy building in Brasília. In December Brazil named Aloisio Regio Bittencourt ambassador to Israel.

In Rio de Janeiro the Brazil-Israel Chamber of Commerce and Industry had new elections in November, naming Ambassador Augusto Frederico Schmidt, now deceased, as its new president.

Some conventions and treaties concluded between the two states in previous years came into effect. Thus, the basic accord on technical cooperation was published in the *Diário Oficial* in November. In the same month a mixed company was founded between Shoevah-Water and Agricultural Development International, Ltd., of Tel-Aviv and CASOL—Comp. de Águas e Solos of Rio Grande do Norte. Israel gave a loan of $100,000 to buy drilling machinery.

In April 1964 an agreement was signed between SUDENE (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 190) and the Israeli Mission for Technical Cooperation in Brazil for drilling a pilot well for use of underground water and for technical assistance in the production of hybrid corn. In October Israel bought 10,000 tons of steel sheets. Altogether seven Israeli ships called at the port of Santos.

The convention for cultural exchange between Israel and Brazil, signed in April 1959, was ratified in March.

The cultural department of the Israeli embassy, which had charge of cultural activities in Latin America and was headed by Minister Shaul Levin, reorganized the Centros Culturais Brasil-Israel (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 191) in Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Porto Alegre, Belo Horizonte, and Salvador (Bahia) and formed a Brazilian Federation of Centers. Other centers were being organized in Curitiba, Recife, and Belém. The first president of the federation was former Brazilian Foreign Minister Francisco Clementino de Santiago Dantas, who died in September; he was succeeded by Professor Flexa Ribeiro. A volume of Dantas's speeches was being prepared in Hebrew with a preface by Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir.

In São Paulo a House for Hebrew Culture and Language was opened in November.

There was a constant exchange of prominent people between Israel and Brazil. Professor Israel S. Drapkin, chairman of the department of criminology of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, lectured in July in Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Curitiba, Porto Alegre, Salvador (Bahia), and Belém (Pará). In São Paulo he was the official guest of the Instituto Latino-Americano de Criminologia (Latin-American Institute of Criminology), an affiliate of UNESCO. Other visitors from Israel included General Tsevi Tsur; Technion President Jacob Dori, in May; General Abraham Yaffe and Hayyim Yahil, director general of the Israeli Foreign Ministry in June, and Finance Minister Phinehas Sappir in August. Professor Michael Sola, director of the department of immunology of the Weizmann Institute, was a guest lecturer at the University of Brazil.
Israeli scientists took part in the first international congress for biochemistry and nuclear medicine in Rio de Janeiro in September.

Brazilian visitors to Israel included Professors Flexa Ribeiro and Carlos Chagas of Rio de Janeiro, Professor Elisio Paglioli of Porto Alegre, Minister of Foreign Affairs Arinos de Mello Franco, and Professor Ana Amélia Carneiro de Mendonça of Rio de Janeiro, who took part in the international conference on the role of women in the struggle for peace and development held in Israel in November.

Professor Oscar Niemeyer, the architect of Brasília, exhibited his "90 days in Israel" in Rio de Janeiro and in Brasília in November.

The Cultural Department of the Israel embassy sponsored an exposition of paintings by Moses Gat in São Paulo, Belo Horizonte, Salvador (Bahia); concerts by the Tel-Aviv Quartet in Porto Alegre, São Paulo, Belo Horizonte, Curitiba, Salvador (Bahia), Recife and Rio, and an exhibition of the works of the Israeli painter Zamuch Gilead in Rio in January.

Gilberto Freire's classic study in Brazilian sociology, Casa Grande e Senzala ("Masters and Slaves"), was translated into Hebrew. An anthology of Brazilian stories, edited by Paulo Rónai, was to be brought out in Hebrew by the Massadah publishing house of Tel-Aviv. Israel Music Publication of Tel-Aviv published Suite Cosmopolitana by Bernhard Hoff of São Paulo. The illustrated magazine on Israel, Israel—Jovem Terra Milenar ("Israel—Young Ancient Land"), edited by the Israeli embassy, reached a circulation of 10,000 and seven editions (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 191).

Antisemitism

In the course of the general unrest during the early part of the year, there was some swastika-smearing in Rio, São Paulo, and Belo Horizonte. A grave incident occurred on February 29 in São Paulo, when a bomb exploded in the Instituto Feminino de Educação e Cultura Beth Jacob (Beth Jacob Institute for Education and Culture for Women). No one was hurt, but there was considerable damage. The authorities did their utmost to find the criminals, and Public Security Secretary Alderio Balboso Lemos and State Governor Adhemar de Barros published a strongly-worded condemnation. The press unanimously denounced the outrages, as did representatives of all parties in the city council and the state legislature.

In São Paulo, Beth El synagogue was smeared before Yom Kippur. The police organized protective measures for all synagogues.

Arab propaganda against Israel increased considerably, but without antisemitic trend, as in other South American countries. Relations between Brazilian citizens of Jewish and Arab origin were not affected.

Personalia

Waldemar Levi Cardoso, a Sefardi, was the first Jew to become a four-star general of the Brazilian army. His brother, Armando Levi Cardoso, also a general, was active in Jewish community life.

The centenary of the birth of Alexandre Levy, first authentically Brazilian
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composer, was celebrated on November 10, and the Academy of Letters held a special meeting in his honor in December. A high-fidelity record of his compositions was produced, and many concerts featured his works.

In January the Rio de Janeiro newspaper *O Globo*, with the largest circulation in Brazil, included two Jews in its list of ten personalities most deserving of the title of Honorary Citizens of Brazil: Regina Feigl, wife of the scientist Fritz Feigl, and Adolfo Bloch, editor of the *Life*-type illustrated weekly *Manchete* ("Headline").

In December the Premio Albert Einstein (Albert Einstein prize) was awarded by the Brazilian Academy of Science to Hans Zocker, a former assistant to Albert Einstein.

The Brazilian Institute of Architects gave prizes to Ruben Breitman, Rachel Esther Prochnik, Jacques Hazan, and Wit Olaf Prichnik.

Alexandre Wollner, a São Paulo landscape architect, won a competition for urbanization plans for Rio in November.

Isaac Karabchevsky, founder and conductor of the Renascença choir of Belo Horizonte, was given a gold medal by the São Paulo association of dramatic critics. Karabchevsky received high praise on tours of Europe and the United States.

Oscar Ornstein of Rio received the Saci prize of the newspaper *O Estado de São Paulo* for his direction of *Minha querida Senhora* ("My Fair Lady").

In São Paulo Rabbi Diesendruck and Dr. Moisés Kahan, former president of the local federation, were named Citizens of São Paulo. Dr. Manoel T. Hidal, president of the Albert Einstein Hospital society, became a Distinguished Citizen.

Dr. Isaias Raw became full professor of biochemistry at São Paulo University.

Ruben Tabacof of Bahia University represented Brazil in international congresses as president of the Brazilian Society of Cardiology.

In Belém, J. J. Aben-Athar was named secretary of finance of the state of Para.

A bust of the late painter Lazar Segall, by the Jewish sculptress Ljuba Wolff, was unveiled on Russel beach in Rio de Janeiro in September.

Alfred Hirschberg was reelected vice-president of the World Council of Synagogues at its convention in Mexico in July.

In Rio Paul Rosenstein, urologist and former professor in Berlin, died at the age of 89 in September.

ALFRED HIRSCHBERG
Mexico

An American historian once commented that most historical accounts of Mexico were legends with footnotes. Most accounts of Mexican Jewry have fallen into this category. Statistics and other data have often been unreliable, perpetuating earlier errors. Hence portions of the ensuing article are at variance with previous accounts.

A survey of the attitudes of the Mexico City Jewish community (Estudio Sociosicológico de los judíos mexicanos) was conducted during 1962 and 1963 by a committee of qualified Mexican Jews, with technical and financial cooperation furnished by the American Jewish Committee. The findings were still unpublished when this article was written.

Historical Background

Jews (or rather crypto-Jews) were among the conquistadores in 1521, and Jews have lived in Mexico continuously since then. In the early days crypto-Jews were a substantial part of the Spanish population in Mexico.

Two Jews were burned at the stake in 1528 by order of the Dominican Fray Vicente de Santa Maria, who exercised inquisitorial powers. Of the many autos-da-fé during the colonial period (1521-1821), there was hardly one which did not have at least one Jewish victim. When Mexico attained its independence in 1821, and the secret cells of the Inquisition were opened, the last prisoner found was a Jew who had been incarcerated since 1795. However, there were decades during which the Mexican inquisitors did not seek them out, and Jews had the opportunity to play an important role in the cultural and commercial development of the country.

For three centuries, Mexican Jewry was mostly of Iberian origin. German Jews came in the second and third quarters of the 19th century. Austrians, Belgians, and French in the last two quarters; Turks, North Africans, Syrians and Lebanese from 1870 to World War I, and East European Jews, including Hungarians and Rumanians, after World War I.

Jewish Populations

Mexico’s last official decennial census was held in 1960. The three religious categories listed for the census were Católico, Protestante, and Israelita.

Not only Jews registered under the Israelita category, but also members of several Protestant sects. One such Protestant sect, known as Casa de Dios, or Bet El, had about 4,000 members. This sect nominally adopted Judaism, but it was evangelical and looked to both Testaments for ethical and moral inspirations. Two other Protestant sects, both of which used the name Iglesia de
Dios (Church of God) and had branches in the United States as well as in Mexico, observed the Saturday Sabbath as well as other Mosaic laws, but they also used the New Testament and honored Jesus, Mary, and the Apostles. They called themselves Jews, without rabbinical sanction or conversion rites. They were neither descendants of Jews of the colonial period nor were they recognized as Jews by the Mexican Jewish communities. Their members registered as Israelitas because they contended that they were descendants of the biblical Jacob-Israel. The groups of so-called “Indian Jews,” popular tourist attractions, were formerly adherents of these Protestant sects. The “Indian Jews,” of whom there are fewer than 200, have never been converted to Judaism. They are mestizos—persons of mixed ancestry—as are the majority of Mexicans.

The Jews of European or Levantine origin also call themselves Israelitas, and the word is applied to many of their institutions. They do not use the synonymous word Judio, or any derivative. (Spanish dictionaries often include a pejorative definition of the word.)

Although the 1960 government census reported 100,750 Israelitas, this was no indication of the Jewish population. The Jewish communities had never undertaken a scientific demographic study. They used figures varying from 29,000 to 32,000, based on affiliations with organized Jewish bodies and philanthropic contributions to local and overseas campaigns. Calculations of the Israeli embassy in Mexico and the author's personal observations during extended trips throughout the country indicated that an estimate of 45,000 was warranted. This included many who had married non-Jews and did not practice Judaism, but who nevertheless acknowledged their Jewish identity. The difference between the actual Jewish population and the figure of 100,750 was accounted for by Casa de Dios and the Iglesias de Dios and the 200 mestizos who called themselves Indian Jews.

Communal Structure

The three principal Jewish communities in 1964 were in Mexico City, Guadalajara, and Monterrey, and there were smaller communities in Cuernavaca, Tijuana, and Veracruz. Small groups or individual Jews were to be found in practically every town on a principal highway, in the capitals of the 29 states of Mexico, and in other towns with populations not exclusively Indian.

Each Jewish community was divided into origin groups, and the affiliation of even the native-born was dependent upon the national origin of their ancestors. The major groups were the Ashkenazim, the Sephardim, and the Arab or Oriental Jews. The Ashkenazim comprised East Europeans (Russians, Poles, Lithuanians, Rumanians), Hungarians, Austrians, and Germans. The Sephardim were immigrants, or their descendants, from Greece, Bulgaria, Turkey, and North Africa. The Arab Jews were from Aleppo and from Damascus.

Nidhe Israel, the Ashkenazi kehillah, maintained a number of synagogues and two shtot-rabbonim (communal rabbis), supervised the Ashkenazi kosher
butchers, two mohalim, a cemetery, a hevrah kaddisha and undertaker, and all other persons and things required by an integral Orthodox community. It was currently erecting a building, Bet 'Am, to house its own offices and many other community organizations. In the 1963 annual elections for its executive committee, five different slates were presented. Nidhe Israel had more representatives on the Comité Central Israelita de México (Jewish Central Committee) than any other group, because the Ashkenazim were believed to comprise the largest section of the Jewish population.

The Sephardi kehillah, Unión Sefaradi, had one rabbi and cantor. The Arab Jews had their own community organization, and their charitable work was done through the Alianza Monte Sinai Beneficencia, the central organization of Jews from Damascus, and Sedaka Umarpe, founded in 1912 and 1909 respectively. Each had its own rabbi.

The various Jewish communities were in the hands of the 20th-century immigrants. Descendants of these Jews, who had been living in Mexico for almost a century or longer, were nearly all converts to Catholicism or Protestantism, or agnostics, or simply preferred not to be identified with the existent groups. Intermarriage was almost universal among the old Mexican Jewish families, although most of the offspring were aware of their Jewish ancestry.

Other Organizations

There were no national Jewish institutions. Each community was autonomous, and there was no bond between them except that of friendship. Discussion of mutual problems was informal. Each community had its own organizations more or less patterned after those of Mexico City, described below.

The Comité Central Israelita was equivalent to a Jewish community council, acting as spokesman for the Jewish community vis-à-vis the government and the non-Jewish community. It included representatives of practically all organized institutions, religious and secular; institutions affiliated with parent organizations were represented through the latter. In 1963 it elected its first new president in ten years.

The largest organization in Mexico City was the Zionist Federation, with which the Sephardim were not affiliated because meeting notices and much of the discussion were in Yiddish. The federation included General Zionists, Labor Zionists, Revisionists, Pioneer Women, and Mizrahi. There was also a WIZO group, which conducted Hebrew classes and in 1962 had its first graduating class. The most active of several Zionist youth groups affiliated with the adult groups was Bene Akiva, founded in 1947. It had its own synagogues, a director (Madrikh) from Israel, study groups, a two-week camp session in the country, and a training center.

B'nai B'rith had an English-speaking lodge which surrendered its charter in 1964 for failure to maintain a minimum membership of 25 and failure to pay dues to the grand lodge. A new Spanish-speaking lodge was chartered in October 1964. The original Spanish-speaking lodge, in existence for thirty
years, averaged about 130 members and operated as a ritualistic society with occasional open meetings. Its principal activity was to maintain representation on the Comité Central Israelita with which it shared the operation of a monthly publication, *La Tribuna Israelita*. This was not a house organ and reflected no activity of the lodge or of B’nai B’rith anywhere.

The Consejo Mexicano de Mujeres Israelitas (Mexican Council of Jewish Women) worked for the welfare of the Mexican general community. Although represented on the Central Committee, it was autonomous. It gave eight scholarships for poor Mexican Christians at the Mexican National University in 1963 and again in 1964. It maintained a room with 12 beds at the Red Cross, and 40 of its members worked in the campaign to eradicate polio, under the aegis of the ministry of health. These women formed a group known as Cavi—Comité Auxiliar Voluntarias Israelitas.

The Comité Central was affiliated with the World Jewish Congress.

The Centro Deportivo Israelita (Jewish Sport Center), affiliated with JWB in the United States, was one of the largest of its kind in the world. It was similar to a YMHA, and required no community financial aid. Non-kosher food was served in its restaurants, but kosher banquet facilities were also available. The center had a hall with a seating capacity of over 1,500, a large library, a theater, cinema, and meeting rooms, besides a gymnasium, swimming pool, and related facilities. Membership was open to all and dues were on a sliding scale determined by financial ability. The Sport Center had a representative on the Comité Central but did not pay any dues to that body.

Jewish doctors and dentists and Yiddish journalists had their own professional organizations. There were several philanthropic organizations, the most important of which, OSE, served all sectors of the community. It was administered by the Jewish doctors and dentists, who gave their services without charge.

**Schools**

There were six secular private Jewish schools and one yeshivah, of the East European traditional kind. (Two schools were called yeshivot but were not of the traditional type.) Three schools were sponsored by the Sephardim and Arabs, four by the Ashkenazim, including Tarbut, founded by the Zionists, and the Or Israel yeshivah. All of the Ashkenazi schools except Tarbut taught both Hebrew and Yiddish. Tarbut and the Sephardi and Arab schools taught only Hebrew. The secular programs of all schools were under the jurisdiction of the Mexican ministry of education, which assigned to the school teachers who were not necessarily Jewish.

All the secular schools had some Mexican Christian students, assigned by the ministry of education on a scholarship basis or because they lived nearer to these schools than to a public school.

Or Israel and Yeshiva Yavne included primary and secondary classes. They were under the supervision of Rabbi D. S. Rafalin, the original shtot rov, but not the first rabbi in Mexico. It received a subvention from Nidhe Israel, and the other Ashkenazi schools received some financial support from the kehillah.
Sedekah Umarpe conducted a Talmudical Academy for advanced students and adults.

The oldest school was the Colegio Israelita, founded in 1924, with classes from nursery through senior high school. Like public-high-school graduates, its graduates were eligible for the National University. Five per cent of its enrolment was non-Jewish and tuition-free. When the Colegio Israelita introduced Hebrew into its curriculum in the 1940s, the Bundists founded the Nuevo Colegio Israelita. The Bundists soon lost influence in their own schools, however, since the younger parents did not share the anti-Zionism of their elders. In 1963-64 there was a change in the directorship of the school and the school board.

Although the Ashkenazi schools jointly supported a teachers’ seminary, there was a dearth of teachers. Few men were attracted to the profession in the first place, and many young women left teaching after marriage. Most Hebrew teachers were imported from Israel and stayed two to four years.

The 1962-1963 survey of the Mexican Jews confirmed the suspicion held by many that only about 65 per cent of Jewish children attended the Jewish schools at any one time, rather than 85 per cent, as had been estimated by Jewish community leaders. Even this figure was perhaps high, since the survey sample was selected from the membership lists of synagogues and the Centro Deportivo Israelita. In other words, no account was taken of Jews for whom there was no positive Jewish identification. The records of individual schools showed Jewish secundaria (junior-high schools) enrolment to be 50 per cent lower than Jewish elementary-school enrolment. The indication was that most of the dropouts transferred to non-Jewish private schools.

Religion

Nidhe Israel maintained a chain of synagogues in various parts of Mexico City. The Polanco branch was building a new edifice. Two of the branches employed their own rabbis, with the aid of a small subvention from Nidhe Israel. All services were Orthodox.

Until 1963 the Arab communities had no branches, but then they began to build a branch in the Polanco area. The Germans had a weekly Friday-night service on the lower floor of the Avenida Yucatán synagogue and rented quarters for the High Holy Days. In 1963 and 1964 they rented space at the Rabbi Judah Halevi Temple (the Sephardi synagogue). The Sephardim had a unique form of liberal service.

There were two Conservative synagogues. The older, Beth Israel community center, had approximately 90 affiliated families and much of its service was in English. It had been without a Conservative rabbi since 1962, and in 1964 was led by a graduate of the Hebrew Union College (Reform). The congregation held no Saturday-morning services except for a rare bar mitzvah, and conducted a three-hour weekly Talmud Torah. The second Conservative synagogue, founded in 1960, acquired land for its own building in 1964 and had about 300 affiliated families. Daily services were held throughout the year, but a four-hour weekly Talmud Torah was disintegrating. Most of its
members were native-born Mexican Jews who sought a change from Orthodoxy.

There were several European-trained rabbis in Mexico who acted as religious functionaries for the Bet Din and kashrut supervision. A few taught in Jewish schools.

**Cultural Activities**

There were five Jewish periodicals—one monthly, and the others weekly, semi-weekly, or thrice-weekly. The weekly *Prensa Israelita* was in Spanish, two others divided their space between Spanish and Yiddish, and the rest were entirely in Yiddish. *Horizonte*, a monthly magazine in Spanish devoted to worldwide Jewish news, made its appearance in 1964. The monthly *Tribuna Israelita* was in Spanish and had a circulation of about 2,300, mailed to the Latin American embassies and other important agencies and people. It contained mainly translations of material from American and Israeli publications and included digests of speeches by prominent Mexican non-Jews.

The last Jewish Book Week was in 1960. The Centro Deportivo Israelita held many art exhibits of various kinds each year, at which non-Jews as well as Jews exhibited.

Rabbi Jacob Avigdor, one of the shtot-rabbonim, gave a series of lectures in Yiddish each year on various secular subjects. There was a community-sponsored choral group of excellent caliber. Nidhe Israel sponsored a series of concerts in 1964 which featured American cantors and Metropolitan Opera stars. The Mexico-Israel Cultural Institute sponsored several lectures and Israeli song and dance recitals. Most organizations had programs for their own members, usually in Yiddish. This made Mexico a magnet for Yiddish journalists from abroad.

In April a *Guide to Jewish References in the Mexican Colonial Era, 1521-1821*, by Seymour B. Liebman was published by the University of Pennsylvania Press in Philadelphia.

In 1963 the Kessel award for literature, administered by the Central Committee's cultural committee, went to Masha Greenbaum for her collection of reminiscences of Jewish Lithuania during the war. The author was an English citizen living in Mexico and writing in Spanish and won one of the rare awards to a Mexican resident. Previous recipients had almost all been American and Israeli authors of Yiddish works, but in recent years there had been an increase of books in Spanish written by Jews.

**Civic and Political Status**

There was no legal or governmental discrimination against Jews, but during the regime of President Adolfo López Mateos, 1958-64, there were only two known Jews who had governmental posts. One of them was promoted to a higher position under the new president, Gustavo Díaz Ordaz. For the most part, Mexican Jews were not active in politics.

There were only a few Jewish university professors, but this was the result of Jewish occupational choice rather than of any bias against the employment
of Jews. These few, as well as those in governmental employ, took no part in Jewish communal affairs. Mexican Jews tended to isolate themselves within their own ethnic sphere both socially and professionally, although good relations existed in business and professional activities. Staff positions in hospitals were open to any Jewish doctors seeking them. It was not because of discrimination that Jews did not achieve more public prominence.

There were no ghettos. Most Jews lived in three areas in Mexico City, but Jews were to be found in every part of the city except the slums. In general, Jews had not integrated themselves into the general stream of Mexican life. For this they were not entirely responsible. Assimilation to the Mexican Christian community presented certain difficulties which were not easily overcome. The campesino of the countryside, who had never seen a Jew, thought of Jews as possessing horns and a tail. He was not antisemitic in any real sense, even though on leaving church on Good Friday he placed sparklers in a figure of Judas, fired them and shouted, "Death to Judas" and "Death to the Jews," without distinguishing between the two.

The urban Mexican who had no close business or personal relationships with Jews regarded them as foreigners, non-Mexicans. This was illustrated by an event in the fall of 1964. The Jewish community had arranged a dinner in honor of President López. On the morning of the affair (the first of its kind in modern Mexican history) the new Israeli ambassador to Mexico, Shimshon Arad, presented his credentials. After the usual exchange of cordialities, the president invited Ambassador Arad to be present at the affair "which your people are tendering to me." Like most Mexicans, he did not distinguish between Israelis (citizens of Israel) and Israelitas (Jews).

Even the Jews seemed to regard themselves as foreigners. In the summer of 1962 the Jewish community of Guadalajara presented a school building to the ministry of education. This was in keeping with the custom of most resident foreign communities whose members were not citizens of Mexico. In 1958 the Mexico City Jewish community had made a similar gift.

Zionism and Relations with Israel

The community, except for the Bundists who were comparatively few in number but quite vocal, was Israel- and Zionist-minded. All campaigns received some popular support. A new and successful campaign for the Tel-Aviv University was inaugurated in 1964 when the presidency of the university was assumed by George Wise, who had been a resident of Mexico for more than 25 years. The outstanding event of the year was the visit of Deputy Prime Minister Abba Eban, one of whose numerous addresses was made in the Mexican Chamber of Deputies. The death of Adolfo Fastlicht in August 1964 was a serious loss to Zionism and Israel. He had been Israel's first honorary consul (really acting consul) from 1949 to 1954 and was an important figure in community life in Mexico.

The city of Puebla held a week-long festival in honor of Israel in July 1964. Among the many Mexican Christians prominent in political and cultural life who visited Israel in 1964 were former President Miguel Alemán and the
renowned artist Rufino Tamayo. In 1964, too, a group of young Mexican farmers went to Israel for an extended stay in order to study farming, irrigation, and kibbutz and moshav life. Because the climate and soil of Mexico and Israel shared many common characteristics, the experience of the kibbutzim was relevant for the Mexican ejidos. Several books and articles on Israel were published in 1963 by prominent journalists and political figures who had visited Israel.

Antisemitism and Intergroup Relations

There was a small nucleus of antisemites among the same Mexicans who were generally anti-foreign in their attitudes. Most of them were third- or fourth-rate cultural pretenders who could be readily influenced by any “anti” group. Some of them were in the habit of making disparaging remarks to Jewish students on the National University campus.

In 1963 and 1964, a number of antisemitic books and monographs in Spanish were published. These were mainly translations, including Hitler’s Mein Kampf and the Protocol of the Elders of Zion. Derrota Mundial (“World Defeat”) by Salvador Borrega, first published in 1953, went into 16 printings. These books could be purchased in any bookstore and were prominently displayed in or near slum areas. It was believed that the Arab League and some of the Arab embassies subsidized the publication of this hate literature.

Although generally friendly, the newspapers were inclined to add the word Judío (Jew) to names in the news. When a man in jail for murder was involved in a prison scandal, the newspaper accounts almost invariably referred to Pedro Kleiman, el Judío.” The word was also used when the daughter of a prominent Jewish woman won a beauty contest at the National University. The girl was described as la hija de la Judía. . . .”

In January 1964 the editor of Excelsior, an important daily newspaper, held his annual house party in honor of the Epiphany. For the first time, a rabbi attended. The Sephardi Rabbi Gambach cut one of the traditional cakes called rosca de los reyes (cake of the kings). Archbishop Miguel Dario Miranda y Gomez of Mexico City, a great Catholic liberal, and a Protestant minister cut the other two. The resultant publicity brought upon the rabbi the wrath of many Ashkenazim, who felt that he should not have participated in the ceremony. However, he was supported by B’nai B’rith and subsequently by a prominent staff member of the World Jewish Congress on a visit to Mexico.

Monterrey and Guadalajara each had its own rabbi. Monterrey, the better organized of the two, had the Ha-tikvah community center and a private school, extending from kindergarten through secundaria. In Guadalajara, Ashkenazim and Sephardim shared the same building for prayer and their children attended the same private Jewish school.
Summary of the Findings of the 1962-63 Study of Attitudes of Mexican Jews

This is not a complete digest of the 1962-63 survey. The findings of the survey were delivered to some of the leading members of the Central Committee in 1964 but received no recognition or even discussion. They showed that 52 per cent of working males were in business and 21 per cent in professions—medicine, dentistry, engineering, and architecture. Most were self-employed, and 58 per cent of those employed by others worked for Jewish-owned firms.

Sixty per cent were affiliated with a synagogue, with the highest percentage belonging to the Sephardi synagogue. Almost 75 per cent of the community belonged to the Jewish Sport Center, and 43 per cent to a Zionist organization. While 83 per cent believed that a Jew must marry within the Jewish faith, only 76 per cent believed that to be a Jew one must believe in God; 49 per cent believed that a Jew must belong to a synagogue, and 28 per cent that a Jew must observe dietary laws. But 29 per cent never attended Rosh Ha-shanah services, 40 per cent had homes where Sabbath candles were never lit and 38 per cent never ate kosher food (23 per cent always did, and 39 per cent sometimes). Fourteen per cent recited prayers daily, 19 per cent sometimes, and 67 per cent never. Provision of a Jewish education (not defined) was regarded by 84 per cent as very important and by 14 per cent as "somewhat important." The publication of Yiddish books was considered "very important" by 21 per cent, "somewhat important" by 33 per cent, and "not at all important" by 46 per cent.

In response to the question, "Which organization does the most for Mexico City Jewry?" 15 per cent selected the Central Committee, 2 per cent B'nai B'rith, 18 per cent Nidhe Israel, 16 per cent the Jewish Sport Club and 5 per cent the Zionist organizations; 29 per cent had no opinion.

With respect to antisemitism, 35 per cent said that they themselves had experienced it but 65 per cent said that they had not. An interesting question was, "Are you ever embarrassed by the activities or behavior of other Jews?" It brought an affirmative answer from 68 per cent, a negative answer from 27 per cent; 5 per cent said that they did not know. Poor taste or behavior caused embarrassment to 57 per cent, dishonesty to 17 per cent, "assimilated" Jews to 5 per cent, "racists" to 9 per cent, and Yiddish to one per cent.

SEYMOUR B. LIEBMAN
Western Europe

Great Britain

The major political event of the year was the general election. Held in October, it brought the Labor party to power with a majority of four. As Labor could depend on the six Liberal votes on most issues, they had an adequate working majority, but not one that suggested five years of office. The new House of Commons contained 33 Jews (31 Labor, 2 Conservative). The Queen's speech at the opening of Parliament in November included a promise of action against race discrimination. Anti-colored sentiments had been played down during the election, except at Smethwick, in the Midlands, where supporters of the Conservative candidate exploited racial antagonisms. It was the only constituency where there was a major swing of votes to the Conservatives.

The financial position of the United Kingdom had deteriorated during the election period, and the new government found itself faced by grave balance-of-payments problems, which it attempted to solve by imposing a 15-per-cent surcharge on imports. This greatly annoyed continental exporters, but failed to prevent a run on sterling. The government was forced to raise the bank rate to 7 per cent, and it secured credits of $3 billion from foreign central banks for use in defending the pound. Repayments of $62 million on United States and Canadian loans had to be deferred. It appeared that the “stop-go” approach to the economy was again to prevail.

After Prime Minister Harold Wilson visited President Lyndon B. Johnson in December, he declared that the “charade” of independent nuclear power had come to an end.

Jewish Community

Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie sought to convene a communal conference on the Soviet ban on matzot baking, but was opposed by the Board of Deputies and WJC, both of which claimed the right to initiate any political negotiations. Over 9,000 lbs. of matzot were sent to Moscow by air, but it was questionable how much was distributed.
Roman Catholic Archbishop John Heenan of Westminster addressed the annual general meeting of the Council of Christians and Jews in March. Since he was the first Catholic prelate to attend such a meeting in ten years, Catholic reassociation with the council was linked with the new Vatican approach to ecumenism. The *Jewish Chronicle* gave full coverage to the schema on the Jews, but no other public interest was discernible. Neither Orthodox nor Reform leaders made any statement about it.

In June Abraham Moss defeated Sir Barnett Janner for the presidency of the Board of Deputies. Sir Barnett was 72, and it was widely felt that it was time for a new and younger president. But Moss died suddenly six days after his election, and Solomon Teff, the senior vice-president, who was the same age as Sir Barnett, became acting president and was elected president in October.

The *kashrut* commission, under the *de facto* control of the Federation of Synagogues, held no meetings for a considerable period. There was much criticism when the commission granted a license to cater meat at the London Hilton Hotel to a son of the president of the federation. The license was never utilized, but in the October elections the United Synagogue representatives won complete control of the executive, presaging an overhaul of the constitution.

The Glasgow Jewish Representative Council celebrated its 50th anniversary in April and the Exeter synagogue its bicentenary in September. Jewish students attending a new university in Exeter helped reinforce the community, but Jewish students at new universities in centers like York and Canterbury found little or no Jewish community life. In March the Hillel Foundation sought to deal with this problem by appointing Malcolm Weisman as visiting student counselor.

**Religion**

Behind a facade of official Orthodoxy, there was widespread religious indifferentism. Michael Wallach, registrar of Jews’ College, estimated that only 40 to 45 per cent of families bought kosher meat (about half the pre-war figure; *Jewish Chronicle*, May 15), and the London Board of Shechita reported that 500 fewer heads of cattle were killed under its supervision in 1963 than in the previous year. In 1962 there were 1,549 marriages solemnized by rabbis, a rate of 6 per 1,000 of the Jewish population, or only three-fifths as many as in 1947.

Reform and Liberal movements showed signs of greater cooperation. The cornerstone of a £100,000 ($280,000) extension to the Upper Berkeley Street synagogue (parent synagogue of the Progressive movement) was laid in June. The new building was to house the Leo Baeck College, which would train rabbis for both wings.

The year saw a new crisis over Louis Jacobs, the modernist rabbi who had been widely regarded as the next chief rabbi. He was now director of the Society for the Study of Jewish Theology and a sharp critic of the chief rabbi and the Orthodox establishment.
From 1954 to 1960, when he was replaced by Chaim Pearl, Jacobs had been minister of the New West End synagogue, where he had a strong personal following. This congregation maintained the formal decorousness of an earlier period of United Synagogue history and remained uninfluenced by the more zealous attitudes that permeated many other communities. When Rabbi Pearl left in March for a Conservative congregation in New York, Jacobs, although not an official candidate, was chosen by the selection committee to succeed him. Chief Rabbi Brodie refused to sanction the appointment on the grounds that Jacobs's views were incompatible with the ministry of an Orthodox synagogue. Jacobs enjoyed the wholehearted support of the *Jewish Chronicle* in the dispute, which was conducted in a blaze of publicity that effectively hardened all attitudes. On April 13 the board of management of the New West End synagogue chose Jacobs as minister, and he occupied the pulpit on the following Sabbath. On April 23 the council of the United Synagogue met and, after a stormy debate, deposed the board and appointed four “managers” in their place. On May 3 a large number of the members decided to form a new congregation. They acquired the old St. John's Wood synagogue when that congregation moved to large premises in September and took the name of the New London synagogue.

Chief Rabbi Brodie published a statement on May 5 in which he sharply criticized the *Jewish Chronicle*, referring to it as “the monopolistic Jewish press.” He also stated that “regrettably, everything points to the fact that Dr. Jacobs has been used as a central figure by a few resolute individuals who have openly declared their intention of trying to bring about a new orientation in our community.” A reorientation could also be seen in Rabbi Brodie’s action. Never before had such an ideological commitment been imposed within the United Synagogue, if only because the “Grand Dukes,” who were formerly the lay leaders of the United Synagogue, would have vetoed any attempt to impose a precisely defined orthodoxy on unwilling members.

It was too early to evaluate the real significance of the New London synagogue; it could be the beginning of a “Conservative” movement (American-style) in Anglo-Jewry, or a mere splinter congregation. Much probably depended on the attitude of the next chief rabbi, for Rabbi Brodie would reach the retirement age in 1965. In the meantime, the split within the Orthodox community was widened, and the anti-Brodie wing of the United Synagogue further weakened, when Isaac Levy, the strongest ministerial supporter of Louis Jacobs, resigned from the Hampstead synagogue to become director of the Jewish National Fund in England. During the course of the controversy, Jacobs published *Principles of the Jewish Faith*, in which he expounded his theology.

A Society for the Promotion of Jewish Learning was launched in the summer to counter Jacobs's Society for the Study of Jewish Theology. The chief rabbi was president; Haham Solomon Gaon, vice-president, and Salmond Levin, acting chairman. Of £100,000 ($280,000) promised by Sir Isaac Wolfson over ten years for adult education, part was to be available for the new society.
Education

The London Board of Jewish Religious Education entered into an agreement with the educational trust of the Zionist Federation, which gave £50,000 ($140,000) to establish a Hebrew department at the Jews’ Free School secondary school in memory of veteran Zionist Jacob Kopul Goldbloom. The federation agreed not to establish any secondary school without the consent of the London Board, which in return would encourage students from the Zionist Federation primary schools to enter the Jews’ Free School.

In November the Zionist Federation launched a £100,000 ($280,000) Israel Sieff fund to promote day schools in honor of Sieff’s 75th birthday. These activities were carried on against a background of a marked decline in the number of children attending Jewish schools in the metropolis. A thousand fewer children attended the various London Board centers than in 1962.

Hirsch Zimmels was appointed principal of Jews’ College in February and Jacob Ross was named deputy principal. College enrolment was still too low to produce sufficient ministers. Official salaries were lower than in comparable employments, and most ministers freely accepted substantial gratuities. Such a situation held little attraction for the spiritually-minded. Three Orthodox rabbis left their synagogues during the year to take up teaching (one of them returned to a full-time and another to a part-time rabbinical position later).

Cultural Activities

In January the Ben Uri art gallery opened its first permanent home in the West End of London. In February the Westminster synagogue acquired a large number of Torah scrolls from Czechoslovakia, which it planned to house in a special museum. Walter Laqueur became Director of the Wiener Library after the death of Alfred Wiener in February. The fifth annual Jewish Choir Festival broke fresh ground by having a residential section (with those wishing to attend performances in residence) at Carmel College in April in addition to its usual public concert in London.

Cecil Roth retired as reader in Jewish studies at Oxford University and emigrated to Israel to become visiting professor of Jewish history at Bar-Ilan University. At its December meeting the Board of Deputies approved a plan to set up a research unit to investigate demographic trends within the community. Two sociological studies were published during the year: Leeds Jewry, by Ernest Krausz, and Jewish Life in Modern Britain, edited by Julius Gold and Shaul Esh.

Social Service

In June the Max Rayne Foundation gave £750,000 ($2,100,000) to St. Thomas’s Hospital London and the Wolfson Foundation announced grants of the same figure.

In July a day center and occupational center for mentally handicapped Jewish children was established in Glasgow, and Princess Margaret opened
the Jewish Blind Society day center in Stamford Hill, North London. Minister of Housing Sir Keith Joseph laid the cornerstone of B’nai B’rith apartments for the aged in Edgware, Middlesex, in September. In October the Chaim Weizmann youth center in Manchester was opened, and the Ravenswood Village Settlement for the Mentally Handicapped was consecrated, concluding the first phase of a £400,000 ($1,400,000) project.

Antisemitism

No serious incidents took place during the year. Public opinion was increasingly concerned with the question of nonwhite immigration from the Commonwealth. In the main British Jews avoided any involvement in the issue. No Mosley followers stood in the general election, and the National Socialist movement was rent by a feud between its two leaders.

There was evidence that labor exchanges were cooperating in not sending Jews and Negroes to employers who indicated unwillingness to employ them. After some hesitation, Minister of Labor Joseph Godber announced in July that the exchanges would not assist employers who persisted in discrimination.

The horrors of the concentration camps were once again brought to public attention by the libel case of Wladislaw Alexander Dering v. Leon Uris and Wm. Kimber & Co., Ltd., the British publisher of Uris’s Exodus. Dr. Dering alleged libel in the novel. A large number of witnesses testified to the doctor’s callousness, and he was awarded derisory damages of one halfpenny. The London Times wrote (May 7): “It is probably true to say that an English jury has never had to listen to such horrifying evidence as was adduced in this libel action concerning the facts of Auschwitz.” Unfortunately, coverage in the popular press was extremely meager.

Zionism and Relations with Israel

A number of prominent Israelis visited Great Britain during the year. Deputy Minister for Defense Simeon Peres was the main speaker at the Joint Palestine Appeal president’s dinner in February. Foreign Minister Golda Meir was in London in March and met Premier Sir Alec Douglas-Home and Foreign Secretary Richard A. Butler in talks described as “frank, friendly and very valuable to Anglo-Israeli relations.” Minister of Labor Igal Allon spoke at the principal Joint Palestine Appeal dinner the same month and Zerah Warhaftig, minister of religious affairs, came in April. Peres returned in September and had meetings with the defense and aviation ministers. Minister of the Interior and Health Moses Shapira attended the Mizrahi conference in October, and Mrs. Isaac Ben-Zvi, widow of the late president, came in November to launch an appeal for the Sha’are Zedek hospital in Jerusalem.

Echoes of the Mancroft affair (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 200) continued to be heard. Sir Robert Bignold resigned as chairman of the Norwich Union Insurance Company, in January. The Arab countries blacklisted Global Tours, of which Lord Mancroft, a close associate of Sir Isaac Wolfson, was chairman, as they had the Norwich Union Insurance Company when he was on its board. Although he had been virtually certain of the presidency of the
London Chamber of Commerce in 1965, Lord Mancroft was notified in July that because of Arab pressures he would not be elected. On this occasion Mancroft declined to make an issue of the matter, which was concluded by the issuance in mid-August of a noncommittal joint statement by the Board of Deputies and the Chamber of Commerce: "It is regretted that in connection with a recent approach and withdrawal a public misunderstanding has arisen which is jointly deplored."

The British Zionist Federation's 63rd annual conference in April was addressed by Moshe Sharett. The Poale Zion group made gains on the executive. In July it was announced that no elections to the Zionist Congress would be held and that the United Kingdom would be allotted 26 delegates instead of the previous 19, to be allocated among the various parties on an agreed-upon basis.

Israel House, a permanent center for Israeli students in London, had its formal opening in May.

In September Leyland Motors signed a £3.5 million ($9.8 million) contract with its subsidiary company in Ashdod to produce 1,065 vehicles, and in November two more British submarines were sold to Israel. Israeli exports to the United Kingdom dropped in 1964, partly on account of the effect of frost on citrus fruits, and it was feared that the 15-per-cent import surcharge would further affect its position adversely. In the first seven months of 1964, United Kingdom exports to Israel rose by £4,222,149 ($11,822,017) over the same period in 1963—an increase of 32 per cent. The Anglo-Israel Chamber of Commerce suggested the formation of a council to encourage exports to Israel, but this was turned down by the government in July. Lord Drumalbyn, minister at the Board of Trade, visited Israel in April.

**Personalia**

Barnett Stross, a Labor member of Parliament, and Jules Thorn, an industrialist, were knighted in the New Year Honors, 1964, and Samuel Segal, a former Labor M.P., was made a life peer in December. Sir Cyril Salmon was appointed a lord justice of appeal in January.

Notable deaths included those of Ellis Franklin, banker (January 16); Michael Wix, tobacco magnate (January 23); Sir Maurice Bloch, whisky exporter and philanthropist (February 19); Jack Cotton, real-estate magnate (March 21); Abraham Rubinstein, Glasgow rabbi (April 24); Berl Wober, Scottish communal leader (November 29), and Lord Marks, chairman and joint founder of the Marks and Spencer chain of stores (December 8).

**Norman Cohen**
France

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS

The period under review was marked by a considerably increased divergence of views between France, on the one hand, and NATO and the European Political and Economic Union, on the other. President Charles de Gaulle's "policy of greatness," his preference for a European buffer area which would be in effect another "third world" ruled by France, his increasing tendency to snipe at the United States—all placed a strain on Franco-German relations. The situation alarmed former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, among others, and in October 1964 he came to Paris for private talks with de Gaulle, counting on the excellent personal relations existing between these two political figures, the one already retired and the other less disposed than ever to retire.

The opposition to President de Gaulle, comprising a number of groups without a common platform and ranging from the Communists to the moderate and extreme right, naturally sought to take advantage of the disquiet sometimes aroused by Gaullist foreign policy. Nevertheless some of de Gaulle's ventures, such as his recognition of Communist China, had the support of most opposition groups. The anti-Gaulist opposition lacked common policies and goals and had produced no leader of stature comparable to de Gaulle. The stir and curiosity which initially greeted Gaston Defferre's announcement of his candidacy for the presidency in the upcoming elections quickly gave way to indifference. Defferre, the mayor of Marseilles, met with hostility even within the French Socialist party, to which he belonged, not to mention the Communist attacks and maneuvers directed against him. In the prevailing climate of indifference to politics, the opposition had little chance to achieve the strength or cohesion needed really to challenge the Gaullist hold on power.

Moreover, although French Communist leaders continued to proclaim opposition to de Gaulle, this diminished in vigor as French ties with Germany and the West weakened and the president established new ties with some Communist states. Among those received at the Elysée Palace during 1964, for example, were leading figures from Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria. It seemed possible that the Communists preferred de Gaulle's new "non-alignment," colored as it was by such anti-American aspects as his reference to a "European Europe" at a Strasbourg press conference in November, to a Socialist or left-wing government which would resist Communist encroachment and would remain faithful to the Atlantic Pact.

The "policy of greatness," with all that this involved in the way of initiatives, presidential voyages, and invitations to and receptions for distinguished
foreign guests, was not without its effect on the French attitude toward Israel. Officially there was no change: the State of Israel remained the ally of France, from whom it received arms and equipment. But there was less and less reference to the brotherhood-in-arms of the days of Suez. There were more and more French envoys and unofficial "exploratory missions" to the Arab countries, and there was no doubt that the search for rapprochement between France and the Arab world was reciprocal, with French officials showing a certain "understanding" for such Arab grievances as the Palestine refugee question. This development was doubtless responsible for Prime Minister Levi Eshkol's "private visit" to Paris at the beginning of July, during which he apparently obtained assurances that France's positive attitude toward Israel would continue (see p. 452). But these promises were in general terms, and were not mentioned in the short and discreet official French communiqué on the conversations.

In contrast to Eshkol, King Hussein of Jordan was invited and received very officially, with all the pomp appropriate to the presence in the capital of so august a guest. On the eve of his conversations with President de Gaulle in November, Hussein stressed his role as envoy and plenipotentiary of the entire Arab world, charged with the mission of presenting the claims of Arab nationalism and especially its views on the "Palestinian question." It should be noted, however, that officially the French government was agreeing only to conversations with the sovereign of a specified state, Jordan, and that the cultural and other agreements involved related only to France and Jordan, not to the Arab world generally.

Between the Eshkol and Hussein visits, President de Gaulle made a grand tour of Latin America. Its success was less striking than the government had anticipated. De Gaulle was indeed applauded time and again by Latin American crowds, but the continent did not receive him as a heaven-sent tutor for peoples in need of one. The end of the trip was eclipsed by Nikita Khrushchev's downfall and the Labor victory in the British elections.

At the end of 1964 the French foreign ministry was taking soundings for a revival of French influence in the Arab Middle East. Helped in this endeavor by President Ahmed Ben Bella's Algeria—which France subsidized—French government circles were making contact with representatives of the United Arab Republic.

ANTISEMITISM

In 1964 there was a certain regrouping of the factions of the extreme right, the same elements which were involved in the mad and bloody adventure of the OAS (Secret Army Organization) in the last phase of the Algerian war (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 208–09). Indeed, the extreme right put forward as a candidate for president in the next election Jean-Louis Tixier-Vignancour, the lawyer who had conducted the defense of Marshall Henri Philippe Pétain and later of General Raoul Salan, in the OAS trial. As always, a revival of the extreme right, even on a very small scale, brought with it the threat of anti-
semitism, but the right wing abstained from making specifically antisemitic statements. Even the conspicuously antisemitic fascist, Pierre Poujade, once the leading figure of French neo-fascism (AJYB, 1957 [Vol. 58], pp. 242-248), “compromised” himself politically with a Jew by participating in a so-called “liberal” convention under the chairmanship of the Jewish deputy J. P. David.

In October a former non-Jewish deportee, Paul Rassinier, who had spent time in the Nazi camps, brought suit against Bernard Lecache, editor of Le Droit de vivre, organ of the International League against Racism and Ant-semitism. Shortly after the liberation, Rassinier, a one-time Socialist deputy had published a book entitled Le Mensonge d’Ulysse (“Lie of Ulysses”), in which he asserted that most survivors of the Nazi camps had enormously exaggerated the atrocities committed there. He attributed the murder of the Jews chiefly to Jewish trustees (Kapos). Lecache’s newspaper labelled Rassinier a fascist and said he was a spokesman for an international organization of neo-fascists. The author, who called himself an anarchist, thereupon sued Lecache for libel. The court threw out his suit on the ground that the epithet fascist, by itself, was not sufficient to constitute libel. The trial was rather tempestuous and brought lively reactions from a number of former deportees who testified against the complainant.

In May, on the eve of the university-entrance examinations, something of a sensation was produced by the refusal of the elite École Normale Supérieure to permit the candidacy of a Jewish student who was a Sabbath observer. He had specified in his application that it was impossible for him to take the examinations on a Saturday, for which they had been scheduled, as French university examinations often were. He asked their postponement on the basis of the freedom of worship guaranteed by the French constitution. The university replied that Sabbath observance was incompatible with the duties of a civil servant as well as of a student, who would have to take courses on Saturday. It asserted that while the observance of a religion was in itself altogether legitimate, there was no reason why so strictly observant a person should choose a profession in the public service which would be difficult to reconcile with his religious practices. The administration’s opinion was that religious observance took precedence and that the young man should give up the idea of attending the École Normale and becoming a teacher. The petitioner protested publicly, and the case was discussed in the press. Thus, for the first time, and precisely when Jewish piety was on the rise in university circles, a contemporary case of conscience came before the public.

The young man was finally able to take the examinations which had been postponed to another date, and to enter the École Normale. Except for the Orthodox, Jewish public opinion was not aroused by the affair, but in the Paris (formerly Algiers) monthly Information Juive, Emile Touati published a vehement article against “secularist anti-Judaism.” He drew a parallel between this affair and anti-Judaism of the Soviet type. He argued, among other things, that the École Normale Supérieure not only prepared people to become teachers, but was increasingly training scientific researchers working under the National Council of Scientific Research (CNRS). Freedom of worship,
said Touati, could never be reconciled with such discriminatory measures, which would in practice condemn a citizen to economic and social mediocrity because he was an observant Jew.

In August hooligans raided the old Jewish cemetery of Lauterbourg in Lower Alsace, seriously damaging seven tombs. Desecration of Jewish cemeteries had been rather frequent in Alsace between the two wars, but there had been almost no such incidents since 1945. Such misdeeds were solemnly condemned from the pulpits of the local Catholic and Protestant churches.

In September Paris was the center of a major protest movement against anti-Judaism in the Soviet Union. Several meetings took place under the auspices of various organizations, including the French section of the World Jewish Congress. Some critics accused that organization of issuing excessively moderate protests, which too often took the form of a simple appeal. The news of anti-Judaism in the Soviet Union, however, generated protests that went beyond Jewish circles. Leading Christians and liberals, not open to the suspicion of systematic anti-Sovietism, associated themselves with the Jewish protests. Earlier, in February, the publication by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences of the antisemitic brochure *Judaism without Embellishment* by Kichko, aroused general indignation (p. 425). For the first time in their history, the Jewish Communists of France joined in the general condemnation of Soviet antisemitism, charges of which had hitherto been dismissed by Jewish and non-Jewish Communists as anti-Soviet slander. In fact, the Communist Yiddish daily *Naïe Presse* categorically denounced as anti-Jewish this ostensibly "anti-religious" brochure; the protest was republished without comment under the heading "Information" in *Humanité* (March 24, 1964), central organ of the French Communist party.

**Jewish Community**

**North African Immigration**

In 1964 the continuous flow of Jewish immigrants from Morocco was swelled by the arrival of an average of a hundred Jewish families a month from Tunisia. This influx revived the problem of integrating large numbers of Jews from North Africa into the economy (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 211). Unlike the Algerian refugees two years earlier, the Tunisians were not French citizens, and the questions of work and lodging, as well as of their legal status, required frequent intervention by Jewish institutions. The exodus of Jews from Tunisia was caused primarily by the grave economic crisis there, but an additional factor was the Arabization and Islamization of cultural, economic, and social life (p. 472). Most Tunisian Jews were French-educated and did not know Arabic.

The new arrivals were mostly destitute, bankrupt small merchants or unemployed workers or clerks. Tunisian law permitted each emigrant to take with him only 300 francs ($60), but often the refugees did not have even that much when they debarked at Marseilles. The Jewish organizations did their
best to give initial relief and solve the serious housing problem. At the end of 1964 the total number of North African immigrants was estimated at 200,000, including 130,000 from Algeria.

**Social Welfare and Religion**

The principal burden of helping the Jews from North Africa continued to fall on the Fonds Social Juif Unifié (FSJU). In recent years this organization had assumed many obligations as a consequence of the Algerian tragedy, but at the same time it suffered a substantial decline in the number of contributors, which, to begin with, was only a fraction of the French Jewish population. In April 1964 FSJU reported a decrease in contributors from 15,000 in the year 1962-63 to 12,000 in 1963-64, although French Jewry continued to be prosperous. FSJU's deficit for the 1963 fiscal year rose to about $300,000, while its expenses for only the religious needs of the new communities rose by $60,000. (Figures are from the April 1964 meeting of the FSJU). There was a slow deterioration of Jewish solidarity in those prosperous Jewish bourgeois circles where it had hitherto been most firmly maintained. The lack of generosity of the wealthy French Jews toward Israel had already been deplored by WZO President Nahum Goldmann, who pointed out that the 500,000 French Jews gave less than the 19,000 Swiss or the 35,000 Italian Jews.

Funds were needed also for continual adjustment in institutional and religious facilities for the North African immigrants, geographically dispersed and recently settled in areas where there had previously been no Jewish communities. The construction of synagogues and community centers, or even the opening of small houses of worship, required means which the newly-established communities obviously did not have, and appeals for financial aid either could not be granted or were notoriously inadequate. As a result, numerous proposed projects had to be abandoned, at least for the time being. The most strongly felt deficiency was a great lack of functioning rabbis that left the majority of the new communities without spiritual leaders. The Consistoire Central nevertheless opened some small new synagogues and community centers in the regions of new Jewish settlement in the west, southwest, and southeast of France, as well as in the Paris suburbs, where the number of North African Jews steadily increased. In September a community center was opened in Sarcelles, an eastern suburb, were hundreds of such families had been established in recent years in new low-rent housing developments. Synagogues were also opened in Annecy, in the Alps, and Perpignan, on the Spanish border. Annecy, which previously had had no Jewish community, now had several hundred Jewish families; the town's economy was expanding rapidly. There had been a Sephardi community in Perpignan in the first quarter of the century, but the native Jews had virtually disappeared through assimilation and dispersion. The new community was almost entirely Algerian. In September the Consistoire Central also laid the cornerstone of a synagogue in Caen, an industrial and university city in Normandy where no Jews had lived since the Middle Ages.
Communal Activities

FSIU was planning to open a major community center for Paris and the surrounding area in the prosperous and in part very elegant Auteuil district. The new Auteuil House was to replace the inadequate center in the more crowded Grands Boulevards district which was to become a youth center. There was some opposition to the proposed center both because of its cost and because its critics regarded the most exclusive section of Paris as an unsuitable location for a community house that was supposed to attract the mass of French Jews of North African origin.

While the old Jewish organizations in France continued their normal activities, some of the newer ones expanded their functions. Notable among these was the Association of Jews of Algerian Origin (AJOA), headed by Jacques Lazarus, which gradually abandoned its role as a representative of specific interests to make its presence felt on all levels of Jewish activity. It joined the World Jewish Congress, and its periodical Information Juive absorbed the Congress organ La Vie Juive. During Prime Minister Eshkol’s visit to France, a delegation of AJOA reported to him on the situation of the Algerian Jews in France.

OSE had become an integral part of French life. Its city or district dispensaries increasingly performed a general health function, not confined to the Jews. ORT continued to extend its network of vocational schools, whose needs and activities increased with the new Tunisian influx. There was an increase in the number of children’s homes and especially vacation camps, where strict adherence to kashrut was more and more general even when sponsoring organizations were not religious in nature. The organization Relais Juifs, directed by Henri Pohorylès, was active in developing tourism among Jews; it encouraged international meetings of young Jews during their vacations.

Education and Culture

As with synagogues, there were few full- or part-time Jewish schools in relation to the needs of the recent immigrants. Aside from the ORT technical and vocational schools, and some yeshivot in the Paris region which were not officially registered as Jewish educational institutions, there were 11 full-time Jewish schools in all France. Aside from a kindergarten and a primary school in Paris, a primary school in Lyons, and a yeshivah-lycée in Aix-les-Bains, the rest were lycées which rigorously conformed to the prevailing French secondary-school curriculum and taught Hebrew, Bible, and Talmud in addition. Marseilles, with 60,000 Jews, had no Jewish school except for the ORT vocational school.

On the university level, the University Group for Jewish Studies arranged frequent seminars on Jewish subjects at the Sorbonne. There were also about ten chairs of modern Hebrew in French universities; the courses were given by professors of Israeli origin, but the non-Jewish students usually outnumbered the Jews. These courses were not part of a Jewish educational system,
but resulted from cultural agreements between France and Israel. Also at the Sorbonne, a course in the history of Hebrew was taught in 1963-64 by Professor C. M. Rabin of the University of Jerusalem. A chair of Yiddish and Yiddish literature at the School of Oriental Languages in Paris was held by Alex Dorczanski, who was also a lycée teacher of philosophy.

The major literary event of the year was the publication of Elie Wiesel's *Portes de la Forêt* ("Gates of the Forest") by Editions du Seuil. This novel by the author of *La ville de la chance* ("Town Beyond the Wall") showed great literary maturity and placed Wiesel in the first rank of modern Jewish as well as contemporary French literature. It drew a very strong response from French literary critics. Editions Delpire published *Les Juifs* by Georges Levitte and David Catarivas, a short, excellent account of the essential meaning of Judaism in the modern world.

There were a number of exhibitions of the works of Parisian Jewish painters. Among these were two already well-known artists, Abraham Krol and Michel Adlen.

In August, to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the liberation of Paris, the national mint struck a medal bearing the head of Anne Frank.

**Zionism**

The Zionist Federation of France continued to be a skeleton organization torn by internal dissension between advocates of "political" Zionism and supporters of an apolitical attitude. Since the departure of its former president, André Blumel, it completely lacked any native element, and North African participation was negligible. Nevertheless the young Zionist groups showed relative vitality. This was particularly true of the leftist Ha-shomer Ha-tza'ir and the religious Bene Akiva, which regularly furnished young people for *aliyah* to Israel. These were few in number but qualitatively excellent. The recently founded group Oded, composed exclusively of students, mostly from North Africa, systematically prepared an aliyah of French-educated university graduates to help fill Israel's need for academicians. The Union of Jewish Students of France seemed to be gradually emerging from the obsession with anti-colonial leftism which had characterized it during the Algerian war and its political sequels. It was more concerned with Jewish affairs in 1964 than it had been in 1962 and 1963 and its relations with the organized Jewish community, which had long been strained, improved. Nevertheless its membership remained very small. Of an estimated 15,000 Jewish students in French universities, no more than 2,000 belonged to the union.

**Personalia**

The mayor of Belfort, Pierre Dreyfus-Schmidt, died on July 4, 1964, at the age of 62. Although he was well known as a Jew, the Catholic priests had the church bells tolled. Dreyfus-Schmidt was a "progressive" deputy and then, after its formation, a member of the Unified Socialist party. Ideologically he was on the extreme left of the socialist movement, a neutralist and anti-Gaullist. He was also, and at the same time, Jewish, in solidarity as well as
in religious tradition. In the home of this left-wing mayor of Belfort, the food was kosher. He was a distinguished lawyer; he represented the Zionist defendants in Cairo in 1954. President of the French section of the World Jewish Congress, he had made many trips to the Soviet Union and had intervened energetically for the amelioration of the lot of Soviet Jewry.

In December 1963 André Bernheim, vice-president of the Consistoire Central and a prominent Paris physician, died in Paris at the age of 86. He was a conservative Jew, who zealously studied the Talmud in the ancient manner. During his long life he played an active and fruitful role in Jewish social and religious life. He had a major collection of Jewish art and was one of those responsible for the establishment of the Museum of Jewish Art in Paris. He was the father-in-law of Professor André Néher of the University of Strasbourg and father of the historian Renée Néher-Bernheim.

In August 1964 Zvi Levine, administrative director of the Federation of Jewish Societies of France, died at the age of 69. He was a leader of Po'ale Zion and a member of the cultural commission of FSJU. Born in Lithuania, he was a Hebraist and an expert on Haskalah literature.

ARNOLD MANDEL

Jewish Population of France

Especially in France data on the Jewish population are based on rough estimates and informed guesses, particularly for individual cities and towns. Several demographic investigations have been undertaken, e.g., by Communauté (the cultural and educational service organization established by the American Jewish Committee, Alliance Israélite Universelle, and Anglo-Jewish Association) and by the Fonds Social Juif Unifié (the central Jewish welfare agency), but so far no precise information has been produced on the number of Jews in France.

The compilation offered below represents an attempt to gather all the accessible information. This summary is based mostly on JDC and CJMCAG material, but it should be understood that neither organization is responsible for the use made of their data.

It is estimated that before World War II the total Jewish population in France (excluding the departments and territories of Algeria, at that time an administrative part of France) was about 350,000, including some 175,000 foreign Jews. During the war 120,000 were deported and 60,000 emigrated, fled, or were otherwise unaccounted for. The 170,000 Jews left in France included about 80,000 foreigners who had settled there before 1933 and 5,000 to 10,000 Jews from Germany and Austria. The immigration of refugees from Displaced Persons' camps and Eastern Europe brought the total in 1947 to
210,000 to 225,000. Continuing immigration brought the total to 275,000 in 1948 and to 300,000 in 1957, including refugees from Eastern Europe, Egypt, and French North Africa. Between 90,000 and 100,000 Algerian Jews arrived in 1962.

Table 1 shows the entry of Jewish refugees from Eastern Europe, Egypt, and French North Africa from 1957 to 1964.

**TABLE 1. JEWISH REFUGEES IN FRANCE *—1957-1964**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>From Eastern Europe</th>
<th>From Egypt</th>
<th>From North Africa</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>2,267</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>9,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2,335</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>39,119</td>
<td>44,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td>36,736</td>
<td>39,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>36,085</td>
<td>38,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Registered and assisted by French Jewish organizations; blanks indicate that figures are not available.

While the figures in this table represent only newcomers registered and assisted by French Jewish organizations, they are a fair indication of the general trend. This trend is further shown by the number of Jewish cash-relief recipients, which rose from 1,200 per month in 1956 to 3,700 in 1962, and was about 3,250 in 1964.

As a result of the massive influx of Algerian Jews after the declaration of Algeria's independence in 1962, the Jewish population in France stood at about 500,000 in 1963. This figure will have to be adjusted upward when adequate estimates can be made of the continuing immigration of Jews from North Africa.

Table 2 shows the geographic distribution of the Jewish population in France in 1964. It must be clearly understood that these figures are approximate.

**TABLE 2. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF JEWS IN FRANCE, 1964**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agen</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aix-en-Provence</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aix-les-Bains</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albi</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiens</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angers</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annecy</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antibes—Juan-les-Pines</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxerre</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF JEWS IN FRANCE, 1964'  
(*Cont’d*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avignon</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayonne</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauvais</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfort</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besançon</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béziers</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blois</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourges</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brest</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caen</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannes</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentras</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castres</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châlons-sur-Marne</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châlon-sur-Saône</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambéry</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châteauroux</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherbourg</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont—Ferrand</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colmar</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiègne</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creil</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douai</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Évreux</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenoble</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Havre</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Mans</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lille</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limoges</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunéville</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mâcon</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseilles</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaux</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metz</td>
<td>3,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montargis</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montauban</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulhouse</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>3,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantes</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Geographic Distribution of Jews in France, 1964 (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nîmes</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orléans</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamiers</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris (Seine)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pau</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Périgueux</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpignan</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poitiers</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reims</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rennes</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanne</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rouen</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.-Etienne</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedan</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sens</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sète</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarbes</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thionville</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulon</td>
<td>1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troyes</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valenciennes</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versailles</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vichy</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>492,950</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary:

1. The table shows a total of 81 Jewish settlements in France. There were probably other towns with small Jewish communities not recorded at the time when these estimates were made.

2. Paris had about 300,000 Jews, or 60 per cent of the total Jewish population in France; Marseilles, 60,000; Lyons, 25,000; Nice, 20,000; Toulouse, 20,000; Strasbourg, 14,000, and Bordeaux, 6,400. All other Jewish communities ranged from about 100 to about 3,000.

3. The Jewish community in France was the fourth largest in the world, after the United States, USSR, and Israel.

4. Curiously, the table shows that the present geographic distribution of the Jews as partly following the historic pattern of settlement of Jews in France.
after the expulsion from Spain and Portugal. The Jewish communities in southern France have recently been reestablished and/or enlarged, and in many of them Sephardim have assumed leadership.

Boris Sapir and Leon Shapiro

Belgium

DOMESTIC DEVELOPMENTS

The battle between the French- and Flemish-speaking section of the population continued to dominate the political scene. A new law that provided for the sole use of French or Flemish as the official language in any area, depending on the origin of the majority of the population there, led to a veritable language frontier within the country. It influenced the selection of government personnel and was also responsible for the delay in revising the constitution, virtually unchanged since Belgium's independence in 1830. Powerful factions pushing for a political federation with two separate parliaments threatened the government coalition of the predominantly Flemish Catholic party and the majority Socialist party in the Walloon areas.

Municipal Elections

As a result of these tensions, both the Catholic and Socialist parties lost votes in the municipal elections of October 1964. The Freedom and Progress party until 1962 called the Liberal party, now in opposition to the government coalition, won many seats on a platform of linguistic freedom, especially in Brussels. Five Jews ran on the party's slate in Antwerp, where a large number of Jews who recently acquired citizenship voted for the first time.

Antisemitism

Volksunie, the Flemish People's Union, with notorious Nazi collaborators in its ranks, polled 12 per cent of the votes cast in the Antwerp election. Although it did not use antisemitic slogans, the party's anti-Jewish sentiment was expressed in a letter by one of its leaders to the Belgisch Israëlitisch Weekblad (October 10, 1964), the only Jewish weekly in Belgium. While conceding that the Jews were sufficiently assimilated to speak and read Flemish, the writer still denounced them as alien beneficiaries of Flemish hospitality. He urged them to prove their loyalty by giving unstinting support to the Flemings, for whose struggle, he maintained, Jews should have particular understanding since it was similar to Israel's fight for independence. The edi-
tor replied that Belgian Jews were not aliens but Belgians having the same political and civic rights as all other citizens.

Antwerp's Socialist Mayor Lode Craybeckx was involved in an incident in April that brought severe censure from Jews and non-Jews alike. He shouted to Jews in a café opposite the town hall invectives such as "dirty Jews, parasites, the Nazi crematories should have finished the job!" Witnesses to the incident testified under oath, and Jewish organizations issued strong protests. The non-Jewish editor of Antwerp's daily *Le Matin* wrote a scathing article stating that, as Belgians and citizens, "We are ashamed that a man such as this holds the position of mayor and is permitted to discredit our city." Jewish diamond dealers from the United States refused an invitation to attend a reception at the town hall. Craybeckx, who was frequently seen at Jewish meetings and had officially visited Israel several times, was told by the Israeli embassy not to attend the annual party given on Israel's Independence Day. He subsequently apologized to the community in an open letter to the Antwerp and Jewish press and in a radio announcement.

Craybeckx's apology was officially accepted but condemnation of his outburst continued. Antwerp's Jews were dismayed when Craybeckx again headed the list of Socialist candidates in the municipal elections, and a number refused to run for other offices on the same ticket with him. The scandal cost the Socialists many votes, but Craybeckx was reelected. Later, a message from Cardinal Léon Joseph Suenens, sent to the community on the occasion of Rosh Ha-shanah and the tenth anniversary of the *Belgisch Israelitisch Weekblad*, rebuked a large section of the Belgian people for not being friendly enough to the Jews and called for a change of attitude.

**Nazi Criminals**

Intercession by patriotic organizations and by the association of former concentration-camp inmates moved Justice Minister Pierre Vermeylen to introduce a bill in Parliament extending for ten years the period for prosecution of Nazi war criminals. After a long debate the law was passed on November 19, by the combined vote of all 148 members of the Catholic, Socialist, and Freedom and Progress parties, with the four Communists abstaining on the ground that the law was not strong enough, and the Volksunie casting its 5 votes against it. Frans vander Elst, leader of the Volksunie, argued that such legislation was completely unnecessary two decades after the end of hostilities, and contrary to the spirit of the Declaration of Human Rights. If the law had not passed, 1,338 Belgian war criminals who had been sentenced to death *in absentia* would have been free to return to Belgium in 1965 without punishment. The most notorious among them was the arch-collaborator Léon Degrelle, whom Spain had refused to extradite and who had announced publicly in Madrid that he wished to go back to Belgium to address public meetings and run for public office.

A congress of 25 experts representing the more than 60 organizations of the International Union of the Resistance met in Antwerp on November 19 to examine evidence of the growth of neo-Nazism, particularly in Germany,
Austria, Japan, the United States, and South America. The experts chose Antwerp as their meeting place because they were of the opinion that the most dangerous nucleus of the neo-Nazi movement was being formed there. Jewish delegates to the congress were Marion Muszkat of the University of Tel-Aviv; Simon Wiesenthal of the Documentation Center, Vienna; C. C. Aronsfeld of the Wiener Library, London; Sigmund Roth of WJC, London, and Roger Katz, president of the former Jewish resistance fighters in Belgium.

Economic Situation

The internal political dissension in no way affected the country's economy. Considered as the sick partner in the European Common Market only three years ago, Belgium had now completely recovered. Production and export figures showed an increase of about 7 per cent over 1963, largely because of the many plants built by foreign investors, mainly American. And whereas Belgium had previously had a serious unemployment problem, it now had to recruit manpower from Italy, Spain, and Turkey.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

There were estimated to be 40,500 Jews in Belgium, out of a total population of about 9.5 million. Twenty-four thousand lived in Brussels, 13,000 in Antwerp, 1,500 in Liège, 1,500 in Charleroi, and 500 in small scattered communities. The general trend among the Jews was to move from provincial towns to Brussels or Antwerp, where, they felt, their children could grow up in a Jewish milieu.

But the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Brussels, now the seat of hundreds of international organizations and regarded as in some manner the capital of Europe, did not encourage an intensive Jewish life. There had been no marked change in the size of the community, and intermarriage and assimilation were increasing. Jews were well represented in the professions, especially in medicine and law; many were independent entrepreneurs in the garment, fur, and leather industries.

The Antwerp Jewish community developed along different lines. Its number showed an annual increase of about 400, caused by the high birth rate among the many Orthodox families and a steady influx of refugees from Eastern Europe. Mixed marriages were extremely rare. Most of the Jews were engaged in the diamond trade, with only a few in the professions.

Emigration

There was a significant drop in emigration to all overseas countries. Only 30 persons, all recently arrived refugees, emigrated to the United States—the smallest figure since 1945. Aliyah, too, was negligible, although many Jewish children, especially in Antwerp, were affiliated with youth groups which organized annual trips to Israel. On the other hand, the number of refugees
choosing Belgium as a resettlement country was rising because of the favorable economic situation.

Citizenship Status

Only several hundred of the Jews deported during the war lived to return to Belgium. The larger part of the postwar community consisted of refugees from all parts of Europe, who until a few years ago were stateless, primarily because the acquisition of Belgian citizenship was difficult and costly. More recently, and particularly in 1964, many became citizens as a result of relaxed naturalization regulations, requiring only five or in some cases three years of residence, and a lower fee.

Community Organizations

With the end of CJMCAG (p. 242), Jewish welfare organizations faced a serious cut in the JDC-CJMCAG funds that had been used for current operations. CJMCAG grants of about $4.5 million had made possible the construction of youth centers in Brussels, Charleroi, and Liège, homes for the aged in Antwerp and Brussels, vacation camps, synagogues, and Jewish schools.

For current needs the large communities now organized intensified campaigns. The Centrale d’Oeuvres Sociales Juives, the Brussels social welfare and fund-raising body, set a 1964 campaign goal of $100,000 for its social welfare program, the youth center (with 600 members), a vacation program, and a school canteen. Under its newly elected president, Joseph Konkommer, the Antwerp central welfare organization, Centraal Beheer, deriving its income from membership dues and fund-raising campaigns, sought to increase its constituency. Its program included the construction of a larger home for the aged, social and medical services, and a canteen.

Jewish Education

In Brussels five per cent of Jewish children attended the community’s day school, including grades from kindergarten through high school. Several Jewish leaders, who ascribed the low attendance to the school’s Agudath Israel orientation, opened the Gadenou school, which offered a traditional education with a Zionist orientation for kindergarten and primary-school children. On the initiative of Chief Rabbi Robert Dreyfus, the Central Consistory established an association to promote Jewish religious instruction and raise funds for a larger teaching staff.

In Antwerp about 90 per cent of the Jewish children attended Jewish day schools. Yesode Ha-torah (Orthodox, with an Agudath Israel orientation) had a student body of 1,100 and was building an extension to accommodate more. The enrolment in the Tahkemoni (traditionalist, with a Zionist orientation) was 700. Both schools had classes from kindergarten through high school, and were recognized and assisted financially by the state.

The hasidic groups of the Belzer and the Satmar rabbis each had a primary
day school for some 400 children. The Belzer school was constructing a new building with the help of CJMCAG funds.

Mizrahi's plans for the establishment of a Talmud Torah evening school for children attending non-Jewish schools were opposed by Agudath Israel on the grounds that it could not offer adequate instruction and would be a deterrent to day-school attendance.

Religious Life

In Brussels the cornerstone for the first Sephardi synagogue was laid in October by Conrad Franco, president of the Sephardi community, which had formerly prayed in a separate room of the main synagogue. The number of Sephardim had grown to 200 families with the influx of Egyptian Jews after the 1956 Suez crisis. The Mahaziqe Ha-dat community (Orthodox with Mizrahi orientation) appointed Rabbi Shemariah Karelitz of Vilna as its spiritual leader.

In Antwerp the study quarters of the Mahaziqe Ha-dat synagogue, damaged by fire on Passover eve in 1963, was being rebuilt. Rabbi Hillel Medalie of Leeds, Great Britain, son of the former Moscow chief rabbi, was appointed rabbi of the Shomere Ha-dat community. Several small hasidic synagogues, such as the Chortkover, Visznizer, and Gerer, were rebuilt or completely renovated with the aid of CJMCAG and local funds.

Communal Affairs

Delegates of 52 Jewish organizations of all tendencies met in Brussels in June to discuss the situation of the Soviet Jews. The conference adopted a resolution calling on the Soviet government to grant its Jews religious and cultural rights and to cease the defamatory campaign against Judaism. The resolution was handed to Prime Minister Theo Lefèvre by Max Gottschalk, president of the Centre National des Hautes Études Juives (National Center for Advanced Jewish Studies), who chaired the conference; Paul Philippson, president of the Central Consistory, and Chief Rabbi Dreyfus, with a request that the government intercede in behalf of the Soviet Jews. Lefèvre raised the problem with K. N. Rudnev, vice-president of the USSR council of ministers, who came on an official visit in October. The prime minister showed him antisemitic Soviet publications when Rudnev claimed ignorance of anti-Jewish discrimination in his country.

Numerous memorial services honoring the Jewish victims of Nazism were held throughout the country. There were pilgrimages of thousands of Jews and Belgians to the Mechelen barracks to commemorate the deportation of 26,000 Jews, and to Breendonk, the Belgian concentration camp, where many Jewish and non-Jewish underground fighters had been killed by the Nazis. At Breendonk, now a national memorial, the Czech ambassador placed an urn, containing earth and ashes from Theresienstadt, beside urns from Buchenwald, Auschwitz, Dachau, and other concentration camps. In April the revolt of the Warsaw Ghetto was commemorated in Brussels and a memorial
for Jewish war victims was unveiled at the Charleroi cemetery. Elaborate plans for a 20th-anniversary memorial service marking the liberation of the concentration camps were made in Brussels by the international committee of former camp inmates. The committee also issued a strong appeal to all governments to extend statutes of limitation on the prosecution of Nazi war criminals.

**Restitution**

Jewish organizations repeatedly protested to the government the ineligibility of Belgian Jews to receive indemnities from the DM 80 million ($20 million) of West German reparations funds for Belgian victims of the Nazi occupation. So far, only former political prisoners had received indemnification. In an effort to change the situation, Socialist Senator Henri Rollin interceded with the government in November to use remaining reparation funds for compensation to Belgian Jews who had been forced to wear the yellow star and live in hiding during the war.

Jewish organizations also expressed dissatisfaction with the June 1964 amendment (p. 412) to the German restitution law of 1957 regarding indemnification for the loss of household furniture to persons who had not submitted their claims by March 31, 1959. The organizations maintained that some claimants had not submitted claims because they could not at that time present certain proof required by law. They therefore asked that the period for filing claims be now extended for Belgian Jews.

**Relations with Israel**

Hadassah's 1964 Henrietta Szold Award, consisting of a citation and a gift of $1,000, was given to Queen Mother Elisabeth for her dedication to the Youth Aliyah cause and her help in saving thousands of Jews from Nazi destruction. She donated the $1,000 gift to Youth Aliyah. In her concern for the fate of the Soviet Jews she also joined Bertrand Russell, Martin Buber, Albert Schweitzer, François Mauriac, and other notables in an appeal to Khrushchev to put an end to anti-Jewish discrimination.

The visit of King Baudouin and Queen Fabiola to Israel, on a return trip from the Far East in February, was received with enthusiasm by the Jews of Belgium. The royal couple participated in the planting ceremony of the King Baudouin forest near Nazareth, initiated by the Belgian Jews in gratitude for their countrymen's aid during the Nazi occupation. The king also lit six candles at the Martyrs' Monument in memory of the six million Jews who perished in the Nazi holocaust.

Several prominent Israelis visited Belgium in 1964. Receptions that turned into mass meetings were given in honor of Foreign Minister Golda Meir by the Zionist Federation in Antwerp and Brussels. President Eliahu Elath of the Hebrew University was received by Queen Mother Elisabeth during his visit. A number of Keneset members attended the European Conference of the General Zionists, held in Antwerp in August.
With the aid of Israel Goldstein, world chairman of Keren Ha-yesod, and Edward Rostal of Jerusalem, 1964 contributions to the Magbit (appeal) were 100 per cent larger than the year before. In addition, a postwar record of 8,557 shekalim were sold. There were no elections for delegates to the World Zionist Congress, since an agreement was reached by the parties to send two delegates from Mapai, one from Mapam, one from Herut, one from Mizrahi, and one from the General Zionists.

On the “Day of the Book and of Peace,” sponsored in Brussels in May by the Belgian WIZO and the Belgian-Israeli Friendship League under the patronage of Israeli Ambassador Amiel E. Najar, books by André Maurois, Robert Aron, Irwin Shaw, Henri Torrès, and others, autographed by the authors, were sold for the benefit of WIZO schools in Israel.

In April the car ferry Bilu left from Antwerp on its maiden trip (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], p. 316; 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 222), to begin its regular service as a floating motel between Israel and Italy.

**Arab League Boycott**

Israel’s protracted negotiations for association with the European Economic Community (EEC) were finally successful. A three-year agreement was signed in Brussels on June 5, reducing tariffs on some 25 Israeli export items and exempting Israel from the 20 per cent common external tariff of EEC (p. 453).

The Arab League’s reaction to the agreement, which it had tried to prevent or postpone, was an announcement that it would open an office in Brussels, the seat of the Common Market, in order to study on the spot Israel’s relations with EEC and to strengthen its own economic ties with the member nations.

At the same time the Arab boycott office increased its pressures. Several Antwerp firms received warning from Damascus and the Iraqi embassy in Brussels to break off trade relations with Israel. Firm government action against such pressures was requested by the Belgisch Israelitisch Weekblad and, following an interpellation in parliament in June, Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak sent a note of protest to the Iraqi embassy. Further proof of the government’s friendship for Israel was seen in Foreign Trade Minister Maurice Brasseur’s participation in Belgian Day at the Tel-Aviv International Trade Fair on June 18. However, Arab boycott activities persisted and in October four Belgian firms were advised of information from the ambassador to Libya that they would be placed on the Arab blacklist unless they guaranteed in writing to stop trade with Israel.

**Awards**

The Royal Academy of Languages and French Literature awarded the triennial Léopold Rosy prize to the poet David Scheinert.

The young theater group of the Antwerp Jewish Cultural Circle won the Marcel Vandermolen amateur drama prize for the second consecutive year, this time for its production of Michel de Ghelderode’s *Escurial*.
Personalia

A Flemish-language history of the Antwerp Jews by the historian Ephraim Schmidt was published in February.

Siegfried Ratzersdorfer, for many years president and honorary secretary of the Centraal Beheer, died in Antwerp at the age of 76.

In Brussels Serge B. Chlepner, professor of political economy at the university, died at the age of 74.

Jacob Zwi Lemel, a Jewish journalist and writer, passed away suddenly in May at the age of 63. He was a contributor to *Unzer Vort*, Paris, and author of *Jours de Terreur*, a book on Belgian Jewry's sufferings during the war, which was published several weeks before his death.

Joseph Benezra, vice-president of the Brussels Sephardi community and member of the social welfare agency's board of directors, died at the age of 56.

HERBERT KELLNER

Netherlands

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Jews formed only a small minority of the population, 27,000 out of a total of 12,040,000 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 228). There were no special problems in regard to the status of Jews, whose relations with their non-Jewish neighbors were excellent. The general attitude was that Jews were among the pillars of the Dutch community and had made major contributions to the country's culture (e.g., Spinoza, the painter Josef Israels, and the writer Hermann Heijermans). There was no discrimination of any sort. The only antisemitic event in the period under review (January 1, 1964, to December 31, 1964) was the destruction of some tombstones in the Jewish cemetery at Winterswijk in the Eastern Netherlands. The Christian population of the town immediately took up a collection to indemnify the Jewish community for the damages. The burgomaster and town council promised a reward of $2,500 for the discovery of the delinquents.

Communal Activities

There was still no common body to represent the three sections of the Jewish community, Ashkenazim, Sephardim, and Liberals. Any statement or representation required discussions among the Jewish communities in order to achieve *ad hoc* cooperation. Traditional differences appeared to make any organic cooperation of the Orthodox and liberal congregations nearly impos-
sible. It was increasingly difficult to replace the older leaders, since those academically trained young people who were most interested in Jewish affairs tended to leave for Israel.

The Nederlands Israëlietisch Kerkgenootschap (Federation of the Orthodox Jewish Communities in The Netherlands) discussed the possibilities for a Jewish spiritual revival in Holland. The federation's leaders were especially concerned with the problem of preserving knowledge of Jewish culture, history, and religious tradition. One of them, Mozes Koenig, proposed the establishment of an Ulpan for the popular presentation of Jewish scholarship and culture. This plan was accepted in October, and steps were taken to effectuate it in the near future.

The seminary for Jewish teachers reduced its requirements for admission, making an extended primary-education diploma sufficient. It had 36 students; since 1945, 29 examinations had been held.

The B'nai B'rith had a four-day congress (April) at Scheveningue for European District XIX. Discussion centered on methods of assuring the survival of Jewry in the next generation. A similar discussion was held in July at the conference of the youth department of the World Union for Progressive Judaism in Amsterdam, with 60 delegates from England, France, the United States, Israel, Germany, and Holland.

The Liberal Jewish movement was outgrowing its existing synagogues. To meet its expanding needs, it began the construction in Amsterdam of a large new synagogue with a community center. The cost was met in part by a government contribution, and in part by the community's own funds, supplemented by a substantial CJMCAG grant.

The Jewish Social Work Foundation (Stichting Joods Maatschappelijk Werk) remained the leading philanthropic organization. Through its membership in the Standing Conference on European Jewish Community Services, it was developing closer cooperation with Jewish social services of Belgium and West Germany. Several meetings took place with board members and professionals of the Service Social Juif of Brussels and the Centrale of Antwerp. Protection of children, old-age care, psychotherapy, and training of social workers were the main subjects discussed. The Jewish communities of the Benelux countries initiated a social committee of the Standing Conference, whose first meeting took place in Brussels in October.

CEFINA (Centrale Financierings-Actie voor Joods Sociaal Werk in Nederland) collected about $125,000 as of March. Between Passover and Rosh Ha-shanah the joint Israel drive, Collectieve Israël-Actie, collected nearly $200,000, and the Jewish National Fund about $15,000.

The youth camps at Wijk aan Zee and the psychiatric clinic at Amersfoort were increasingly used by Belgians.

**Zionism and Relations with Israel**

Relations between Israel and the Netherlands continued good. The number of non-Jewish Netherlanders visiting Israel increased steadily, as did the number of Israeli students coming to the Netherlands for special studies.
In December the two countries ceased to require visas from each other’s nationals. The Israeli government opened a tourist office in Amsterdam.

Netherlands Minister of Economic Affairs B. W. Biesheuvel visited Israel and had several conferences with Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and other officials. Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir visited the Netherlands in connection with Israel’s negotiations with the European Economic Community. The “Four days marching event” in July at Nijmegen in the Eastern Netherlands—an annual event to which many countries send representatives—brought Israeli soldier girls and some individual Israeli athletes to Holland.

There were exhibits of the work of Israeli artists, especially in Amsterdam, but they were of relatively minor significance. The general critical reaction was that Israeli painting and sculpture were still in the experimental stage. Nevertheless, a number of Dutch Jewish artists and theoreticians were concerned with Israeli art, including Johan G. Wertheim and Professor Hans Ludwig Jaffé. Willem J. H. B. van Sandbergen, the (non-Jewish) former director of the Municipal Museum in Amsterdam was named an advisor to the Jewish National Museum in Jerusalem for a two-year period.

A gathering of the Netherlands Zionist Students Organization was combined with the congress of the World Union of the Jewish Students, held at Egmont (Holland) in the beginning of 1964. At its sessions the discussions centered around the spiritual crisis of Dutch Jewry. Of about 120 students, half came from the Netherlands and the balance from England, Israel, France, Italy, Sweden, and Switzerland. Among the speakers were Albert Memmi, author of Portrait d’un Juif (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], pp. 13–14; 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 225, 326), and Professor Isaiah Leibowitz of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Leibowitz’s statement that Israel is a non-Jewish secular state provoked wide discussion, both at the congress and in the local Jewish press.

The Netherlands Zionist Congress, meeting January 20–21, too, considered the spiritual crisis within Jewry. The president of the Netherlands Zionist Organization, Jozef S. Van de Hal, asserted that Jewry in the Netherlands was in danger of becoming institutionalized. He noted that mixed marriages had increased to 42 per cent of all marriages in which one partner was Jewish and that only 50 per cent of Jews were members of a Jewish community.

Zionist students in the Netherlands appeared to be increasingly influenced by Orthodox groups. At the request of the Zionist students, Abraham S. Goudsmit, of The Hague, was appointed to serve as a special rabbi for the students. In cooperation with the Jewish Historical Museum in Amsterdam, the student organization opened a Hanukkah exhibition.

Interest in the Hebrew language increased. The Tarbuth center of the Zionist organization arranged courses with 275 participants. This did not indicate any increase in aliyah, although there was a steady trickle of young Jewish people, intellectuals and members of youth organizations, leaving for Israel. The elder generation tended to confine its interest in Israel to visits.
Reparations and Restitution

The modifications in the German Restitution Law, approved in October 1964 (p. 413), did not seem likely to have much importance for Dutch Jewish claimants, since few of them had registered claims larger than Fls. 20,000 ($5,600). Nor was the Hardship Fund of much significance, since most of those entitled to restitution-indemnification had claimed their rights in time. It was estimated that there might be about a thousand new registrations for this Hardship Fund.

Personalia

The 70th birthday of Abel J. Herzberg, the veteran Zionist leader, was celebrated. The Hague received a new chief rabbi, Simon Beeri, formerly of Helsinki.

Among those who died during the year were Raymond Henry Pos, former governor of Surinam and Netherland's ambassador to Cuba and Haiti; Judge Albert Leydesdorff, a leader of the Liberal community; Levi L. Preger, community leader in Rotterdam; Aron Vedder, leading social worker; Alex Wins, a leader of the Po'ale Zion; the distinguished Jewish scholar Rabbi Armin Katz; Otto Meyer, director of the Jewish Historical Museum in Amsterdam, and Lydia Winkel, journalist and leading resistance fighter during World War II.

Gerhard Taussig

Scandinavia

Politically Scandinavia showed little change in 1964. Elections in Denmark and Sweden kept the Social Democratic parties in power, although in Denmark they were in a slightly weaker position than before the elections. Denmark and Norway continued their membership in NATO, and Sweden maintained her status of neutrality. All three remained members of the European Free Trade Area (EFTA). The December 1964 agreement of the Common Market countries on further reductions of duties on their trade with each other was expected to hurt Denmark's vital agricultural exports.

In general, Scandinavian economic activity continued to increase; there were labor shortages in most fields, especially housing, and wages and prices tended to rise.

Jewish Communities

Denmark's 4.6 million inhabitants included about 6,000 Jews, almost all residing in Copenhagen and its environs. Some 1,800 single persons and heads
of families were taxpaying members of the Jewish community. In 1964 there were 62 births, 19 marriages, and 96 deaths. The annual numbers of births and marriages had remained more or less constant since the war. The proportion of older people in the population was growing, as was their need for communal services.

Sweden's total population grew from 7.4 million in 1961 to 7.5 million in 1964, but the Jewish population was unaltered at about 14,000. Half lived in Stockholm and its environs, 1,500 in Gothenburg, 1,500 in Malmö, 350 in Boras, 150 in Norrøping, and the rest in smaller communities in Hälsingborg, Karlstad, Kalmar, Karlskrona, and Sundsvall. The emigrants from Germany and DP's were now self-supporting, but 200 families still received assistance from the Jewish community, aided by grants from CJMCAG.

Norway's 3.5 million inhabitants included about 800 Jews, of whom 600 lived in Oslo and 120 in Trondheim.

**Emigration**

Because of the social, political, and economic stability in the Scandinavian countries and the absence of discrimination, Jewish emigration was small. Only a few families went to the United States and to Israel. Some young people also emigrated, especially the brides of foreigners. There were also a few cases of immigration of this kind, and a few families came from Eastern Europe. Skilled workers of all kinds were welcome, and there were no difficulties as to their integration.

**Status of Jews**

There was no civil or legal distinction between Jews and non-Jews, and discrimination and antisemitism were all but nonexistent. In April 1964, the 150th anniversary of the royal decree which officially recognized the Jewish community in Denmark was celebrated in the synagogue of Copenhagen. This decree prepared the way for full civil and political rights for Danish Jews, finally affirmed in the Constitution of 1849. No discrimination against Jews was ever adopted by any subsequent Danish government even under the hardest pressure during the Nazi occupation. King Frederik IX and Queen Ingrid attended the synagogue service, as did all the highest officials of the country.

In the summer of 1964, Henry Grünbaum, a Jew, became a member of the Danish government as minister of economics.

When Nikita S. Khrushchev paid a visit to the Scandinavian countries in the summer of 1964, it was agreed among the Jewish communities that each of them should protest, through USSR embassies or through their governments, the discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union. The protests attracted widespread attention from the Scandinavian press and radio.

**Community Organization**

The Jews of each Scandinavian country were represented by a central board of the Jewish community. These boards operated nearly all the estab-
lished Jewish institutions: synagogues, homes for the aged, schools. All Jews were community members unless they formally notified their board of their decision to resign. Only a few resigned—in Denmark, five to ten persons yearly. The boards taxed the members about two per cent of their taxable income, through special commissions. The 1964 budgets were about $100,000 for Copenhagen, $250,000 for Stockholm, and $20,000 for Oslo.

With considerable aid from CJMCAG, community centers had previously been built in Oslo, Gothenburg, Malmö, and Stockholm. In 1964 the Copenhagen Jewish community started the remodeling of its administration building into a center which was expected to furnish adequate, modern premises for all cultural activities.

The Scandinavian Jewish youth organizations had since 1919 been united in a federation which held annual summer congresses in each of the countries in turn, with lectures, discussions, and camping activities.

The communities always worked closely with each other, and a meeting of board leaders from the three countries to discuss common problems, mainly cultural and educational, was planned for the spring of 1965.

Under the auspices of the Copenhagen Jewish sport club Hakoah a site was bought in an idyllic place near Copenhagen for a summer and training camp, to be open also to other Jewish youth clubs. A substantial grant for this project was obtained from CJMCAG.

The communities of Denmark and Sweden were members of the Standing Conference on European Jewish Community Services and in 1964 contributed to the emergency aid sent by all European communities to the Jews of Skopje, Yugoslavia, who were heavily hit by an earthquake.

**Jewish Education**

Denmark had a 160-year-old primary school. Originally there had been one school for boys and one for girls, but after the war they were united into a coeducational school. It had its own board of directors, the majority of whose members were also members of the community board. The school had seven classes with about 140 pupils. Most teachers were Jewish, and lessons in Jewish subjects were given five hours per week, on an average, to each class. Ninety per cent of expenses were met by government and municipal subsidies. A Talmud Torah, founded in 1853, had about 120 pupils and was run by the community. A kindergarten connected with the day school had 40 to 50 children. The migration of community members into the suburbs of Copenhagen necessitated a regular bus service for the smaller children. Even with substantial subsidies from governmental sources, the kindergarten fees were high, and the major part of the bus-service costs therefore had to be paid by the Jewish community.

A program for supplying educational material for children and young people was started, with the aid of CJMCAG, with the publication of a Danish translation of Gilbert Klaperman's *Story of the Jewish People*.

The school conducted a summer camp on the northern coast of Zealand to which the children went for three-week periods, for lectures and vacations.
In 1964 the camp was enlarged and modernized with the aid of CJMCAG. The most Orthodox group, Mahaziqe ha-Dat, had a kindergarten and a heder with 60 to 70 pupils.

In Sweden the Hillel Day School, founded in 1955, had about 100 pupils in six classes. It had its own premises in the new Judaica House, the community center of the Stockholm community, inaugurated in September 1963. This gave the pupils an opportunity to participate in the activities of the youth center in the same building. The center also housed a kindergarten with 40 to 50 children, and there was a Talmud Torah with about 550 pupils. Bus service was provided to pupils from the environs. The budget for the schools was about $32,000. The community also ran a summer camp in Glämsta, on the sea near Stockholm, to which children from the other Swedish and Scandinavian communities were invited to participate in sports, lectures, and even bar mitzvah preparation.

In Norway there was no Jewish day school, but 80 children in Oslo and Trondheim received religious education.

**Religious and Cultural Activities**

Marcus Melchior was chief rabbi of the Copenhagen community. He lectured on Jewish subjects all over Denmark and was known as one of the finest orators in the country. After five years of preparation for the rabbinate at Jews' College in London, Rabbi Melchior's son, Bent Melchior, was installed as the second rabbi at the end of 1963. Besides performing his rabbinical duties, Bent Melchior lectured at the Jewish day school and the Talmud Torah and organized study circles.

Members of Agudath Israel were organized in Mahaziqe ha-Dat. They had a synagogue of their own and a rabbi, Israel Chaikin, but were also members of the central community of Copenhagen.

In Stockholm the chief rabbi was Professor Kurt Wilhelm. The second rabbi was Emil Kronheim, who was about to retire. Stockholm and Gothenburg also had very small Orthodox congregations.

B'nai B'rith lodges in Copenhagen, Stockholm, Malmö, Oslo, and Gothenburg were united through a Scandinavian board and worked closely together through the exchange of lecturers and the periodical *B'nai B'rith Nyt*, published in Copenhagen.

The communities had clubs for adults and youths, covering every field of cultural activity. In 1964 the Federation of Scandinavian Jewish Youth Organizations (S.J.U.F.) held its yearly congress in Finland and a summer camp in connection with this congress. The federation had its own periodical, *S.J.U.F.-Bladet*.

Denmark also had the *Jødisk Samfund*, a monthly dealing with general Jewish matters and subsidized by the community. *Israel* was published by the Zionist organization, and a new periodical, *Jødisk Debat*, was issued by a group of young people. Preparations were made to establish a club for Jewish students in Copenhagen early in 1965, similar to the one which had existed in Stockholm for many years.
In Sweden the literary magazine, *Judisk Tidskrift*, appeared for the 37th year. After the death of Professor Hugo Valentin of the University of Uppsala in 1963, the *Tidskrift* was edited by the economist Franz Arnheim. Daniel Brick edited the Zionist and literary monthly *Judisk Krönik*, founded in 1931, and the Stockholm community issued the quarterly *Församlings-bladet* on communal affairs.

In September a new and revised edition of the principal work of the late Professor Valentin, *Judarna i Sverige* ("The Jews in Sweden"), was published in Stockholm.

Works published in Denmark in 1964 included *Skrædderens Søn* ("The Tailor's Son"), a book of memoirs by Sam Besekow, producer at the Royal Theater in Copenhagen. It described his childhood and youth among the Jews who, like his own father, had fled from the pogroms in Russia at the beginning of the 20th century and settled in Copenhagen. The book was hailed by critics as a masterpiece.

On the 150th anniversary of the freedom charter of the Danish Jews, the Copenhagen Jewish community and the local B’nai B’rith lodge published a symposium, edited by the librarian Julius Margolinsky and Professor Poul Meyer. In nine essays the authors described all aspects of Jewish life in Denmark during the preceding 150 years. Rafael Edelmann, librarian of the Royal Library of Copenhagen, wrote of the great Jewish scholar and rabbi, David Simonsen, whose ancestors were among the first Jews settled in Denmark. After his death in 1932, Simonsen’s famous collection of Hebraica and Judaica was given to the Royal Library. This *Bibliotheca Simonseniana* was now, through Edelmann’s skill and care, one of the finest collections of Judaica in Europe. In 1964 the library was enlarged through a gift from the author Shea Tenenbaum, of Long Island, N.Y., of about 800 volumes of mostly modern Yiddish writings, including the catastrophe literature. Edelmann himself continued to edit the *Corpus Codicum Hebraicorum Medii Aevi*. The Parma Pentateuch was completed, and Part III of Maimonides’ commentary on the Mishnah was prepared for publication in 1965.

**Zionism and Relations with Israel**

About 4,000 Jews in Scandinavia were members of various Zionist organizations united in the Union of Zionist Federations of Scandinavia. The Denmark-Israel Society, with a majority of non-Jewish members, was very active in arranging lectures and tourist flights to Israel.

Only a few families and idealistic young people went on ‘aliyah. But many young people went to Israel to spend a year of voluntary service, *shenat sherut*, in a kibbutz, and there were numerous chartered flights from all Scandinavian countries to Israel.

Many high officials visited Israel, among them the Danish minister of ecclesiastical affairs, Mrs. Bodil Koch, who later opened the annual United Israel Appeal in Copenhagen with an enthusiastic and stirring speech. In 1964 the appeal raised about $60,000 in Denmark, $100,000 in Sweden, and $20,000 in Norway. Considerable amounts were also raised by Keren Kayyemet
le-Yisrael, Youth Aliyah, and WIZO. WIZO in Denmark and the Agudath Israel's sewing circle each supported a kindergarten in Israel. The Zionist youth organization, Bene Akiva, was active.

**Social Services**

The Jews benefited equally with non-Jews from the high standards of social legislation in the Scandinavian countries. For special needs and supplementary relief, the Jewish communities and their philanthropic institutions disposed of the interest from large endowments—in Denmark and Sweden $1.5 million, and in Norway about $150,000. These funds also furnished means for medical aid, recreation, scholarship, trousseaus, and assistance to Jews in transit. Sweden received $90,000 from CJMCAG for relief and rehabilitation of hard-core cases among immigrants. The Swedish ORT committee received $15,000 from the Swedish government for technical training of Jewish youth. In Norway a wide campaign for relief and refugees, under the sponsorship of the King, was opened by the Norwegian Refugee Aid, of which the Jewish community was a member.

Homes for the aged and nursing homes existed in all Scandinavian countries. The new old-age and nursing home in Copenhagen, inaugurated in 1961 in the presence of Queen Ingrid, was enlarged in 1964 from 32 to 36 rooms. Because of the still growing need for care for the aged, the community began to remodel an apartment house into a 27-room nursing home. Ninety per cent of the capital outlay and all maintenance expenses were to be paid from government and municipality resources. The Jewish women's organization in Copenhagen arranged a regular service for visits to lonely old people, summer excursions and fortnightly gatherings.

**Personalia**

In Oslo, Norway, the German-born Salo Gronowitz was appointed professor of atomic energy at the university.

In May the president of the Jewish community of Copenhagen, Otto Levysohn, died, aged 65. In connection with the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Freedom Charter in April 1964, he had been awarded the Royal Order of Knighthood of the First Degree. The King sent a message of condolence to his widow. Leo Fischer, who succeeded him as president of the community, had also been awarded the Royal Order of Knighthood in connection with the same celebration.

**Julius Margolinsky**
Italy

December of 1963 saw the resignation of a temporary government headed by Giovanni Leone. Aldo Moro, another representative of the Christian Democratic party, Italy's largest political grouping, then formed a cabinet based on the "opening to the left," a new coalition of parties which for the first time since 1947 included the Socialist party of Pietro Nenni. Besides the Christian Democrats and the Socialists, the cabinet included the Social Democrats and the Republicans, as had most previous cabinets. Nenni became vice premier and the Social Democrat Giuseppe Saragat foreign minister.

The government was subjected to constant sniping from political groupings outside the governmental coalition—the relatively small Monarchist and Liberal parties on the right and the large Communist party on the left—as well as from dissidents within the Christian Democratic and Socialist parties. At the same time the government was also under attack by organized labor and big business because a series of measures it was forced to adopt to check inflation slowed down Italy's economic boom. Conflict and mistrust among the partners in the coalition hindered agreement on policies and the introduction of major reforms, and the government finally resigned in June 1964.

A few weeks later Moro was entrusted with the formation of a new government based on the same coalition, which appeared to be the only one capable of mustering a parliamentary majority. The coalition faced yet another test in December 1964, when the seriously ill President Antonio Segni resigned. The secular parties in the coalition backed Saragat for the post, while the Christian Democrats nominated Giovanni Leone, one of the party's more conservative leaders. But many left-wing Christian Democrats refused to support Leone, casting their ballots for more radical members of their party, such as former Premier Amintore Fanfani or the trade-union leader Giulio Pastore, or abstaining. From December 16 to 28 the deadlock continued, as votes shifted among a number of candidates of all political hues. Saragat was finally elected on the twenty-first ballot by a majority that included the secular parties in the coalition, most of the Christian Democrats, and the Communists, whose votes had been cast first for their own candidate, Senator Umberto Terracini, and then for the Socialist Nenni.

The Vatican

The period under review was notable for the pilgrimage of Pope Paul VI to the Holy Land in January 1964 and the overwhelming approval of the document on the Jews by the third session of Vatican Council II, on November 20. The declaration, absolving the Jewish people of the deicide charge, was adopted after long deliberation and against opposition (see p. 123). Nearly
the entire Italian press, both religious and secular, as well as the radio and television, praised these two initiatives of the Church. On his return from the Holy Land, Paul VI was enthusiastically received by the population of Rome.

The press showed extremely mixed reactions, however, to the dispute over the role of Pope Pius XII during the Nazi murder of six million Jews. Paul VI repeatedly defended the memory of Pius XII, as did L'Osservatore Romano, the official organ of the Vatican, and Civiltà Cattolica, the publication of the Jesuits. On the other hand, a number of secular periodicals and serious studies of contemporary history, though avoiding negative judgments on Pius XII, were cautious in their approach to the question.

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY

The number of Jews in Italy changed little in the period under review. Births and deaths were approximately equal and immigration was very limited, in the absence of conditions that had stimulated it earlier. Official statistics continued to estimate the size of the Jewish community at 35,000, concentrated in the major cities. Rome, with its Jewish proletariat, was the only city to show a natural population increase; it now had over 13,000 Jews, almost all of native Italian stock. Milan was second, with about 9,500, an increase of 1,500 in one year. Its industrial and commercial development and the rather liberal naturalization laws favored this new community. It attracted a large percentage of immigrants, both recent and of longer standing: first from Germany, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Rumania; then from Egypt, Lybia, Iraq, and Iran. Other major Jewish communities were Turin, with 2,000; Florence and Trieste, with 1,500 each; Venice, with 1,100; Leghorn, with 1,000, and Genoa, with 800. Several once large communities were now reduced to a shadow of their former importance: Pisa, 500; Ancona, 400; Padua, Ferrara, Modena, Mantua, Verona, and Vercelli, 200 or fewer. South of Rome, with the exception of Naples with a Jewish community of about 500, there were no concentrations of Jews large enough to be worth counting. In contrast to the situation in recent years, conversions to Catholicism no longer constituted an important factor; and mixed marriages, though rather frequent, did not always mean defection from Judaism.

Community Activities

The administrators of the individual communities performed miracles of balancing their budgets in an effort to preserve a community structure passed down to them through the centuries. They had to deal with problems concerning worship, education, and social assistance which were aggravated by the lack of active interest in communal affairs on the part of most members. Legacies that had been left to the communities had lost their value and their real property had deteriorated. At the same time, they received greatly reduced contributions from JDC and CJMCAG. The problem was no longer one of constructing new synagogues and new centers, as it had been for some
years after the war, but of meeting the operating expenses of existing institutions with the moderate obligatory dues paid by the members.

Two important projects were completed by the community of Rome, under the presidency of Professor Fausto Pitigliani. The Asili Infantili Israelitici (Jewish Children's Home), considered one of the most progressive institutions of its kind in the city, was now located in a well-designed new building, dedicated in March. It was erected on the same site on Lungotevere Sanzio where the organization had occupied a small villa for fifty years. Thanks to contributions made in memory of Angelo Donati, a banker who was born at Modena and lived in France, where he was able to save many Jews during the Nazi occupation, one floor was reserved for the Collegio Rabbinico Italiano and its library, thus resolving a problem which had seriously concerned the Unione delle Communità Israelitiche Italiane (Union of Italian Jewish Communities). Archives from the smaller communities nearing extinction were also transferred to this building.

Another initiative which won particular acclaim was the establishment of a Jewish Museum in Rome's Central Synagogue. Here the story of the Jewish community of Rome, the first reference to which goes back to the ambassadors sent to the city by the Maccabees, was presented painstakingly in a series of mementos spanning the period from the ancient Republic to present-day Rome. On display were plaster casts of catacomb inscriptions and of the architrave of the recently uncovered Ostia synagogue, the oldest known in Europe. There were also exhibits of ancient manuscripts, silver, tapestries, ceremonial and art objects, and historical documents. Among the last were records of the Nazi deportations of Italy's Jews.

Education and Culture

Jewish education was the joint responsibility of the education department of the Unione delle Communità Israelitiche and of the corresponding agencies in the individual communities. Jewish nursery schools enrolled a total of 529 children; elementary schools, 1,248; the scuole medie (intermediate schools), 648; teacher-training schools, 45; and Talmud Torahs, 389—in all, a total of 2,859 receiving regular Jewish instruction. Of these, only 369 students in Milan could finish the full eight-year course of the scuola media, the first three years were offered to 222 in Rome and 51 in Turin. Elementary-school attendance was 645 in Rome, 364 in Milan, and 90 in Turin. There were elementary schools also in Florence, Genoa, Leghorn, and Trieste. Venice had only a single nursery school, while Ancona and Ferrara had no Jewish schools at all.

The Collegio Rabbinico Italiano in Rome had thirteen students in intermediate courses and six in the advanced group, hardly an adequate number to fill the vacancies gradually appearing in the rabbinate. Chief Rabbi Elio Toaff, speaking at a two-day conference on educational problems convened by the Union of Italian Jewish Communities in June, proposed that the scope of this college be enlarged to serve as an institute not only for rabbinical students, but for all Jews who wish to engage in advanced Jewish studies. At
this conference, attended by rabbis, educators, and communal representatives, Jewish communities throughout the country were urged to provide adequate means of support for Jewish education by the time education subsidies from CJMCAG were terminated, next year.

The five ORT vocational schools, the Associazione delle Donne Ebrehe Italiane (ADEI—Association of Italian Jewish Women), WIZO, and the various Jewish cultural groups directed by young people (Centri Giovanili Ebraici, Bené Akiba, Movimento Torah we-Israel), offered valuable training to 3,300 Jewish students throughout the country.

Publications

Fifteen Jewish newspapers and magazines were published in Italy, each of the larger communities having its own information bulletin. Approximately 7,000 Jewish families received an average of four or more periodicals regularly and were therefore fully informed of events affecting the Jews in Italy, Israel, and elsewhere.

The publication of books of Jewish interest also was vigorous. The Unione delle Comunità continued to furnish material for teachers and textbooks for children. Of special importance were the recently published first two volumes of Storia di Israele (“History of Israel”), compiled by Elia S. Artom, and a new translation, with additions, of the Storia degli Ebrei (“A History of the Jews”) by Solomon Grayzel. To the Italian reader this new presentation of the well-known Grayzel history was especially attractive because it contained additional detailed information on Italian Jewry. The response to Attilio Milano’s new book Il Ghetto di Roma—Illustrazioni storiche (“The Ghetto of Rome—Historical Insights”), published by Staderini of Rome, showed the reawakened interest of both Jews and non-Jews in the history of Italian Jewry, long neglected by both Christian and Jewish scholars. The second volume of the Bibliotheca Historica Italo-Judaica (“Italo-Jewish Historic Bibliography”) by the same author, published by Sansoni of Florence, offered a guide to new historical research projects. A brief but penetrating study by Gemma Volli, I “Procesi tridentini” ed il culto del beato Simone da Trento (“The ‘Trials of Trent’ and the Cult of the Blessed Simon of Trent”), originally appeared in the literary and political periodical Il Ponte, Florence. As a result of this article, the ecclesiastical authorities reexamined a blood libel dating back to 1475 and forbade the faithful to enter a chapel in the church of San Pietro at Trent commemorating the alleged martyrdom of the boy Simon Unverdorben.

Non-Jewish publishing houses, too, continued to feed Italian interest in Jewish affairs. After having found a good market for books on Jewish subjects by Italian and foreign Jewish writers of international reputation, they turned to Israeli literature. Racconti di Gerusalemme (“Stories of Jerusalem”) by the eminent writer Samuel Joseph Agnon, published by Mondadori, met with resounding success. The volumes of Racconti d’Israele (“Stories of Israel”), published by Dall’ Oglio, and Mordecai Bernstein’s dramas published by Il Saggiatore, were also well received.
Attitude Toward Jews

The attitude of the state toward its Jewish citizens was in general correct and friendly. This year was marked by the absence of such occasional misunderstandings as had occurred in recent years, perhaps partly because the Socialists were now represented in the government together with the Christian Democrats. Nevertheless it appeared that a bill to punish public offenses against all religions equally with offenses against the Catholic religion would remain blocked in the Chamber of Deputies.

Three Jews were appointed to serve on the national planning committee for commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Resistance: Judge Sergio Piperno, president of the Unione delle Comunità Israelitiche, and the Communist leaders Senator Umberto Terracini and Deputy Emilio Sereni. One of the major events of this anniversary was the observance in Rome of October 25 as a day memorializing the deportation of Italy's Jews. On this occasion a gold medal "for civic merit" was presented to the Unione delle Comunità, as the representative of Italian Jewry. This was the first time such an honor had been accorded to a public institution. A commemorative plaque was also placed in the ghetto of Rome, on the very building from which the Nazi roundups began on October 16, 1943.

As a result of an agreement reached in June 1961 between Italy and the Federal Republic of Germany, the Bonn government paid 6.5 billion Italian lire (about $10 million) to the Italian government, to be divided among former deportees and the survivors of those who died in concentration camps, whether Jews or Christians. Upon publication of the conditions for the distribution of the money in the Gazzetta Ufficiale of January 21, 1964, about 15,000 Jews submitted claims.

Zionism and Relations with Israel

On the whole, there was no dissension in matters of principle within the organized Italian Jewish community. Its members were moderately observant of religious practices and compactly mobilized in support of Israel. The direction of the community, which had been in the same hands for many years, was being transferred, without opposition, to younger men whose leadership potential had matured in the last ten or fifteen years. The Federazione Giovanile Ebraica d'Italia (FGEI, Italian Federation of Jewish Youth), with a large following among young Jews, was the training ground for the new leaders. The Federazione Sionistica Italiana (Italian Zionist Federation), under the presidency of Giovanna Luzzatto and later of Maria Mayer; the Associazione delle Donne Ebrene d'Italia, and WIZO, all energetically cultivated relations between Italy's Jews and Israel.

The relative proximity of Italy and Israel and the many transportation facilities resulted in a flow of tourists and students between the two countries. But emigration to Israel was very small.

In Israel the Bet WIZO-Italia, providing after-school recreation for hundreds of children from the poorer sections of Jaffa, was largely financed by
WIZO and ADEI. The Conegliano synagogue in Jerusalem, with services conducted according to the Italian rite and a museum of precious, traditional Jewish art objects, were visited by many Italian and other tourists. Arks with sacred furnishings, formerly belonging to Italian synagogues no longer in use, continued to be transferred to various synagogues in Israel under the direction of Umberto Nahon.

Trade relations between Italy and Israel were not extensive, since Italy was unwilling to offend the Arabs by significant commitments toward Israel. But Italy's participation in the International Fair at Tel-Aviv, which opened in June 1964, seemed to portend an increase in such trade in the future. Only the United States Pavilion was more impressive than the Italian, which was visited by large number of Israelis and foreigners.

**Personalia**

A number of prominent Jews passed away during the period under review: Gino Luzzatto of Venice, 87, a foremost authority on the economic history of Italy who had been for some decades professor, and twice rector, at the Ca' Foscari University in Venice and president of ORT-Italia and vice-president of the Associazione Italia-Israele; Paolo d'Ancona, of Milan, for many years professor of the history of art at the university, an expert on Italian miniatures and pre-Renaissance sculpture and paintings, and Leone Leoni, formerly chief rabbi of Ferrara and Venice. Leone Carpi, lawyer, member of a noted family of Italian patriots and a Zionist Revisionist leader for thirty years, died in Jerusalem, where he had been living in his latter years.

The death of Professor Vincenzo Arangio Ruiz, not a Jew, was a great loss to the Jewish and non-Jewish communities. A jurist of fine reputation, he had been president of the Associazione Italia-Israele since its inception.

**Attilio Milano**

**Greece**

The general election in November 1963 ended eleven years of rightist rule which had begun with the victory of Marshal Alexander Papagos at the polls in November 1952. The National Radical Union, headed by Papagos's successor Constantine Karamanlis, was defeated by the Center Union of the 75-year old George Papandreou. The latter did not have an absolute majority, however, and was unwilling to make any concessions to the Communist-backed Union of the Democratic Left in order to secure the support of its deputies. As a result, new elections were held in February 1964 in which the Center Union secured 174 of the 300 seats in parliament. Among the measures introduced by the Papandreou government during its first year
in office were free education at all levels, from elementary school through university, and an increase in the legal minimum wage. It also amnestied most of the country's remaining political prisoners, whose number had already been reduced from over 50,000 in 1950 to less than 1,000.

The continuing Cyprus crisis did not permit the government to concentrate on domestic problems. In general, Premier Papandreou sought to dissuade the Cyprus government from taking measures likely to provoke Turkish counter-action. The Greek government's relations with President Makarios of Cyprus were at times severely strained, both because of his penchant for rejecting its advice and because of a suspicion that Makarios was no longer interested in Enosis—union with Greece—but wished to retain Cyprus as an independent state under Greek Cypriot rule. Greece was also uneasy about Makarios's importation of Soviet weapons. Yet, Papandreou rejected Turkish proposals that the Greek and Turkish governments undertake direct negotiations on the Cyprus issue. He held that such negotiations, if they failed, could produce a serious crisis in the relations between the two countries, and therefore urged that negotiations be conducted, through the United Nations mediator, only by representatives of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots. There was, however, no contact between the leaders of the two communities on Cyprus.

Turkey sought to bring pressure on Greece through action against Greek citizens living in Turkey. By the end of 1964 it was estimated that more than half of the 12,000 members of this group had been expelled on one pretext or another. No action had been taken against the much larger group of Turkish citizens of Greek descent, mostly in Istanbul, who were protected by the Turkish constitution and the Treaty of Lausanne, but they lived in constant fear as long as the Cyprus question remained unsettled. The Turkish government also imposed restrictions on various activities of the Greek Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarchate, situated in Istanbul, and expelled some of its priests.

The Cyprus question also adversely affected Greece's relations with her Western allies and limited her participation in NATO. On several occasions Greek forces did not participate in NATO maneuvers to avoid cooperation with Turkish units. There were also occasional demonstrations against United States offices in Athens because of supposed American partiality for the Turks. After the withdrawal of United States missiles from Turkey, Russia shifted from a pro-Greek position on Cyprus to one closer to Turkey.*

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

The Greek population of approximately 8,500,000 included only about 6,500 Jews; before the war the Jews had constituted approximately one per cent of the population. In the past several years the size of the Jewish population had not changed significantly. Emigration was almost nonexistent; Israel exerted

---

* This section reviewing general political developments was prepared in the office of the American Jewish Year Book.
little attraction for the time being, and the doors of the United States were practically closed since the expiration of the special legislation on behalf of displaced persons on June 30, 1952.

The Jewish population, blended into its environment, was scattered among 18 communities, varying greatly in size and distributed throughout the country. (The largest were Athens with 2,800 Jews, Salonika with 1,000, and Larissa with 450.) The consequent crumbling of communities with small Jewish populations formed an obstacle against which efforts to reconstitute a Jewish life broke down. In recent years the members of the Jewish community succeeded in regaining their former positions in all fields of current activity. One would search in vain for signs of the ruin which had resulted from the Second World War and the Nazi occupation. But the remarkable economic recovery of the Jews was not accompanied by any comparable revival in education and religious activity. Nevertheless, even the modest degree of success attained in these areas represented a triumph over obstacles.

**Finances**

The community was faced with a financial problem as a result of the prospective cessation, at the end of 1964, of allotments from the CJMCAG, which was terminating its work. It hoped to meet this problem by making the communities self-supporting through investments, the income from which would permit them to balance their budgets while making proper provision for their various programs, especially in education and social welfare. The capital invested in this manner would become the property of the communities, which would pledge themselves not to alienate it. It would come from such community-owned sources as funds held by OPAIE (Organization for the Assistance and Rehabilitation of Greek Jews) and the properties of defunct communities. Unfortunately, this proposal was only under study at a time when it would have been desirable to have it in full operation. It was hoped that the necessary investment capital could be mobilized in time, and that the project would serve as a point of departure for autonomous communities anxious to do more and better work. At the same time, there was some fear that autonomous communities would not be anxious to seek the advice of the central council when it was no longer distributing the allotments from abroad which they had hitherto received through it. Besides its important role as the representative of Greek Jews (AJYB, 1960 [Vol. 61], p. 218), the Central Council of Jewish Communities had increasingly advised and coordinated the communities in their activities.

The economic rehabilitation of the communities was only one aspect of the problem. The Council was also faced with the task of finding local contributions to replace the funds previously received from CJMCAG, so as not to reduce its activities. At its convention in July, the Council appealed to all communities to practice “austerity” until such funds were found—a prospect that was not too favorable at the time of writing.
Education

Two newly established Jewish schools in Larissa and Athens had 50 and 150 students respectively. The first was a state school for Jewish children, and the second a communal school. Both schools were under non-Jewish direction because of the lack of a Jewish candidate with the requisite qualifications for the directorship.

Elsewhere, local initiative made up for the absence of regular classes, which could not be organized because of the lack of teachers and sufficient students. In one place a traveling teacher would make regular visits to neighboring communities; in another, volunteer teachers would bring the youth together and spread the good word. Elsewhere, as in Salonika, teachers chosen and appointed by the community provided students in some private schools with a Jewish education during periods when their fellow students were taking a course in religion. Jewish studies received the same accreditation as the course in religion. It was estimated that two of every three Jewish children between the ages of seven and twelve received from one to six hours of Jewish instruction a week. Effective vehicles of Jewish education, which had the advantage of combining the useful with the pleasant and which reached a large number of children and adults, were the excellent translations of textbooks used in the United States, such as *Jewish Heroes* published by United Synagogue, and *Outline of Jewish Knowledge*, published by the Bureau of Jewish Education (now Jewish Education Committee). Aside from these translations, no current Jewish literature was available in Greek.

Religious Activities

In general, it became easier to meet the religious needs of the community. Some synagogues were restored, places of prayer were organized, young rabbis trained in foreign seminaries returned to take up their duties, and others were preparing to follow them. To the extent that the communities were willing and able to undertake the necessary sacrifices for using their service, these young rabbis could be expected to bring a great stimulus to religious life and to expand Jewish education and improve its quality.

Intergroup Relations

The small Jewish population did not constitute a problem for anyone, living in harmony with the rest of the population. This was indicated by the relatively high percentage of mixed marriages; among the Jewish population of Athens, these accounted for 26 out of 92 marriages in the four years under review. Since these marriages were usually accompanied by the conversion of the non-Jewish spouse, they attracted less attention and caused less disquiet than they formerly had. The percentage of such marriages elsewhere in Greece was very low.

There was no organized antisemitism and the Jews were not subject to discrimination. The wave of swastikas which reached the country at the beginning of 1960 was arrested in mid-1963. They were to be seen until then,
though at fairly long intervals, illuminated by flaming torches or accompanied by threatening letters. These were directed to certain Jews, who were ordered to leave the country on pain of death: to theater directors who had produced pro-Jewish plays such as *Dreyfus, Anne Frank*, and Bertholt Brecht's *Irresistible Rise of Arturo Ui*, or had welcomed Jewish groups; and to Greek artists who had been acclaimed in triumphal tours of Israel. Here and there, persons caught in the act of daubing swastikas were arrested, tried, and released. But there was no indication that these incidents involved any clandestine organization, or were anything except the acts of individual crackpots. The reaction to them was always genuine and spontaneous; the press demanded the discovery and exemplary punishment of the culprits, and the ministry of justice directed the prosecutors to apply the law with full rigor.

The primate of Greece, speaking for the Orthodox church, delivered a withering condemnation of antisemitism at a special news conference called in April, 1960 for that purpose. Recalling the Jewish roots of Christianity, he declared that hate was incompatible with the Christian spirit and that antisemitism wherever it showed itself was always an anti-Christian act.

These declarations followed shortly the suggestions made by Amilcas Alevizatos, a professor at the school of theology of the University of Athens, and taken up in the newspaper *Vima* (January-February, 1960) by the well-known philo-Semitic journalist Pavlos Paleologos, that all passages "offensive to the dignity of the Jewish people" be removed from the Good Friday liturgy. This question came under the jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarchate.

**Indemnification and Restitutions**

The problem of heirless property still remained unsolved. OPAIE, an organization established by a decree of March 1949 to receive these properties, (*AJYB*, 1960 [Vol. 61], p. 218) had not been able to claim them because of its inability to furnish the required proof of the death of the victims who had perished in concentration camps. Such proof could not be gotten without the aid of a special law, which had not yet been passed and which neither the Jews nor the government seemed to be pressing for. Although it was occasionally possible to establish the fact of death by the testimony of witnesses, this was insufficient for any large-scale recovery of heirless property. OPAIE was therefore mainly confined to administering heirless properties, the income from which augmented the welfare funds of the central council. As a result of a considerable increase in the last few years, these properties were now estimated at a value of about $600,000.

Another problem was that of properties abandoned on Rhodes by owners who were formerly Italian residents and now lived in other countries, and who had showed little interest in claiming their rights, which were in imminent danger of being abrogated. An effort was made to draw up a list of these abandoned properties and their owners living in Africa, the United States, and Latin America, in order to request them to cede their claim for the benefit
of the Jewish philanthropies administered by the central council. After a promising start, this effort failed to produce any result.

Another type of claim, also in danger of lapsing, existed under German law for property seized in Greece and transported to Germany. Indemnification for such property depended on proof of its transport to Germany, and many such claims had remained unsatisfied for years because it was impossible to furnish the necessary proof.

In March 1960 an agreement was signed in Bonn, setting DM 115,000,000 ($3,830,000) as the indemnification to be paid by the Federal Republic of Germany to persons in Greece who had suffered under the Nazis for reasons of race, religion, or opposition to Nazi ideology. The agreement was ratified in August 1961. At the same time a law was promulgated defining the categories entitled to indemnification and fixing the payments for each category. The original proposal was modified to give greater consideration to basic Jewish claims, with the warm support of the spokesmen for the parliamentary majority (Dimitrios Vranopoulos) and the minority (Ioannis Toumbas). These modifications removed provisions which would have confined payments to heirs of the first degree, most of whom had died in concentration camps along with their relatives, and excluded the more numerous heirs of the second degree, as well as those who were Greek nationals at the time of the persecutions but had subsequently emigrated and had thereby forfeited their citizenship and right to indemnification.

The amounts of indemnification were fixed at 30,000 drachmas ($1,000), payable to heirs, for loss of life; 25,000 drachmas ($833) for 60 per cent disability and proportionately smaller sums for lesser degrees, and 1,000 drachmas ($33) for each month of deprivation of liberty and deportation. It was estimated that of some 62,000 claims for indemnification, about 7,200 were Jewish; approximately 6,000 of these were from persons living abroad. The average Jewish claim was believed to be higher than others, since in many cases Jewish claims combined personal claims with claims as heirs. The DM 115,000,000 paid by Germany turned out to be inadequate to meet all the claims recognized as legitimate; as a result the claimants received only 55 per cent of the amount provided under the law.

Relations with Israel

Although Greece still did not recognize Israel de jure, relations between the two countries were friendly, and were becoming closer. There was a growing exchange of visitors, drawn from the political, cultural, commercial, and journalistic spheres, between the two countries. Particularly worthy of mention were the visits of Deputy Prime Minister Abba Eban and archaeologist Yigael Yadin to Athens to deliver well-attended and enthusiastically received lectures at the School of Political Science and the Archaeological Society. Minister of Public Works Angelos Angeloussis' visit to Israel in October 1964, was the first by a Greek cabinet minister during his term of office. Such officials as the governor and vice-governor of the Agricultural Bank also visited
Israel. The visits, usually followed by speeches, press reports, or articles, helped to inform the Greek public of Israel's achievements.

Artistic exchanges included a week of Greek movies in Tel Aviv, a Greek theatrical tour, an exhibit of Greek painting in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and Haifa, and a similar Israeli exhibit in Athens. Serious efforts were under way to develop tourism in both directions; the regular air and sea services between the two countries were supplemented by the inauguration of a ferry service. Groups of students enjoyed Israel's hospitality on scholarships while studying in such fields as agriculture, construction, and poultry-raising.

Trade between the two countries continued to increase, and Greece improved her balance in the exchange. Greek exports to Israel rose from $2.9 million in 1962 to $4.45 million in 1963; in the same period imports from Israel increased from $3.6 million to $4.6 million. In 1964, for the twelfth successive year, Israel participated in the Salonika international fair, although Greece had never been represented at the biennial international commercial exposition of the Middle East in Tel Aviv.

Relations Between Israel and Cyprus

Israel's relations with Cyprus were in many respects similar to her relations with Greece. There were the same exchanges of visits and study missions, and Israeli goodwill visits to share the fruits of Israel's experience in agriculture, trade, unionism, hotel management, and the like. Before the Cyprus crisis, Israel furnished about 85 per cent of the tourists visiting that country. The two countries had exchanged ambassadors since 1961. Although contacts with Cyprus were restricted by the crisis on the island, relations did not seem to be affected by the efforts of Cyprus to strengthen its ties with the non-aligned states in order to win support for its cause. President Makarios remained faithful to his pledge to maintain friendly relations with all countries, especially the neighboring ones.

Victor Semah

West Germany

FOREIGN POLICY AND STATUS OF BERLIN

Expectations that Chancellor Ludwig Erhard would be less committed to close relations with France than Konrad Adenauer had been, and more inclined to adjust German policies to those of the United States and Britain, were not entirely borne out by events.

In reporting on his first five months in office to the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) congress in Hanover (August 15 to 17), Chancellor Erhard asserted that the main purposes of his foreign policy were the strengthening
of NATO and reconciliation with France. Negotiations with the United States on a Multilateral Nuclear Force (MLF), however, created opposition among Germany's NATO partners and strained the ties with France, which the Franco-German friendship treaty of 1963 had intended to promote. There was also increased dissension in the European Economic Community, concerned largely with Franco-German differences over a common grain price for the EEC.

German foreign-policy initiative was hampered by several factors: the campaign of Konrad Adenauer's "Gaullist" faction of CDU against Foreign Minister Gerhard Schröder's willingness to seek new solutions for outstanding problems, the impending Federal elections of 1965, and the opposition of powerful groups of refugees and farmers to any changes in the status quo.

In 1964 Chancellor Erhard and Foreign Minister Schröder had conversations with British, Italian, French, and American leaders, including Presidents Charles de Gaulle and Lyndon B. Johnson. There were no major announcements about any of these conversations, although a conference between Henry Cabot Lodge, former United States ambassador to South Vietnam, and Chancellor Erhard, on August 26, did result in an announcement that Lodge had received a promise of German economic aid for the American effort in Southeast Asia. An October conference between Prime Minister V. G. M. Marijnen and Foreign Minister Joseph M. Luns of the Netherlands and Chancellor Erhard resulted in an agreement to proceed with further plans to unify Europe, while leaving the door open for England's participation.

In a speech in New York on June 11, Erhard declared that the Munich agreement of 1938 was dead and that the Federal Republic had no territorial claims against Czechoslovakia. This assurance was given to counteract Transportation Minister Hans Christoph Seebohm's repeated public statements laying claim to the Sudetenland, seized by Hitler Germany in 1938 (p. 413).

There were several developments concerning relations with the Soviet Union and with the (East) German Democratic Republic (DDR).

In response to the friendship treaty between Moscow and East Germany signed on June 12, Washington, Paris, and London issued a statement stressing that Berlin's close ties to the Federal Republic were "essential for the viability of Berlin . . . and will be maintained. . . ." The three Western powers also asserted, for the first time, the right of the Federal government to represent Berlin to third powers.

On September 1 the acting premier of East Germany, Willi Stoph, said that former Chancellor Adenauer had employed authorized representatives of the Federal Republic in 1962 to make contact and propose negotiations for a political détente. This claim was denied by Adenauer, who said that Stoph exaggerated the importance of some technical talks in 1962.

On September 2 Soviet Prime Minister Nikita S. Khrushchev announced his intention to visit Bonn early in 1965, but his successors failed to indicate whether they would make such a visit in his stead.

A German expert in detecting wiretaps, Horst Schwirkmann, who had been checking the German embassy in Moscow, was poisoned on September 9 in
Sagorsk (USSR). He was treated at a West German hospital, and Bonn addressed a sharp note of protest to Moscow, demanding punishment of those responsible. The Soviet government expressed its regrets about the incident.

An agreement which had permitted West Berliners to visit relatives in the East during the 1963–64 Christmas season led to nine months of negotiations for a new and broader agreement. On September 9 the East Berlin government announced that after November 2 old-age pensioners could visit relatives in West Germany for up to four weeks. West Berlin Senatsrat Horst Korber and DDR Undersecretary of State Erich Wendt signed a one-year agreement allowing West Berliners to visit relatives in East Berlin at the end of October and on Christmas, New Year, Easter, and the Whitsuntide holidays of 1965. The agreement worked without friction, and 57,000 West Berliners visited East Berlin in the fall of 1964.

Early in October, 57 residents of the Soviet Zone succeeded in escaping to West Berlin through an underground passage, in the largest mass escape since the construction of the Berlin Wall. When an East German army officer discovered the passage, he was shot by West Berlin accomplices of the escapees. A West Berlin court convicted them of murder.

On November 22 the German public honored the memory of John F. Kennedy on the first anniversary of his assassination. Memorial addresses were delivered by Chancellor Erhard and by Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt. An exhibition of Kennedy mementos was opened by Mrs. Edward Kennedy at Frankfurt, and the German postal authorities issued a special stamp bearing the late president’s picture.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

President Heinrich Lubke was reelected for a five-year term on July 1 by 710, of 1,024 Bundestag votes. The Social Democratic party (SPD) was sharply criticized for not having offered a candidate to oppose him. On February 16 Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt was elected president of SPD by 320 of 334 votes and named as the party’s candidate for chancellor in the 1965 Bundestag election. Konrad Adenauer was elected head of CDU by that party’s congress on August 17.

The Social Democratic party made major gains in communal elections in Lower Saxony, Hesse, North Rhine-Westphalia, Rhineland-Palatinate, and the Saarland. Public-opinion surveys in November showed that nationally the party was about seven per cent more popular than the CDU-CSU which had been the strongest party for 15 years and, together with the small FDP, had formed the government.

In June former Admiral Hellmuth Heye, the deputy for armed-forces affairs (designated by the Bundestag to watch over the activities of the military), published a series of articles in the weekly Quick, sharply criticizing the treatment of soldiers by officers of the Bundeswehr. These articles aroused heated public debate. On June 22 Chancellor Erhard, Bundestag President Eugen Gerstenmaier, and spokesmen of all political parties expressed their confi-
dence in the overwhelming majority of Bundeswehr personnel, but the gov-
ernment promised to examine carefully Heye's report and to bring about such
changes as might be justified by his charges. On November 3, after a long ill-
ness, Heye resigned his position and was succeeded by Matthias Hoogen
(CDU) on December 11.

A series of fatal attacks on taxi drivers provoked demands for reintroduc-
tion of the death penalty, abolished by the Federal constitution. Adenauer
and other CDU members and FDP member Siegfried Zoglmann spoke in fa-
vor of the death penalty for certain crimes, while Chancellor Erhard, Minister
of Justice Ewald Bucher, and SPD Deputy Carlo Schmid opposed it. Although
public-opinion polls ran strongly in favor of the suggested constitutional
change, there was no prospect of its being accomplished in parliament.

The death of Heinrich von Brentano on November 14, at the age of 60,
was mourned by all political parties and the public. He was the first foreign
minister of the Federal Republic (1956 to 1961) and a loyal supporter of
Konrad Adenauer's European policy.

**ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

On March 6 a commercial agreement with Bulgaria was added to those in
effect with Rumania, Hungary, and Poland. The three-year agreement pro-
vided for an exchange of goods worth 460 million marks.

On July 16 German-Yugoslav economic negotiations were successfully con-
cluded in Bonn. The Federal Republic agreed to treat Yugoslavia as a General
Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) member, and the Yugoslavs con-
spired to postpone negotiations on their reparation claims against West
Germany.

The Federal budget for 1964 was DM 60.3 billion, six per cent higher than
that for 1963. It passed the Bundestag on April 16 after a two-day debate and
over the opposition of SPD. A DM 63.9-million budget for 1965 was adopted
in October.

At the end of 1963, 29.5 million people were employed in West Germany
(excluding Berlin). These included more than a million foreign workers,
mainly from Italy, Spain, Greece, and Turkey. There were 146,000 unem-
ployed, but 614,530 jobs were unfilled. In the fall of 1964 the number of
unemployed was 102,000, and 680,000 jobs were unfilled.

On May 13 the Federal cabinet decided to introduce anti-inflationary meas-
ures, and tariffs were lowered to facilitate imports. On July 1 tariffs on im-
ports from EEC countries were reduced by 50 per cent. At the same time, the
Federal government urged the Common Market to reduce tariffs by 25 per
cent on trade with third countries.

Grand Duchess Charlotte of Luxembourg, President Lübke, and President
de Gaulle opened the new major waterway linking the Rhine with the indus-
trial area of Lorraine. Two-thirds of the cost of the project, DM 800 million
($200 million), was borne by France and one-third by the Federal Republic.
FORMER NAZIS

In January Hans Krüger, appointed minister for refugees in October 1963, was suspended pending verification of charges against him by the East German regime, in December 1963, that he had participated in the formulation of death sentences against Polish citizens while serving as judge of a special court in Konitz. Krüger denied this at first, but photostatic documents confirming his appointment as assistant judge of the special court were produced later. He resigned from the cabinet early in 1964.

The Bavarian minister of cultural affairs and education, Professor Theodor Maunz, who had long been under attack because of his statements as an expert on constitutional law during the Nazi regime, resigned in July.

WAR CRIMES AND NAZI CRIMES

The Central Office for the Investigation of Nazi Crimes at Stuttgart-Ludwigsburg, established in 1959 to coordinate and accelerate procedures, announced in September that it had investigated or initiated legal action in a total of 688 cases. In 1964 only 19 proceedings required further investigation, while of the closed cases, 508 had been handed over to prosecuting authorities and 59 had been joined to pending trials.

Minister of Justice Ewald Bucher reported to parliament early in the fall of 1964 that by January 1 of that year, German courts had sentenced 5,445 persons in addition to about 5,000 prosecuted by Allied courts. About 800 cases were still pending.

Robert M. Kempner, who had been an assistant prosecutor at the Nuremberg trials and was now a lawyer and author in Frankfurt, estimated that there were several thousand Nazi criminals for whom no search had as yet been instituted at all or who had not been apprehended. As an example, he noted that the murder of 4,000 Catholic priests in the Dachau concentration camp had not yet been investigated.

Under existing German law, the statute of limitations was to end the possibility of opening new cases against Nazi criminals on May 8, 1965, the 20th anniversary of the end of World War II. There was heated discussion of the question of extending this time limit. Proponents of an extension held that mass murderers should not be protected by law, while opponents argued that to extend the statute would be to introduce an unconstitutional \textit{ex post facto} law. As a compromise measure, some experts, like Kempner, suggested that the statute of limitations should be considered as running not from May 1965, but rather from the birth of the Federal Republic in 1948 or the ending of the occupation status in 1955, when West Germany gained real sovereignty.

Even among cabinet members, there was no unity on this question. Interior Minister Hermann Höcherl suggested at the end of September that the statute
of limitations be extended by five years. Justice Minister Bucher soon there-
after declared that constitutional objections were decisive, and the Federal
cabinet finally adopted that view. Public protest within and outside of Ger-
many was heavy. Israeli Prime Minister Eshkol repeatedly demanded further
trials in addresses to the Keneset and in a letter to the Federal chancellor.
Erhard's reply was not made public. On November 18 the Zentralrat der
Juden in Deutschland proposed that a suggested extension of the statute of
limitations from 20 to 30 years be put in force without delay.

On November 20 the Federal government published an appeal to all gov-
ernments, organizations, and individuals within the country and abroad to
aid in the unearthing of Nazi crimes and those who committed them.

On December 9 the Bundestag requested that the government intensify
efforts for the prosecution of Nazi murderers and report before March 1,
1965, whether indictments had been initiated in all known cases. If it could
be established that they had been, it was hoped, no new legislative steps would
be required. All parties voted for the resolution except FDP, which voiced
misgivings of "a legal-political nature," thus supporting Justice Minister
Bucher.

The most important Nazi crimes trial of 1964, and the largest German post-
war trial, was the Auschwitz trial which opened before the Frankfurt assize
court (Schwurgericht) on December 20, 1963. It was not expected to end be-
fore the second half of February 1965.

Sixty per cent of the persons interviewed in a public-opinion poll conducted
in August by the Divo Institute indicated that they had taken notice of the
Auschwitz trial; 95 per cent had taken notice of the Eichmann case. Only
50 per cent of all persons interviewed were able to state precisely the purpose
of the trial: the punishment of the perpetrators of the crimes committed in
the Auschwitz (Oświęcim) concentration camp. While 53 per cent considered
it proper to continue holding such trials, 39 per cent were opposed because
"one should not stir up these things after so many years." The strongest aver-
sion from the Auschwitz trial and similar proceedings was evinced by persons
between the ages of 35 and 45 (45 per cent of whom were against the trial).
Younger and older people were somewhat more favorably disposed to the
trials. The higher the degree of education, the more pronounced was approval
of the trials.

A later public-opinion survey conducted by the Wichert Institute of Tue-
bingen, in mid-October, revealed that 63 per cent of men and 76 per cent
women were against the continuation of trials. Again, elderly people were
more strongly opposed to further proceedings than young people.

The original indictment was directed against 23 men, for murder and
assisting in murder in a multitude of instances between 1942 and 1944. Be-
fore the opening of the court sessions the last Auschwitz commandant, former
SS Sturmbannführer Richard Baer, died at the age of 52. Heinrich Bischoff
(60) died during the trial, and the cases of Hans Nierzwicki (59) and Gerhard
Neubert (55) were severed from the main proceedings because of illness. The
trial continued against 19 former SS Führer and Unterführer, who now
ranged in age between 42 and 69 years. Among them were Robert Mulka (69), Karl Höcker (53), Wilhelm Boger (58), Hans Stark (43), Johann Schobert (42), and Franz Hofmann (58). Hofmann was already serving a life sentence for murder committed in the Dachau concentration camp. They included one academically trained engineer, three physicians, a pharmacist, two civil servants, and one man trained in the law. Fourteen of the accused were still under investigative arrest. On December 12 the court visited the Auschwitz site, but all but one of the defendants refused to participate in that trip.

A large exposition on the Auschwitz camp horrors, which opened in Frankfurt in November, provoked protests by the defense counsel, and pictures of the defendants were removed.

The Frankfurt assize court also had before it, starting on April 27, the trial of two close collaborators of Adolf Eichmann, former SS officials Hermann Krumey (59) and Otto Hunsche (53). The prosecution charged them with the deportation to Auschwitz, between March 19 and July 9, 1944, of about 438,000 Hungarian Jews, approximately 300,000 of whom were killed immediately. They were also accused of robbing Jews of money and objects of great value.

In April the Kiel court sentenced former SS Obersturmbannführer Hans Graalfs (49) to the minimum penalty of three years of penal servitude for having assisted in the murder of 760 Jews in Russia.

In the same month, after ten weeks of deliberation, the Braunschweig court sentenced former SS officials for assisting in the murder of 5,200 Jews in one instance, 1,700 in another, 200 in a third, and two in still another in Pinsk in August 1941. Franz Magill (63) and Kurt Wegener (55) received sentences of five years, Walter Dunsch (59) four years and four months, Hans Walter Zech-Nenntwich (47) four years. Zech-Nenntwich was freed by one of the jail guards and escaped to Egypt, but returned from there and surrendered to the legal authorities of Lower Saxony. One defendant was not convicted for lack of evidence.

On May 12 the Cologne court sentenced ex-SS Hauptsturmführer Werner Schönemann (52) to six years of penal servitude for aiding in the killing of 2,170 Jews in White Russia.

On June 30 the court of Aurich sentenced Karl Struwe (61) and the Borkum physician Werner Scheu (53) to nine and ten years respectively for aiding in the murder of 220 Jews in Lithuania. Three other defendants were found not guilty.

On October 29, after proceedings of many months' duration, the Hanover court sentenced Anton Müller (55) to five years, Adolf Schaub (51) to two years and three months, Luitpold Fuhrmann (66) to two years, and Josef Schmidt (65) to two years and six months for murder or aiding in the killing of 7,600 Jews in Sobibor. One accused, Herbert Schoenborn, committed suicide while under investigative arrest. The proceedings against the major defendant, Richard Nitschke (66), for whom the state attorney had demanded a life sentence, were interrupted because of his ill health. During the trial, de-
fense counsel Gerd Heinecke of Hanover asserted that, as a dictator, Hitler was above the law and that, although he ordered the killing of people, he was not motivated by evil or base tendencies. Although his deeds were terrible and the deaths of the victims horrible, Heinecke said, officials and soldiers who carried out those orders, “thus doing only their duty,” should not be punished. These opinions were widely condemned by legal authorities and public opinion.

The trial of ex-SS Obersturmbannführer and General of the Army Karl Wolff (64) opened on July 13 and ended on September 30 at Munich. Wolff had been chief of Heinrich Himmler’s personal staff. He was found guilty of having assisted in the deportation and killing of at least 300,000 Jews who were transported from Warsaw to Treblinka, and was sentenced to 15 years. Wolff, who in the last phase of the war conducted the negotiations for surrendering the German forces in Italy to the Allies, had for years successfully concealed his collaboration in Nazi crimes. He was the highest surviving official of the SS and Himmler’s staff.

In Düsseldorf the trial of 11 men involved in crimes committed at Treblinka between July 1942 and October 1943 opened on October 12. The main defendant was the former SS official Kurt Hubert Franz, charged with complicity in the murder of 700,000.

On October 15 the Cologne court opened the trial of 10 former SS and concentration camp officials charged with shooting more than 10,000 Soviet prisoners of war at the Oranienburg camp in 1941 and 1942.

The trial of Ewald Peters (49), a department head in the security branch of the Federal criminal investigation office, was upset by his suicide in jail on February 3. Arrested late in January, after having accompanied Chancellor Erhard to Rome as a bodyguard, Peters had been charged with having played a part in the mass execution of Jews in Southern Russia in 1942 and 1943.

The so-called euthanasia trial opened at Limburg on July 14 and was ended prematurely in the middle of September. Two main defendants had committed suicide while being investigated: Professor Werner Friedrich Heyde (who used the alias of Sawade) and his colleague Friedrich Tillmann. A third defendant, Bernhard Bohne, had escaped to South America in the summer of 1963. The only remaining defendant, Hans Hefelmann, was charged with having had a decisive part in the killing of 70,000 adults and 3,000 children who were mentally or physically handicapped. The proceedings were suspended on September 13, after a court medical officer established Hefelmann’s physical inability to stand trial.

**INDEMNIFICATION AND RESTITUTION**

The Novelle (concluding amendments) to the restitution legislation (Rückersstattungsgesetz) of the Federal Republic was adopted by the Bundestag in June 1964. One essential improvement provided for the payment in full of claims which previously could be satisfied only 50 per cent. The sum of DM 1.5 billion ($375 million) was reserved as an upper limit. The possibilities for
full satisfaction of claims under the revised restitution law put restitution claimants in a much better position than that which obtained for persons making claims under the indemnification law. Indemnification claimants could receive no more than DM 75,000 (a little less than $20,000) at the time of writing. Claims up to DM 80,000 ($20,000) were to be satisfied in 1964, up to DM 240,000 ($60,000) in 1965, and all others after January 1, 1966. Interest was to be paid from January 1, 1968. A fund of DM 800 million (previously DM 400 million) was set aside for claimants who filed late or whose property was confiscated by the Nazis abroad. Claimants whose rights were damaged in the Eastern part of Berlin were to be covered by the new law, as were all who resided in areas specified by the *Novelle* at any time between January 30, 1933, and December 31, 1961. The Novelle was approved by the appropriate parliamentary committee on April 22 and by both houses of parliament in June; early in October the president signed it into law. Final legislation on indemnification was not yet formulated.

In anticipation of the changes in Federal law the State of North Rhine-Westphalia decreed several improvements in its restitution legislation on February 12.

**ANTISEMITISM**

There were no reports of major antisemitic incidents. It was clear that anti-Jewish prejudices were not yet fully eradicated, but reliable scientific studies and public-opinion surveys were not available for 1964. Agitators succeeded in convincing some people that fantastic restitution sums were paid to Jews in and outside of Germany and that tremendous amounts were being paid to Israel. Some Germans also resented the continuation of the search for Nazi criminals, wanting this chapter of German history to be forgotten. Lastly, the question of giving full diplomatic recognition to Israel seemed to irritate people. The long delay had aroused feelings of guilt and these were projected against the Jews, as if they were, as the Nazis had claimed, "eternal trouble-makers."

Occasional desecrations of Jewish cemeteries and anti-Jewish utterances were reported, but their frequency, was below that of the recent past.

**Nationalism**

Although antisemitism and Nazism were not only officially taboo but—as practically all observers agreed—dead as political forces, nationalist tendencies were sometimes easily awakened. All major political parties catered to nationalist feelings, reputedly strongest among the refugees from Eastern Germany and Eastern Europe. Frequent Sunday speeches by Transportation Minister Seebohm, demanding Sudeten areas which had been restored to Czechoslovakia, were mildly criticized by Chancellor Erhard, but never corrected by the speaker himself, who continued to enjoy the ardent support of the refugee organizations.
Periodicals appealing to nationalist groups and emotions increased in circulation and popular appeal. The most important one was the cleverly edited Deutsche National-Zeitung und Soldaten-Zeitung, published in Munich; it denied that it was antisemitic and was able to cite the fact that a number of Jews wrote for it. Among them were two American Reform rabbis associated with the American Council for Judaism—Rabbi Elmer Berger, executive vice-president of the Council, and Rabbi Abraham Cronbach, professor emeritus at Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati. An interview with Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, also appeared in the paper. It was nevertheless a definitely nationalistic and prejudiced publication. Of course, under the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and expression to everyone who did not openly advocate the overthrow of the government or the replacement of the democratic order by a totalitarian one, no action against this or similar publications, like Nation Europa of Coburg, was or could be taken.

Attempts to organize rightist parties were less successful than in former years. The German constitution stipulated that a political party had to gain five per cent of the vote or a plurality in one district to be represented in parliament, and the same provision existed in the states, except Bavaria, where ten per cent of the vote was required. None of the rightist splinter groups—the most important of which were the Deutsche Reichspartei, the Deutsche Gemeinschaft, and the Deutsche Block—were able to obtain seats in state or Federal parliaments or in communal councils. On November 28 a new Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands was founded in Hanover by Friedrich Thielen of Bremen, Adolf von Thadden (Deutsche Reichspartei), Wilhelm Gutmann, and Heinrich Fassbender. Their chances of success seemed negligible for the time being.

HIAG (Hilfsgemeinschaft auf Gegenseitigkeit der Soldaten der ehemaligen Waffen-SS), an association of former SS members claiming to have only mutual-benefit purposes, held some meetings but was often prevented from holding larger gatherings either by order of public authorities or as a result of public protests. It did get some encouragement from a few politicians.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

The Deutscher Koordinierungsrat der Gesellschaften für christlich-jüdische Zusammenarbeit (German Coordinating Council of Societies for Christian-Jewish Cooperation) sponsored the annual national Brotherhood Week in March. There were special celebrations in 36 cities; in Berlin more than 100 lectures, discussions, plays, films and exhibits were scheduled. The press, radio, and television cooperated, and the Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland published two special issues of more than 116 pages. The high point of Brotherhood Week was the ceremonial closing of the Cologne exposition “Monumenta Judaica” (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 254), which had received hundreds of thousands of visitors from all over Germany and abroad since its opening in October 1963. Four thousand five hundred persons at-
tended the event and 8,000 others could not be seated. The assembly was addressed by Augustin Cardinal Bea, head of the Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity in Rome, Professor Ernst Simon of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who represented Martin Buber, and Evangelical Bishop Wilhelm Stählin. Each made a plea for tolerance and mutual understanding based on the common Judeo-Christian heritage. Cardinal Bea pointed out that the late Pope John XXIII had considered it a major purpose of the Ecumenical Council to improve relations not only between various Christian groups, but also between Catholics and Jews (see p. 109).

The Cologne Library for the History of German Jewry, "Germania Judaica," founded in 1958, extended its activities. It held an educators' conference late in January at which the main speakers were the Hamburg publisher Gerd Bucerius, Professor René König of Cologne University, Professor Saul B. Robinson (of Israel), director of the UNESCO institute for educational questions at Hamburg, and Professor H. J. Gamm of the Pedagogic Academy at Oldenburg. They all discussed methods of interpreting intergroup problems, particularly those concerning Jews.

The annual Hour of Commemoration was held on the birthday of Anne Frank at her birthplace in Frankfurt. Her 75-year-old father, Otto Frank, attended the ceremony for the first time.

Various religious groups cooperated in urging the Federal government to establish diplomatic relations with Israel.

RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL

Israel's relations with the Federal Republic were subjected to serious strains in 1964. While the absence of formal diplomatic relations between the two countries had created tensions for years, the problem now became more urgent and painful than before. The restitution agreement between Germany and Israel was to expire in 1965. The trade mission which had been established under this agreement still transacted much business that would ordinarily be handled by consular or diplomatic officials. With the agreement's expiration, there would be no agency to perform these functions.

Israel was increasingly concerned about the German scientists who were producing weapons for Egypt (see p. 453; AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 302). Also, neither the Israeli government nor people had any sympathy for the German government's reluctance to extend the statute of limitations for Nazi crimes beyond May 9, 1965 (p. 409). While the German public did not in general seem interested, there was strong pressure from press and television to give Israel full diplomatic recognition. A petition for action in this direction was initiated by the Coordinating Council of the Societies for Christian-Jewish Understanding and the German Trade Unions Association at a rally in Cologne in October. Delegates of all major political parties demanded action by the government without further delay, as did Evangelical groups and students' organizations.

In a radio interview with the journalist Alfred Joachim in April Chancellor
Erhard stressed his cordial personal relations with Jewish leaders such as Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and WZO President Nahum Goldmann, but expressed misgivings about Arab reactions to any West German recognition of Israel.

King Hussein of Jordan visited Germany late in November, and President Gamal Abdul Nasser of the United Arab Republic was expected to return Bundestag President Eugen Gerstenmaier’s November visit to Egypt in the spring of 1965. Gerstenmaier had long been known as a friend of Israel. Reports that these visits were aimed at improving relations between Israel and its Arab neighbors found little credence.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

The Jewish population of the Federal Republic as a whole increased slightly, although West Berlin’s remained stable. Deaths substantially exceeded births, but Jewish immigration was again much higher than emigration. The immigrants included many “returnees,” i.e., Jews who had lived in Germany before the holocaust and came back to spend their last years in their country of origin. The average age was steadily rising: on October 1, 1963, it was 44.8; on October 1, 1964, 46.1.

On October 1, 1964, there were 25,064 Jews, of whom 13,568 were men and 11,496 were women. Of these 5,794 lived in West Berlin, with a slight excess of men over women. From October 1963 to October 1964 there were only 69 Jewish births, but 482 deaths. Immigrants numbered 1,223 and emigrants only 531.

Communal Affairs

The more than 70 Jewish communities carried on their traditional religious, educational, social, and charitable activities. The Zentralrat der Juden in Deutschland directed by its secretary-general Hendrik George van Dam in Düsseldorf, continued to represent German Jewry at home and abroad. Its administrative council (Ratsversammlung; AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 257) met regularly and provided a link between the communities.

A two-day conference of the Zentralrat at Hanover in March was attended by about 80 delegates from all over Germany. Professor Herbert Lewin of Offenbach, council president, reported on the first half of his term

---

1 The increase from 22,853 to 25,064 within one year was due not only to the excess of immigration over emigration but even more to a change in the method of counting the Frankfurt Jewish community. Until 1964 Frankfurt counted only the registered members of the local Jewish community (July 1: 2,837). On October 1, 1964, the city of Frankfurt published the number of all persons who had registered with its authorities as Jews: 4,122 on that date. Thus it became clear that in Frankfurt 1,285 or 45 per cent of the Jews had not joined the Jewish community. If that percentage obtained for West Germany as a whole, there would be about 35,000 Jews, even though only about 24,000 were registered members of Jewish communities.
of office, and van Dam spoke, among others things, on Arab anti-Jewish propaganda in Germany, former Nazis in high offices, trials of Nazi criminals, indemnification and the economic situation, and fund raising. Problems of financing and of social security for communal employees were also discussed.

In October the council directorate met in Cologne. It demanded full freedom of expression for all victims of Nazism, protested against a gathering of former members of the Waffen-SS at Rendsburg, opposed enforcement of the statute of limitations for Nazi murderers, and urged the establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel and the recall of German weapons experts from Egypt.

Religious Activities

While Federal and state central bodies concentrated on problems of restitution and indemnification, politics, and public relations, most religious and cultural activities fell to the local communities. The number of rabbis increased to twelve, with rabbis officiating in Berlin, Cologne, Dortmund, Düsseldorf, Heidelberg, and Munich, and serving neighboring communities, as well. There was also an increase in the number of teachers to 56 in October. They instructed children in the laws, customs, and history of Judaism and in Hebrew.

The approximately 1,200 school-age Jewish children attended public schools where they also were able to receive religious instruction from community teachers. In a few cities these classes were supplemented by hadarim. Germany’s was the only sizable Jewish community in which no full-time Jewish day school existed. There had been a considerable number in pre-Hitler Germany and even under Hitler. (In 1937 there were still 151 Jewish primary and 18 high schools).

No new synagogues were dedicated in 1964. In December 1963 a prayer room was rededicated in Augsburg. (The main synagogue building, once one of the most beautiful in Germany, remained in ruins.) Bavarian Prime Minister Alfons Goppel as well as high clergymen of both Christian churches attended, and Catholic Bishop Josef Stimpfle sent a cordial letter.

Cultural Activities

The Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland, published in Düsseldorf by Karl Marx and edited by Hermann Lewy, completed its 19th volume. Founded as a Jewish communal weekly for the British occupation zone soon after World War II, it had by now replaced most of the dozens of Jewish periodicals that existed in Germany before 1938. It was read by numerous non-Jews and circulated not only in Germany, but also in about 50 other countries; a special edition was flown to Israel. It made a major contribution to the cultural life of the community. Other Jewish weeklies included one in German and one in Yiddish that were published in Munich, and two by and for Jewish youth (Kontakt, first in Cologne and more recently at Düsseldorf, and Schalom, in Berlin).

Numerous books on Jewish subjects were published by German publishers, including four firms owned by Jews and having a specific Jewish program. At
the annual book fair at Frankfurt more than 200 new Jewish books were advertised by 68 different non-Jewish publishing houses. Even this was only a fraction of the books on and by Jews currently published in West Germany. An anthology of Jewish writings, edited by the late Federal President Theodor Heuss and published on his 80th birthday by the Econ publishing house at Düsseldorf, went into a second edition shortly after publication.

On May 27 the 80th birthday of Max Brod was widely celebrated. Poet, novelist, and Kafka editor and biographer, Brod lived in Tel-Aviv but still paid annual visits to Germany. Sizable crowds honored him at Düsseldorf and Munich, and he received the Pirkheimer prize at Nuremberg.

On the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the death of the Jewish composer Giacomo Meyerbeer, in May, the Berlin State Institute for Musical Research exhibited 120 items from its Meyerbeer archive of 3,000 documents relating to the composer's life and work.

The annual Leo Baeck prize was awarded to Konrad Schilling, a Cologne teacher, for his part in preparing the "Monumenta Judaica" exposition. At the award ceremony in Cologne's city hall, addresses were delivered by Cologne Lord Mayor Theo Burauen and Alexander Ginsburg and H. G. van Dam on behalf of the Zentralrat.

In March the Hebrew University opened a sociology institute named for Franz Oppenheimer, whose 100th birthday was celebrated on March 30, with an address by Chancellor Erhard at the Free University of Berlin.

The 80th birthday of the painter Ludwig Meidner, once a leading impressionist, was widely celebrated in April. His works were exhibited in various cities, and he was made an honorary citizen of Darmstadt, where he was still painting. He had returned to Germany in 1953 and lived there almost forgotten until 1963, when he was rediscovered by accident during the "Synagoga" exposition.

In August a special German postage stamp was issued on the 100th anniversary of the death of Ferdinand Lasalle, great German socialist, who had lived and died as a Jew.

In September the 50th anniversary of the death of the Jewish socialist Reichstag member Ludwig Frank was observed by the city of Mannheim, where he had lived.

Social Services

As in previous years, the Zentralwohlfahrtsstelle der Juden in Deutschland (ZWST—Central Welfare Office of Jews in Germany) was the major instrument for providing social and health services by and to the Jewish community of Germany. No statistics on these activities were available.

ZWST published three issues of its organ, Jüdische Sozialarbeit, and the League of Jewish Women three issues of its periodical Die Frau in der Gemeinschaft.

In January Jewish social workers met at Munich to study the personal problems of Jews in Germany. The ZWST youth commission decided to increase the number of Jewish youngsters sent to Israel during their vacations from
40 to 50. At a meeting in Berlin in May discussion centered on problems of child care. Twenty directors of Jewish kindergartens met in Berlin in June to discuss common problems. A seminar for vacation helpers was conducted at Wembach. Wembach and Sobernheim provided summer vacations for about 500 children and a sizable group of adults.

The 72 children who survived a madman's bomb-throwing rampage at a Catholic school in Cologne accepted an invitation to spend a few weeks in July at the children's home of that Jewish community.

In a joint ceremony in Munich, JDC celebrated its 50th anniversary and the Jewish loan institute, Iwria, its tenth, in October. During the decade Iwria provided 1,002 loans totaling more than DM 4 million ($1 million). Of these loans, 633 went to merchants, 148 to craftsmen, 107 to small industrialists, 68 to intellectuals, and 46 to others.

The Jewish Hospital of Berlin celebrated its 50th anniversary in November 1964.

A book by Dora Edinger about the life and writings of the late Bertha Pappenheim, the German Jewish feminist and social worker, was published in 1963 by Ner-Tamid at Frankfurt.

Zionism

The Zionist organizations (General, WIZO, and youth groups) remained active politically and socially. The Israeli campaigns (Keren Ha-yesod, Keren Kayyemet le-Yisrael, and Children's and Youth Aliyah) all raised increased sums. The Keren Ha-yesod (Magbit—United Israel Appeal) reported on November 12 a total of DM 1.5 million, an increase of more than DM 300,000 over 1963. In two years the number of donors had risen from 1,200 to 1,700. Its presidium consisted of Professor Herbert Lewin, Henry Ehrenberg, Rabbi I. E. Lichtigfeld, Manfred Rosenthal, Arno Lustiger and Henry Ormond. The Children's and Youth Aliyah reported a 1963 income of about a half million marks: the 1964 figures were not yet available.

The representatives of the Zionist Organization met at Stuttgart on January 19. In September Israel Kornat became secretary general of the Zionist Organization in Germany. Four delegates were to represent Germany at the World Zionist Congress which was to open in Jerusalem in late December.

In April Nahum Goldmann spoke in Frankfurt to celebrate the 16th birthday of Israel. He also spoke in Munich for the first time in 30 years.

Personalia

In January the Munich lawyer Siegfried Neuland was honored on his 75th birthday. He had refounded the Munich Jewish community with 105 survivors in 1945 and headed it most of the time since 1951. From 1952 to 1963 he represented Bavaria's Jews in the state senate.

In March at Frankfurt Dr. Fritz Kauffmann, who had emigrated to Denmark in 1933, received the Paul Ehrlich Prize of DM 100,000 ($25,000) for his research on the salmonella bacteria.
Jacob Picard (aged 81) received the Bodensee prize on June 14 at Überlingen. Most of his stories centered around Jewish life in small villages near Lake Constance, where Picard grew up. Picard was now an American citizen.

In December Josef Wulf of Berlin was awarded the Carl von Ossietzky medal by the local group of the International League for Human Rights, in recognition of his numerous studies on various aspects of the Nazi regime.

In February Rudolf Ullstein died at the age of 89. He was the last of the five Ullstein brothers, whose publishing house had been the largest in Germany until 1933. He returned from England to his native Berlin in 1949 to reactivate his old firm.

In February, with the death of Alfred Wiener, founder of the London library bearing his name, German Jews and Gentiles recalled that he had for decades been a leader of the Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith. Shortly after his death, the Berlin Jewish community awarded the Heinrich Stahl prize to the Wiener Library.

Shelomo F. Ettlinger died in Frankfurt in February. He was a historian of Frankfurt Jewry and vice president of the B’nai B’rith lodge there. He emigrated to Israel in 1937 and returned 20 years later.

Lawyer Hugo Goldberg died at Wiesbaden in April. He was the honorary president of the local Jewish community.

Marek Allerhand, honorary president of the Magbit committee and a leader of the Berlin Jewish community, died in May at the age of 82.

In May Hans Reichmann of London died at Wiesbaden at the age of 64. Until 1938 he had been a legal advisor (Syndikus) of the Central Association of German Citizens of Jewish Faith. In London he was active in HIAS, United Restitution Office, the Council of Jews from Germany and the Leo Baeck Charitable Trust, and other institutions such as the Leo Baeck Institute and the Wiener Library. He was buried in London where his widow, the well-known historian Eva G. Reichmann, was living.

Lawyer Edouard Lehmann of Saarbrücken, member of the directorate of the Central Council of Jews, died in June.

Joel Brand, who negotiated with Adolf Eichmann in Budapest in 1944 for the release of Hungarian Jews and later wrote and testified about it, died in July at the age of 57.

One of Germany's best-known actors, Ernst Ginsberg, died in December, at the age of 60. He was famous in Berlin and Munich before 1933, emigrated to Switzerland, and was again seen in Munich after 1952.

HANS LAMM
On October 15, 1964, Moscow stunned the world with the news that Nikita Khrushchev had been removed as secretary of the Communist party presidium and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and placed in forced retirement. Khrushchev was replaced by Leonid Brezhnev as party boss and Alexei Kosygin as premier. While there had been rumors of internal conflicts among the top Soviet leaders and of opposition to some Khrushchev policies, the fall of the Soviet leader was completely unexpected both in the West and in the Communist countries. Prague and Warsaw expressed “surprise,” and in Hungary Kádár spoke about Khrushchev’s “great merits.” Most of the satellite leaders, though accepting the change, praised Khrushchev’s achievements and expressed the hope that his departure would not radically alter Soviet policies.

Khrushchev’s removal was followed by a swift reorganization of the Soviet power apparatus. Besides Brezhnev and Kosygin, the top group included Anastas Mikoyan, chairman of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet; Mikhail Suslov, one of the veterans who survived Stalin and the changes following his demise, and Nikolai Podgorny, a Khrushchev protégé. Alexander Shelepin, former head of the secret police and of the Young Communist League, and Pyotr Shelest, the boss of the Ukraine, became full members of the party presidium, apparently replacing Khrushchev and the ailing Frol Koslow, who died shortly thereafter. Many second-rank officials, among them Pavel Satyukov, editor of Pravda, and Alexei Adzhubei, editor of Izvestia and son-in-law of Khrushchev, were replaced. The party structure was reorganized, and the division between the agricultural and industrial sectors within the party committees was eliminated.

Destalinization

The Kremlin leaders continued the “liberal” policy of destalinization. Many old-time Bolsheviks were posthumously rehabilitated. In January a movie based on Yuri Bondarev’s novel, Stillness, was shown in Moscow, telling of the arrest of a devoted Communist on trumped-up charges and describing
his brutal treatment. In its September issue the periodical *Novy Mir* carried a startling piece, "One Destiny," by O. Morosova, in which the author gave a completely objective account of her life, the revolution, the civil war, and the purges. In the fall of 1964 Moscow was shocked by the disclosure of the memorandum left by Palmiero Togliatti and published in Italy after his death in August while on a visit to the Crimea. After initial hesitation, Togliatti's testament was republished in *Pravda* on September 10. Togliatti insisted that "the question of the origin of the cult of personality—how this cult became possible—has not been solved" and that it was necessary to undo suppression of personal freedom introduced by Stalin. On December 13 *Pravda* noted that the methods of Andrei Vishinsky, in contravention of "socialist legality," had been decisively condemned by the party and reiterated that the Soviet state, on its new level of development, was losing its class character and was gradually becoming the state of all the people. But for the time being, the new regime maintained controls over artists, writers, and scholars.

**Foreign Policy**

The new leaders reaffirmed Soviet support of the Asian-African struggle against "neo-colonialism," but took no major steps to alter the balance of forces in the underdeveloped and newly established countries.

The Sino-Soviet dispute continued unabated, and the Russians were clearly in no mood for concessions to the Chinese, who repeatedly emphasized the need for territorial readjustment along the long Sino-Soviet border. Peking hinted that the USSR was too big, and that it included many foreign lands and peoples. Replying to these charges, Khrushchev had made it clear that "we don't want a war... however, if we are attacked, we will defend our borders with all means at our disposal" (*Pravda*, September 20). While the tone of Soviet-Chinese exchanges after Khrushchev's removal was softer, nothing in the positions of the two adversaries changed, and the split between them remained unhealed.

**Economic Policy**

Shortly before his removal, Khrushchev announced a "consumer first" policy, but indicated that due attention would be paid to heavy industry as well. This line was essentially continued by the Brezhnev-Kosygin team. The new Soviet rulers appeared to be revamping the structure of planning and management in the direction of decentralization suggested by the Soviet economist Yevsey Liberman. The Liberman system was being tested in two garment factories.

**JEWISH POPULATION**

There was no precise information on the number of Jews in the Soviet Union, but at the end of 1963 the estimated number was 2,454,000. This estimate was based on the assumption that the Jewish population, which had stood at 2,268,000 in the 1959 census, had had the same rate of natural increase as
the general population—17 per 1,000 in 1959, 1960, and 1961; 15 per 1,000 in 1962; and 14 per 1,000 in 1963. The population of the USSR was 208,827,000 in 1959, and was estimated at 226,300,000 at the end of 1963. Thus, Jews were about 1.1 per cent of the total population. Available data indicated 285,000 Jews in Moscow, 165,000 in Leningrad, 220,000 in Kiev, 90,000 in Odessa, 39,000 in Minsk, 42,000 in Kishinev, 16,000 in Vilna, 14,000 in Vinitsa, 18,500 in Gomel, 30,000 in Czernovitz, 10,000 in Zhitomir, and 9,250 in Mogilev.

Communal and Religious Life

The Jews of the Soviet Union continued to experience many disabilities and in fact, if not in law, were living under a discriminatory regime. Despite constitutional provisions guaranteeing the free exercise of religion, restrictions on Jewish religious life continued, and the removal of Khrushchev did not improve the situation. According to official sources, there were 97 synagogues in the Soviet Union in 1964. The Jewish congregations ministered to the needs of religious Jews, but their efforts were hampered by the absence of a central Jewish communal organization, the creation of which was discouraged by Soviet authorities.

Soviet authorities continuously interfered with the administration of Jewish communal affairs. Thus in June the police ousted the three-man governing body of the Moscow Central synagogue and replaced it with a new group known only as Fishlovitch, Mikhailovitch, and Olitzky. Later Mikhailovitch replaced Nahum Paler as head of the synagogue. There were reports that after vehement attacks in the Odessa newspaper Znamia Kommunisma, the great synagogue of Odessa, the only one in that city, was to be closed. The Jews of Odessa had decided to renovate their synagogue and raised a fund for the purpose. Znamia Kommunisma charged that the money was being used for black-market operations and that the “synagogue and the burial society became a center of extortion . . . for the benefit of the clergy and hangers-on. . . .” Using as pretexts the dwindling number of believers, the “anti-social behavior” of synagogue leaders, termination of leases, and, simply, the necessity of utilizing the buildings for other purposes, local Soviet authorities forced the closing of many houses of worship, particularly in small cities where local Jews were unable or afraid to request the continuance of their synagogues. There were reports that the synagogues of Tashkent (Uzbek SSR) and Alma Ata (Kazakh SSR) were threatened with closure. (Moscow denied that the synagogues in Minsk and Zhitomir had been closed [AJYB, 1964 (Vol. 65), p. 269], saying that they had been moved to new quarters.)

Reports from the Soviet Union indicated that despite the relaxation in 1964 of the rules governing the baking of matzot there were not enough matzot for all Jews observing Passover. Official spokesmen for the Moscow Jewish community confirmed reports that the synagogue had been permitted to rent a special building for use as a bakery, but the building was put at the disposal of the community too late to install all the necessary facilities. In Moscow and in Leningrad the bakeries were closed as fire hazards for a few days, and
although they were later reopened, there were considerable delays in the production schedule. In some places it was difficult to obtain flour, which was in short supply, and the authorities did not take into consideration the delays in receiving allotments even when the flour was forthcoming. The situation was particularly difficult in large Jewish centers, where large numbers of religious Jews required matzot.

Many packages of matzot were sent to the Soviet Union from abroad, but such imports were looked upon with disfavor by Soviet authorities, and the packages were returned.

The Moscow Yeshiva Kol Jacob, the only one in the Soviet Union, continued to function, but its enrolment had dwindled to a few students and some older individuals who came regularly to participate in the lessons. Young people desiring to enter the yeshivah were discouraged by official pressure and social ostracism. Under these circumstances, the yeshivah was not able to prepare young rabbis to replace the old ones, whose average age was 70.

In February Judah Leib Levin, chief rabbi of Moscow and head of the yeshivah, celebrated his 70th birthday. There was a special thanksgiving service in the Moscow synagogue in the course of which the rabbi, surrounded by many congregants and guests, including Bishop Alexei of the Orthodox church, prayed for peace. While the shortage of prayer shawls, phylacteries, and prayer books continued, in June Rabbi Levin refused a gift of a set of the Talmud offered by a Canadian Jewish leader, saying that “there is no necessity to send your copy of the Talmud to us.”

Despite social pressure and continued campaigns in the press, a considerable number of Jews remained strongly attached to Jewish religious tradition. Jean-Pierre Bloch, a French politician who was in Leningrad during Rosh Ha-shanah, reported that some 6,000 Jews came to the services. Those who were unable to gain admission followed the prayers from outside. Bloch also reported that besides the main synagogue, there were in Leningrad many shtiblakh (chapels) used by hasidim as well as by worshipers originating in Poland and the Ukraine. (In February Rabbi Abraham Twerski, the last hasidic rebbe in the Soviet Union, emigrated to Israel.)

On the eve of Rosh Ha-shanah, the Moscow community published a religious calendar for the year 5725 (1964-65). The printed luah contained 35 pages of Russian and Yiddish text, including, in addition to customary material, the Kaddish (prayer for the dead) and a special prayer for peace. The Kaddish was accompanied by a Russian transliteration, and the prayer for peace by a Russian translation. During the Yom Kippur services, thousands of Moscow Jews jammed the Central synagogue, where Cantor David Sternberg conducted the prayers. Some 15,000 young people crowded the square in front of the Moscow synagogue to celebrate Simhat Torah.

Antisemitism in the Press

The Soviet press gave wide coverage to events pertaining to the life of various nationalities and minorities, but ignored news of Jewish interest. How-
ever, the press was full of stories featuring Jewish names in connection with crimes, violations of law in the synagogue, "Shylocks," etc. This type of press report was particularly widespread in the local newspapers of Byelorussia, Moldavia, and the Ukraine, where there were large Jewish communities and the local populations had a long history of anti-Jewish attitudes. Such items appeared, among others, in Zvyazda (Minsk), January 9; Sovetskaya Byelorussia (Minsk), April 8; Rabochaya Gazeta (Kiev), February 9 and May 16, and Sovetskaya Moldavia (Kishinev), May 13 and June 14. From time to time this type of coverage found its way into the central press. Thus, a story in Krokodil (Moscow, May 30) alluded to some criminal "gesheft"—a word indicating the Jewish aspects of the case. Toward the end of 1963 and in 1964, the Soviet press devoted much attention to the case of the young Leningrad poet, Joseph Brodsky. Brodsky, a Jew, was accused of living as a "parasitic idler" who loved a "foreign fatherland" and was trying to run away abroad. He was sentenced to five years' compulsory labor in the Archangel province, in the far north.

**Antisemitic Publications**

Toward the end of 1963 a viciously antisemitic book by Trofim Kichko, Judaism Without Embellishment, was published in Kiev under the sponsorship of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 269). Soon after, on January 11, 1964, another volume of the same type, Contemporary Judaism and Zionism, by F. Mayatzki, was sent to the printers in Kishinev, Moldavia. The Mayatzki book repeated all the anti-Jewish cliches current among Jew-baiters. Mayatzki's bibliography included such items as "Joint [JDC], a Department of American Intelligence," by J. Marek, published in Moskovski Propagandist in 1953, and in Pravda Ukraini, February 11, 1953. Marek's piece was part of the campaign surrounding Stalin's "doctors' plot" and was later repudiated, along with other similar material, by the Soviet authorities as a groundless pack of lies. Nevertheless, Mayatzki included it among his "scientific" sources.

**Discrimination**

Available material indicated there were only a few Jews among top party and government officials. Benjamin E. Dimchitz and Juli Khariton were the only Jewish members of the Central Committee of the party (Dimchitz was also chief economic planner of the Soviet Union). There were only five Jews among the 1,443 members of the Supreme Soviet (1962-66): Rebekah Vishtchinikin (Birobidjan), Gen. Jacob Kreizer (Far East), Ilya Ehrenburg (Latvia), Benjamin Dimchitz (Khabarovsky), Juli Khariton (Gorki oblast). The first three were members of the National Chamber and the last two of the Union Chamber. There were very few among the top echelons of local administrations. According to available data, there was a heavy concentration of Soviet Jews in such fields as accounting and statistics. There were continuing reports
of difficulties faced by Jewish students in obtaining admission to the best universities, or in receiving academic promotion on the faculties of universities.

**Economic Trials**

During the period under review major trials for “economic crimes” involving an alleged ring of 24 black-marketeers were held in Moscow. Seven Jews and three non-Jews were sentenced to death. In announcing the forthcoming trials, in 1963, Izvestia had emphasized the Jewish names of the alleged ring-leaders (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 272-73). In Moscow another Jew, Arkadi Greenberg, was sentenced to death as the head of an illegal group of 21 persons trading in knit goods. Five Jews were given prison sentences in Kiev for complicity in a crime involving speculation in gold, for which a Jew, Jacob Sheinkin, had been condemned to death in 1963. The local Soviet press continued to emphasize the Jewish names of persons brought to trial for various misdeeds, but reports that two Jews who were convicted had been “framed” appeared in Komsomolskaya Pravda and Literaturnaya Gazeta. In the first case it was reported that Boris Bukhbinder, director of a school in Stavropol, convicted for complicity in an embezzlement, had been the victim of investigative methods carried over from the days of the Stalin “personality cult.” In the second case R. Frekhtman, convicted a year before for black-market-eering in the Ukraine, was described as a war hero whose name had been attached to criminal activities by swindlers whom the accused did not even know.

**Western Reaction to Soviet Antisemitism**

In the West the plight of Soviet Jews was the object of frequent intervention by both Jewish and non-Jewish organizations (see p. 312). In April the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry met in Washington. A similar conference was held in France in October under the chairmanship of Daniel Mayer, Socialist leader and president of the Ligue des Droits de l’Homme. At the October meeting of UNESCO, Moshe Avidor, the Israeli delegate, brought up the question of Soviet discrimination against Jewish culture. Severe criticism of anti-Jewish persecution in the Soviet Union was voiced by the International Commission of Jurists (Journal of the International Commission of Jurists, Summer 1964) and in the report of the Socialist International issued in 1964. As more information on the economic trials became available, the protest movement against Soviet treatment of Jews attracted many radical intellectuals who otherwise were generally favorable to the Soviet Union. The publication of antisemitic books in the Ukraine and Moldavia provoked a wave of indignation in the Jewish world. The Kichko book created consternation among Communist parties in the West. The Communist parties of Italy and Great Britain and the Swedish Communist youth organization strongly condemned it, as did the American Worker and Morning Freiheit, and the French Naie Presse and Humanité. Apparently under pressure from Western Communist sources, the Ideological Commission of
the Soviet Communist party acknowledged that the Kichko book “may in-
suit the feelings of believers and be interpreted in a spirit of anti-Semitism”
(New York Times, April 5, 1964). Soon after, however, the official Soviet
news agency, Tass, asserted that there was no antisemitism in the Soviet
Union and no Jewish question (JTA, August 20).

The British philosopher Bertrand Russell criticized the Soviet Union for a
policy of injustice and forced assimilation against Russian Jews. Writing to
Aaron Vergelis, editor of Sovetish Heymland, Russell quoted a letter he had
received from a Soviet war veteran, whose name he withheld, complaining
that Russian Jews lived under “a special regime” and that it was impossible
to place problems of interest to Jews before Soviet governmental authorities.
“We want,” the writer said, “nothing more than to receive the same rights as
Jews in Poland, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia.” Russell asked Vergelis to
bring the letter to public attention. He warned the Soviet leaders that he was
concerned for “justice and for the good name of the Soviet Union . . . and
that pursuit of peace and general understanding between peoples and nations
will be harmed by silence” (World Jewry, London, September-October 1964).
Vergelis did not publish Russell’s letter, nor did he give space to the letter
of the Soviet war veteran. He did, however, publish a reply asserting that both
letters were part of a campaign “based . . . on unfounded accusations and
are part . . . of cold war-positions . . .” (Sovetish Heymland, Moscow, Sep-
tember-October 1964).

Cultural Situation

Vergelis, chief official spokesman of Soviet Jewry, repeatedly declared that
Soviet authorities did not favor Jewish cultural autonomy and did not intend
to support Jewish efforts in education. Jewish schools, Jewish kindergartens,
and Jewish institutions for adult education were still not permitted.

A Yiddish book was published in November, the first in three years. Issued
by Sovetish Heymland, Azoi lebn mir (“This Is How We live”), included
pieces by 19 writers.

While there was, to all intents and purposes, no publishing in Yiddish, ac-
cording to the Soviet writer Abba Finkelstein, 67 books by Yiddish writers
appeared in translation in various languages of the Soviet Union in 1962-63,
as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Books</th>
<th>Number of Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>818,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7,316,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,264,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 1955-63 total of Yiddish books published in translation was 267 volumes with 21,683,385 copies in 19 languages. (Data for the period 1955-61 have been adjusted; Sovetish Heymland, No. 3, 1964, pp. 152-58; AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], pp. 355-56).

There were no Jewish communal cultural activities in the Soviet Union, but many Jewish individuals and groups were active in music and the theater. A new ensemble of Jewish instrumentalists and vocalists, Words and Music, was organized in Leningrad and included the actor Meir Braude, the pianist Simeon Freudenberg, and the singer Anna Shevelieva. In the spring, Dina Roitkop of Riga and Benjamin Chaitovsky of Vilna presented a program of Yiddish songs and drama in many cities of the Ukraine, including Odessa, Negin, and Czernovitz. The popular singer Nehamah Lifshitz continued to give recitals throughout the Soviet Union. On September 2, 3, and 5, she performed in Minsk and on September 10 presented the same program in Moscow, singing songs by Isaac Leyb Peretz, Hayyim Nahman Bialik, and Zalman Shneur. While Miss Lifshitz enjoyed a solid reputation, she was criticized in Sovetskaya Byelorussia (Minsk), on September 20, for “narrow-mindedness and preoccupation with nationalistic and religious songs.”

The Yiddish art ensemble of Czernovitz, under the direction of Sidi Tal, played Jewish comedy and drama in Moscow and Leningrad and later throughout Kazakhstan. The Yiddish drama ensemble of Vilna also continued its activities. In 1964 it presented the play Ver iz shuldig? (“Who Is Guilty?”), by A. Zhinokov and B. Halperin, directed by S. Becker and L. Lurie. In May in Kharkov, Soviet Yiddish intellectuals celebrated the 80th birthday of Nathan Rozovsky, one of the oldest actors of the Yiddish stage in the Soviet Union, and in June the 80th birthday of Joshua Lubomirsky, a well-known theater director, was celebrated throughout the country.

In November Ilya Ehrenburg was the main speaker at a Moscow meeting of the Writers’ Union in honor of Isaac Babel, who perished under Stalin. It was reported that Hillel Alexandrov, associate professor at Leningrad University, was working on the archives of the late Israel Zimberg, which were in the Leningrad division of the Asian Peoples’ Institute. Novosti stated that Zimberg had perished in 1939, “a victim of the cult of personality.”

Despite current anti-Jewish discrimination, Jews still accounted for a disproportionate high percentage of Russia’s mature scientists, many of them
prominent in space technology. Of the 103 persons nominated for election to full membership in the Academy of Science, 16 appeared to be Jews, and of 438 persons nominated for election as corresponding members, 58. Among the persons who received the 1964 Lenin Prize were 14 with Jewish names, including 13 scientists and one artist. The scientists were Ben Zion Vul, Solomon Rifkin, Dina Gabe, Mark Aisenman, Evgeni Sapir, Sofia Belkin, Alexander Bistritsky, Lev Tzibulin, Gregor Ostrin, Solomon Shaikewitch, Selman Sominski, Hanan Isaacson, and Nathan Abelev. The artist was Maya Plisetskaya of the Moscow Ballet Theater, who recently performed with great success in New York. These honors indicated that Jews who are professionally important to the country were permitted to enjoy high pay and prestige.

Relations with Israel

While the Soviet Union maintained normal diplomatic relations with Israel, Moscow’s policy in the Middle East remained uncompromisingly hostile to Israel and favorable to the Arab states. Premier Khrushchev had sharply attacked Israel’s plan for bringing Jordan River water to the Negev, and during his visit to Egypt in May he told his hosts at a mass rally in Port Said that Israel was a menace not only to the Arabs but also to the whole world. Earlier, in greeting President Gamal Abdul Nasser, Khrushchev referred to the Sinai campaign, “where Israel was serving as the agent of imperialism” (Pravda, May 10, 1964). At the same time the Kremlin continued its anti-Israeli propaganda, only slightly varying the contents to suit the needs of the moment. Thus, Radio Moscow told its Arab listeners that the American and German military establishments wished to make Israel an atomic-rocket base for NATO (JTA, April 7, 1964). Even the American-Israeli desalination agreement was held to be “a cause of concern to the Arabs” (JTA, June 19, 1964).

The change in Soviet leadership did not affect Moscow’s policy in the Middle East. According to Al-Ahram, as quoted in JTA, October 22, 1964, strong assurances were given Nasser that the Kremlin would continue its close ties with Egypt and would recognize Nasser’s “vanguard role in Asia and Africa.” In the United Nations, after the Syrian-Israeli clashes in December, the Soviet Union vetoed a United States-British resolution calling upon Syria and Israel to cooperate in preventing future clashes in the area north of the Sea of Galilee (see p. 303). Soviet delegate Platon D. Morozov called the resolution “a hypocritical document” placing the aggressor (meaning Israel), and the victim (meaning Syria) on an equal footing. The Moscow press continued to attack “Zionist propaganda” by Israeli tourists and accused Israeli officials of distributing leaflets, magazines, and other Zionist materials among the Jews of the Soviet Union. In July three Israeli citizens visiting the USSR were arrested and deported for alleged propaganda activities.

At the same time, an agreement reached in July between the USSR and Israel laid the ground for cultural exchange programs (see p. 453). As a result, Soviet soloists and a conductor were to appear with the Israeli Philharmonic, and in return Israeli artists scheduled appearances in the Soviet Union.
Earlier, a delegation of four women from the world executive of WIZO, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Raya Jaglom, visited educational institutions in Moscow, Kiev, and Leningrad. Eleven Israeli scientists participated in the Seventh International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnographic Sciences in Moscow.

Emigration to Israel was limited mostly to old persons who sought reunion with their families. According to a Soviet spokesman, 200 such persons left the Soviet Union to settle in Israel in 1963 (*Jewish Daily Forward*, New York, May 21, 1964).

**Commemoration of the Catastrophe**

In May an imposing ceremony in Riga honored the memory of 125,000 Latvian Jews murdered by the Nazis. Six candles symbolizing the six million murdered Jews were lighted at the mass graves of the victims, and the municipality voted an appropriation to establish a permanent memorial (*Folks-shtimme*, Warsaw, May 19, 1964). A monument to the Jewish martyrs of Pinsk was erected by the city council of that city. It was also reported that a street was named for a Jewish Hero of the Soviet Union named Moshkovsky, who fell in action in 1939 (*Day-Jewish Journal*, New York, August 8, 1964). The anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto revolt was commemorated by the Vilna Jewish choir with a concert of appropriate songs (*Folks-shtimme*, May 27, 1964).

**Personalia**

L. Rosenhois, a veteran Soviet Yiddish writer and the last surviving member of the editorial board of *Der Shtern*, died in Minsk in June. Samuel Marshak, an eminent translator of Shakespeare into Russian and a notable poet in his own right, died in Moscow in July. Eugene Varga, the well-known Communist economist and theoretician, died in Moscow in October. Solomon Lurie, a classical scholar, died in Lvov in November. A memorial meeting on the 70th anniversary of the birth of Ian Gamarnik, once head of the political department of the Soviet army, took place in the Red Army Frunze Home in Moscow. Gamarnik committed suicide in 1937 to avoid trial and execution during the Stalin purges.

Leon Shapiro
During the period under review there were indications that Wladislaw Gomulka, secretary of PPZR (Polish United Workers' [Communist] party), was having difficulties with both the right-wing, Stalinist "partisans" and the liberal, "revisionist" followers of the October 1956 revolution. The long-postponed fourth congress of PPZR took place in Warsaw in June 1964. There was nothing spectacular in the proceedings, although some party members circulated undercover literature critical of Gomulka and defending the Chinese Communist line. There were, however, some organizational changes. The Central Committee was expanded from 77 to 85 full members and from 65 to 78 candidate members. The Politburo was increased from 10 to 12 members, the two new places going to Franciszek Waniolka, a vice premier since 1962, and Eugeniusz Szyr, a well-known economic administrator and a Jew. By adroit maneuvering, Gomulka succeeded in weeding out men who had in the past criticized his policies or otherwise demonstrated opposition. As the year progressed it became clear that Gomulka had thwarted both extreme groups, and by balancing one against the other had consolidated his control of both the party and the country.

By Soviet standards the Polish people continued to enjoy a certain freedom in the arts and letters. But Polish intellectuals, mindful of 1956 ideals, strongly objected to government censorship and other restrictions. In March, 34 of Poland's foremost writers, scientists, and journalists wrote to Premier Josef Cyrankiewicz requesting that cultural policy "be changed to conform to the spirit of the rights guaranteed by the Polish constitution . . ." Among the signers of this letter were the writers Anton Slonimski and Jerzy Andrzejewski, the scientists Leopold Infeld and Wacław Sierpinski, and Melchior Wankowicz, a well-known author who had acquired United States citizenship after World War II and then returned to live in Poland. Though the protest was never publicly acknowledged, the government took strong measures against the independent intellectuals, including, in some cases, withdrawal of passports for foreign travel and a decrease in paper allocation to "guilty" publications. At the Polish writers' congress in Lublin, in September, Gomulka, fresh from his victory at the party conclave, appealed to the assembled writers to halt the "decline in the dynamism" of Polish literature and to "help the party solve all the problems connected with the building of socialism . . ." In November Wankowicz was sentenced to 18 months in prison on a charge of dissemination of false information causing harm to the Polish state. In December Lucjan Motyka became minister of culture, replacing Tadeusz Galinski, who had been associated with the government restrictions against writers. Polish intellectuals were pleased about this change.

Poland continued to face considerable economic difficulties, many of which
were due to errors in economic planning. A new five-year plan being drafted for 1966–70 emphasized the necessity of creating about a million and a half new jobs.

According to *Zycie Gospodarcze* (May 31, 1964), Poland had 21,133 agricultural circles (voluntary collectives), 102 service and producer cooperatives, and 72 cooperative farming centers in 1963. Some 8,000 additional agricultural circles were registered but had not yet begun their work. About 79 per cent of the active circles showed a profit. A somewhat novel approach to agriculture was the so-called agrominimum system, which was gradually being introduced into private farming to raise production by good agricultural methods. By concentrating supervisory powers in the hands of a political technocracy, this tended toward increased centralization and control of private farming. For the time being, Poland continued to seek wheat abroad to satisfy its needs.

The silent struggle between the state and the Catholic church continued unabated, although both sides were reluctant to depart from the uneasy "policy of coexistence." Primate Stefan Cardinal Wiszynski stepped up the church's resistance to the continuing encroachment of the state in education, family relations, and similar fields. The church also reiterated its disapproval of the fellow-traveling Pax group, led by Boleslaw Piacecki, a well-known fascist in prewar Poland. The government repeatedly accused the church of promoting political aims incompatible with the interests of the state. The Gdansk city council sought to expropriate the Pelpin building, which housed a theological seminary. Another seminary near Poznan was raided by the police in September, and in Wroclaw the municipality moved to expropriate the building that was the archbishop's residence and the episcopal seat.

State Council President Aleksander Zawadski, titular head of the state, died in August, after a long illness. He was replaced by Edward Ochab, former secretary of the Central Committee and a member of the Politburo.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

Only about 1,000 Jews left Poland for various European countries and Israel. There were no substantial changes in the status of the Jewish community. In the spring there were unconfirmed reports that at least 20 Jews had been dismissed from high government posts (*Forward*, New York, May 24, 1964). While both the party and the government fought overt antisemitism, it was still common among the Polish population, especially in small cities and villages. Racial offenses were forbidden by law, but this did not stop anti-Jewish incidents. The Lodz district court sentenced a building superintendent named Matrontzyk to six months in prison for an antisemitic attack on a Jewish tenant, Bezalel Weinrob (*Folks-shtimme*, Warsaw, April 2, 1964). In Legnice, in western Poland, Jan Horoszkewicz was sentenced to 14 months at hard labor for insulting and attacking two Polish Jews, Abraham Moneta and Mandel Tastowsky (*JTA*, October 27, 1964). Twelve Jews were among
36 persons who received medals for their revolutionary activities (London Jewish Chronicle, February 28, 1964).

**Jewish Population**

Precise data on the Jewish population in Poland were not available. A survey published in Zycie Warszawy (December 12, 1963) indicated that there were 31,000 Jews. This seemed to be a realistic estimate. According to the same publication Jews were the third largest minority in the country, after Ukrainians (180,000) and Byelorussians (165,000). There were some indications that besides the 31,000 Jews identified in the survey, an undetermined number—one estimate was 5,000—lived a Marrano-like existence and were gradually disappearing into the surrounding population.

**Communal Life**

Jewish communal life centered around the Communist-dominated Cultural and Social Union of Polish Jews, which claimed 27 local affiliates. Leyb Domb was still president and Edward Reiber secretary-general.

In July the presidium of the Union met in Lublin to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the "establishment of new Poland" and the "reestablishment of Jewish life." The meeting was widely reported by the state radio and press, and the central organ of PPZR, Tribuna Ludu, gave it special coverage. The union issued a call to Jewish workers and youth for greater efforts in behalf of "our socialist fatherland and in behalf of Jewish communal work" (Folks-shtimme, July 29, 1964). In September the Union reported that there were 23 Jewish youth clubs with 1,500 members (Folks-shtimme, September 22, 1964).

The cornerstone for a building to house Jewish social and cultural activities in Warsaw (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 283), was laid in Grzebowski Place in September. It was to have a theater and a library, as well as the office of the producer cooperative Odrodzenie. The space allotted for the cooperative was to be paid for by JDC. The building was to be completed sometime in 1966. Jewish leaders devoted much effort to Jewish activities in cities with small Jewish populations. In Bialystok, Lublin, Gdansk, Przemysl, Wloclawek, and other places, the almost total absence of persons with an adequate Jewish background made impossible the continuation of many Jewish projects.

**Religious Life**

In 1964 the Union of Jewish Religious Congregations (Wa'ad Ha-kehillot) claimed 21 affiliated local congregations. Isaac Frenkel was still president, but during 1964 his situation seemed somewhat precarious because of rumors that his own conduct during the Nazi occupation was not above reproach and because his wife had been the personal secretary to Hayyim Rumkowski, the head of the Lodz Judenrat. No one, however, dared overtly to attack the honor of the couple.

Jewish religious life continued to deteriorate. There were no rabbis, and
as time passed it became more and more difficult to assure the continuation of religious practices like circumcision and bar mitzvah for those Jews who wished to. The religious union experienced many difficulties in maintaining its welfare activities. Though it was still represented in the Central Relief Committee on an equal basis with the Cultural and Social Union, the latter was trying to change the parity basis and obtain control.

In cooperation with the Cultural and Social Union a special committee surveyed the famous Jewish cemetery of Gesia, where such notables as Meir Balaban, Isaac Leyb Peretz, Jacob Dinenson, S. Anski, and others were buried. It was recommended that the government take charge of the graves of many Jewish writers and scholars to save the monuments from decay.

**JEWISH EDUCATION**

There were six Jewish state elementary schools and three secondary schools, with 1,400 pupils. Wroclaw, Lodz, and Legnice each had an elementary school and a secondary school, while Dzierzgonow, Szczecin, and Wlodzycz had only elementary schools. A new building and a dormitory were being constructed in Wroclaw to accommodate Jewish children from out of town.

In March a countrywide conference of youth club workers was held in Legnice. In August a special refresher course was given in Srodborow for teachers of Jewish subjects in Jewish schools, as well as for workers with youth and young adults. The course was organized by the ministry of education with the cooperation of the Cultural and Social Union and was directed by L. Losowsky. It was a part of a continuing effort to help Jewish schools overcome the lack of qualified personnel and to prepare needed workers for youth programs.

**Social Welfare**

The JDC-supported welfare program continued, operating through local relief committees consisting of representatives of the Cultural and Social Union and the Union of Religious Congregations. In mid-1964 the program covered some 13,000 persons: 7,000 received cash relief, 1,750 benefited from feeding programs, 750 received medical aid, 212 were students, and 1,790 participated in various cultural programs. JDC also supported a home for the aged in Warsaw, with 100 residents, and the 15 kosher kitchens supervised by the Union of Jewish Religious Congregations in various cities. ORT continued to operate vocational training for some 2,500 students. During the summer some 3,000 Jewish children, including pupils in Jewish day schools, were sent to summer camps with JDC help.

**Producer Cooperatives**

There were 17 Jewish producer cooperatives operating under the sponsorship of the Cultural and Social Union. The value of their total output in 1963 was Zl 214,192,000, with a net profit of Zl 20,606,000 (Zl = $.04). Special
measures were taken to establish efficient methods of production, and the introduction of a better system of work resulted in making all cooperatives profitable. The cooperatives employed 1,959 persons, besides 463 home workers. About 75 per cent of the workers employed in the producer cooperatives had been trained by ORT. A large number of these were home workers, mainly women (Folks-shtimme, June 24 and July 4, 1964). There were 7,000 to 8,000 Jews, including families, associated with the producer cooperatives in 1964, or about a quarter of the total Jewish population of Poland.

**JEWISH PRODUCER COOPERATIVES—MID-1964**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bytom</td>
<td>Im. Anielewicza</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dzierzonia</td>
<td>Wspolna Praca</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glywice</td>
<td>Im. Lewartowskiego</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legnice</td>
<td>Postep</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodz</td>
<td>Farmedia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rozvoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kr. Pacanowska</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swidnica</td>
<td>Specyfica</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szeczin</td>
<td>Dobrobyt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>Amika</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tlumacz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odrodzenie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroclaw</td>
<td>Ineka</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wielobranzowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robotnik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zary</td>
<td>Im. Boh. Getta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CULTURAL ACTIVITIES**

The Cultural and Social Union had great difficulty in developing Jewish cultural activities, particularly in bringing small Jewish groups in scattered cities into Jewish institutional life. Aside from this, it was faced by a tendency toward assimilation into the dominant Polish culture among the younger generations. Jewish youth, lacking traditional Jewish background or education, were apparently not interested in maintaining their Jewish identity. The union, however, continued to devote great energy to its multiple cultural undertakings. In 1964 there were over 100 projects, including dramatic groups, choral ensembles, instrumental and dance groups, and reading circles. The union launched a series of activities to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the first publication of Mendele Mocher Seferim's story *Dos kleyne mentshele* ("The Little Human Being"), the beginning of modern Yiddish literature.

The Jewish publishing house Yiddish Bukh offered its readers books by Sholem Aleichem, Peretz, and Abraham I. Reisen. Its list also included *Mit a freylikhn ponim* ("With a Happy Face"), by Sam Liptzin of New York. It
announced plans for publication of 10 Yiddish textbooks, including an elementary reader and a three-part Yiddish grammar.

The Historical Institute was devoting the current year chiefly to studies on the period of the catastrophe. It also continued publication of Bletter far geshikhte. Yiddishe shriften, a literary monthly of the Cultural and Social Union, celebrated the publication of its 200th issue.

In January a festival of Jewish amateur cultural clubs was held in Warsaw. Seven clubs were admitted to the festival: the drama circles of Czestochowa, Zary, Legnice, Warsaw, and Lodz, the vocal and instrumental groups of Swidnica, and the reading circle of Katowice. The 1964 season of the Esther Kaminska state theater opened later, in January. It presented Der pipernoter ("The Viper"), by the Soviet-Jewish writer Evgenyi Schwartz, directed by Henryk Zycel. The 3,000 subscribers of the state theater in Warsaw, Lodz, and Wroclaw were each to see five plays. The same system applied to every city with a minimum of 200 subscribers. In February the Yiddish state theater visited Vienna and was warmly received by both the public and the Austrian press. In May it left for a tour of England, where it presented 24 performances, and France, where it presented 15.

Abraham Morewski, one of the oldest Jewish actors in Poland, died on March 10, 1964, at the age of 78.

**Commemoration of the Catastrophe**

A special commission was appointed by the Cultural and Social Union to prepare observances of the 21st anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto revolt. Salo Fiszgrund was the chairman, and members included David Sfard and Edward Reiber. On April 19 there was a solemn assembly before the monument to the victims of the ghetto, and the Polish radio gave much time to the commemoration.

On May 10 the memorial at the Treblinka camp, where over 800,000 Jews were killed by the Nazis, was dedicated in the presence of high Polish officials. Many Jewish delegations from abroad participated in the ceremonies. Those present included WJC President Nahum Goldmann; Sir Barnett Janner, president of the British Board of Jewish Deputies; Moses Rosen, chief rabbi of Rumania; JDC European Director Charles H. Jordan, and representatives from Argentina, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Sweden, and other countries. About 30,000 witnessed the proceedings, which were opened by Stanislaw Turski, rector of the Warsaw University. The ceremonies concluded with a recitation of traditional Jewish prayers. Two hundred wreaths were laid at the monument. The memorial is situated on the spot where the gas ovens once stood; a huge stone holding a menorah is surrounded by smaller stones representing cities and villages where the Jewish victims lived. According to the report submitted by Joseph Pietruszinski, general secretary of the Council for the Protection of Monuments of Struggle and Martyrdom, Zl 8 million was contributed to the Treblinka memorial by people throughout Poland. Twenty-five Jewish organizations from abroad, including the CJMCAG and JDC, also contributed to the cost. Speaking at the reception tendered him and other
Jewish leaders from abroad by Janucz Wieczorek, president of the Council for the Protection of Monuments, Nahum Goldmann expressed deep appreciation for the great effort that the Polish government was making to keep alive the memory of the martyrs. He also praised the support of Jewish schools, theater, and other Jewish institutions (JTA, May 13, 1964).

LEON SHAPIRO

Czechoslovakia

Czechoslovakia continued to pursue its distinctive course of de-Stalinization in 1964. A number of old-line party bureaucrats were missing from the official list of candidates for the June 14 parliamentary election. They included ex-Premier Viliám Široký, former Slovak Communist party secretary Karol Bacílek, and Bruno Koehler, former boss of the German sections of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia. At the end of 1964 not a single important prewar Communist held a position of power in the party apparatus. The new leadership was composed of people who had been lower-echelon or youth functionaries before 1939 or who joined after the war.

President Antonín Novotný had sought to bolster his position by allying himself with Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev. When Khrushchev visited Czechoslovakia on the 20th anniversary of the August 1944 uprising, he was met at the airport by Novotný and all members of the party presidium. Novotný hailed Khrushchev as the leader “who personally directed Soviet assistance to the Slovak national uprising from the headquarters of the Ukrainian guerrilla movement,” and Khrushchev referred to Novotný as an “outstanding figure of the Czechoslovak and international Communist movement.” A few weeks later Khrushchev was retired.

Novotný survived the crisis, but not without further concessions to the opposition inside and outside the party. A relaxation of foreign-travel restrictions was one such concession. Family units were still not permitted to go abroad together, but there were exceptions even to this rule. Czechoslovaks visited Western Europe, the United States, and even Israel in increasing numbers.

In November the new parliament unanimously reelected Novotný as president. Time and again in 1964 the party and state leadership asserted their authority against dissenters among writers, economists, and university teachers. However, not all critics were intimidated, and especially not the group around Kulturný Život (“Cultural Life”), the journal of the Slovak Writers’ Union, although some changes were imposed on its editorial board. On the eve of the First of May celebration, the 1964 Klement Gottwald state prize was awarded to the Slovak poet Laco Novomeský, and Kulturný Život extolled him as the spokesman for Czechoslovakia’s revisionism.
Novomeský, a Communist for 40 years, had been a party intellectual of some note before the war. During the war he was one of the leaders of the August 1944 revolt against the clerico-fascist Slovak government, allied with the Nazis. In the course of the Stalin-Gottwald purge he was denounced as a Slovak nationalist and was imprisoned for several years. Amnestied and, in 1963, rehabilitated and reinstated in the party, he thereafter expressed with impunity what others did not dare to utter. He created a sensation by publishing an article calling for the exoneration of nonparty victims of the purge, and specifically of Záviš Kalandra, a gifted political writer and historian, who was executed in 1950, along with the Czech Socialist deputy Milada Horáková and others.

Kalandra had left the Communist party in the thirties and spent five years in Nazi concentration camps. Returning to Prague after the war, he was the first to raise his voice against the antisemitic tendencies to be found in the new totalitarianism represented by the Communist party. His pamphlet, *Socialists and Antisemitism*, in the “Leaflets for All Working People” series, was published by the Czechoslovak Social Democratic party, in 1946. Six years later, an officially instigated wave of antisemitism engulfed the Communist party itself and led to the liquidation of most of its prominent Jewish members.

In September Mordecai Oren, the Mapam leader who had been a prosecution witness in the Rudolf Slánský trial of November 1952 (AJYB, 1954 [Vol. 55], p. 288; 1963 [Vol. 64], p. 365), was at last officially exonerated by the Czechoslovak judicial authorities. Having been forced to confess imaginary crimes and to recite in open court a memorized confession which incriminated Slánský and his codefendants, Oren himself was tried in secret in October 1953 and sentenced to 15 years in prison. He served almost three years, first in the Jáchymov uranium mines and then in the state prison of Leopoldov, which held Eduard Goldstiicker, the former Czechoslovak minister to Israel and an authority on Franz Kafka (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 287), and Rudolf Slánský’s brother Richard, as well. In May 1956, three years after Stalin’s death, the attorney general suspended the remainder of Oren’s sentence and he was released from prison. After his release he waged a persistent fight for judicial rehabilitation and wrote a book about his experiences in Czechoslovak jails which was translated into French as *Prisonnier politique à Prague (1951–1956)*. It took seven years for the Prague government to clear Oren officially, and a few months more to clear his cousin Simeon Ohrenstein, former assistant to the Israeli commercial attaché in Prague. Ohrenstein, convicted as another of Rudolf Slánský’s “Zionist accomplices,” was pardoned in October 1954 after having served three years of a life sentence.

In September the Israeli radio *Jerusalem* announced that the Prague government had consented to pay damages to Oren, who said he could use whatever he might be paid to establish a cultural center at his kibbutz.
The Central Association of Jewish Religious Communities in Slovakia and the Council of Jewish Religious Communities in Bohemia-Moravia continued to represent the regional religious communities and local congregations. Among the Jews who were allowed to leave for Israel and other countries were two of the five rabbis still active in 1963 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 286). Chief Rabbi Eliáš Katz in Slovakia and the 89-year-old Chief Rabbi Richard Feder of Bohemia and Moravia were the spiritual leaders of the community. Locally, religious functions were increasingly carried out by cantors and laymen. Bratislava, the second largest Jewish community of Czechoslovakia reported two circumcisions during the first half of 1964. During the same period 15 Jews were buried in the Jewish cemetery of the city.

The assembly of delegates of the Jewish Religious Communities in Bohemia-Moravia, which met in Prague in November 1963, expressed concern about the shortage of rabbis and rabbinical students. The assembly was informed that the ministry of education had offered a state scholarship for studies at the rabbinical seminary of Budapest, but nobody had applied. All communities were urged to search for suitable candidates.

Of the 400 Jewish cemeteries in the Czech districts, the report to the assembly stated, only those in cities or townships with a Jewish population were properly cared for. A similar problem existed with regard to synagogues no longer in use.

The assembly approved the establishment of a peace fund of the Council of Jewish Religious Communities to finance its activities "against fascism, revenge seekers, militarism, and racial discrimination, and in behalf of world peace," and to develop contacts with Jewish organizations outside Czechoslovakia. It elected a new board and executive committee, with František Ehrmann as chairman and František Fuchs and Bedřich Bass as vice-chairmen. Each of the five regional Jewish communities in Bohemia and Moravia—Prague, Brno (Brünn), Usti (Aussig), Plzeň (Pilsen), and Ostrava (Ostrau)—nominated four members and four alternate members to the board. The next executive committee was composed of the chairman of the council, the two vice-chairmen, and two representatives of each of the religious communities.

The 20th anniversary of the eradication of the Czech family camp Auschwitz-Birkenau B IIb where, on the night of March 8, 1944, 3,826 Czech Jews were gassed, was commemorated by most Jewish communities with memorial services and in Prague by an anti-fascist rally in the great auditorium of the Jewish community center.

The 20th anniversary of the Slovak uprising was commemorated by Věstník ("Gazette"), with a long report on the participation of Jewish resistance fighters, both Communists and non-Communists, which emphasized the military activities of Ha-shomer Ha-tza'ir and the Maccabee youth. Both these Zionist groups were proscribed when Czechoslovakia became a Communist state.
Cultural Activities

Greater emphasis was placed on the conservation of art treasures and the creation of tourist attractions in 1964 than in the past. In June a permanent exposition of "Synagogal Textile Treasures from the 16th to the 20th Century" was opened by the Jewish State Museum in the Spanish synagogue of Prague. The museum had approximately 10,000 ceremonial objects, Torah curtains, mantles, draperies, etc., which the Nazis had stored in a central warehouse during the war—part of a vast collection of Jewish memorabilia, religious objects, and other materials which the Nazis had gathered for the ostensible purpose of creating a research center for the study of the Jewish people. In January (New York Times, February 1, 1964) the Jewish State Museum had sold more than 1,400 Torah scrolls from the same collection to an unidentified Briton. The scrolls were to form the nucleus of a Jewish museum at the Westminster synagogue of London which would also serve as a memorial to the destroyed Jewish communities of Czechoslovakia. In September the Shach Synagogue of the Moravian town of Holešov, a renowned center of Jewish learning in the 17th century, was reopened as the permanent home of the exposition "The Jews in Moravia." The synagogue was built in the 16th century and rebuilt in baroque style in the 18th. In 1964 only a handful of Jews were left of the 200 families who had lived in Holešov before World War II.

At the initiative of the League for Israel-Czechoslovak Friendship, the Moreshet publishing house in Israel issued a Hebrew translation of Dětské kresby na zastávce k smrti, Terezin 1942–1944 ("Theresienstadt 1942–1944: Children on a Way Station to Death"). The book also appeared in an Anglo-American edition (McGraw-Hill, New York-Toronto-London) under the title I Never Saw Another Butterfly: Children's Drawings and Poems from Theresienstadt Concentration Camp. This edition contained 25 poems and 59 watercolors, drawings, sketches, and cut-outs selected from about 4,000 such items in the Jewish State Museum's archives. Eighty-six pictures by four Theresienstadt painters (Fritz Fritta, Otto Ungar, Karel Fleischmann and Peter Kien), all of whom perished during the war, were shown at the Ben Uri art gallery of London. A new, detailed description of the Theresienstadt ghetto, compiled by Karel Lagus and Joseph Polak and called Město za mřížemi ("A Town Behind Bars"), was published in 1964.

Arnošt Lustig published a new novel, Modlitba pro Kateřinu Horowitzovou ("A Prayer for Catherine Horowitz"). Ladislav Fuks, whose novel Mr. Theodore Mundstock won an important literary prize in 1963, published a volume of short stories, Mi černovlási braťi ("My Dark-Haired Brothers"). Josef Škvorecký, generally considered as the best contemporary Czech novelist, turned to a Jewish theme in Sedmiramenný svícen ("The Seven-Armed Candelabra"). The novel was written in 1954 but could not appear then. The book dealt not only with the Nazi pogrom but also, and in this it was unique, with the hostility with which Czechs who had moved into Jewish apartments and houses treated those who returned from the death camps.
Hana Bělohradská's story *Bez krásy, bez límce* ("Without Beauty—Without a Collar") and Ladislav Grossman's *Obchod na korze* ("The Shop on Main Street") both dealing with Jews during the Nazi period, were selected for full-length movie productions. The lead in *The Shop on Main Street* was offered to Ida Kaminska, the director of the Yiddish Theater of Warsaw.

The *Věstník* ("Gazette") continued as the organ of the Council of Jewish Religious Communities in the Czech Lands and the Central Association of Jewish Religious Communities in Slovakia. The mimeographed German *Informationsbulletin* was directed to readers outside Czechoslovakia. The *Židovská ročenka* ("Jewish Year Book") for the year 5725 (1964–1965) appeared in August. It contained contributions by Rabbis Richard Feder, Eliáš Katz and Bernard Farkaš and by Rudolf Iltis, Erich Kulka, Jakub Markovič, Emil F. Knieža, František Gottlieb, Arnošt Lustig, and others.

**Contacts with Israel**

In June 1964, the 80-year-old writer Max Brod, Franz Kafka's friend and literary executor, arrived from Israel for his first postwar visit to his native Prague and spent an afternoon with the leaders of the Jewish community. A life-long Zionist, Brod stressed his interest in Jewish-Czech cooperation and the importance of Hebrew for the Jews in the diaspora. He expressed the hope that representative books by modern Hebrew authors would be translated into Czech and announced that his autobiography would be published in Czech by Mladá Fronta.

Hanan Rosen, the secretary of the League for Israel-Czechoslovak Friendship, also visited Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak-Jewish writers Arnošt Lustig, Emil F. Knieža, and Erich Kulka visited Israel, as did Slovakia's Chief Rabbi Eliáš Katz, who took part in the opening there of the exposition "The Annihilation of the Jews of Bohemia and Moravia," organized by the Prague Jewish State Museum.

The remains of Ben Avigdor, the Hebrew writer and publisher of Hayyim N. Bialik, I. L. Peretz, Sholem Aleichem, Sholem Asch, and others, who died in 1921 in Karlovy Vary (Carlsbad), were exhumed and transferred to Israel.
Hungary

In 1964 the János Kádár regime maintained its "liberal" policy of following the Khrushchev line both at home and in foreign affairs. When Khrushchev visited Hungary in March and spoke in favor of "a good plate of goulash," he found a sympathetic audience.

Indicative of the prevailing official attitude was greater contact with foreign countries. In 1963 the number of Hungarians traveling abroad reached 521,000, and some 585,000 foreigners visited Hungary. Although from time to time the Communist party took writers and artists to task for "anti-socialist" morality and "reactionary approach," all sorts of novels, plays, and essays were nevertheless published, including some that indirectly defended the existentialist view of man, modern painting, and modern music.

At the same time, the regime was not prepared to tolerate organized opposition. In December 1964 the Hungarian supreme court sentenced five persons to prison for trying to reorganize the Democratic People's party and the Liberal party, both of which had been banned by the Communists since 1949.

In an effort to increase industrial production, Budapest-appointed factory directors were invested with sole responsibility for the management of their enterprises. They were supposed to meet production quotas and to operate plants at a profit. The government also moved toward widening the role of the factory councils, the present substitute for the workers' councils which sprang up during the 1956 revolt. These elective bodies, reactivated toward the end of 1963, had advisory functions in such matters as industrial planning, wages, and the size of the labor force.

There was substantial improvement in the economic situation and trade with Western nations increased. According to official sources, the 1964 harvest exceeded that of 1963, and it was expected that Hungary would need to purchase little grain from the West.

While the regime continued to accuse Vatican "reactionary circles" of open attacks on the Communist state, it also continued the policy of "coexistence" with the Roman Catholic church. In September an accord was signed with the Vatican, stipulating the framework and areas of activity of the Catholic church in Hungary. There were sporadic reports that Josef Cardinal Mindszenty was to be permitted to leave the country. At the end of 1964, however, the cardinal was still in asylum in the United States embassy at Budapest.

In September President Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia arrived in Budapest on an official visit. This was Tito's first visit to Hungary since 1947 and he used it, clearly in agreement with Kádár, for an open attack on Red China for attempting to "hamper our fight for world peace."

Khrushchev's removal from office in October caused consternation in Budapest. Kádár openly expressed surprise at Khrushchev's dismissal and credited
him with great accomplishments, particularly in the struggle for peace and against Stalinist diehards. Kádár also repeated his support of the policies adopted by the 20th and 22nd congresses of the Soviet Communist party (1956 and 1961), opposing both "dogmatism" and "revisionism." At the same time, the government denied rumors of a planned withdrawal of the estimated 80,000 Soviet troops from Hungary.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

Estimates of the number of Jews in Hungary varied from 70,000 to 90,000. There were few overt acts of antisemitism and, according to reliable reports, the authorities dealt speedily and severely with all cases of known anti-Jewish acts or propaganda. In the course of 1964, however, Jewish cemeteries in Debreen and Aszod were defiled by vandals, whom the police were not able to apprehend.

For the first time since the establishment of the Communist regime, the anniversary of Theodor Herzl's death was officially commemorated in Hungary. Permission was granted for a public meeting to mark the 60th anniversary of this event, which was attended by official representatives of the Israeli embassy and by Francz Csaba, Hungarian vice-chief of protocol.

There was no real obstacle to emigration, but only small numbers of Jews left Hungary. Most of these were Orthodox, who sought a more intensive religious life abroad. By East European standards, the Jews in Hungary had an active religious and cultural life, centering around the Central Board of Jewish Communities (Magyar Izraeliták Országos Képviselete). The Budapest community of 60,000 Jews had some 30 synagogues, both Orthodox and Neolog (the latter resembling the American Conservative synagogue). According to official figures, it had 18,500 dues-paying members. Part of its budget was met by governmental grants, as with all churches. There were enough kosher butchers to supply meat to all who wanted it. On Passover the Hungarian Jews had a sufficient quantity of matzot, and the community organized fourteen public sedarim.

While not affiliated with worldwide Jewish organizations, the Central Board maintained contact with communities abroad, particularly in England, France, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Poland. It also had continuing relations with CJMCAG. Endre Sos was president of the Central Board; its secretary-general, Tibor Pener, died in November. In Budapest Imre Benoschofsky was chief rabbi of the Neolog community and Jeno Schuck of the Orthodox community.

**Welfare, Education, and Culture**

The manifold Jewish welfare activities in Hungary were directed by a special social council of the Budapest board. Its services included a Jewish hospital, headed by Dr. Stephan Weicz, with 224 beds, staffed by 10 Jewish physicians and equipped with a kosher kitchen; four homes for the aged pro-
viding various social services and religious activities, and several canteens where needy, mostly elderly, people received free meals.

With the aid of CJMCAG, the community maintained a secondary school (gymnasium) for some 140 students, and a yeshivah-getannah (primary day school) for 30. Thirty Talmud Torahs attached to synagogues in Budapest and in provincial cities provided supplementary Jewish education. The Budapest community also supported a theological seminary under the direction of the scholar Sandor (Alexander) Scheiber, which had nine students and six professors and a dormitory to make it easier for students from provincial cities to attend. In 1964, three seminary graduates became rabbis in provincial congregations: David Weicz in Congros, Thomas Ray in Szeged, and Imre Sahn in Debreczen. In 1964 the seminary undertook extensive renovation of its building and synagogue. The Jewish Museum’s fine exhibit of Jewish religious art objects was open to the public. But because little had been added to the collection, the museum’s cultural importance had been somewhat diminished.

The Central Board continued its extensive publication and research program. In 1964 it included Monumenta Hungariae Judaica (2 volumes), Bibliography of Hebraica and Judaica Published in Hungary (3 volumes), and a documentary series on the position of the Jews under Nazi occupation (3 volumes). The board also continued publication of its weekly magazine Új Élét, edited by Rooz Rezso. A valuable library of 150,000 microfilms of documents on Jewish ghettos established in 1944 was prepared and collected by the Jewish communities from sources in the central state archives and in the municipal archives of smaller towns, including Debreczen, Eger, Miskolc, and Pecs. The research program was made possible through an annual subsidy from CJMCAG. Some of the CJMCAG funds were used also for the restoration work at the Cemetery of Martyrs at the Dohany Street synagogue.

Although it maintained a relatively large network of activities, the Hungarian Jewish community was in a state of latent crisis. It suffered from the gradual disappearance of the older generation of Jews who were attached to religious observance and tradition. On the other hand, there was considerable disaffection on the part of young people educated in an atheistic state and looking for employment in state-managed professional institutions, where religious adherence leading to an identity, separate from the state, was frowned upon.

Fulop Grunwald, a distinguished scholar and co-editor of Monumenta Hungariae Judaica, died in January 1964.

Leon Shapiro
Rumania

RUMANIA'S INDUSTRIAL growth continued during 1964, despite the Soviet desire that the country play a largely agricultural role within the framework of Comecon, the council for mutual economic assistance of the communist countries. Instead, Rumania demonstrated her independence by concluding economic agreements with the United States and France.

No official total figures on industrial production for 1964 were available at the time of writing, but the Rumanian News Agency claimed in June that in the first five months of 1964 the industrial-production plan was over-fulfilled by 3.2 per cent and that 74 per cent of the industrial growth was due to increased productivity of labor. The New York Times reported in December 1964 that foreign trade had doubled in five years, instead of the planned six, and amounted to more than $2.1 billion a year.

In January 1964 the deputy chairman of the state planning commission, Mauriciu Novak, was quoted as stating that Rumania would never agree to any joint planning with Comecon. Referring to Russia's still unfulfilled promise of four years earlier to supply equipment for an important Rumanian steel mill at Galatz, he emphasized that Rumania would get the most modern and efficient equipment for her industries wherever she could, East or West.

An official statement declared that Rumania was determined to proceed with industrialization and expansion of trade with the West and rejected Moscow's plan for specialized production by Comecon members. A month after the publication of this document—called by some Western journalists a "Rumanian declaration of economic independence"—an economic agreement between the United States and Rumania was signed in Washington after two weeks of negotiations. This enabled Rumania to purchase most commodities without special licenses, including equipment for oil refineries, the petrochemical industry, and steel mills; complete plants, and possibly even a nuclear reactor. It was also agreed to raise the diplomatic missions in Washington and Bucharest to the rank of embassies. The American delegation was headed by Averill Harriman, undersecretary of state for political affairs, and the Rumanian delegation by Gheorghe Gaston-Marin, deputy premier and chairman of the state planning commission.

A trade agreement with France, which followed the agreement with the United States, was concluded in five days of negotiations and signed by French Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Murville and Rumanian Deputy Foreign Minister Corneliu Manescu. The only information released about it was that it concerned scientific and technical cooperation.

Rumania again showed her independence in the discussion of a development plan for the lower Danube valley that would have involved both Rumania and Bulgaria. An article in the bimonthly geography journal of Moscow
University by Y. B. Valev, professor at the university, had asserted that "the joint development of the lower Danube region could best be handled in the future by a lower Danube international complex within the framework of collaboration of the Socialist countries." The Rumanian outcry against the plan began in the June 1964 issue of Viatza Economica ("Economic Life") and was taken up by the press and radio. This immediately produced a retraction of the plan in Izvestia by the noted Russian economist O. Bogomilov, who acknowledged that "the Rumanian objections are legitimate."

In March 1964 La Nation Roumaine, the organ of the Rumanian refugees in France, estimated the population of Rumania at 18,877,000 and the membership of the Communist party at 1,240,000, an increase of 140,000 over 1962. The writer estimated that in spite of the great industrial progress two-thirds of the population were still in agriculture, and asserted that the increased tempo of industrialization was causing hardship in the cities as well as in the villages. The economic institute of the Rumanian Academy published a report on incomes, quoted by Labor in Exile (August-September 1964) the publication of refugee trade unionists from the East, from which it appeared that the wages of industrial workers in Rumania have been almost twice as high in 1938 as in 1963.

DE-RUSSIFICATION

Together with the effort to loosen economic ties with the Communist world, the drive to free Rumania from Russian cultural influence, begun some time before, was intensified in 1964. Russian language and literature ceased to be compulsory subjects in primary and high schools. Now optional, they were not popular. The Maxim Gorky Institute in Bucharest, a training school for teachers of Russian, was closed. The same fate befell the Russian Book Institute which, together with a chain of book stores belonging to it, had had a virtual monopoly in the book market. It was replaced by a publishing institute and bookstores dealing in world literature. The greatest change in this direction was the discontinuance of the Rumanian edition of the Soviet weekly New Times, which was replaced by a publication of the Union of Rumanian Journalists called Lumea ("World").

Russian names of streets and parks, factories and collective farms, were replaced by Rumanian names.

Rumania continued to take advantage of the ideological conflict between Moscow and Peking. It took a stand in favor of peaceful coexistence and against "exporting revolution" (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 291). At the same time, it opposed the conference of Communist countries planned for December 15, 1964,¹ which had been intended to condemn and isolate China, declaring that it would participate in an international Communist gathering only if all Communist parties were invited. Two Rumanian delegations went to China in 1964, one in March to mediate the Moscow-Peking conflict and one

¹ The conference was cancelled after Khrushchev's removal in October 1964.
in September for the 15th-anniversary celebrations of the Communist regime. Both delegations included top leaders—the first, Prime Minister Ion Gheorghe Maurer, and the second, President Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej himself.

George Bailey in the *Reporter* (New York, November 5 and 19, 1964), after an extensive trip through Rumania and especially Transylvania, reported the revival of a spirit of aggressive intolerance against the Hungarian minority. A formerly autonomous region in an area densely populated by Hungarians, with its capital at Târgu-Mureș, was abolished and its university merged with the Rumanian university at Cluj. Since there were 1,700,000 Hungarians in the area, the question arose whether this action indicated a generally unfriendly attitude toward ethnic minorities.

A propaganda campaign for economic independence and national revival began at the height of Rumania's dispute with the Soviet Union. Workers in shops and collective farms were encouraged to discuss these sensitive political problems, which until then had been strictly forbidden. The spirit and direction of these discussions was indicated by the fact that the Russian wives of Rumanian workers were not allowed to attend the meetings (New York Times, July 5, 1964).

Even the ticklish question of Bessarabia came under scrutiny. This province, which the Russians first acquired in 1802 but which had belonged to Rumania between the two world wars, was annexed to the Soviet Union after World War II. Max Frankel reported in the New York *Times* (December 18, 1964) that the Rumanians were reopening the question of Bessarabia by publishing an anti-Russian essay on the subject by Karl Marx. The Russians were thus put on notice that the subject of Bessarabia was still very much alive.

There were also some signs of liberalization of the Communist regime. The Associated Press reported (June 15, 1964) that thousands of prisoners had been freed from prisons and forced-labor camps. Deputy Prime Minister Alexandru Birlădeanu put the number of those liberated in the last three and a half years at 7,674, including 2,400 in the first half of 1964 alone. The explanation given was that economic progress was so extensive and the Rumanian people so united in "Socialist patriotism" that the prisoners could now go free.

That the liberalization was limited was suggested by a report from Bucharest in the Paris refugee organ *La Nation Rumaine* (April-May, 1964) about a certain N. N. Tarnoviceanu, formerly a professor at the university of Jassy. Liberated from prison after 15 years of detention, he was assigned a job as laborer in the Bucharest central market.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

The organ of the Federation of Jewish Communities in Rumania, *Revista cultului mosaic* (June 1964), estimated the Jewish population at about 150,000. A figure of 145,000 was given by the London *Jewish Chronicle* (February 14, 1964), which reported 60,000 Jews in Bucharest and about 10,000
each in the cities of Jassy, Galati, Cluj, Alba Julia, Bistritza, and Marmorosh-Sighet, with the rest in smaller cities and towns. At the beginning of 1963 the Jewish population of Rumania had been estimated at 170,000 to 180,000 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 294).

About 15,000 Jews were employed in state-owned industries and commercial enterprises, and an estimated 6,000 were doctors, dentists, and technicians. Many Jews were self-employed in little shops and service trades which were still tolerated by the government.

Rumania recognized the Jews not only as a religious group but also as an ethnic minority, guaranteeing them full rights to the use of their language and the exercise of their culture. This was emphasized from time to time by both Jewish officials and government spokesmen, but the tri-lingual Revista cultului mosaic (Rumanian, Hebrew and Yiddish), still the only publication of the Rumanian Jews, did not report any cultural or social activity in the Jewish community during the whole of 1964.

In 1964 the Federation of Jewish Communities apparently made a start toward reorganization. Since the death of its last elected president in January 1961 (AJYB, 1962 [Vol. 63], p. 387), the office had remained vacant. In 1964 a new central body was created and Chief Rabbi Moses Rosen was chosen temporary president of the federation, until regular elections could be held. The number of organized Jewish communities in Rumania was given in Revista cultului mosaic (June 1964) as 70, whereas 100 communities were said to have existed the year before (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 293).

The Rumanian authorities did not interfere with the efforts of the federation to establish fraternal relationships with world Jewry. The August 1964 issue of Revista cultului mosaic reported a visit by two representatives of the Hungarian Jewish community, Rabbi Jeno Schuck and Endre Sos, president of the Hungarian Central Board of Jewish communities. They came at the invitation of Chief Rabbi Rosen and were greeted by the Minister of Church Affairs D. Dogaru, who welcomed the visit as a “contribution to friendship among peoples.”

The publication of the 100th issue of the Revista cultului mosaic (January 1964) was the occasion for special celebrations. There were greetings from rabbis and community leaders from several countries, among them Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie of the United Kingdom; President Barnett Janner of the Board of Deputies of British Jews; the Sephardi chief rabbi of Israel, Isaac Nissim; the chief rabbi of Moscow, Yehuda Leib Levin, and the chief rabbi of Sweden, Kurt Wilhelm.

In an interview on Radio Bucharest, reported in the February 1964 issue of the Revista, Chief Rabbi Rosen praised the government for helping the Federation of Jewish Communities provide for Passover. It was emphasized that, as in previous years (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 293), no Jew would lack matzot at Passover. The government provided the federation with 80 carloads (800 metric tons) of flour for the manufacture of matzot.

Among the political prisoners released from jails and labor camps during the year were a number of Zionists. The Jewish Chronicle (May 5, 1964)
remarked that "the release seems to be part of efforts to create a proper climate for the economic and financial talks with the United States to start next week."

Rumanian Deputy Prime Minister Gheorghe Gaston-Marin, the leader of the delegation sent to the United States to negotiate the economic agreement, was a Jew whose name had been Grossman. Born in Transylvania, Gaston-Marin lost his entire family to the Nazis. He was the chairman of the state planning commission.

A possible sign of a more favorable policy toward Jewish emigration to Israel came from a statement in the Revista (June 1964) that "divided Jewish families should have the opportunity to emigrate to Israel and other countries. . . . The Rumanian government approaches this question with deep humanitarian feelings. . . ." Never before had a statement of this kind appeared in a Rumanian publication.

A medical representative of JDC, hitherto considered a subversive organization, spent a week in Bucharest at the invitation of the government to take part in a conference on the pathological consequences of the Nazi persecutions. According to the Jewish Chronicle (October 7, 1964), the official Rumanian press also reported the participation of Charles Jordan, general director of JDC, at the unveiling of the Treblinka monument in Poland.

Reports of antisemitism continued and some newly arrived immigrants in Israel reported great suffering during the long waiting period before they received their exit-visas.

When the famous Yiddish actress Dinah Koenig died in Bucharest (May 7), the Rumanian Association of Artists and the commission on theater and music of the ministry of culture published expressions of sympathy and condolences and sent representatives to the funeral.

An article about Yiddish folksongs in Rumania, written by the Rumanian Jewish writer Emil Saculetz, appeared in the Warsaw Yiddish newspaper, Folks-shitme (August 22). A well-documented article about the history of the hasidic movement in Rumania—written by a Yiddish writer from Rumania using a pen-name—appeared in the New York Yiddish monthly Yidishe Kultur (August-September, 1964). Articles such as these about Jewish life in Rumania, wholly unpolitical in content, found no place in Rumanian publications.

JOSEPH KISSMAN
On the home front, the main feature of the year was the prestige of Prime Minister Levi Eshkol, reinforced by successful official visits to the United States and France. Despite growing criticism by former Premier David Ben-Gurion, Eshkol won a vote of confidence from his party and widespread approval from the press and general public when he resisted Ben-Gurion’s demand for a fresh inquiry into the “Lavon Affair” (AJYB, 1962 [Vol. 63], pp. 401–03), though a strong minority continued to support Ben-Gurion.

Eshkol’s friendly reception by President Lyndon B. Johnson was marked by the conclusion of a United States-Israel agreement for cooperation in the nuclear desalination of seawater. Israel’s cooperation with developing countries was extended, particularly in Latin America.

Despite repeated Arab threats, the water carrier (pipeline) went into operation without incident, but anxiety was aroused by Arab announcements of long-term planning and closer military cooperation toward the end of attacking Israel at a propitious time. A number of Syrian attacks during the year led to clashes on the northern frontier, and there were several incidents on the border with Jordan in December.

Foreign Affairs

Premier Eshkol and Foreign Minister Golda Meir continued to advocate local disarmament with mutual inspection, a great-power guarantee of the sovereignty and integrity of Israel and her neighbors, and the solution of all disputes between them by peaceful means. But there was little sign that the thaw in the cold war had reached the Middle East.

In reply to a Knesset question on May 20, Eshkol repeated David Ben-Gurion’s assurance of December 1960, that “nuclear development in Israel is designed exclusively for peaceful purposes.” The government of Israel, he declared, “has not taken the initiative in introducing new arms or new types of arms—either conventional or nonconventional—into the Middle East.”

On January 16 the Prime Minister wrote Nikita S. Khruschev that Israel agreed with the Soviet premier’s emphasis, in his letter of December 31, 1963,
on "the necessity to forego the use of force for changing territorial situation of any frontiers that have come into existence, and the obligation to settle international disputes by peaceful means." However, he added, "My government maintains that a general and global undertaking is hardly enough, and that the principles in question must also be applied to specific regions."

Egyptian President Gamal Abdul Nasser's reply to Khrushchev's letter excluded the Arab-Israel dispute from the scope of the principles proposed by the Soviet Union.

The Arab States

The Arab summit conferences in Cairo in January and Alexandria in September reiterated the uncompromising hostility of the Arab states to Israel (p. 299). The Israeli government protested on September 13 against the "declaration by 13 states, members of the United Nations, announcing that it is their objective to attempt to destroy another state, also a member of the United Nations, and to plan a comprehensive military attack against Israel."

The prime minister answered an Arab threat to divert the upper tributaries of the Jordan in order to deprive Israel of water with a statement to the Knesset on January 20: "Israel will draw water from Lake Kinneret (Sea of Galilee) within the quantities allotted her in the Unified Plan. Israel will oppose unilateral and illegal measures by Arab countries and will act for the preservation of her vital rights." He pointed out, further, that Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon were drawing considerable quantities of water from the Jordan-Yarmuk system, and that Israel was drawing no more than her share from Lake Kinneret in accordance with the Johnston Plan.

The first stage of the water carrier (pipeline) to bring water from Lake Kinneret to irrigate the arid Negev, was completed in May and went into operation. No action was taken by the Arab states, despite their repeated declarations that they would regard its operation as a threat to peace.

Armed infiltration across the borders continued at intervals throughout the year, and Syrian posts repeatedly fired on Israeli farmers and workers in the demilitarized zones and other areas near the northern frontier. A series of grave shooting attacks by Syrian forces was brought to the attention of the president of the UN Security Council on July 8 by Michael Comay, Israel ambassador to the UN.

On November 13 Syrian posts fired on an Israeli patrol, ignored the UN observers' request for a cease-fire, and, when the Israeli forces returned fire, started shelling the villages of Dan and She'ar Yashuv. Israeli aircraft went into action to silence the Syrian artillery positions from which the villages were being shelled. General Odd Bull, chief of the UN Truce Supervision Organization, reported that the Syrians had started the shooting and, while

---

1 The Johnston Plan for the utilization of the waters of the Jordan, the Yarmuk and their tributaries, which was negotiated by Ambassador Eric Johnston, President Dwight D. Eisenhower's special envoy, with Israeli, Syrian, Lebanese, and Jordanian experts, but rejected by the Arab League in 1955.
criticizing Israel for not attending the meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission, added: "The prevailing atmosphere of tension between the two countries is also a consequence of Syria’s steadfast refusal to seek an end to its conflict with Israel."

In the UN Security Council, the USSR supported Arab accusations of Israeli aggression and vetoed a United States-Great Britain resolution calling on both sides to keep the peace.

The United States and Western Europe

Premier Eshkol paid an official visit to America from May 31 to June 11, on the invitation of President Johnson. It was the first such visit made by an Israeli prime minister. In a joint communiqué issued on June 2, President Johnson reiterated "United States support for the territorial integrity and political independence of all countries in the Near East" and emphasized "the firm opposition of the United States to aggression and the use of force or the threat of force against any country."

Agreement was also reached to undertake joint studies on problems of desalting seawater, as President Johnson had proposed in February, at a Weizmann Institute dinner in New York. Four United States experts came to Israel in July to examine the feasibility of the project together with Israeli experts and an observer from the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the joint team continued its inquiries in the United States in September. In October the team recommended that the United States and Israeli governments engage a consulting firm to prepare detailed studies, to be completed by mid-1965, for a dual-purpose nuclear power and desalting plant, to be in operation by 1971, providing 175 to 200 megawatts of electricity and 125 to 150 million cubic meters (about 30 to 40 billion gallons) of pure water a year. It was emphasized that the project’s experience would be freely placed at the disposal of all other countries.

Prime Minister Eshkol also visited France from June 28 to July 10, where he met with President Charles de Gaulle, Premier George Pompidou, Foreign Minister Maurice Couve de Mourville, and Defense Minister Pierre Messmer. In the course of the talks, de Gaulle repeatedly referred to Israel as "our friend and ally" and Israeli proposals for cooperation with France in oceanography and arid-zone research met with sympathetic attention. Official spokesmen described them as having established complete harmony of views.

Summing up both visits, Eshkol reported to the Kneset on July 10 that it had "been shown that Israel is not alone in her struggle." On July 15, he qualified his previous remark: "Israel must enhance her deterrent strength, while making a constant effort to persuade friendly nations to support her independence and integrity." On July 20, in his reply to the debate on his statement, he urged the four great powers to cooperate in consolidating peace and prosperity in the Middle East by opposing any change in frontiers except by agreement, stopping the arms race, and helping to raise the standard of living in the area.
In March Foreign Minister Golda Meir visited West European countries and declared herself satisfied with the results of her talks. On June 4, negotiations which had started in November 1962 were concluded in Brussels with the signing of a trade agreement (see p. 384) between Israel and the European Economic Community (EEC; Common Market). This was the second agreement between EEC and an outside country. While Israel would have preferred to be accepted as an associate member, the agreement was considered valuable as a first step, obligating EEC to take Israeli interests into account in its future policy. Speaking in Israel on October 8, Sicco Mansholt, vice-president of the EEC commission, regretted that the Community had "submitted to various pressures" and failed to grant Israel associate membership, which he regarded as "the only solution to Israel's relations with the Market."

**West Germany**

Relations with Germany were mentioned in almost every foreign-policy statement by the premier and the foreign minister, and were repeatedly brought up for discussion in the Keneset by the opposition. On May 4, after a demand by Foreign Minister Meir that the German government "undertake without delay the measures necessary to stop the work of the German scientists in Egypt," the Keneset reiterated its resolution of March 20, 1963, demanding "urgent measures by the West German authorities to put an immediate end to this criminal activity." This demand was repeated by the prime minister in the Keneset on October 19. He also criticized West Germany’s reluctance to establish diplomatic relations with Israel, for fear of Arab reactions, and called on the German government to prevent the statute of limitations on Nazi crimes from taking effect on May 8, 1965, the 20th anniversary of Germany’s surrender. On November 18 Deputy Premier Abba Eban expressed "profound disappointment and indignation" at the West German government’s intention to allow the statute of limitations on these crimes to come into force. (See p. 410)

In July Eshkol presented Israel's views concerning the Oder-Neisse line between Germany and Poland, when he said that "any demand for boundary changes in this sensitive area, in the heart of Europe, is liable to upset international stability and endanger the peace of the world," and that, therefore, the existing situation in the area, after the postwar exchange of population, "should be accepted as a permanent solution."

**The Soviet Union**

Indications of a slight improvement in Soviet-Israeli relations were seen in the cultural-exchange agreement in July for reciprocal visits by Soviet and Israeli musicians during the year, and in the October agreement for the sale of Soviet property in Jerusalem. Two-thirds of the price was to be paid in the form of citrus exports, and Foreign Minister Golda Meir expressed the hope that the agreement would open a new chapter in trade and other relations.
between the two countries. She noted that this was the first agreement signed by Israel in Jerusalem with any of the great powers.

Other Countries

Relations with the developing countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Mediterranean area continued to expand. Israel's international-cooperation activities embraced 90 countries, including 40 countries of sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America, more than any other nation except Britain and the United States.

Distinguished visitors during the year included Pope Paul VI, the king and queen of Belgium, the presidents of Togo and Dahomey, and the prime minister of Iceland.

Pope's Visit

Pope Paul VI spent 12 hours on Israeli soil during his pilgrimage to the Christian sites in the Holy Land. In a message issued on the eve of his arrival, Prime Minister Eshkol referred to "the historic and unprecedented significance" of the occasion and declared that "the people of Israel will respect the Pope's wishes regarding the nature of his visit." Chief Rabbi Isaac Nissim issued a message of welcome to "the illustrious pilgrim" but declined to participate in the official welcome on the ground that, as the visit was of a religious nature, the Pope should have given the chief rabbi the opportunity to receive him.

In order to facilitate the Pope's journey to the holy places, a special frontier post was opened at Taanach, and he was welcomed at the nearby historic site of Meggido by President Zalman Shazar, accompanied by the prime minister, the Keneset speaker, and other dignitaries. Noting that he had come "from Jerusalem, our capital," President Shazar's welcoming address spoke of "the devastation of my people during the last generation" and "the fulfillment of prophecy by the ingathering of our people here from all the corners of the earth and the renewal of their independent life as in days of old."

In reply, the Pope declared: "Your Excellency knows, and God is Our witness, that We are not inspired during this visit by any other motives than purely spiritual ones. We come as a pilgrim; We come to venerate the Holy Places; We come to pray." He said that he included in his prayers "the sons of 'the people of the Covenant,' whose part in the religious history of mankind can never be forgotten."

After celebrating mass in the Grotto of the Annunciation, the Pope visited the holy places on the Sea of Galilee and then made his way to Jerusalem, where he was welcomed by the mayor, and to Mount Zion. Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, dean of the College of Cardinals, visited the Chamber of the Holocaust on Mount Zion, where he lit six candles in memory of the six million killed, expressing on behalf of the Pope "our sympathy and participation in the anguish and sorrow at the terrible destruction wrought on the people of Israel."
In a farewell address at the Mandelbaum Gate, the crossing point into Jordan territory, President Shazar recalled that Micah, who prophesied that men would “beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks,” also stated, “For all the peoples walk each in the name of its god, but we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever.”

In his reply, Pope Paul referred to the “suspicions and even accusations” that had been leveled at the name of Pope Pius XII and declared: “We are happy to have the opportunity to state on this day and in this place that there is nothing more unjust than this slight against such a venerated memory.” In conclusion, he said: “It is with satisfaction that We are happy to think that our Catholic children living in this country will continue to enjoy the rights and liberty to which all men are today considered to be entitled.”

It was noted that the Pope did not expressly mention either the Jewish people or the State of Israel during his pilgrimage.

**DOMESTIC AFFAIRS**

The population at the end of 1964 was 2,531,200: 2,244,700 Jews and 286,500 others, mainly Arabs and Druses, compared with 2,430,100 Jews and 274,620 others at the end of 1963.

Immigration during the four years 1961 to 1964 was about 250,000, the largest continuous influx since 1948-1951. The Jewish Agency said that unless Soviet Jews were permitted to emigrate, immigration from “countries of distress” would probably be completed in another four or five years, and immigration from the prosperous countries of the Americas and Western Europe, which totaled 22,000 during the previous four-year period, would be of vital importance for Israel.

The cabinet proclaimed 1964 as Aliyah Bet (clandestine immigration) Year, to mark the 30th anniversary of the first arrival of “illegal” immigrant ships in Mandatory Palestine. Prime Minister Eshkol recalled that between 1934 and 1948 some 100,000 such immigrants had come to Palestine in 96 blockade-running ships, 90 of which were brought in by the Haganah, as well as by land and air.

Major General Isaac Rabin succeeded Major General Tsevi Tsur as chief of staff of the Israel Defense Forces in January; Phinehas Koppel succeeded Joseph Nahmias as police inspector general in June, and Arieh Levavi succeeded Hayyim Yahil as director general of the foreign ministry in October.

In January the Israeli Press Council adopted a code of press ethics, banning deception, pressure, or threats to obtain the news; defamation or incitement against individuals, and unfounded accusations of a national, communal, religious, or racial character.

In a communiqué issued on March 15, after a joint session with the Zionist executive, the government of Israel pledged “full moral, public, and economic support” for the World Zionist Organization’s educational and cultural activities. The members of the executive “expressed the determination of the Zionist movement, while continuing to discharge its obligations in the spheres of im-
migration, absorption and settlement on the land..., to concentrate, intensify and invigorate its efforts in the Diaspora in the education of children and youth” in order “to strengthen the attachment of Jewish communities in the Diaspora to the State of Israel,” to intensify the consciousness of Jewish unity, to impart to the younger generation “the values of Judaism and its spiritual heritage,” and to “awaken and cultivate the mental readiness and active desire to settle in Israel.” The prime minister expressed the government’s concurrence with this program, and it was agreed that the effort to “enhance the Zionist spirit in Jewish life” was a matter of joint concern for the State of Israel and the World Zionist Organization.

At the meeting of the Zionist General Council which started on the following day, the “problem of Jewish survival” and the protection of Diaspora Jewry against disintegration through assimilation were placed in the forefront of the movement’s tasks by ZOA President Nahum Goldmann and by Moshe Sharett, chairman of the executive. These were also the central themes of Goldmann’s opening address to the 26th Zionist Congress in Jerusalem in December.

In May the Supreme Court, sitting as a court of criminal appeal, gave its reasons for quashing a five-year sentence imposed by the Tel-Aviv district court on Hirsch Barenblat for collaborating with the Nazis as chief of the Jewish police under the Judenrat in the town of Bendin. Justice Isaac Olshan said that the question of the attitude the Jewish leadership should have adopted under the Nazis must be left to history. Justice Moses Landau declared that it would be sheer sanctimoniousness to criticize the “little men who did not rise to superhuman heights of morality while being persecuted by the Nazi regime.”

On July 9, the late Vladimir (Ze’ev) Jabotinsky, founder of the Zionist Revisionist movement, was reinterred on Mount Herzl, Jerusalem, in the presence of President Shazar and other national leaders. Speaker Kaddish Luz delivered a eulogy in the Keneset. In his will Jabotinsky had requested that his remains “may not be transferred to Palestine unless by order of that country’s eventual Jewish government.” The cabinet decided in March “to assist the family to transfer the remains of the deceased to Israel by issuing an instruction that would comply with the request of the deceased made in his will.”

The new town of Carmiel, the center of the Galilee development plan initiated by Prime Minister Eshkol, was inaugurated in October; it was planned for a population of 50,000. Border settlements established during the year were Mevo Modi’in, at the birthplace of the Maccabees, near the Jordanian border, in November, and Biranit, near the frontier with Lebanon, in December. Both were initially set up as outposts manned by Nahal, the defense forces’ agricultural pioneering corps.

In November the Supreme Court rejected the application of the Arab nationalist El Ard group for registration under the Ottoman law of societies on the ground that its declared program “expressly and totally negates the existence of the State of Israel in general and the existence of the state in its
present form in particular. . . . It is the elementary right of every state to
defend its liberty and its very existence against enemies from without and
their supporters from within."

The "Alignment" and the "Affair"

After Isaac Ben-Aharon of Ahdut Ha-'avodah (Unity of Labor) proposed
a federation of Israel's labor parties, Prime Minister Eshkol opened negotia-
tions with Mapam (United Workers' party) for their inclusion in the cabinet
as a preliminary to discussions on labor unity. No agreement was reached,
however, and Ahdut Ha-'avodah agreed to open talks for an "alignment"
(ma'arakh) with Mapai alone.

Negotiating committees were headed by Premier Eshkol and Israel Galili,
secretary-general of Ahdut Ha-'avodah. The main lines of an agreement began
to emerge in May: the two parties would submit joint lists of candidates for
the next elections to the Keneset, the municipalities, and the Histadrut (Gen-
eral Federation of Labor), with joint platforms agreed upon in advance. Their
representatives in the legislature and in the local administrations would con-
stitute united groups governed by majority discipline. There were three main
difficulties:

1. Ahdut Ha-'avodah demanded a solution to the problem of Mapai's Min
Ha-yesod group, supporters of Phinehas Lavon, the former Histadrut secre-
tary-general and principal figure in the "affair" of 1954 (AJYB, 1962 [Vol.
63], p. 401). The group threatened to leave the party unless Mapai annulled
its 1961 decision to remove Lavon from his Histadrut position. After consult-
ing several Mapai leaders, Eshkol sent a personal letter to leaders of Min
Ha-yesod on May 2, declaring that the 1961 decision was a matter of history
and no longer had any significance. Ben-Gurion criticized Eshkol for taking
this step without the approval of the party's institutions. The Mapai secretariat
took note of Eshkol's letter, without formally approving it. A further letter
from Eshkol to Ben-Gurion, stating that he did not regret his part in the
deposition of Lavon, aroused Min Ha-yesod's anger, and they continued to
press for full reinstatement.

2. Ahdut Ha-'avodah insisted on its right to maintain a separate faction
in the Histadrut, while agreeing to a joint slate in the elections and regular
consultations with Mapai's representatives in the federation's governing
bodies. Ben-Gurion objected to this as "a deception of the electors."

3. Ahdut Ha-'avodah insisted that for the duration of the agreement Mapai
should not attempt to replace proportional representation by the constituency
system of elections. Ben-Gurion argued that electoral reform was vitally im-
portant and that only the party convention was entitled to abrogate an article
of the party's program.

After returning from the United States and France in July, Eshkol reached
an agreement with Galili, which he reported to the Mapai secretariat. A sec-
ton of Ahdut Ha-'avodah, led by its veteran ideologist, Isaac Tabenkin, ob-
jected to any bipartite agreement without Mapam, while Ben-Gurion continued
to press his objections.
While the discussions on the "alignment" were in progress, further developments threatened Mapai unity. On October 22 Ben-Gurion submitted a dossier to Minister of Justice Dov Joseph and Attorney General Moses Ben-Ze'ev. The dossier contained an account of the Lavon Affair, prepared on Ben-Gurion's instructions before his resignation by Haggai Eshed, a Tel-Aviv journalist, and an analysis by two lawyers of the proceedings and conclusions of the cabinet's Committee of Seven, which had cleared Lavon in 1960. Ben-Gurion demanded a judicial inquiry into the work of the Committee of Seven, while the two lawyers recommended a comprehensive inquiry into the 1954 affair.

On November 6 Minister of Agriculture Moses Dayyan, the leading figure in the pro-Ben-Gurion Mapai group, resigned from the cabinet because of "the absence of the identity of views which a minister must have with the prime minister."

On November 15 the Mapai central council approved the general lines of the Eshkol-Galili agreement on the "alignment," Ben-Gurion and Dov Joseph abstaining. Ben-Gurion announced his resignation from the central council, which, he said, was not entitled to pigeonhole electoral reform, and declared that he would appeal to the party convention.

On November 7 Min Ha-yesod announced its decision to leave Mapai and form an independent political movement.

On December 6 Dov Joseph proposed to the cabinet that a comprehensive official inquiry should be instituted into the 1954 affair. Both he and the attorney general severely criticized the procedure and conclusions of the 1960 Committee of Seven, though they rejected Ben-Gurion's demand for an inquiry into its work. Eshkol strongly opposed the proposal and demanded that Mapai should leave its representatives in the cabinet free to decide the issue according to their own consciences.

At a meeting of the central council on December 14, there was strong minority support for an inquiry, and Ben-Gurion announced that if this was accepted he would not insist on his demand for an inquiry into the Committee of Seven. Next day, before the central committee could resume its session and take a vote, Eshkol submitted his resignation, which involved that of the cabinet as a whole, declaring that the question was a matter of state, and ministers should have unfettered discretion to decide it without party interference. This step won widespread parliamentary and public support, and the Mapai central committee unanimously called on Eshkol to form a new cabinet, rejecting the proposal for an inquiry by a two-thirds majority.

On December 23 Eshkol submitted his new cabinet to the Kneset, unchanged except for the appointment of Akiva Govrin, minister without portfolio, as minister of tourism, and received a vote of confidence by 59 votes to 36. To signify their approval of Eshkol's rejection of the inquiry proposal the nine Mapam members abstained instead of, as usual, voting against the government.

Ben-Gurion announced his intention to publish his dossier on the Lavon
Affair and to appeal against the “alignment” agreement at the Mapai convention in February 1965.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

The dynamic development of Israel’s economy continued in 1964, but there was a large increase in the negative balance of trade. This was partly due to a considerable growth in personal consumption, which necessitated higher imports and diverted domestic resources from exports. At the same time government measures to stabilize prices resulted in heavy pressure on the available supplies, which led to a further increase in imports.

The gross national product totaled I£9.3 billion, 15.3 per cent more than in 1963 (11 per cent more in terms of 1963 prices), and the national income was I£7.2 billion—an increase of 15 per cent. National income per capita was I£2,800 ($933), 10.3 per cent more than in the previous year.

Industrial output reached I£6 billion, an increase of 14 per cent, while agricultural output rose 10 per cent. Investment in the economy totaled I£2.59 billion, of which residential building accounted for I£802 million, ships and planes I£176 million, industry I£451 million, transport and communications I£411 million, trade and services I£478 million, and agriculture I£160 million.

Exports totaled $649 million. Exports of goods, at $350 million, were 4.2 per cent higher than in 1963, industrial exports rising 15.5 per cent, while agricultural exports dropped 23 per cent, because of a fall in international citrus prices and frost damage to the citrus crop. Invisible exports, such as tourism, rose 17.5 per cent.

There was a rise of 18 per cent in imports, owing to increased prices, a tendency to increase inventories, considerable purchases of ships and planes, and higher domestic consumption.

Capital imports totaled $565 million, an increase of 8 per cent. Of this, unilateral receipts amounted to $335 million, while long- and medium-term movements of capital (including $99 million in State of Israel bonds, 24 per cent more than in 1963) totaled $251 million, compared with $170 million in the previous year.

Average unemployment was 15 per cent less than in the previous year, and there was an unsatisfied demand for labor. The consumers’ price index rose 5 per cent, somewhat less than in each of the two previous years. As a result of higher land-betterment taxes, the rise in real-estate prices slowed down considerably.

Average wages per employee rose 14 per cent—equivalent to a rise of 9 to 10 per cent in real terms. In view of the rise in the national output, Histadrut decided at the beginning of the year to press for a general wage increase of 3 per cent, but rises, especially in the services, were considerably larger.

A beginning was made toward implementation of the report of a com-

mittee, headed by David Horowitz, Governor of the Bank of Israel, which had been appointed by the government in November 1961 to examine the wage and salary system in the public services. It recommended a general reclassification in state and local administration, the Jewish Agency, and other public bodies on the basis of a comprehensive job analysis. The coordinating committee of professional men's organizations, however, demanded exemption from this process, and agreements were reached with most of the unions in this sector, increases ranging from 12 to 14 per cent. There were a number of unofficial strikes during the year by civil-service groups dissatisfied with the pace and results of reclassification, but in the latter part of the year joint labor-management committees were continuing with the work.

Important industrial development during the year included the completion of the national water carrier, bringing the waters from Lake Kinneret to the Negev; completion of the Kishon port near Haifa, the near-completion of the one at Eilat, and considerable progress in building the new port at Ashdod; investment of $50 million in the merchant fleet; initiation of the petrochemical complex at Haifa; expansion of the Haifa refineries, and completion of additional installations at the Dead Sea Potash works, trebling their output capacity.

Residential building, a considerable part of which was for new immigrants, increased by 13 per cent.

The 1965-66 budget, presented in December 1964, was £4 billion, 8 per cent more than for 1964-65. Finance Minister Sappir said that this was a small increase, in view of the rise in the population and the higher price level; the budget for 1964-65 had been 27 per cent higher than the previous year's. There was no increase in general tax rates, but the purchase tax was to be extended to certain services. Income-tax estimates were up 26 per cent, while indirect taxes furnished 44.7 per cent of the revenue, compared with 47 per cent in 1963-64. £90 million from tax revenue was to be allocated to the development budget.

£865 million was budgeted for development, including £217 million for immigrant housing. Government building was to be cut down to the utmost, except for hospitals, schools, etc.

In the ordinary budget, education, with an increase of £66 million, took second place, next to defense. Subsidies were to be reduced from £210 million to £160 million.

EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND CULTURE

Schools

Over 700,000 pupils were enrolled in Israeli educational institutions at the beginning of the 1964-65 school year. These included some 90,000 in post-primary schools and almost 20,000 in institutions of higher education.

About 70 per cent of pupils who had completed elementary school were continuing their studies—about half in academic institutions and the rest in
vocational schools. Children of immigrants from Asia and Africa made up about 25 per cent of pupils receiving post-primary education, 53 per cent of them in academic schools.

Measures to improve educational standards, especially among children of new immigrants, included: free kindergartens for 21,000 more three- and four-year-old children; introduction of the "long school day" in another thousand classes, bringing the total up to 3,500, and special supplementary lessons for backward pupils; separate grouping of children in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades (ages 11 to 13) for the study of Hebrew, mathematics, and English, in order to enable each to progress at the rate best suited to his abilities; exemption of a third of high-school pupils from tuition fees, with payments for the rest scaled to parents' incomes; establishment of 24 post-primary schools, with the aid of donors from abroad (15 of which were to be comprehensive schools), and a 50-per-cent increase in the number of students in teachers' training colleges within the next three years.

Higher Education

Israel held fifth place among all nations for the proportion of university-level students to population—750 out of every 100,000—according to a statement in July by Zalman Aranne, minister of education and culture. He emphasized, however, that still more students were needed at the institutes of higher learning, and the government was constantly increasing its subventions to the latter. Subventions totaled some £40 million in the fiscal year under review, or about half the budgets of these institutions. University leaders, nevertheless, declared that expansion was limited by lack of money and asked further government aid. Joel (Giulio) Racah, rector of the Hebrew University, said the faculty of natural sciences was unable to accept all qualified applicants; the ratio admitted ranged from one out of two to one out of three in the various departments, and in medicine there were over 400 applications for some sixty places in the first year.

Jacob Dori, president of the Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, said that besides the 880 freshmen admitted, 250 candidates had passed the entrance examinations, but could not be accepted for budgetary reasons.

The Hebrew University opened the academic year with 10,000 students, Technion with 3,600, Tel-Aviv University with 3,300, Haifa University College (opened in 1963 under the academic supervision of the Hebrew University) with 900, and Bar-Ilan University with 1,500 students.

The Artur Rubinstein chair of musicology was inaugurated and a new school of dentistry was opened at the Hebrew University; Technion opened the Karl P. Compton and Canada buildings for its chemistry department; the Weizmann Institute of Science dedicated the Institute of Organic Chemistry and the Charles Clore International House for Students and awarded its first degrees to graduates of the Feinberg graduate school; a new campus was inaugurated at Tel-Aviv University, and Haifa University College got new premises.
Archeology

Important discoveries were made at Masada, site of Herod’s desert fortress, where the Jewish Zealots made their last stand against the Romans in 73 CE. The excavations, lasting over six months, were headed by Professor Yigael Yadin of the Hebrew University, with the aid of the Israeli defense forces and a thousand volunteers from Israel and abroad. Buildings uncovered included the palace bath house, the oldest known synagogue, and the rooms in the casement wall occupied by the rebels. Finds included 2,200 coins, 200 ostraca, a liturgical scroll identical in style with those found at Qumran, and scroll fragments containing passages from Genesis, Leviticus, and Psalms, and the Hebrew original of Ecclesiasticus.

The second season, during which the excavations were to be completed and the remains reconstructed, began at the end of November. The reconstruction was to be financed with contributions from the Israeli public.

Other interesting archeological finds during the year included a fifth-century mosaic floor at Beth-shean; town fortifications, a pottery kiln, and other remains ranging from the Hyksos age to the 18th century, at Jaffa; Canaanite, Israelite, and Hellenistic remains at Tel Zeror, near Hadera; Philistine and late Bronze Age statuettes and pottery at Tel Zippar, midway between Lachish and Ashkelon; inscribed pottery fragments from the period of the First Temple at Tel Arad.

Cultural Activities

The annual Israel prizes for cultural distinction were awarded to Professor Ze’ev Ben-Hayyim, head of the Institute of Jewish Studies at the Hebrew University and vice-president of the Hebrew Language Academy, for his book *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans*; Professor Moses Rachmilewitz, head of the department of internal medicine at the Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical School, for his life’s work; Supreme Court Justice Professor Moses Silberg, for his book *Personal Status in Israel*, and Meir Margalit, of the Ohel Theater, one of the country’s outstanding actors in comedy, for his life-long contribution as actor and director.

Outstanding features of the fourth Israel Festival of Music and Drama were the first performance of *Abraham and Isaac*, a cantata specially written by Igor Stravinsky and conducted by the composer at the ancient Roman amphitheater at Caesarea; the presentation of the complete cycle of Beethoven’s symphonies, under the baton of Joseph Krips; the premiere of Odeon Partos’s *Violin Concerto*, with Yehudi Menuhin and the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra; chamber music by an ensemble led by Hephzibah and Yehudi Menuhin and by the Juilliard Quartet of New York, and performances by the Bristol Old Vic, the Cameri, and the Inbal Yemenite Dance Theater.

On June 3 the Israeli soccer team won the Asian Soccer Cup, having defeated India, Korea, and Hong Kong in the finals, which were held in Israel.
On March 17, more than four years after the date first scheduled for the election, Israel's two chief rabbis and a chief rabbinate council of five Sephardim and five Ashkenazim were duly elected. Isaac Nissim was reelected Sephardi chief rabbi, receiving 84 votes to 34 for Obadiah Hadaya, and Isser Judah Unterman was elected to succeed the late Isaac Halevy Herzog, who died in 1949, by 60 votes to 57 for Solomon Goren, chief chaplain to the Israeli defense forces.

In view of agitation against Christian missionary activities among Jewish children, Prime Minister Eshkol on March 1 submitted to the cabinet the results of a survey prepared at his request. Eleven Christian schools in Israel were attended by 900 Jewish children, according to the survey, but only three of the schools, attended by 95 of the children, preached Christianity. According to Zerah Warhaftig, minister of religious affairs, however, there were 1,380 children at 29 Christian schools, including kindergartens.

Since 1950, 200 Jews had adopted Christianity or Islam, but only 11 children had been converted to Christianity. In the same period, 407 Moslems, Druses, and Circassians had been converted to Judaism.

On March 26 the Jerusalem chief magistrate fined 104 young men, mostly yeshivah students, sums ranging from £25 to £100, with the alternative of imprisonment for 3 to 15 days, for criminal trespass in the course of anti-mission demonstrations in September 1963 in the courtyard of the St. Joseph Mission. Ninety-four refused to pay their fines and served their sentences.

The S.S. Shalom, flagship of Zim, completed her maiden voyage on March 24, with an exclusively kosher cuisine instead of the dual cuisine—one kosher and one “international”—planned by the company. This was the outcome of a prolonged campaign by the rabbinate and the religious parties against the serving of non-kosher food on the ship to attract passengers on luxury cruises. The rabbinate had refused to grant the ship a certificate of kashrut if two kitchens were installed, and the National Religious party had threatened a cabinet crisis.

There was a lengthy controversy over the rabbinical supervision of the large regional Marbek abattoir at Kiryat Malachi, established by Deromit, a cooperative of the agricultural settlements in the south. The rabbinate at first refused to license the abattoir on the ground that kashrut must be supervised by local rabbis in the locality where the meat was to be consumed, and then imposed conditions which the management said it could not meet. When the Supreme Court granted the company's application for an order nisi against the chief rabbinate, the latter failed to put in an appearance, on the ground that this was purely a matter of religious law. The court ruled on August 11 that it alone could decide whether this was indeed the case and adjourned to enable the chief rabbinate to be represented. Before the hearing could be resumed, Chief Rabbi Unterman reached an agreement with Deromit, which withdrew its application.
A man deemed to be a kohen (descendant of a priestly family), who had married a divorcee without rabbinical sanction, applied to the Tel-Aviv rabbinical court for a declaratory judgment recognizing the marriage. The court, while refusing the application, ruled on June 25 that neither of the two could marry anyone else without first obtaining a divorce from each other. It was stated that the status of the couple lay “at some point between the two concepts” of married and single.

On October 30 the Supreme Court overruled a decision of the Rabbinical High Court, which had ordered a woman to accept a divorce from her husband on the ground that there were doubts whether she was Jewish. The Supreme Court held that if she was not Jewish, the Rabbinical Court had no jurisdiction, while if she was, there were no grounds for its decision.

On August 31 the Council of the Chief Rabbinate decided, after the intervention of the president, the prime minister, the mayor of Jerusalem, and the Kneset, to delete the words “Bene Israel” from the directives issued in February 1962 concerning inquiries to be made in case of marriages between members of the Bene Israel community from India and other Jews. The words were replaced by the formula “anyone concerning the ritual purity of whose family status any suspicion or doubt arises.”

The controversy had broken out again (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], p. 391) when several Bene Israel families staged a sit-down strike for the second time, in August, outside the chief rabbinate and Jewish Agency offices in Jerusalem. They were supported in their demand for the withdrawal of the directives by a number of political parties. On August 17, after a statement by the prime minister and a debate in the Kneset, the House passed a resolution appealing to the rabbinate to “take public opinion into account and find a way of dispelling the causes of the sense of unfairness felt by the Bene Israel.”

There were five Reform congregations in Israel, totaling 500 families, in addition to the Jerusalem chapel of the Hebrew Union College. They were organized by the Circles for Progressive Judaism and affiliated to the World Union for Progressive Judaism. The largest, the Har-el synagogue in Jerusalem, was founded in 1957; the others were in Kefar Shemaryahu (near Tel-Aviv), Upper Nazareth, Haifa, and Ramat Gan. There were also Conservative congregations in Jerusalem and Haifa.

The Circles published the first Reform prayer book which was entirely in Hebrew. Each synagogue had its rabbi, but these were not recognized by the ministry of religious affairs and could not perform legally valid wedding ceremonies. Some of the congregations met with difficulties in obtaining accommodation for their services.

PERSONALIA

Leo Kadman, president of the Israeli Numismatic Society and participant in many Zionist congresses, died in Jerusalem in January, at the age of 68. Aaron Zisling, one of the 37 signers of the Proclamation of Independence in 1948 and minister of agriculture in the provisional government, died in Afula on
January 16, at the age of 63. Joseph Shapiro, chairman of ORT, a governor of the Weizmann Institute of Science and a founder of the Tel-Aviv Art Museum, died in Tel-Aviv on January 21, at the age of 68. Rabbi Abraham Mordecai Weingarten, former chairman of the Jewish Community Council of the Old City of Jerusalem, died on January 26, at the age of 68. Isaac Yaari, member of the editorial staff of Davar, died in Tel-Aviv on February 2, at the age of 48. Leyb Glantz, world renowned cantor and liturgical music composer, died in Tel-Aviv in February, at the age of 59. Genia Twersky, social-welfare pioneer, twice member of the Kneset and member of the Histadrut executive, died in Jerusalem in April, at the age of 62. Ze’ev Sheffer, former Mapai deputy speaker in the Kneset and one-time Haganah chief of staff, died at Kibbutz Ayyelet Ha-shahar on April 10, at the age of 73. Meir Grossman, prominent Zionist leader and writer and co-founder of JTA, died in Tel-Aviv on June 27, at the age of 76. Joel Brand, wartime leader of Hungarian Jewry, died in Bad Kissingen, West Germany on July 13, at the age of 58. Abba Gordin, prominent Yiddish writer and poet, died in Tel-Aviv in August, at the age of 77. Abraham Derori, Herut member of the Kneset, died in Tel-Aviv in August, at the age of 45. Hayyim Brand, former leader of Ahdut Ha-‘avodah in the United States, died in Tel-Aviv in October. Menahem Kraicer, since 1951 director of the Israeli office of UHS, died in Tel-Aviv in November, at the age of 62.

MISHA LOUVISH

Lebanon

LEBANON is the only Arab country which is a democracy, in the Western sense, and where Christians constitute the majority of the population. According to the last official census (1958), 53 per cent of the total population of 1,750,000 were Christians of different denominations and 47 per cent Moslems and Druses. When Lebanon won independence from France in 1943, an unwritten national covenant was concluded between the Christians and Moslem communities to guard the country against either domination by other Arab states or commitments to the West. The agreement also provided that the president must be a Christian, while the prime minister and the speaker must be Moslems.

On August 18 Charles Helou, minister of education in the cabinet of his predecessor, General Fuad Chehab, was elected President by a vote of 92 to 7. For the first time since Lebanon became independent, the election was held in an atmosphere of tranquillity and the inauguration ceremonies were in sharp contrast to those of 1958, held in the midst of civil unrest. (AJYB, [Vol. 60], pp. 249–250). President Helou is known to pursue a policy of cooperation with the Arab states within the framework of the Arab League but,
like his predecessors, he is determined to steer clear of inter-Arab unity or federation.

LEBANON AND ISRAEL

Because former President Chehab wished to preserve this equilibrium, he declined to participate in the January 1964 Cairo summit conference called to discuss means of preventing Israel's use of the Jordan River waters to irrigate the Negev (p. 299).

Lebanon had hoped that the projected pumping station would be placed on the Banyas River in Syria. But, on the basis of technical reports submitted by Arab League Secretary General Abdel Khalek Hassouna at the Alexandria meeting in September, plans were approved to start construction on the Hasbani River in Lebanon. The Lebanese parliament reluctantly agreed to this plan and to a joint Arab defense agreement to ward off a possible Israeli attack on the Hasbani water works once construction was begun. In the event of an Israeli attack, Lebanon was to permit troops of other Arab states to enter her territory. These troops, Lebanese Foreign Minister Philip Takla stated in January 1965, would be confined to specific areas, have limited missions, and leave the country as soon as the Lebanese government considered their task to be completed.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Population

The first settlement of Jews in Lebanon dates back to Biblical times. There are records of cultural and trade relations between King Hiram of Tyre and King Solomon. One of the prophets is buried on Lebanese territory in Sujod, which has become a place of pilgrimage. Later, Jewish communities of merchants and artisans flourished in Deir-el-Kamar, Saïda and Tripoli, and Beirut, where ancient synagogues bear witness to an active Jewish life.

At present the Jewish community of Lebanon is variously estimated to be between 5,000 to 6,000 persons, or approximately 1,000 to 1,200 families. There had been 3,500 to 4,000 Jews at the end of the 1920's. The influx of Jews from Syria and Iraq after the Arab-Israeli war increased the number to nearly 10,000. Later some of the wealthier families emigrated to Europe, mainly to Milan and Geneva, and to Latin America, where they settled in Mexico City, Buenos Aires, and São Paulo.

Most Lebanese Jews are Sephardim, originating from various countries on the Mediterranean coast, mainly Turkey and Syria. All but about 100 are Lebanese nationals. They are concentrated chiefly in the Wadi-Abu-Jamil district of Beirut, but there are some families in Saïda in the south and in Tripoli in the north. In the main, the community is composed of middle-class families, of whom approximately 70 per cent are engaged in business and commerce and have made important contributions to Lebanon's economy. About 25 per cent are artisans and five per cent are in the liberal professions.
Community Organization

The Beirut community was reorganized at the turn of the century. Since then, its affairs have been administered by a Community Council of twelve. Members in good standing constitute the General Assembly, which elects the Community Council, the official representative body of the Jews. Although Council elections are held biennially, the roster of community leaders, including the president, Joseph Attie, has not changed in the last 30 years.

Because of the delicate relationship between Lebanon's two principal religious groups and their own sensitive position, the Jews have refrained from active participation in the country's political life. They have restricted themselves to the solution of their own problems and the preservation of their civil rights, as provided in the constitution for all religious minorities.

The Beirut community has a number of active institutions, housed in a modern community center and supervised by committees which are responsible to the Community Council. These include the Bikkur Holim ("Visiting the Sick"), the Talmud Torah, and the synagogue committee, as well as others dealing with shehitah and burials.

Religious Activities

There are three large synagogues and 12 smaller houses of worship and study in Beirut. Two rabbis, four shohatim and three mohalim attend to the community's religious needs.

The history of Lebanon's chief rabbinate goes back to the period when Beirut was an autonomous vilayet (province) of the Ottoman empire, and its chief rabbi was appointed by and responsible to the chief rabbi of Turkey. When Greater Lebanon was created under the French mandate, the chief rabbi's autonomy was extended. Traditionally he has been the head of the Jewish community, the presiding judge of the Beth Din, and the community's representative in all official business with the government.

Chief Rabbi M. Lichtman retired in 1960. The post is still vacant. The community has turned to the Rabbinical Assembly of America for recommendations, because it is felt that the appointment of an American rabbi would enhance the status of the office.

Jewish Education

Beirut, the seat of the Lebanese, American, and French universities, is a prominent center of higher learning in the Middle East. Stimulated by the atmosphere of scholarship, the Jewish community, too, stressed schooling for its youth. Its excellent facilities provide an education from kindergarten through lower secondary school.

The largest day school was founded by the Alliance Israélite Universelle (AIU) in 1866. Until 1918 it was the only institution, providing a combined Jewish and secular education for 1,200 children. The present building was erected in 1927 adjacent to the synagogue and, together with it, forms
the community center. However, AIU could offer few scholarships and many impoverished children had to attend missionary schools.

At the end of World War I the community made a serious attempt to offer free education to the indigent. In 1919 a group of Orthodox Jews created a Talmud Torah to give a few orphaned children religious training. Financial assistance was provided by the community and, throughout the years, instruction in Arabic and French and all other general courses were added to the curriculum. Later the Talmud Torah admitted tuition-paying children and, in 1927, with funds donated by the Tarrab family, the Selim Tarrab Talmud Torah was built. Its present enrolment is 250. The school’s curriculum differs from that of the AIU school only in its greater emphasis on Hebrew and religious studies. It has official recognition and receives an annual government subsidy of £L1,000 ($300).

The community also has a smaller religious school run by Otzar Ha-torah, with 80 children from kindergarten to the age of eleven. Its curriculum is the same as that of the other schools, but concentrates even more on religious training.

After graduation, students who wish to continue their education enroll in the various Catholic and Protestant secondary schools or in the high schools maintained by the French embassy and the American University. Some complete their studies at the French and American universities.

A vocational training center is planned for youths who do not go beyond the community schools. Since only few Jews become artisans or skilled tradesmen, its enrolment is expected to be low.

Youth Programs

Trained teachers conduct physical-education courses for the pupils of the AIU and community schools on the well-equipped athletic field adjoining the Talmud Torah. The Commission de la jeunesse (Youth Commission) offers three sports classes weekly for 175 boys and 175 girls between the ages of 12 to 17; two days are set aside for college and university students and other older youths. Sports festivals are arranged twice a year. The facilities are also used by the 130 members of the Jewish scout movement.

Scouting is encouraged among Jewish children. Three summer camps, each lasting several weeks, are run for boys and girls between the ages of eight and fifteen. The costs are shared jointly by the participants, a private donor, and the community's Youth Commission.

Since 1963 Oneg Shabbat sessions have been held every Saturday morning for the upper-class students in AIU and more advanced non-communal schools. At these well-attended meetings, portions of the Bible are read in Hebrew and French and discussed by qualified persons. Group singing and refreshments add a lighter note to the occasion.

Cultural and other activities are offered in the recreation hall of the community school. The 200 members of the Foyer de jeunesse (youth group) and the 225 younger boys and girls of the Foyer pour petits (children's group) have active and varied programs, including games, lectures, and dancing.
Health and Welfare

Bikkur Holim, the health organization, cares for some 350 indigent patients, most of them chronically ill. It maintains a dispensary, and those requiring bed care are placed in Lebanese hospitals. Hospitalization costs for needy non-citizens are paid by Bikkur Holim, while Lebanese nationals receive state assistance.

A child-welfare program provides quarterly medical examination for all children in the community schools; financial assistance to children of indigent parents from infancy until they become wage earners; special after-school classroom facilities where children from overcrowded homes can do their homework, and special instruction for retarded children.

Finances

The community's primary source of income is a compulsory annual tax, the arikha, imposed on every member according to his ability to pay. It is augmented by fees for weddings and other functions and by special donations made to the main synagogues. Roughly 35 per cent of the total funds expended are income from the waqfs—trusts or settlements of communal property. The capital and income from such property are limited by law and by the deed of trust to exclusive use for communal and religious purposes.

The first waqf was established in 1922. The only property held by the Beirut community earlier had been the land on which the community center was built. However, this property, by its very nature, did not provide an income, and in 1930 other waqfs were established. Initially, funds for these waqfs came from three sources: payment for communal property which the Beirut municipality had expropriated for essential development purposes; a substantial increase in the arikha, and special donations from the well-to-do. The community set up a waqfs commission and a reconstruction fund to plan and manage buildings constructed for investment purposes or for communal use.

Among the fund's first achievements was the erection of a synagogue in Bhandoun, a large summer resort near Beirut. A second building, consisting of shops and offices, yielded an annual income of about 13 per cent of the capital invested. The proceeds covered the cost of a new community dining hall and kitchen, and equipment for the youth center. More recently, the sale of land, the acquisition of a commercial building, and the establishment of waqfs by prominent Beirut Jews, such as the Zilkha and Bashi families, made possible the addition of a floor to the Talmud Torah building for six new classrooms and a large assembly hall with film-projection equipment. In this way the community manages to enlarge its facilities and keep them in good repair and at the same time to have adequate funds for a full program designed to maintain its institutions and care for its needy members.
North Africa

Tunisia

In 1964 President Habib Bourguiba continued the policy which had begun to develop after the Bizerte crisis of 1962—movement toward the Arab bloc and of uneasy relations with the West. Despite his diplomatic ability he was unable to avert the cancellation, in October 1964, of the Franco-Tunisian commercial convention, under which Tunisian products received preferential tariff treatment from France. This placed the Tunisian economy in a difficult position.

Relations with Other Countries

Relations with France entered a critical phase in 1964. In August 1963 France had granted Tunisia MF200 million (about $40 million) for the purchase of French goods and for such social purposes as the construction of hospitals and schools. In return, the Tunisian government promised to spread out the nationalization of lands belonging to French companies over a period of five years. It had already nationalized 100,000 hectares (247,104 acres) in 1957 and 350,000 hectares in March 1963. Then, in May 1964, President Bourguiba decreed the immediate nationalization of all foreign-owned land. The new decree affected 350,000 hectares, of which 147,000 belonged to French companies, 150,000 to individual French citizens, and 45,000 to citizens of Italy and other countries.

The French government replied by outright cancellation of budgetary aid and denunciation of the commercial convention giving preferential status to Tunisian products. It was the first serious interruption of Franco-Tunisian trade, and at the time of writing commercial ties were still cut. Despite many attempts by President Bourguiba to renew discussions, it appeared that the French government had decided to maintain the break. Bourguiba’s response was to name Mohamed Masmoudi, well known as a friend of the West, as the new Tunisian ambassador to Paris.

Relations with the other countries of the Maghreb improved. Since Tunisia’s recognition of Mauretania in 1960, relations with Morocco had been strained; diplomatic ties had been suspended, and there had been a political boycott of Tunisia by the Casablanca bloc. The first step in a rapprochement
came at Cairo in January 1964, when in the course of a conference of African heads of state there was a conversation between Bourguiba and King Hassan II of Morocco, followed by a resumption of diplomatic relations. In December 1964 King Hassan came to Tunis in person publicly to seal the reconciliation. A major factor impelling Hassan to a reconciliation with Bourguiba was the deterioration of relations between Morocco and Algeria.

Normal relations between Tunisia and Algeria were likewise resumed after the crisis of 1963, when President Bourguiba had accused Algerian President Ahmed Ben Bella of protecting Tunisian dissidents. The economic agreements of December 1963 remained in force. A Maghreb economic commission was established by a conference of the ministers of industry of the three Maghreb countries and Libya, held in Tunis on September 30, 1964. It was to prepare for the economic integration of the four countries and especially to formulate a common position toward the European Common Market.

The most important visitor to Tunisia in 1964 was Chinese Premier Chou En-lai; after his visit Tunisia officially recognized the People’s Republic of China. President Ould Dadah of Mauretania visited Tunisia in October.

In June Tunisia signed a treaty with the Vatican, by which the latter handed over to the government most of the churches in Tunisia. The Tunis cathedral remained dedicated to Catholic worship, but the great Carthage cathedral became a museum. Churches were forbidden to ring their bells.

**Domestic Affairs**

President Bourguiba’s Neo-Destour party, which achieved Tunisian independence and was now in effect the only party in Tunisia, held its quinquennial congress in Bizerte in October 1964. The congress adopted important changes in the structure of the party, designed on the one hand to strengthen the authority of the president and on the other to further a certain osmosis between state and party. Previously Neo-Destour had been directed by a political bureau of 15 members elected by the congress. Under the new rules, it was to be headed by a presidium named by President Bourguiba from the enlarged central committee of 50 members elected by the congress. Bourguiba also defined Tunisian “socialism,” which appeared to be more “social” than “socialist.” To indicate this tendency toward socialism, the party renamed itself the Parti socialiste destourien (Socialist Constitutional party). Actually Bourguiba’s moves seemed to be directed against the trade unions, which sometimes pressed for higher wages despite Tunisia’s precarious economic situation.

Bourguiba was reelected president with 1,255,152 votes out of 1,301,543 voters registered, or 96.4 per cent, as against the 91.5 per cent he had received in the first election in 1959. The Tunisian constitution limited the president to three five-year terms. The single parliamentary list presented by the Parti socialiste destourien was also approved by 96 per cent. One Jew, Albert Bessis, was among the deputies elected.

The most important cabinet reshuffle since 1960 brought new leaders to the helm. Habib Bourguiba, Jr., became minister of foreign affairs and
Ahmed Ben Salah, known for his socialist views, retained his position as minister of planning. While young Bourguiba was increasingly regarded as the president's eventual successor, his pro-Western views and the fact that his mother—President Bourguiba's first wife—was French, were obstacles difficult to overcome.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

There were 10,000 to 15,000 Jews in a total population of 4,400,000 at the beginning of 1965. There had been no census since 1955, but the natural increase was estimated at 2.1 per cent annually. About two-thirds of the Jews were in Tunis and the rest in Nabeul, Sousse, Sfax, Bizerte, and Djerba. Emigration continued, and there seemed little chance that the trend would be reversed. Since independence more than 100,000 Jews had left the country.

Tunisia had traditionally been hospitable to Jews. Synagogues have been excavated dating from the fourth century. In the eighth century the sultans of Kairouan had Jewish ministers and physicians. During the German occupation in 1942-43, when the Axis authorities tried to arouse the Arab masses against the Jews, Habib Bourguiba gave orders to the underground Neo-Destour party that the Jews were not to be disturbed. When Tunisia became independent in 1956, its cabinet included a Jew, André Barouch. This long history, so fruitful for both parties, came to a sudden end after the Bizerte crisis of 1962 (AJYB, 1962 [Vol. 63], pp. 432-36). The Jews found themselves faced with a choice between being a part of a country which appeared to be turning its back on the West and following the road of pan-Arabism, or emigrating. Between July and November 1962, 30,000 to 40,000 Jews left Tunisia and by December 1963, 10,000 more had followed. In 1964 the rate was about the same: 10,000 Jews emigrated. In Paris the Fonds Social Juif Unifié spent NF3.5 million ($700,000) on assistance for 6,300 Tunisian immigrants (see p. 370).

Nevertheless, the legal status of all Tunisian citizens was the same, whatever their religion. Tunisian Jews belonged to the Neo-Destour, public employment was open to all, and any Jew could leave the country if he had paid his taxes and was not charged with an offense. No Tunisian Jew was ever prevented from leaving. At one time passports were refused to those who had previously sought visas for Israel, but these restrictions appeared to have been removed. (The visas for Israel were now given on separate sheets by Israeli consulates in Europe.) Yet the basic causes of emigration continued to intensify. One major factor was the anti-Israel attitude of President Bourguiba. His visit to Cairo for the meeting of Arab heads of state in January 1964, where he proposed the formation of units of infiltrators who would "work inside Palestine for a solution to the problem," disturbed even the most sympathetic. In September 1964 the ministry of culture ordered the seizure of all books—geographical, historical, political, or cultural—touching even remotely on Israel.

Another basic factor was the disastrous economic situation, which had a
particularly strong effect on the Jews. The restrictions on imports resulted in blocking almost completely the issuance of import licenses to Jewish merchants, who in most cases had to work through Moslem front men. And when the dinar was devalued, all merchants had to give the government 25 per cent of the value of their inventories. Since the export of capital goods or furniture from Tunisia was expressly forbidden, Jews who emigrated had to leave everything behind. The controls were strict, and violators were severely punished by fines and imprisonment.

In government departments Jewish employees often found little chance for advancement. The progressive Arabization of the administration increasingly barred the Jews, most of whom were French in their culture, from positions of responsibility. There were of course exceptions. Two Tunisian Jews continued to fill the high posts they had held for five years, Marcel Hassid as associate director of the National Agricultural Bank and Serge Guetta as associate director of the Tunisian Bank Company. Albert Bessis was elected a deputy in October. The most important French-language daily in Tunisia, *La Presse*, had a Jewish editor, Henri Smadja. So did another daily, *Le Petit Matin*, edited by Simon Zana.

It is worth noting that the Tunisian weekly *Jeune Afrique* gave an important place to Jewish problems. Its columns, open to readers, contained a variety of discussion between Arabs and Jews. Its editor Bechir Ben Yahmed, former minister of information, even went so far as to propose the formation of a federation of eastern states, to include both the Arab states and Israel. This was perhaps the first time that an official Arab paper thus implicitly recognized the existence of the State of Israel.

There was no longer an official Jewish community, but only a Provisional Administrative Committee for the Jewish Religion. The elections which were to have been held in 1958 did not seem likely ever to be held. This committee received no government assistance and remained voluntarily in semi-obscurity. Its resources came from the taxes on kosher meat and sacramental wine, the sale of matzot for Passover, contributions in the synagogues, and funerals. These revenues came to 12,000 dinars in 1964 (about $21,000). No new synagogues were built, but in contrast to the situation of the churches, there was never any question of their being deconsecrated. The Zionist movement was of course prohibited, but some of its publications circulated clandestinely.

The changes in the Jewish community were reflected on the position of the Alliance Israelite Universelle schools. In 1962, there had been 2,082 Jewish students among a total student body of 3,768; in 1963, 1,542 of a total of 3,515, but in the 1964-65 school year, only 1,013 of 3,751. In three years, the Jewish percentage in the AIU schools has fallen from 55 to 27.

The Tunisian Jewish colony in Paris included a number of notable members. Among them were the novelist Albert Memmi, the Opéra Comique singer Andrée Gabriel, the radio producer Nicole Hirsh, and Georges Dyan, winner of the Prix de Rome in sculpture. Two young singers, Frida Boccara and Jocelyn, achieved recognition.
Morocco

The years 1963 and 1964 were eventful for Morocco in both domestic and foreign affairs.* The new Moroccan constitution, adopted by referendum on December 7, 1962, came into force. A parliament of 144 members was elected under its provisions on May 17, 1963. In the election the Front for the Defense of Constitutional Institutions, supporting the policies of King Hassan II, was opposed by a coalition of the rightist and traditionalist Istiqlal and the left-of-center Union of Popular Forces, largely based on the trade unions. The opposition coalition won most of the urban seats, while royalist candidates were generally successful in the rural areas. Neither side securing a majority, minor groups and independent members held the balance of power. The role of parliament under the constitution was limited, so that the lack of a dependable parliamentary majority did not prevent the king from carrying out his policies. He continued to act as his own prime minister.

There were several trials of persons accused of plotting the assassination of the king and the overthrow of the government, and of others charged with having been members of armed bands which had entered the country from Algeria. Among those sentenced to death or long prison terms at these trials were leaders of the Union of Popular Forces, including a few who were tried in absentia after fleeing the country. But although some of its leaders were in prison or exile by the end of 1964, the Union had not been outlawed. On several occasions during the period under review, strikes and student demonstrations led to clashes with the police. Unrest was increased by economic difficulties.

The Casablanca bloc, to which Morocco had formerly belonged, disintegrated in the course of 1963 and relations between Morocco and its other members, especially the United Arab Republic and Algeria, deteriorated. A border dispute in the Sahara led to an undeclared war between Algeria and Morocco in September 1963. Morocco charged the UAR with arming Algeria and the latter asserted that the United States was equipping the Moroccans. The mediation of the Organization of African Unity, and especially Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, ended the fighting in October. Prisoners, mostly Algerians captured by the better trained and equipped Moroccan army, were released, and the boundary dispute was submitted to arbitration. The situation began to improve in 1964, and a conference of cabinet ministers of the three Maghreb states (Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia) and Libya initiated plans for closer economic cooperation. Relations between Morocco and Tunisia, which had been broken off when Tunisia recognized Mauritania despite Mo-

* This section, reviewing general political developments, was prepared in the office of the American Jewish Year Book.
roccan protests, were resumed in 1964, and King Hassan visited Tunis. Agree-
ments for cooperation in a number of fields were signed by the two countries. 
While Morocco had not yet recognized Mauritania at the end of 1964, the 
Moroccan claim to sovereignty over that Saharan area was not being actively 
pursued.

The worsening economic situation produced a severe shortage of foreign 
exchange, and in November 1964 the government announced new import 
regulations to conserve Morocco's resources. Among other things, these abol-
ished the preferences which had previously existed for imports from the 
franc zone. Later that month the French ministry of finance responded by 
announcing that no commodity originating in Morocco would henceforth 
be imported into France without a permit from the commercial attaché of the 
French embassy in Rabat. Morocco continued to receive both economic and 
military aid from the United States, as well as a number of other countries. 
Negotiations with Spain for the cession of the remaining Spanish enclaves in 
and adjacent to Morocco continued.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

When Moroccan independence was proclaimed in March 1956, there were 
almost 200,000 Jews living in the country. In July 1960 the Moroccan Sta-
tistical Service officially reported a Jewish population of 161,000, or two per 
cent of the total population. Fifty per cent of these were below the age of 20.

In December 1964 the population figure generally quoted by Moroccan 
Jewish leaders was 85,000. Of these approximately 60,000 lived in Casa-
blanca. Communities in the rural South had practically ceased to exist. In 
two years the Jewish population of Marrakech had dwindled to a quarter of 
its former 10,000. The Jews had also vacated the mellahs of many cities in the 
North, notably Rabat. In September 1964 the Istiqlal organ *Al 'Alam* took 
issue with the closing of all stores in the Rabat mellah on the Sabbath “since 
the mellah is no longer inhabited by Jews.”

The increasingly close relationship between Morocco and the rest of the 
Arab world and the progressive deterioration of the country's economic situ-
ation were the main reasons for Jewish emigration in 1963–64. Unemployment 
was increasing, and the rare help-wanted ads almost always specified “Moroc-
can nationality and Moslem religion.” Under these conditions even the hesi-
tant were preparing to leave. There was also a tendency to leave because 
“everybody is going.”

**Communal Activities**

In its anxiety not to do anything which might create obstacles to this emi-
gration, the Council of Jewish Communities maintained a prudent silence 
throughout the year. Even the nation-wide Jewish congress, which by law 
was to meet every three years, did not convene in 1963, as scheduled. The 
newspaper of the Moroccan Jewish communities, *La Voix des Communautés,*
the only organ representing the interests of the Jews, ceased publication in November 1963, solely because its editor had to go to Paris.

When rabbinical judges, who as officials of the Moroccan state ruled on questions of personal status and inheritance among Jews, left the country or died, they were not replaced. Within two years their number decreased from 50 to 31. The supreme rabbinical tribunal, presided over by the 80-year-old chief Rabbi Saul Danan, a descendant of Maimonides, existed on a provisional basis after March 1964, when the ministry of justice unified and laicized the Moroccan courts. The other rabbinical tribunals were to continue to function. Of these the most important was the Casablanca tribunal presided over by Chief Rabbi Chalom Messas, with the assistance of Chief Rabbi Moïse Malka. The Institut des Hautes Études Rabbiniques, established in 1950 to train rabbinical judges and spiritual leaders for the Jewish community, ordained about ten rabbis; then, for various reasons, the Institut became an ordinary yeshivah with no hope for further development. Nevertheless the Moroccan government continued its contribution.

Another type of problem existed for the numerous schools of the Alliance Israélite Universelle (AIU), ORT, the Otzar Ha-torah, and the Lubavitcher movement. These schools no longer found many students for their classes. The Alliance schools, founded and assisted by AIU, and now administered by Ittihad-Maroc, a local Jewish group, had about 11,500 students (33,000 in 1959). The AIU-supported École Normale Hébraïque of Casablanca continued to train Hebrew teachers. ORT still maintained four schools in Morocco. Because of its emphasis on religious studies, an Otzar Ha-torah secondary school, established in October 1964, was immediately filled although it charged tuition. The department for the education of Jewish youth, which for three years had actively supervised Jewish education, no longer had more than a nominal existence.

The Casablanca Jewish community opened two homes for the aged. Increasingly, all the activity being conducted by the communities was for the aged. The young no longer had a future in Morocco.

Despite an anti-Jewish press campaign, the authorities were solicitous of the interests of the Jews. On Yom Kippur (September 1964), Casablanca's Governor Bourrine visited the synagogue and greeted the Jewish citizenry on behalf of King Hassan II. In general, the government did everything it could to preserve the equality of rights between Jews and Moslems. Many Jews held important positions in the government. Among them were Charles Benarroch, a high official in the defense ministry; Charles Azoulay, member of the consultative council; Salomon Bensabat, justice of the supreme court; Robert Asseraf, legal counselor of the Chamber of Deputies, and Albert Sasson, dean of the faculty of sciences of the university at Rabat.

**Jewish Agitation**

In May 1964 an 80-year-old Jew, Abraham Hayot, on his way to morning prayer in the Jewish quarter of Casablanca, was drenched with oil and burned alive by Moslems who took flight and could not be apprehended. At first it
was suspected that it was a political act instigated by political groups. At the
time, many unfounded rumors were also heard of the abduction of Jewish
children in different cities. But an investigation established that the unfortu-
nate Jew had been burned because of an altercation on the previous day with
a Moslem at the slaughterhouse where he was employed.

In September 1964 former Islamic Affairs Minister Allal al Fassi, now
president and leader of the conservative and clerical Istiqlal party group in
the National Assembly, launched a political assault on the Moroccan Jews.
Attacking the government and the royalist party in the course of a debate on
agrarian reform, he shouted: “Morocco is a Jewish state. It is run by Jews
and foreigners.” The only Jewish deputy, Meyer Obadia, did not dare reply
and withdrew from the chamber while al Fassi was called to order by Assem-
ibly President Abdel Krim Khatib and applauded by his own party.

The outburst, which fitted in with an anti-Jewish campaign that the Istiqlal
and its newspapers had been conducting for some years, caused great disquiet
among the Jews. In February 1964 Al ’Alam had attacked Foreign Minister
Ahmed Réda Guédira for having named a Jew, Robert Asseraf, as the direc-
tor of his cabinet. Guédira had thereby violated the tacit rule, in existence
since Morocco’s independence, which barred Jews from positions in the for-
eign affairs ministry. Other papers took similar positions. The liberal publica-
tion An-Nidal, edited by Rachid Mouline, which had no political influence
whatsoever, protested against what it called the “Judaization of Morocco.”

Istiqlal always used the Jewish question as a weapon against the govern-
ment. Racism played its classic role of diverting attention from real problems.
The result was distrust, hostility, discrimination, and even violence against
those chosen as scapegoats. Some months before his provocative remarks to
the National Assembly al Fassi had granted a long interview to Victor Malka,
editor of La Voix des Communautés, in which he reaffirmed that “Moroccan
Jews are full citizens and [would] never be victims of racist discrimination.”
This statement appears to have been intended merely for exploitation abroad,
to restore the international prestige of the Istiqlal which had been seriously
undermined precisely because of its racist attacks.

In fact, the antagonism of the Istiqlal toward the Jews grew steadily after
the elections of April 1963, in which it had hoped to get their support. But
almost all the Jews voted for the royalist Front for the Defense of Constitu-
tional Institutions. The Jewish deputy Meyer Obadia was elected on the
royalist ticket, as was a Jewish senator, David Amar. On the day after the
elections Istiqlal launched a major campaign against the government. It
charged that the Jewish votes had been bought by promises of emigration
permits to Israel.

In October 1964 Istiqlal dropped all pretense and, for the first time, asked
the government to declare Jews second-class citizens. “In Tunisia,” the Istri-
qlal newspaper asserted, “Jews are no longer considered as nationals. For
example, the number of Jewish pharmacies permitted is very small compared
to what it is in Morocco, where 50 per cent of the pharmacies belong to
Jews.”
This anti-Jewish press campaign was not confined to Istiqlal. It was thereafter part of Moroccan politics, and all parties, except the royalist, took anti-Jewish positions at one time or another. Violently anti-Jewish articles appeared with extraordinary regularity in Akhbar Al-Dounia (“News of the World”), a weekly with a larger circulation than any newspaper in Morocco. One such attack followed when the Casablanca municipal council, with three Jewish members (Jacob Banon, Elias Benouaich, and Georges Niddam), voted a subsidy of 1.5 million Moroccan francs to three Moroccan Jewish philanthropies: OSE, Students’ Aid, and the Murdoch Bengio Home. Although this was not the first time that such subsidies had been granted to Jewish institutions, Akhbar Al-Dounia severely criticized the council for giving priority to Jewish causes. The same issue contained a demand for the expulsion of Victor Malka from the country on the ground that he was to become associate editor of Israel’s broadcasting station Qol Israel. Victor Malka instituted a libel suit against Akhbar Al-Dounia. His attorney was Meyer Toledano, former member of the Casablanca Municipal Council.

At the end of 1964 Morocco’s Jewish communities were living as if everything they stood for was about to vanish. And because the present had no substance, they leaned on the past. They were not working for the future because they did not believe in a future. The springs of hope had been poisoned for them.

Victor Malka

Algeria

Political Developments

Political developments of Algeria in 1964 centered on the efforts of President Ahmed ben Bella to consolidate his quasi-dictatorial regime in the face of violent opposition by various elements who denounced him as a usurper of the national revolution. Despite many signs of real popular discontent, especially on the part of the former moujahidines (soldiers of the underground army of liberation), and the existence of several small guerrilla bands in Kabylia, this opposition could not be regarded as genuinely expressing the reactions of the masses of poor peasants or the large numbers of unemployed workers; their reactions were still uncrystallized, sporadic, and anarchic.

Ben Bella’s opponents were primarily professional politicians, former leaders of the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic (GPRA) and the Front of National Liberation (FLN). It was a factional struggle of the sort almost always found in regimes resulting from revolutions. The conflicts were less ideological than personal, although all Ben Bella’s opponents were
at one in denouncing the repressive methods of the government. Ferhat Abbas, the one-time head of GPRA and later president of the Algerian National Assembly, who had been eliminated from political life amid a rain of denunciations as an "agent of the bourgeoisie," no longer seemed to play a political role inside the secret or semi-secret coalition of the conspirators.

Hocine Ait Ahmed, the Kabyle "Trotzky" of the Algerian revolution, remained the principal rallying point of a subversive movement preparing an insurrection. This old cellmate of Ben Bella in French prisons continued to exercise a strong influence on the irreconcilables of Kabylia. The ethnic antagonism between the Kabyles of East and Central Algeria and the Arabs of the West—Ben Bella was himself an Arab from the Oran region—was one of the motivating factors in the insurrectionary movement. But the leaders of the Kabyle revolt, needing the support of the Arab world outside Algeria, played down this aspect of the conflict and refused to yield to the temptation of an autonomism or separatism which would have been injurious to their cause. Ait Ahmed was arrested and, at the end of 1964, was awaiting trial. Colonel Mohammed Chaabani, military leader of another revolt and a noted veteran of the revolutionary struggle, was tried for high treason, condemned to death, and executed. Appeals from abroad for presidential clemency were without result.

Ben Bella's position could not be considered as very solid, and his power was based largely on police methods. Nevertheless, the dictator of the new Algeria used every respite from the critical internal political and economic situation to build up popularity as a great leader of Arab nationalism, with a pan-Arab perspective. Thus he seconded UAR President Gamal Abdul Nasser on the question of Arabism, like him, but with even more vehemence, continually inveighing against the "imperialism" of Israel—although the majority of the poor fellahin tilling the Algerian soil not only did not give a fig for this problem but did not even have any clear idea as to the precise location of the "imperialist" country against which their leader's wrath was directed.

Ben Bella's major "anti-Zionist" pronouncements were made in Cairo at the special Arab summit conference in mid-January, 1964, and at the meeting of nonaligned nations in October. However, despite his virulent attacks on Israel, the Algerian president did nothing to give effect to his 1962 promise to send an expeditionary force of 100,000 Algerians for the "liberation of Palestine."

**Attitudes Toward Zionism**

In connection with the "Palestine Week" organized by the Algerian government (February 17 to 24, 1964) "to express the solidarity of the entire Algerian people with the Arab people of Palestine" there was a large popular open-air rally in Algiers. Minister of Habous (worship and religious properties) Tewfik Madani was one of the principal speakers and declared, according to the accounts in the Algiers press: "The Algerian revolution will keep its promises before men and history to despoiled Palestine. Algeria is ready to
carry on the struggle of liberation for the freedom and dignity of our brothers despooled, oppressed, and dishonored by the Zionists and their helpers. People of Palestine, we are at your side and together we shall break the chains of slavery."

In 1964 this aggressive anti-Zionism was confined to verbal violence. The explosion of an arms shipment on an Egyptian vessel in the Port of Bône was at first attributed to "Zionists." This was a trial balloon, and the accusation was dropped when there was no popular "anti-Zionist" reaction. Other presumptive culprits were sought in the form of Ait Ahmed's oppositional guerrillas. The catastrophe, which claimed many victims, appears actually to have been accidental and not a political crime.

In contrast to Morocco, Algeria had no cases or affairs involving "suspicions of Zionism" against individual Jews. Among the remnants of the Jewish community of Algeria, there were former members and sympathizers of Zionist organizations who were well known as such, but nobody bothered them or demanded retractions from them. No pressure was exerted on the leaders of the community to declare themselves against Zionism, and they made no anti-Zionist statements. It was enough simply to omit any public mention of the existence of the State of Israel. The films Exodus and Ten Commandments were, to be sure, banned as "Zionist." But the sharp denunciations of Israel by government officials were not the product of any consciousness of the "Palestinian problem" on the part of the Algerian masses. As to the young Algerian intellectuals, it was possible to speculate that the attitude of the Algerian nationalist advocate of Arab-Jewish cooperation Abd-el-Kader (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 328) was not altogether exceptional. Thus in the March 9, 1964, issue of the periodical Jeune Afrique, in the course of a controversy started by a letter from one Elias Banna, pretending to be a Jewish student at the University of Munich (it was subsequently shown that there was no student by that name at Munich), a young Algerian Moslem came to the defense of Israel, asserting that the Jews of that country only asked "what all of us ask"—the right to live and to work on the land of their forefathers. He rejected the usual argument of Arab politicians that, since the Arabs were not responsible for the crimes committed against the Jews by Europeans, it was not up to them to make up for them by furnishing a fatherland to the surviving Jews. "On the contrary," this Algerian Arab wrote, "the Arabs should be proud that it was our Third World which received and readjusted to life the survivors of the horrible Nazi camps."

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

Ben Bella's ambition to achieve leadership in presenting the claims of the "third world" and the nonaligned nations also found expression in the active and open support given by the Algerian government to the anti-Tshombe rebellion in the Congo. And in the latter part of 1964, Ben Bella entered into competition with his ally Fidel Castro for the support of anti-American forces, whatever they might be, by indicating his readiness to extend hospi-
tality to the former Argentine dictator Juan Perón when the latter was in trouble with his Spanish hosts after his unsuccessful trip to South America.

Internationally, Ben Bella had a far greater measure of support from the Soviet Union than the other Maghreb nations, Tunisia and Morocco. There were numerous Soviet technicians and a Soviet health mission in Algeria. But the France of Charles de Gaulle also supported Ben Bella, although it was questionable whether French support would continue if current negotiations on Franco-Algerian cooperation in exploiting the oil of the Sahara were to break down. Meanwhile, French financial aid to Algeria came to 32 per cent of the French government’s rising African budget. There was some opposition in the French senate to the mounting total of these subsidies, especially since the Algerian government did not always refrain from anti-French gestures. (Thus in 1964 it decreed the nationalization of properties belonging to persons who had collaborated with the French colonial regime.) But the French government obtained Ben Bella’s promise, which he kept, that there would be no Algerian demonstration against the French experimental nuclear explosions in the Sahara at the end of 1964. A demonstration planned by a section of FLN was prohibited by the Algerian police.

**Jewish Population**

All figures on the number of Jews remaining in Algeria were very rough approximations. There had been no census of the Jewish population since independence—nor for a long time before, under French rule. The estimate for 1964 was approximately 4,000. Just as in France, the membership lists of the consistorys furnished no precise information, since there were always Jews not registered in the communities, as well as small groups organized into unofficial communities. Besides, available figures did not include the small number of Jews who had remained in the southern territories or returned to them after having tried to establish themselves in France or Israel. The communal structure of these Jews of the Sahara districts (the M’Zab) had always been different from that of the other Jews of Algeria. They were not fully French citizens, they had retained their “personal status,” and they bore a much greater resemblance to the inhabitants of the mellahs of the Moroccan interior than to the completely gallicized Jews of the Algerian coast.

In the small towns and in some of the more important cities, every trace of Jewish communal life was gone, because only two or three Jewish families often remained in each. But where the community still functioned, even with a minimum of members and resources, religious customs were observed, so far as was possible, without the slightest interference on the part of the authorities. The principle of freedom of worship and the respect always given by the Moslems of North Africa to Jewish sanctuaries and Jewish traditions remained inviolate in spite of all the events and torments of recent years. Nevertheless, Algerian Jewish life had an extremely limited character because of the drop in the Jewish population. There was a shortage of rabbis and hazazonim even for the small remnant of Algerian Jews who had not wished to
leave the country. The principal efforts to maintain tradition were in the sphere of kashrut, which the Jews of North Africa did not give up easily. Cultural activities, relatively intense in the last period of French rule, were nonexistent; religious observance was reduced to a strict minimum. There were no longer regular Sabbath services.

Jewish Communities

In February 1964 the leaders of the Jewish communities of Algeria met in Oran to reconstitute a Federation of Jewish Communities. A delegation of five was sent to Paris to attend the meeting of the Central Consistory on February 16. (In theory, the local Algerian consistories were still a part of the Central Consistory of Israelites of France and Algeria.) This delegation also made contact in Paris with the Association of Jews of Algerian Origin (AJOA; see p. 372).

Reports from several small and medium Jewish communities in Algeria gave some idea of the extent to which the springs of Algerian Judaism had dried up. Thus in Colomb-Béchar, in the southern part of the Oran district some 700 kilometers from Oran, there was formerly a Jewish community of 2,000. In February 1964 there still remained in the city a hundred persons of the Jewish faith, without a rabbi, mohel, or shohet. Kashrut was nevertheless observed by the members of the dwindling community, who received the meat by truck from Oran. Bar mitzvahs could not be celebrated, because there were no teachers capable of preparing candidates. Nearby Machéria and Ain-Sefra, where several dozen Jewish families formerly dwelt, each had two left in 1964.

At Tlemcen, in the extreme west of Algeria on the Moroccan border, the Jewish community still had a hundred families in January 1964. Tlemcen, with its “Tomb of Raab,” was a holy place and center of pilgrimage for all North African Jews. The community had more than a thousand members on the eve of independence. Chief Rabbi Hai’m Touati (father of the noted Parisian Jewish publicist Emile Touati), a leading personality of Algerian Orthodox Jewry, learned in the Talmud and the Kabbalah, was the spiritual leader of the remaining Jewish community. A traveling chaplain, Rabbi Brahim Choukroun, served the whole region as mohel, hazzan, and shohet.

Algiers

There was not a single mohel living in the capital, Algiers; when there was a circumcision, it was performed by the mohel of Oran. Jewish religious life centered on the observance of Rosh Ha-shanah and Yom Kippur. In Algiers services were held in the Temple Lebar and the Temple Hara. (The Great Synagogue in the Place du Grand Rabbin Abraham Bloch was closed.)

On the eve of Yom Kippur a delegation of consistory leaders—President Charles Hababou, Vice-President Robert Bério, and Rabbi Gilbert Seror—visited Minister of Habous Madani to invite him, in the name of the Jewish population, to attend the services on the following day. The minister accepted the invitation and came to the synagogue in time for ne’ilah, the closing
prayer. Hababou made an appeal for the brotherhood of all believers, and Madani responded by extending his warmest wishes for a happy new year to all the Jewish communities of the country. He also gave the worshippers the personal greetings of President ben Bella and paid homage to the moral precepts contained in the Torah: "The Koran, coming from the Bible, teaches all its believers respect for the individual, mutual understanding, and the love of one's neighbor." In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the president of Algeria himself will attend Yom Kippur services in 1965.

The same report from Algiers also described the celebration of Sukkot in that city. A public sukkah was put up next to the building of the old rabbinical school. Meals were distributed to the indigent, thanks to a special fund from JDC.

**Personalia**

In January 1964 Albert Smadja died in Marseilles at the age of 65. He had been president of the Jewish community of Oran from 1936 until the great exodus which followed the Algerian revolution; had served as president of the Federation of Jewish Communities of Algeria and of the Zionist Federation of the Oran district, and had represented the Oran community in the Central Consistory of Jews of France and Algeria. He was also councilor for foreign commerce and administrator of the Bank of Algeria.

Arnold Mandel
Southern Africa

Political Developments

In the Republic of South Africa the year was marked by continued racial tension as further steps were taken to implement apartheid. At the same time the economic boom continued, and the effects of political developments on the country's trade remained relatively small. Two neighboring African states, the former British protectorates of Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, achieved complete independence in July and October; the former became Malawi and the latter Zambia. The three British High Commission Territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland—enclaves within the Republic's territory—moved toward self-government and early independence under African rule. Meanwhile the government of the colony of Southern Rhodesia (which dropped "Southern" from its name after Northern Rhodesia became Zambia), elected by a white minority of approximately 4 per cent of the entire population, continued to press for independence, and to hint that it would end British rule unilaterally if it could not do so by agreement. Britain, backed by a unanimous vote of the other Commonwealth members, made it clear that no unilateral declaration of independence would be recognized; when the Labor party came to power, Prime Minister Harold Wilson spelled out the government's intention to apply vigorous sanctions if such a declaration were attempted.

Republic of South Africa

The South African government introduced new restrictions on the African population by the Bantu Laws Amendment Act. This measure, passed in April 1964 and scheduled to go into effect in January 1965, was based on the doctrine that no African had the right to be in any part of the Republic except his assigned "native reserve"; if he was permitted to be elsewhere, it was strictly on sufferance and for the benefit of the white economy. Hence no African was to be allowed to live outside the reserves unless employed, and he could seek employment outside his assigned reserve only with the approval of government labor bureaus. In the parliamentary debate, Mrs. Helen Suzman of the Progressive party declared that the measure "strips the African of
every basic pretension to being a free human being in the country of his birth and reduces him to the level of a chattel."

The 90-day-detention clause, under which the police had been empowered to arrest suspected persons without judicial authorization and hold them incommunicado for 90 days—which could be extended for 90 days more as many times as they saw fit—came under heavy attack. Testimony in a number of court cases indicated that some, especially non-whites, had been tortured during their detention. A number of the trials which were conducted under the Sabotage and Suppression of Communism Acts were wholly or partly based on information obtained through the use of the 90-day clause. An interchurch campaign for its abolition began in May. The clause was nevertheless renewed when it expired in June; in November, however, Justice Minister Balthazar Vorster announced that its use would be suspended after January 11, 1965. He added that it might later be revived if the government thought it necessary.

There were a large number of trials on charges of sabotage and Communism, terms which were very broadly defined under South African law. Perhaps the most important of these was the Rivonia trial (named for the location of a farm belonging to one of the defendants), which had begun in 1963. The main defendants were Nelson Mandela and Walter Sisulu, former leaders of the African National Congress. In the course of the trial both testified that they had come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to end the system of white supremacy without resort to violence, since all other avenues were closed. They had therefore become leaders of the underground organization Spear of the Nation and had committed some acts of sabotage, though not all with which they were charged. They stressed that these acts were carefully planned to prevent loss of life; that Spear of the Nation was not connected with the African National Congress, and that while Communists participated in its work, it was not Communist-controlled. Among the other defendants were three whites: James Kantor, Lionel Bernstein, and Denis Goldberg, the owner of the Rivonia farm. The case against Kantor was dismissed during the trial. The trial concluded in June with the conviction of all remaining defendants except Bernstein, who was acquitted but immediately rearrested under the Suppression of Communism Act. (He was later admitted to bail and fled the country.) Goldberg, Mandela, Sisulu, and four other Africans and one Indian were sentenced to life imprisonment. They decided not to appeal. The defense attorney, Abraham Fischer, was later arrested under the Suppression of Communism Act; he and fourteen others went on trial in November 1964.

Those convicted in the numerous other political trials held during the year included several university teachers and a number of journalists, one of them Hugh Francis Lewin, an editor of Drum, the leading popular magazine directed to an African audience. Three Africans who had been convicted of a number of political crimes, including murder, were executed despite pleas for mercy from UN Secretary General U Thant and the UN Security Council. A trial which drew special attention was that of Frederick John Harris, accused of
murdering a 77-year old woman who died as a result of injuries sustained in the bombing of the Johannesburg railway station on July 24. Harris, a teacher and former chairman of the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee, admitted placing the bomb but testified that in order to avoid loss of life he had notified the police in advance of the explosion. He was found guilty, and on November 6 was sentenced to death. Dennis Higgs, accused by the South African government of having been an accessory in the same case, was kidnapped from his home in Northern Rhodesia and taken to South Africa on August 28. After diplomatic protests from Great Britain, South Africa released him and returned him to his home in Lusaka. It later unsuccessfully sought his legal extradition. Large numbers of political opponents of the government continued to be confined to specific areas, or to their homes, without judicial proceedings or specific charges. The best known among them was Chief Albert Luthuli, who had been permitted to leave his home briefly so that he might receive the Nobel Peace Prize in person. His five-year detention period ended in 1964, but was renewed for another five years on more rigorous terms. In December police seized the papers of New York Times correspondent J. Anthony Lukas as he was about to leave the country. The papers were returned two days later, but without an apology. The incident brought a protest from the United States government.

South Africa's international relations continued to deteriorate. Various United Nation bodies passed resolutions criticizing or condemning her; perhaps the most important of these was the Security Council resolution, adopted on June 18, to study the possibility of applying economic sanctions against South Africa. The resolution was supported by the United States and the United Kingdom as well as by all non-permanent members except Czechoslovakia. That country and the Soviet Union abstained because the resolution did not provide for immediate sanctions; they were joined in abstention by France, on the ground that the resolution constituted interference with the internal affairs of a member state. In November the UN Special Committee on Apartheid recommended total economic sanctions against South Africa.

South Africa also had trouble with other international organizations. In March it withdrew from the International Labor Organization. The South African delegation walked out of the annual assembly of the World Health Organization (WHO) after that body had adopted a resolution depriving South Africa of voting rights and calling on the secretary-general of WHO to prepare proposals for the expulsion or suspension of members whose “official policy is based on racial discrimination.” But Prime Minister Hendrik F. Verwoerd told Parliament that South Africa would not voluntarily withdraw from WHO.

In November, 22 African states voted to cut all rail and sea links with South Africa and to refuse passage to planes bound to or from that country. In the same month the United States and Britain announced that they would sell no further arms to South Africa after the expiration of existing contracts. Firms in both countries, however, continued to be deeply involved in the South African economy, and they remained among the Republic's major
trading partners. Although trade between South Africa and most African nations declined sharply as a result of sanctions, the new African states of Zambia and Malawi made it clear that they could not participate in the boycott because all their trade with the rest of the world passed through either South Africa or the Portuguese possessions. Some African nations, which had at considerable sacrifice cut off raw-material exports to South Africa, complained that their places had been promptly taken by Communist states, especially East Germany and China. The latter's trade with South Africa, which had tripled in 1963, again increased sharply in 1964.

Southern Rhodesia

In Southern Rhodesia political activity during the year centered on the demand of the white minority for independence under the existing constitution, which guaranteed continued white rule. In April Prime Minister Winston Field, whose militancy in the pursuit of this goal was deemed inadequate by most members of his Rhodesian Front, was succeeded by the more extreme Ian Smith, who hoped to achieve independence by Christmas. In furtherance of this purpose he announced a referendum in November on the voters' view on independence; at the same time, to demonstrate African support of the proposal, he arranged a "consultation" of chiefs appointed and paid by the government. The two African nationalist movements, led respectively by Joshua Nkomo (who had the support of most African states) and Rev. Ndabaningi Sithole, were suppressed and various new African political movements, formed to replace them, were immediately banned. Both Nkomo and Sithole, and large numbers of their followers, were imprisoned during most of the year. Various charges against them were thrown out by the courts, and other court decisions held their administrative detention to be illegal, but the government refused to release them, and they remained in custody at the end of 1964. New penal measures were passed during the year to repress nationalist activity: long prison sentences and flogging were made mandatory for various minor offenses, and possession of bombs was made punishable by death. In August the Salisbury Daily News, owned by the leading British Tory newspaper chain headed by Lord Thomson, was banned on the ground that it was not a newspaper "but an instrument of political agitation."

The opposition Rhodesian National party of former Premier Sir Edgar Whitehead declared its opposition to a unilateral declaration of independence in May. In August it reorganized as the Rhodesia party under the leadership of Sir Roy Welensky, who had been prime minister of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland until its dissolution. Sir Roy reentered politics as candidate in a parliamentary by-election, but was badly defeated. The November referendum showed a substantial majority for independence, but only 61 per cent of those eligible voted. Both the outgoing Tory government and the incoming Labor government of Britain made it clear that they would not recognize the "consultation" of chiefs as demonstrating the African support essential for a grant of independence. In October, after Labor had taken office, Prime Minister Harold Wilson broadcast a warning to Southern Rhodesia
that a unilateral declaration would end relations between Rhodesia and the nations of the Commonwealth, most foreign governments, and international organizations, and that it would produce economic disaster and leave the country isolated in a hostile continent. This warning was promptly seconded by the United States. (It was also reported that South Africa and Portugal had unofficially told Prime Minister Smith that they would be unable to give him active support or even recognition in case of a unilateral declaration of independence.) Smith then declared that "the British government's moves of the past weeks have upset everything and I can see no prospect of independence by Christmas, as I had hoped." He added that the results of the referendum would not be taken as a mandate for unilateral independence.

**Malawi and Zambia**

The two other members of the dissolved federation became independent under African rule, but under very different circumstances. Nyasaland, which became independent as Malawi in July, was a very poor country without major resources and required substantial British economic help. Zambia, in contrast, was one of the richest countries in Africa, with one of the world's largest copper resources, and had a large and growing export surplus available for financing a development program. Zambia increased its income from this source by raising the income tax paid by the copper companies (while reducing taxes on small businesses to encourage economic development) and by taking over, with British assistance, the royalties formerly collected by the British South Africa Company on copper production. Since the demand for copper was steadily increasing and prices were rising, Zambia's economic prospects were bright. One development project under consideration was the construction of a new railroad linking Zambia and Malawi with the sea by way of Tanzania, thus freeing them from their existing dependence on communications through the Portuguese colonies, Southern Rhodesia, and South Africa. The completion of such a railroad was expected to take several years.

Both Zambia and Malawi experienced political troubles during the year. Before independence Prime Minister Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia found it necessary to suppress disorders provoked by a fanatical religious group, the Lumpas, headed by a priestess who claimed to have come back to life after dying and visiting heaven. There were also a number of strikes on the railroad and in the mines by white workers who feared that they would be displaced by Africans, and by Africans who resented the attitudes of the whites. They had no serious effect on the economy, however. In Malawi more serious trouble developed in September, when Prime Minister H. Kamuzu Banda charged that several leading members of his cabinet had been conspiring against him with Communist China. The cabinet was reorganized and Banda's opponents, who denied the charges but asserted that he had kept too many Europeans in government posts, were expelled from the governing Malawi Congress party. Some were taken into custody while others fled to neighboring countries or went into hiding. Banda denounced Tanzania for giving his opponents asylum.
High Commission Territories

The smallest of the three High Commission territories, Swaziland, held elections in June under a compromise constitution imposed by Britain when white settlers and traditionalist chiefs were unable to reach an agreement with nationalists who wanted a democratic regime based on universal suffrage. The elections resulted in a sweeping victory for the traditionalist-white alliance, but opponents charged that the victorious groups had received financial support from South Africa. In Basutoland a similar conflict between radical and traditionalist elements was settled by a compromise which provided for elections in 1965 and independence a year later under the name of Lesotho. In Bechuanaland the modernist-traditionalist conflict was bridged by the personal prestige of Seretse Khama, the British-educated chief who had been exiled from his country in 1952 by Patrick Gordon Walker, then colonial secretary in the British Labor government, because of his marriage to a white girl. The election of a legislative assembly by universal adult suffrage was scheduled for March 1965. In all three territories, leaders of most political groups recognized that geography would make it necessary for them to maintain relations with South Africa; there were also economic ties of major importance, since about half the foreign workers in South Africa came from the High Commission territories.

Maurice J. Goldbloom

South African Jewish Community

The 1960 census reported 116,066 Jews, out of a European (white) population of 3,088,492 and a total population (all races) of 16,002,797.

A statistical analysis of the 1960 census figures, published in the Southern African Jewish Times of March 20, 1964, showed that the Jewish community was 98.6 per cent urban and that age levels for Jews were higher than for the rest of the white population: 42.4 per cent of Jews were over 39, compared with 31.1 per cent for white South Africans as a whole. There were 114,404 Jews in the urban areas: 57,707 in Johannesburg; 23,866 in Cape Town; 6,110 in the East Rand complex of towns; 5,231 in Durban; 3,576 in Pretoria, and 2,811 in Port Elizabeth/Uitenhage.

In several regions, including the Transkei and Zululand, no Jews were recorded.
CIVIC AND POLITICAL STATUS

Jews were full citizens of South Africa, participating in all branches of national life. Eleven Jews were members of parliament (9 in the House of Assembly and 2 in the Senate), and 13 sat in provincial councils. There were 18 Jewish mayors and 13 deputy mayors. The Jewish community both shared in and contributed to South Africa's growing prosperity.

Antisemitism

Political tension during the year was highlighted by sabotage trials, the explosion of a bomb at the Johannesburg railway station, and the detention of a large number of persons under the so-called 90-Day Clause of the General Laws Amendment Act (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 339; 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 485). Letters in several newspapers remarked on the number of people with Jewish names involved in these detentions. In August a monthly newsletter called Anticom, issued by the Inter-Church Anti-Communist Action Committee of the Dutch Reformed churches, devoted four of its eight pages to material purporting to show that Jews were linked with Communism; that Jews had been behind the Russian revolution; that Lenin had been a Jew, Haim Goldmann, and purporting to quote from United States secret service reports that "Bolshevism is organized and directed by Jews, who have no nationality and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things."

A leading national newspaper, the Johannesburg Sunday Times, showed that the articles were based on known forgeries, and charged that "the tone and character of the Anticom articles are clearly aimed at whipping up feelings against Jews among members of the Dutch Reformed Churches."

The South African Jewish Board of Deputies protested to the Anticom committee and to the leadership of the Dutch Reformed church. The Jewish press called on the church to repudiate Anticom. Dr. J. D. Vorster, actuary of the Dutch Reformed church and one of the persons associated with the Anti-Communist Committee, denied that the articles were antisemitic or intended to excite feeling against Jews, but added "New York Jews financed Lenin." As far as South African Jewry was concerned, Dr. Vorster declared, they should "come out openly against Communism." If the Jewish community was doing something against Communism, he did not know about it. It was time to counter the spread of Communism among Jewish youth.

Die Transvaler, Johannesburg Nationalist daily, invited the Board of Deputies to comment on Vorster's views. The board rejected Vorster's argument and said: "The issue is not where does the Jewish community stand vis-à-vis Communism, but where do the Afrikaans churches stand vis-à-vis Anticom, published by a body set up under their joint auspices?" Commenting on Vorster's call to Jews to "come out openly against Communism," the board asked: "Why this specific call to the Jewish community when the struggle against subversion, violence and sabotage is a struggle in which all South
Africans of all creeds, nationalities and races are vitally concerned?” On the argument of Jewish names among alleged Communists, the board said:

Dr. Vorster must know that they constitute only a tiny fraction of the Jewish population and that the Jewish community has as little control or influence upon these individuals as the Afrikaans or English communities have upon Afrikaner or English Communists. No other section in South Africa would for a moment be held responsible, or accept responsibility, for the unlawful acts of such individuals. The Jewish community is no exception. Moreover, many of these persons have only the flimsiest ties with Jewish communal life.

Affirming that the Jewish community stood for law and order and condemned subversion and violence, the board also pointed out that anyone aware of the facts knows that Jews have little reason to be sympathetic to Communism, either on the ground of its philosophy of atheistic materialism, which is incompatible with Judaism, or because of the Soviet Union's long record of suppression of Jewish religious practices, of Jewish cultural expression, and of other forms of organized Jewish group life.

Chief Rabbi Bernard Moses Casper similarly spelled out Jewish dissociation from Communism, in a sermon at the Great synagogue, Johannesburg, which was extensively reported in the press.

A. J. van der Merwe, moderator of the Dutch Reformed church, told the Southern African Jewish Times that Anticom did not speak for the church, which would never lend itself to any movement against Jews. He could not conceive of his church lending its prestige “to this diatribe in Anticom. . . . I believe our Church sincerely hopes and tries to live on friendly terms with our Jewish community.” The country would, he said, have been poorer without its Jews.

The Cape Town Nationalist daily, Die Burger, sharply condemned the Anticom articles.

The provincial moderatures of the Dutch Reformed church, in replies to the letter addressed to them by the Board of Deputies, dissociated themselves from the Anticom articles and reaffirmed their church's goodwill to the Jewish community. In particular, a lengthy reply from the Cape moderature took note of the board’s concern for the maintenance of law and order, its condemnation of subversion and violence, and Chief Rabbi Casper's statement on the Jewish attitude to Communism. It reaffirmed that the Dutch Reformed church would never “do or say anything which can in any way provide grist to the mill for any movement which has as its aim to further antisemitism.” It welcomed the fact that “our Jewish compatriots enjoy here, what we heartily grant them, the freedom which belongs to every citizen in a democratic state.” The reply further stated that the moderature had referred the correspondence to the Anticom committee, with a request to report back.

Direct antisemitic agitation was again, for the most part, confined to the distribution of leaflets by the same persons noted here previously (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 341-42). There seemed to be links between local antisemites and agitators and organizations in other parts of the world. Some of
the leaflets were direct reproductions of material emanating from Einar Aberg of Sweden or his counterparts in England and America. Some antisemitic leaflets also sought to exploit political differences between Israel and South Africa, and Jewish names among alleged Communists and saboteurs.

In March, while Alec Gorshel, Jewish M.P. of the United party, was criticizing a government bill, G. F. Froneman, a Nationalist member, interjected: "Go to Israel!" The interruption stung Gorshel into saying: "Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a Jew. The next time I get the advice, which is often addressed to members of my race on this side of the House, to 'go to Israel,' am I not entitled to reply: 'Go to Hell'?"

There were angry comments from some government members, and the chairman told Gorshel to moderate his language. Opposition members alleged antisemitism. Government members (including Minister of Finance Theophilus E. Donges) pooh-poohed the charge. A leading government front-bencher, J. S. Labuschagne, categorically affirmed that there was no antisemitism in the National party and paid warm tribute to the contribution, present as well as past, which the Jewish community had made to South Africa.

A report in the New York Herald Tribune alleged "rabid antisemitism" which "with vehemence and intensity burst the other day upon Parliament," caused "concern mingled with fear" that "sent shudders throughout the 110,000 strong South African Jewish community." The article drew a letter from the Board of Deputies which was published in the Herald Tribune on April 10. The board declared:

We cannot permit this report to go unchallenged. Several Jewish journals in this country have reprinted the report with comments such as, "This will make you rub your eyes ... the unrecognizable picture of South African Jewry" and "South African Jews will be amazed to read this fantastic distortion of the local position. . . ."

The antisemitic interjections of a few individuals in Parliament rightly called forth indignation and criticism—happily not from Jews alone.

They are not to be regarded as expressions of the policy of the government or of the Nationalist party. More than once in recent years the Prime Minister has gone on record in deprecating anti-Jewish prejudice.

South African Jews are accepted as, and have always been, an integral element of the South African community.

COMMUNAL ORGANIZATION

Communal work continued in the pattern of previous years, without major new developments. The Board of Deputies planned to have a new headquarters in Johannesburg, in a building which could also house other Jewish institutions. The board also arranged for a pension fund for Jewish rabbis and cantors, complementing the pension fund for Hebrew teachers which it had piloted some years previously.

Board Chairman Teddy Schneider, and Vice-Chairman Maurice Porter
attended sessions of the World Jewish Congress in Israel in July and the CJMCAG, World Conference of Jewish Organizations, and World Council of Jewish Education in Geneva.

Joseph Amiel arrived in South Africa from Israel in December to assume office as the new director of the board’s youth department.

The 12th national conference of the Union of Jewish Women of Southern Africa was held in April. Reports described the activities of branches throughout the country in promoting intercommunity goodwill, as well as the success of the union’s adult-education program, embracing study groups, tape-recordings, and audiovisual material.

The Golden Jubilee conference of the Hebrew Order of David, largest Jewish fraternal organization in South Africa, with 26 lodges in various parts of the country, honored Henry Blank on his retirement as grand secretary after 35 years of service. He was succeeded by David Wacks.

B’nai B’rith established new lodges in Bloemfontein, Cape Town, and Durban, and at a national conference in April set up a B’nai B’rith Council for Southern Africa to coordinate its nine local lodges.

**Fund Raising**

Improved economic conditions led to better response to campaign appeals. This was especially the case with the Israeli United Appeal campaign, which was organized by Harry L. Shapiro of the American UJA during a six-month mission to South Africa. At the invitation of the South African Zionist Federation, Judge Samuel Freedman of Canada visited South Africa in August to launch the campaign at banquets in the main centers. Improved results were also achieved in the South African Women’s Zionist campaign, launched in April by visiting WIZO emissaries Lily Frank and Genia Kanowitz of Israel.

Raymond Schmittlein, vice-president of the French National Assembly, and Israeli Keneset members Hayyim Landau and Eleazar Shostak visited South Africa in May to launch a campaign for the building of the Jabotinsky memorial center in Tel-Aviv. Conducted by the Zionist Revisionist party, the campaign drew support from all sections of the community.

The United Communal Fund, which meets the budgets of South African Jewry’s main national institutions, continued the campaign it had begun in 1963, and by mid-1964 recorded an increase both in number of contributors and average contributions.

The Simon Kuper Foundation Trust was established to help finance Jewish day schools in 1964. It was named in memory of the judge who played a leading part in fostering the Jewish day-school program (AJYB, 1962 [Vol. 63], p. 462; 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 346). A campaign to raise R1 million ($1.4 million) for the foundation program was launched in November at a Johannesburg banquet addressed by Neville Laski of Britain.

**Religion**

There was further abatement of the Orthodox-Reform controversy (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 343), and the current of religious life flowed more calmly
during 1964. Rabbi Casper, former dean of students at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who had arrived in South Africa in September 1963 to become chief rabbi of the United Hebrew congregation of Johannesburg, helped to develop communal harmony. Traveling widely on pastoral visits, he met all sections of the community and found a warm response. In June the Federation of Synagogues of the Transvaal, Orange Free State, and Natal elected him to serve as its chief rabbi, as well, and appointed him a dayyan of the Beth Din. The South African Board of Jewish Education elected him its honorary president, and the South African Zionist Federation co-opted him to its executive council.

In August Chief Rabbi Casper’s congregation celebrated the golden jubilee of its synagogue. A special commemoration service was attended by representatives of the province and the city who, at a banquet which followed, paid tribute to the contribution which the United Hebrew congregation had made to the public welfare.

The Cape Town Hebrew congregation, led by Chief Rabbi Israel Abrahams, announced plans in September for the building of a R100,000 Jewish center, to include a communal hall and other congregational facilities.

E. S. Rabinowitz resigned as rabbi of the Green and Sea Point Hebrew congregation, Cape Town, to return to England and Jacob Vainstein resigned as rabbi to Port Elizabeth Orthodox Jewry in order to take up a position in Israel. Harry Abt retired from the ministry of the Oxford synagogue in Johannesburg and became cultural officer of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies. Rabbi Solomon Poupko came from the United States in September to Johannesburg's Sydenham-Highlands North Hebrew congregation, while Cantor Elijah Greenblatt of Israel became the congregation’s hazzan. Cantor Joseph Malovany of Israel was appointed hazzan of Johannesburg's Yeoville synagogue. Rabbi E. Duschinsky came from the United States to join the Board of Deputies staff as rabbi to the country communities.

In the Reform sector of the community, after growing criticism of his policies, which had been a factor in the Orthodox-Reform controversy previously referred to, Rabbi Ahron Opher resigned the chief ministry of Johannesburg’s United Progressive Jewish congregation. He returned to the United States in July, and the congregation appointed Arthur Saul Super as its senior rabbi. Super had come to South Africa in 1960 as editor of the Zionist Record, but left journalism to join the ministry of the Johannesburg United Progressive Jewish congregation in January 1964. Rabbi Raphael Sonnenfeld came from East London to join the Johannesburg Reform ministry. Rabbi Walter Blumenthal became spiritual leader of the Springs Reform congregation. Rabbi Jacob Funkenstein assumed the ministry of the Port Elizabeth Reform congregation.

Education

The 13th national conference of the South African Board of Jewish Education met in Johannesburg in February. Reports showed that schools administered or supervised by the board had 9,000 pupils: 2,000 in nursery
schools, 3,500 in Talmud Toras, and almost the same number in day schools. The area under the Cape Board of Jewish Education accounted for 3,000 more children. Both boards served only the Orthodox majority of South African Jewry; counting the enrolment of Reform and Yiddish schools, a total of 15,000 children received formal Jewish education in South Africa in 1964.

Attention was focused on the Jewish day schools. There were now 10: in Johannesburg, King David primary at Linksfield with 1,077 pupils, King David high with 650, King David primary and high school at Victory Park with 443, and Bernard Patley junior with 167; in Pretoria, Carmel with 251; in Durban, Sharona with 336 and Carmel high with 140; in Port Elizabeth, Theodor Herzl with 172; in Cape Town, Herzlia and Weizmann, with about 1,300 between them.*

Rabbi Norman Lamm of New York, guest of honor at the conference, complimented the board on the standard of its day schools, but thought that the time allotted to Jewish studies should be increased.

The conference decided to invite Professor Tsevi Adar, director of the school of education of the Hebrew University, to make a systematic survey of South Africa's Hebrew schools and frame recommendations for further development. Adar arrived on this mission in August.

In Cape Town A. E. Rivlin completed the mission which had brought him to South Africa in 1959 as director of the Cape Board of Jewish Education, and was succeeded by Z. Lenz in December.

Zionism and Relations with Israel


Zionist work began to regain momentum after the setback in Israel-South African relations which developed in 1963 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 344–45). This was reflected in the substantially increased totals in the Israeli United Appeal and Women's Zionist campaigns (see p. 493). There were traditionally large attendances at Israeli Independence Day celebrations throughout the community in April. Visits in August by Elijah Dobkin, head of the youth and halutz department of the Jewish Agency and in October by Jacob Tsur, world chairman of the JNF, further reinforced Zionist sentiment.

In July Tsevi Infeld retired after 25 years as general secretary of the South African Zionist Federation to settle in Israel. Secretary Sidney Berg succeeded him.

In November Joseph Daleski stepped down after 15 years as chairman of the Zionist Revisionists and was elected vice-president. He remained a vice-chairman of the South African Zionist Federation and a member of the World

* There was also a Jewish day school in Bulawayo, Carmel with 131 pupils, and in Salisbury, Sharona with 52.
Zionist Actions Committee and the World Revisionist Executive. Haim Lewis, former editor of the *Zionist Review* (London) arrived in Johannesburg in September to become editor of the *Zionist Record*.

The Magen David Adom, the Israel Maritime League, and organizations supporting the Hebrew University and other Israeli institutions continued to be active.

**Social Services**

Advances in the national economy decreased the demands on Jewish welfare agencies for relief, but social services for the orphaned, the aged, and the chronically sick required higher budgets, because of larger numbers and rising costs.

The Transvaal Jewish Welfare Council’s case load of 1,130 families was 69 cases smaller than in the previous year. Johannesburg Hevrāh Kaddisha allocations for relief and rehabilitation dropped R17,000 to R187,315. The Witwatersrand Hebrew Benevolent Association reported a considerable drop in the number of applications for interest-free loans, though increased grants kept its total loan allocation of R122,904, within R2,000 of the previous year’s figure. Jewish Women’s Benevolent Society expenditures on relief and rehabilitation decreased from R65,159 to R61,999. Proportionate decreases were reflected in other provinces.

Jewish orphanages and homes for the aged in Johannesburg and Cape Town earned commendations from national welfare officials for their high standards. Our Parents’ Home in Johannesburg opened a new wing in February, and the Cape Jewish Aged Home projected plans in November to add a R400,000 home for the chronically sick, similar to the Chronic Sick Home of the Witwatersrand Jewish Aged Home in Johannesburg, South African Jewry’s largest welfare institution.

ORT-OSE sponsored a plastics-technology course at the Witwatersrand Technical College, in addition to its manual-training courses in several schools, its scholarships, and its vocational-guidance services. ORT-OSE and the Board of Deputies continued their employment-placement services.

Reporting in December on prison visiting, Rabbi S. Katz of Pretoria revealed that there were fewer than 100 Jews among a total of 70,000 offenders of all races in South African prisons.

**Cultural Activities**

Israel Zangwill’s centenary was observed in Johannesburg in April at a function sponsored by Peoples’ College (a joint Board of Deputies and Zionist Federation undertaking) and the South African P.E.N. Center; there were also Zangwill memorial lectures in other cities. “Anglo-Jewish Writing Since Zangwill” was the general theme of Jewish Book Month (sponsored by the Board of Deputies) in October. William Frankel, editor of the London *Jewish Chronicle*, then visiting South Africa, accepted the board’s invitation to head the Book Month program and lectured in Johannesburg and other leading centers.
Cultural activities included regular courses on Jewish subjects conducted by Peoples' College; adult-education programs sponsored by the Union of Jewish Women of Southern Africa; seminars conducted by Zionist bodies, and a variety of other activities under the aegis of the Histadruth Ivrit and the South African Yiddish Cultural Federation.

The Yiddish Cultural Federation brought Jacob Botosansky, Argentine Yiddish writer, to South Africa on a lecture tour in September and mourned his death of a heart attack in the middle of the tour. His body was flown back to Buenos Aires for burial.

Books by South African Jews published during the year included Chief Rabbi Israel Abrahams' English translation of Professor Umberto Cassuto's biblical commentary *From Noah to Abraham*; *Mi-ma'ayan Mahshevotai* (Hebrew essays) by Rabbi Isaac Goss; *Mit a Shmaykhl oif der erd* (Yiddish sketches) by Hirsch Shishler; *Readings in Modern Fiction* (critical studies) by Professor Edward Davis; *Both Sides of the Mask* (biography) by Lewis Sowden; *They Came to South Africa* (history) by Fay Jaff; *Redeemed* (novel) by Lea Raik.

**Personalia**

Joseph Friedman of Durban was appointed a judge of the Supreme Court of South Africa (Natal division) in February 1964, replacing Judge Edgar Henochsberg, who retired. Both were former presidents of the Council of Natal Jewry.

South African Jewry was saddened by the death in April, after a long illness, of Rabbi Michael Kossowsky, *rav* of the Bet Ha-m'drash Ha-gadol in Johannesburg, *dayyan* of the Beth Din, president of Mizrahi, a vice-president of the South African Zionist Federation, and one of the best-known spiritual leaders in the country.

Other losses suffered by South African Jewry during 1964 included Willy Cohn, founder of B'nai B'rith in South Africa and honorary life president of the Johannesburg lodge (January); former veteran city councillors and communal workers Hessel Kroomer of Johannesburg (April) and Martin Hammerschlag of Cape Town (August); veteran Johannesburg communal leaders Lily Sive (July), Joseph Bahr (October), and David Hayden (November); Leopold Greenberg, former judge of appeals, sometime acting chief justice of South Africa, and honorary president of Keren Ha-yesod and Israeli United Appeal (September); Brigadier Fritz Baumann Adler, a barrister, senator, and director of artillery in the South African army in World War II (September); Baruch Leib Rubik, leading Cape Town Jewish cultural worker (September); Alfred Friedlander, former member of parliament and Cape Town communal leader (November), and Morris Kentridge, a member of parliament for 40 years and Zionist leader (December).

**EDGAR BERNSTEIN**
World Jewish Population

The figures presented below are based on local censuses, communal registrations, the estimates of informed observers, and data obtained from a special inquiry conducted by the YEAR BOOK (AJYB, 1961 [Vol. 62], pp. 382–88). Changes due to births and deaths have been taken into account only in so far as they were reflected in figures furnished by local sources. The figures represent only the best possible approximations and will have to be revised when new and better data become available.

Available figures indicate that during the period under review (January–December 1964) some 55,000 Jews, mostly from North Africa and some of the Jewish communities in Europe, emigrated to Israel.

DISTRIBUTION BY CONTINENTS

The estimated world Jewish population at the end of 1964 was about 13,216,000. Approximately 6,610,000 (50 per cent) were in the Americas, 3,933,000 (30 per cent) in Europe, including the Asian part of Turkey and the Soviet Union, 2,345,000 (17.5 per cent) in Asia, 264,000 (2 per cent) in Africa, and 72,000 (0.5 per cent) in Australasia.¹

Europe

Of the 3,933,000 Jews in Europe, 2,454,000 were in the Soviet Union, 285,000 in the countries of the Soviet bloc, and about 1,193,000 in the non-Communist countries. The largest Jewish populations in Western Europe was in France (500,000). While the great influx of Jewish immigrants to France has stopped, there was a continual minor flow which will increase further the Jewish community there (see p. 374). There was also some immigration to Spain, mainly from North Africa. Estimates of the size of the Jewish community in Spain varied from 4,000 to 6,000. We use a figure of 5,000, since exact data are as yet unavailable. Great Britain had 450,000 Jews; Rumania, ¹ Figures in the tables below are rounded to the nearest 50. Because of differences in sources and dates, some figures given here may not agree with figures in other sections of this volume.
140,000; and Hungary, 80,000. In all other countries of Europe the Jewish population was under 50,000.

TABLE 1. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN EUROPE, BY COUNTRIES, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population(a)</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1,762,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>7,172,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9,290,000</td>
<td>40,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>8,078,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>13,951,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4,684,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4,545,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>47,853,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>73,000,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>53,812,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8,480,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>10,088,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2,841,000</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>50,457,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>328,000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>11,967,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3,667,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>30,691,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>9,037,000</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>18,813,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>226,000,000</td>
<td>2,454,000(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>31,077,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7,604,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5,810,000</td>
<td>19,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>30,256,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>19,065,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>690,675,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,933,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^b\) Includes Asiatic regions of the USSR and Turkey.

**North, Central, and South America**

The Jewish population of the United States was estimated to be about 5,612,000 (p. 139). There were some 267,000 Jews in Canada and about 689,000 in Latin America. There was a further decrease in the Jewish population of Cuba to 2,750 in 1964 including both persons affiliated with various communal activities in that country and the unaffiliated. As a result of political unrest in some Latin American countries there was some migration from one country to another and some emigration abroad.
### Table 2. Estimated Jewish Population in North, Central, and South America and the West Indies, by Countries, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population*</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>18,928,000</td>
<td>267,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>38,416,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>189,375,000</td>
<td>5,612,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total North America</strong></td>
<td>246,719,000</td>
<td>5,901,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>239,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1,338,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>7,203,000</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curaçao</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>3,334,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2,721,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>4,095,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>4,448,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2,008,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1,687,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1,541,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1,177,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>894,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Central America</strong></td>
<td>30,833,000</td>
<td>11,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>21,719,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>3,596,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>76,156,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8,222,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>15,098,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>4,726,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>1,903,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>10,365,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>307,000</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2,914,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8,144,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total South America</strong></td>
<td>153,150,000</td>
<td>689,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>430,702,000</td>
<td>6,609,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Table 1, note *.

### Asia and Australia—New Zealand

Of the 2,345,000 Jews in Asia, 2,223,000 were in Israel, 80,000 in Iran, and 18,000 in India. No other country in Asia (aside from Turkey and Asian USSR) had as many as 10,000 Jews. Australia had a Jewish population of 67,000, and New Zealand 5,000.
### TABLE 3. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN ASIA, BY COUNTRIES, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aden</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>23,664,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>686,400,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>589,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>3,592,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>453,147,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>100,045,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>22,182,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>6,855,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2,507,200</td>
<td>2,222,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>95,900,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2,152,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>98,612,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>30,241,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1,733,000</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>5,251,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>4,555,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,550,085,200</td>
<td>2,345,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Table 1, note *.  

### TABLE 4. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10,916,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2,538,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13,454,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Table 1, note *.  

### Africa

The Jewish population of Africa continued to dwindle. Including 116,000 in the Union of South Africa, it was about 264,000. At the end of 1964 only some 4,000 Jews remained in Algeria, 30,000 in Tunisia, 85,000 in Morocco, and 4,000 in Egypt. Available reports indicated that departures from Jewish communities in North Africa continued, and that the old Jewish settlements there were in process of gradual liquidation.
### TABLE 5. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN AFRICA, BY COUNTRIES, 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abyssinia</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>11,020,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo Republic</td>
<td>15,007,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>27,963,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>8,847,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1,504,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>12,360,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Rhodesia</td>
<td>4,010,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>4,494,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of South Africa</td>
<td>17,057,000</td>
<td>116,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>120,762,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>264,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* See Table 1, note *a*.

### COMMUNITIES WITH LARGEST JEWISH POPULATIONS

The three largest Jewish communities in 1964 were in the United States, the Soviet Union, and Israel. Together they accounted for more than 75 per cent of the Jewish population of the world. Only in four other countries was there a Jewish community over 200,000—France, Great Britain, Argentina, and Canada.

### TABLE 6. COUNTRIES WITH LARGEST JEWISH POPULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5,612,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>2,454,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2,223,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>267,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION, SELECTED CITIES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basle</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bordeaux</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochin</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>13,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haifa</td>
<td>195,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismir</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>181,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>53,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leningrad</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (greater)</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseilles</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>285,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oslo</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plovdiv</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio de Janeiro</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salonika</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarajevo</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teheran</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Aviv-Jaffa</td>
<td>394,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toulouse</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valparaiso</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>9,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>6,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For cities in the United States, see p. 149.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAJE</td>
<td>American Association for Jewish Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acad</td>
<td>academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACLU</td>
<td>American Civil Liberties Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act</td>
<td>active, acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADL</td>
<td>Anti-Defamation League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv</td>
<td>advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affil</td>
<td>affiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agr</td>
<td>agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agric</td>
<td>agriculturist, agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJCongress</td>
<td>American Jewish Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJYB</td>
<td>AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>America, American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amb</td>
<td>ambassador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appd</td>
<td>appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assoc</td>
<td>associate, association, associated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asst</td>
<td>assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atty</td>
<td>attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bd</td>
<td>board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib</td>
<td>Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bibliog</td>
<td>bibliography, bibliographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bklyn</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bur</td>
<td>bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCAR</td>
<td>Central Conference of American Rabbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chmn</td>
<td>chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJFWF</td>
<td>Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJMCAG</td>
<td>Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coll</td>
<td>collector, collective, college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colo</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>com</td>
<td>committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comdr</td>
<td>commander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comm</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commr</td>
<td>commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comp</td>
<td>composer, composed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cond</td>
<td>conductor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conf</td>
<td>conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cong</td>
<td>congress, congregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constr</td>
<td>construction, constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contrib</td>
<td>contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corr</td>
<td>correspondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>died</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem</td>
<td>democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dept</td>
<td>department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dir</td>
<td>director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dist</td>
<td>district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>div</td>
<td>division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>econ</td>
<td>economic, economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed</td>
<td>editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edit</td>
<td>edited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edil</td>
<td>editorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edn</td>
<td>edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ</td>
<td>education, educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educl</td>
<td>educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>English, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estab</td>
<td>established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exec</td>
<td>executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fd</td>
<td>fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fdn</td>
<td>foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fdr</td>
<td>founder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fed</td>
<td>federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for</td>
<td>foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen</td>
<td>general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ger</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gov</td>
<td>governor, governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>govt</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hist</td>
<td>historical, history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hon</td>
<td>honorary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hosp</td>
<td>hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUC-JIR</td>
<td>Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILGWU</td>
<td>International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl</td>
<td>including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ind</td>
<td>independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inst</td>
<td>institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instn</td>
<td>institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr</td>
<td>instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internat</td>
<td>international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ital</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDA</td>
<td>Joint Defense Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDC</td>
<td>American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNF</td>
<td>Jewish National Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPA</td>
<td>Joint Palestine Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTA</td>
<td>Jewish Telegraphic Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Jewish Organizations¹

UNITED STATES

Organizations are listed according to functions as follows:

- Religious, Educational p. 514
- Cultural p. 511
- Community Relations p. 509
- Overseas Aid p. 513
- Social Welfare p. 525
- Social, Mutual Benefit p. 523
- Zionist and Pro-Israel p. 527

Note also cross-references under these headings:

- Professional Associations p. 532
- Women's Organizations p. 533
- Youth Organizations p. 533

COMMUNITY RELATIONS


AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE (1906). Institute of Human Relations, 165 E. 56 St., N. Y. C., 10022. Pres. Morris B. Abram; Exec. V. Pres. John Slawson. Seeks to prevent infraction of the civil and religious rights of Jews in any part of the world and to secure equality of economic, social, and educational opportuni

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS (1917; reorg. 1922, 1938). Stephen Wise Congress House, 15 E. 84 St., N. Y. C., 10028. Pres. Joachim Prinz; Exec. Dir. Will Maslow. Seeks to eliminate all forms of racial and religious bigotry; to advance civil rights, protect civil liberties, and defend religious freedom and separation of church and state; to promote the cre-

¹ Includes national Jewish organizations in existence for at least one year prior to June 30, 1964, based on replies to questionnaires circulated by the editors. Inclusion in this list does not necessarily imply approval of the organizations by the publishers, nor can they assume responsibility for the accuracy of the data. An asterisk (*) indicates that no reply was received and that the information, which includes title of organization, year of founding, and address, is reprinted from AJYB, 1964 (Vol. 65).
tive survival of the Jewish people; to help Israel develop in peace, freedom, and security. Congress Bi-Weekly; Judaism.


COMMISSION ON SOCIAL ACTION OF REFORM JUDAISM (1949) (under the auspices of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations). 838 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10021. Chmn. Irving J. Fain; Dir. Albert Vorspan; Assoc. Dir. Balfour Brickner. Develops materials to assist Reform synagogues in setting up social-action programs relating the principles of Judaism to contemporary social problems; assists congregations in studying the moral and religious implications in social issues such as civil rights, civil liberties, church-state relations; guides congregational social-action committees. Issues of Conscience.


COORDINATING BOARD OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS (1947). 1640 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Co-Chmn. Label A. Katz (B'nai B'rith), Barnett Janner (Board of Deputies of British Jews), Namie Philips (South African Jewish Board of Deputies); Secs. Gen. Maurice Bisgyer (U. S.), A. G. Brotman (U. K.), J. M. Rich (S. A.). As an organization in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, represents the three constituents (B'nai B'rith, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, and the South African Jewish Board of Deputies) in the appropriate United Nations bodies with the purpose of advancing and protecting the status, rights, and interests of Jews as well as related matters bearing upon the human rights of peoples.

COUNCIL OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS IN CIVIL SERVICE, INC. (1946). 51 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10004. Pres. Herman P. Mantelell; Sec. Beatrice Zeitlin. Supports merit system in civil service; promotes professional, social and cultural interests of its members; cooperates with other organizations in promoting understanding and amity in the community. Digest.

JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE (1933). Atran Center for Jewish Culture, 25 E. 78 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Nat. Chmn. Adolph Held; Exec. Sec. Benjamin Tabachinsky. Seeks to combat antisemitism and racial and religious intolerance abroad and in the U. S. in cooperation with organized labor and other groups; aids Jewish and non-Jewish labor institutions overseas; aids victims of oppression and persecution. JLC News; Labor Reports; Point of View.

—WOMEN'S DIVISION (1947). Atran Center for Jewish Culture, 25 E. 78 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Nat. Chmn. Eleanor Schachner; Exec. Sec. Mina Goldman. Supports the general activities of the Jewish Labor Committee; maintains child-welfare program in Europe and Israel; conducts a broad educational program in connection with current economic and social problems; participates in educational and cultural activities.


NATIONAL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

NATIONAL COMMUNITY RELATIONS ADVISORY COUNCIL (1944). 55 West 42 St., N. Y. C., 10036. Chmn. Aaron Goldman; Exec. V. Chmn. Isaiah M. Minkoff. To study, analyze, and evaluate the policies and activities of the national and local agencies; to ascertain the problem areas from time to time; to ascertain the areas of activities of these organizations and to conduct a continuous inventory of their projects; to serve as a coordinating and clearance agency for projects and policies, to eliminate duplication and conflict of activities, and to recommend further projects to member agencies; to seek agreement on and formulate policies. In the Common Cause; Joint Program Plan for Jewish Community Relations.

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS (1936; org. in U. S. 1939). Stephen Wise Congress House, 15 E. 84 St., N. Y. C., 10028. Pres. Nahum Goldmann; Dir. Internat. Affairs Dept. Maurice L.Perlzweig; Chmn. Amer. Sect. M. Nussbaum. Seeks to secure and safeguard the rights, status, and interests of Jews and Jewish communities throughout the world, within the framework of an international effort to secure human rights everywhere without discrimination; represents its affiliated organizations before the United Nations, the Organization of American States, the Council of Europe, and other governmental, intergovernmental, and international authorities on matters which are of concern to the Jewish people as a whole; promotes Jewish cultural activity and represents Jewish cultural interests before UNESCO; organizes Jewish communal life in countries of recent settlement; prepares and publishes surveys on contemporary Jewish problems. Congress Digest; Current Events in Jewish Life; Folk un Velt; Information Series; Information Sheets; Institute of Jewish Affairs Reports; Jewish Cultural Affairs; Periodical Reports; World Jewry.

CULTURAL


AMERICAN BIBLICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA SOCIETY (AMERICAN TORAH SHELEMAH COMMITTEE) (1930). 210 W. 91 St., N. Y. C., 10024. Pres. Leo Jung; Cor. Sec. Jacob H. Arond; Author-Ed. Menachem M. Kesher. Fosters Biblical-Talmudical research; sponsors and publishes Torah Shelema (the Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation) and related publications; disseminates the teachings and values of the Bible.


CONGRESS FOR JEWISH CULTURE, INC. (1948). 25 E. 78 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Exec. Dir. Hyman B. Bass. Seeks to centralize and promote Jewish culture and cultural activities throughout the world, and to unify fund raising for these activities. Bulletin fun Kultur Kongres; Fun Noentn Ovar; Zukunft.


HISTADRUTH IVRITH OF AMERICA (1916; reorg. 1922). 120 W. 16 St., N. Y. C., 10011. Chmn. of Presidium Morris B. Newman; Gen. Sec. Yerachmiel Weingarten. Emphasizes the primacy of Hebrew in Jewish life, culture, and education; conducts Hebrew courses for adults; publishes Hebrew books; sponsors the Hebrew-speaking Masad camps, the Hebrew Academy, which serves as a channel for the exchange of research and study among academicians in the field of Hebrew culture, and the Moar Ivri, a youth group on campuses and in cities throughout the United States; sponsors cultural exchange with Israel through organized tours and ulpanim. Hadoor; La- mishpaha; Niv; Perakim.

—, HEBREW ARTS FOUNDATION (1939). 120 W. 16 St., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Marcus Rottenberg; Dir. Tzipora H. Jochsberger. Promotes and understanding and appreciation of Hebrew culture in the American Jewish community through such educational projects as the Hebrew Arts School for Music and Dance, the Hebrew Arts Teacher-Train-
historical research, the presentation and publication of the history of German-speaking Jewry, and in the collection of books and manuscripts in this field; publishes a year book as well as monographs. *Bulletin; LBI News; Year Book.*


**National Foundation for Jewish Culture** (1960). 729 Seventh Ave., N. Y. C., 10019. Pres. Edwin Wolf, 2nd; Sec. Judah J. Shapiro. Provides guidance and support to agencies, organizations, institutions, and activities in the field of Jewish culture; advises and informs Jewish communities, welfare funds, federations, and individuals in matters pertaining to Jewish culture; organizes and maintains a general clearinghouse of information with respect to matter pertaining to Jewish culture. *Bulletin.*


**Office for Jewish Population Research** (1949). 165 E. 56 St., N. Y. C., 10022. Pres. Salo W. Baron; Sec-Treas. Morris Fine. Gathers population, and other statistical data on the Jews of U. S.; to provide such data to Jewish agencies and the general public and to stimulate national interest in Jewish population research through publications and other media.

**Society for the History of Czechoslovak Jews, Inc.** (1961). 82-34 265 St., Floral Park, N. Y. 11004. Pres. Kurt Wehle; Sec. Walter Kauders. Seeks to study the economic, religious, political, social, and cultural history of the Jews of Czechoslovakia and to disseminate information on the subject through the publication of books and pamphlets.


**OVERSEAS AID**


vocational training schools throughout the world. *ORT Bulletin, ORT Yearbook.*


**—-: Women's American ORT (1927).** 222 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003. Nat. Pres. Mrs. Max M. Rosenberg; Nat. Exec. Dir. Nathan Gould. Represents and advances the program and philosophy of ORT among the women of the American Jewish community through membership and educational activities; supports materially the vocational training operations of World ORT Union; contributes to the American Jewish community through participation in its authorized campaigns and through general education to help raise the level of Jewish consciousness among American Jewish women. *Highlights; Women's American ORT News.*

**A.R.I.F.—Association Pour le Retablis-**


**Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, Inc. (1951).** 3 E. 54 St., N. Y. C., 10022. Pres. Nahum Goldmann; Sec. Mark Uveeler. Utilizes funds received from the German Federal Republic under terms of an agreement with the Conference for the relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of needy victims of Nazi persecution residing outside of Israel.

**Freeland League for Jewish Territorial Colonization (1933; in U. S. 1938).**

200 W. 72 St., N. Y. C., 10023. Pres. N. Turak; Exec. Sec. Mordkhe Schaechter. Plans large-scale colonization in some sparsely populated territory for those who seek a home and cannot or will not go to Israel. *Freeland; Oifn Shvel.*

**Jewish Restitution Successor Organiza-**

**—-tion (1947).** 3 E. 54 St., N. Y. C., 10022. Pres. Monroe Goldwater; Exec. Sec. Saul Kagan. Acts to discover, claim, receive, and assist in the recovery of Jewish heirless or unclaimed property; to utilize such assets or to provide for their utilization for the relief, rehabilitation, and resettlement of surviving victims of Nazi persecution.


**Vaad Hatzala Rehabilitation Commit-**


**RELIGIOUS, EDUCATIONAL**

**Academy for Higher Jewish Learning**

**(Academy for Jewish Religion) (1956; reorg. 1961).** 135 E. 50 St., N. Y. C., 10022. Dean S. Michael Gelber; Sec. Stanley Marks. To ordain men as rabbis to serve Reform, Conservative, or Orthodox congregations.

**Agudas Israel World Organization**


**Agudath Israel of America, Inc. (1912).** 5 Beekman St., N. Y. C., 10038. Admin. Pres. Michael G. Tress; Exec. V. Pres. Morris Sherer. Seeks to organize religious Jewry in the Orthodox spirit, and in that spirit to solve all problems facing Jewry in Israel and the world over. *Jewish Observer; Dos Yiddische Vort.*

**Children's Division—Pirchei**

**Agudath Israel (1925).** 5 Beekman St., N. Y. C., 10038. Educates Orthodox Jewish children in the traditional Jewish way. *Darkeinu; Inter Talmud Torah Boys; Leaders Guide.*

**Girls' Division—Bnos Agudath**

**—-Israel (1921).** 5 Beekman St., N. Y. C., 10038. Chmn. Chaya Korb. Educates
Jewish girls to the realization of the historic nature of the Jewish people as the people of the Torah; to greater devotion to and understanding of the Torah; to seek solutions to the problems of the Jewish people in Israel in the spirit of the Torah. Kol Basya; Kol Bnos.

—YOUTH DIVISION-ZEIREI AGUDATH ISRAEL (1921). 5 Beekman St., N. Y. C., 10038. Exec. Dir. Boruch Borchardt. Educates Jewish youth to the realization of the historic nature of the Jewish people as the people of the Torah; to greater devotion to and understanding of the Torah; and to seek solutions to all the problems of the Jewish people in Israel in the spirit of the Torah. Agudah Youth; Leaders Guide; Orthodox Tribune.


ASSOCIATION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH SCIENTISTS (1947). 84 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Azriel Rosenfeld; Sec. Nora Smith. Seeks to promote the orientation of science within the framework of Orthodox Jewish tradition; to obtain and disseminate information relating to the interaction between the Jewish traditional way of life and scientific developments; to interest and assist Orthodox Jewish youth in the study of science, and to assist in the solution of problems pertaining to Orthodox Jews engaged or interested in scientific pursuits. Intercom.


Federation of Jewish Student Organizations (1937). 3010 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10027. Pres. Frank Tuerkheimer; Sec. Eileen Thaler. Fosters knowledge and appreciation of Judaism and encourages participation in the Jewish community; serves as a clearinghouse for the exchange of information about Jewish student activities in N. Y. C.

Gratz College (1895). 10 St. and Tabor Rd., Philadelphia, Pa. 19141. Pres. Mitchell E. Panzer; Dean Elazar Goelman; Registrar Daniel Isaacman. Trains teachers for Jewish religious schools; provides studies in Judaica and Hebraica; maintains a Hebrew high school and a school of observation and practice; provides Jewish studies for adults; community-service division coordinates Jewish education in the city and provides consultation services to Jewish schools of all leanings. College Register; Gratz-Chats; Ner Talmid; Telem; What's New; Yearbook.

Hebrew Teachers College (1921). 43 Hawes St., Brookline, Mass. 02146. Dean Eisig Silberschlag. Trains men and women to teach, conduct, and supervise Jewish schools; to advance Hebrew scholarship and make available to the general public a constructive knowledge of the Jewish spiritual creations and contributions to the world's culture and progress. Hebrew Teachers College Bulletin.


Herzliah Hebrew Teachers Institute, Inc. (1921). 314 W. 91 St., N. Y. C., 10024. Act. Pres. Mendel Haber; Dean Aharon Horowitz. Trains teachers of Bible, Hebrew language, and Jewish religion for Hebrew elementary schools, parochial schools, and high schools; conducts a junior and senior high school, teachers institute, graduate division, and adult-extension courses.

Jewish Information Society of America (1959). 72 E. 11 St., Chicago, Ill. 60605. Pres. Bernard M. Epstein; Sec. David Brandwein. Seeks to work for a better understanding of the Jewish religion among non-Jews and estranged Jews; to introduce prospective proselytes to Jewish congregations and befriend them, and to arrange for their instruction in the Jewish religion. Constructed N. Y. World's Fair (1964-65) exhibit representing the Jewish religion. Jewish Information.

JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, INC. (1940). 15 W. 86 St., N. Y. C., 10024. Pres. Ira Eisenstein; Exec. Sec. Vida Kaufman. Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as an evolving religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Eretz Yisrael as the spiritual center of the Jewish people, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice, and peace; sponsors the Reconstructionist Press. Reconstructionist.


JEWISH TEACHERS ASSOCIATION—MORIM (1926). 426 W. 58 St., N. Y. C., 10019. Pres. Harris Shafner; Sec. Dorothy G. Posner. Promotes the religious, social, and moral welfare of children; provides a program of professional, cultural, and social activities for its members; cooperates with other organizations for the promotion of goodwill and understanding. ITA Bulletin.


AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORY CENTER (1953). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10027. Chmn. Sol Satisky; Dir. Alan Nevin; Co-Dir. Moshe Davis. Promotes the writing of regional and local Jewish history in the context of the total American and Jewish experience.


UNIVERSITY OF JUDAISM, West Coast School of JTS (1947). 6525 Sunset Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif. 90028. Pres. David Lieber; V. Pres. Samuel Dinin. Serves as a center of research and study for graduate students; trains teachers for Jewish schools; serves as a center for adult Jewish studies; promotes the arts through its fine-arts school, art gallery, and theater; through its Earl Warren Institute on Ethics and Human Relations, promotes study of relationship of law to ethics in western civilization. Register; University News.


MIRREY YESHIVA CENTRAL INSTITUTE (in Poland 1817; in U. S. 1947). 1791-5 Ocean Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11233. Dean Shrage Moshe Kalmanowitz. Maintains a Mesivta high school and rabbinical seminary; seeks to spread ideals of Jewish faith in the community and abroad; engages in rescue and rehabilitation of scholars overseas.


NATIONAL COUNCIL OF BETH JACOB SCHOOLS, INC. (1943). 150 Nassau St., N. Y. C, 10038. Pres. Ira Rosenzweig; Sec.-Treas. David Ullmann. Operates Orthodox all-day schools and a summer camp for girls.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF YOUNG ISRAEL (1912). 3 W. 16 St., N. Y. C, 10011. Nat. Pres. David H. Hill; Nat. Dir. Ephraim H. Sturm. Maintains a program of spiritual, cultural, social, and communal activity towards the advancement and perpetuation of traditional, Torah-true Judaism; seeks to instill in American youth an understanding and appreciation of the ethical and spiritual values of Judaism. Young Israel Viewpoint; Youth Department Manuals.

— ARMED FORCES BUREAU (1939). 3 W. 16 St., N. Y. C, 10011. Chmn. J. David Delman; Dir. Stanley W. Schlessel. Advises and counsels the inductees into the armed forces with regard to Sabbath observance, kashrut, and Orthodox behavior; supplies kosher food packages, religious items, etc., to servicemen; aids veterans in readjusting to civilian life. Armed Forces Viewpoint; Guide for the Orthodox Servicemen.


— INTERCOLLEGIATE COUNCIL—OF YOUNG ADULTS (1950). 3 W. 16 St., N. Y. C, 10011. Pres. Elliot Feit; Dir. Stanley W. Schlessel. Provides a program of spiritual, cultural, social, and communal activity for the advancement and perpetuation of traditional Judaism among American college youth; serves as a clearinghouse for information on religious traditions and maintains kosher dining clubs and dorms on college campuses. Voice.


Ner Israel Rabbinical College (1933). 4411 Garrison Blvd., Baltimore, Md. 21215. Pres. Jacob I. Ruderman; Exec. Dir. Herman N. Neuberger. Provides full secular and religious high-school training; prepares students for the rabbinate and the field of Hebrew education; maintains a graduate school which grants the degrees of Master and Doctor of Talmudic Law; maintains a branch, the Ner Israel Yeshiva College, in Toronto, Canada. Catalogue.

P'eylim-American Yeshiva Student Union (1951). 3 W. 16 St., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Jacob Weisberg; Dir. Avraham Hirsch. Aids and sponsors pioneer work by American graduate teachers and rabbis in new villages and towns in Israel; does religious, organizational, and educational work and counseling among new immigrant youth; maintains summer camps for poor immigrant youth in Israel; belongs to worldwide P'eylim movement which has groups in Argentina, Brazil, England, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, France, and Israel; engages in relief work among Algerian immigrants in France, assisting them to relocate and to reestablish a strong Jewish community life. P'eylim Reporter.


*Theological Seminary Yeshivath Chachmey Lublin (1942). 25870 Fairfax St,
Southfield, Mich. Pres. Rabbi Moses Rothenberg; Sec. Harry Stolsky. Maintains school for higher Jewish learning leading to a rabbinical degree.


—: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HEBREW DAY SCHOOL PARENT-TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS (1948). 156 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C. 10010. Nat. Pres. Mrs. Clarence Horwitz; Chmn. of Bd. Sam E. Aboff. Acts as a clearinghouse and service agency to PTA's of Hebrew day schools; organizes parent education courses and sets up programs for individual PTA's.


UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS (1873). 838 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Maurice N. Eisendrath; V. Pres. Jay Kaufman. Serves as the central congregational body of Reform Judaism in the western hemisphere; serves its approximately 651 affiliated temples and membership with religious, educational, cultural, and administrative programs. American Judaism; Jewish Teacher; Keeping Posted.

—: COMMISSION ON SOCIAL ACTION OF REFORM JUDAISM. See p. 510.


— : NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEMPLE ADMINISTRATORS OF (1941). 838 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Frank J. Adler; Admin. Sec. Harold Friedman. Fosters Reform Judaism; prepares and disseminates administrative information and procedures to member synagogues of UAHC; provides and encourages proper and adequate training of professional synagogue executives; formulates and establishes professional ideals and standards for the synagogue executive. NATA Quarterly.

—: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEMPLE EDUCATORS (1955). 838 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Max Frankel; Exec. Sec. James J. Levbarg. Represents the temple educator within the general body of Reform Judaism; fosters the full-time profession of the temple educator; encourages the growth and development of Jewish religious education consistent with the aims of Reform Judaism; stimulates communal interest in and responsibility for Jewish religious education. NATE News.


—: NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEMPLE YOUTH (1939). 838 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Charles Tobias; Nat. Dir. Samuel Cook. Seeks to train Reform Jewish youth in the values of the syna-
gogue and their application to daily life through service to the community and congregation; sponsors study programs, cultural activities, summer camp sessions and leadership institutes, overseas tours, an international student exchange program, and work projects within the United States and abroad. NFTYMES.


UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF AMERICA (1898). 84 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Moses I. Feuerstein; Exec. V. Pres. Samson R. Weiss. Serves as the national central body of Orthodox synagogues; provides educational, religious, and organizational guidance to congregations, youth groups, and men's clubs; represents the Orthodox Jewish community in relationships to governmental and civic bodies, and the general Jewish community; conducts the national authoritative U Kashruth certification service. Kashruth Directory; Youth Study Guides.


UNION OF ORTHODOX RABBIS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, INC. (1902). 235 E. Broadway, N. Y. C., 10002. Mems. of Presidium Eliezer Silver, Moshe Feinstein, Jacob Kamensteinzky, David Lifshitz, Pinhas Teitz; Exec. Dir. Meyer Cohen. Seeks to foster and promote Torah-true Judaism in America; assists in the establishment and maintenance of yeshivot in the United States; maintains committee on marriage and divorce to aid individuals with marital difficulties; disseminates knowledge of traditional Jewish rites and practices and publicizes regulations on synagogal structure and worship.


UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA (1913). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10027. Pres. George Maislen; Exec. Dir. Bernard Segal. Seeks to assert and establish loyalty to the Torah and its historical expositions and to further the observance of the Sabbath and the dietary laws; to preserve in the Service the reference to Israel's past and the hopes of Israel's restoration; to maintain the traditional character of the liturgy, with Hebrew as the language of prayer; to foster Jewish religious life in the home, as expressed in traditional observances; to encourage the establishment of Jewish religious schools; services affiliated congregations and their auxiliaries, in all their religious, educational, cultural, and administrative needs. Adult Jewish Education; Our Age; Outlook; Synagogue School; Torch; United Synagogue Review.

ATID, COLLEGE AGE ORGANIZATION (OF 1960). 218 E. 70th St., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Jerry Epstein; Nat. Dir. Paul Freedman. Offers opportunities to the Jewish college-age adult to continue and strengthen his identification with Judaism; fosters an awareness of the essential harmony between the ideals and traditions of Judaism and American de-
democracy. Kol Atid; Reaching Your Collegiate Congregant.

—- Commission on Jewish Education (c. 1930). 218 E. 70 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Chmn. Simon Greenberg; Dir. Morton Siegel. Promotes higher educational standards in Conservative congregational schools and publishes material for the advancement of their educational program. In Your Hands; Our Age; Synagogue School.

—- Educators Assembly of (1951). 218 E. 70 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Hyman Pomerantz; Exec. Sec. Herbert L. Tepper. Promotes, extends, and strengthens the program of Jewish education on all levels in the community in consonance with the philosophy of the Conservative movement; fosters higher professional standards for school administrators functioning under congregational auspices. Annual Proceedings; Educators Assembly Bulletin; Personnel; Facts and Trends.

—- National Academy for Adult Jewish Studies of (1940). 218 E. 70 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Chmn. Bd. of Gov. Louis M. Levitsky; Dir. Marvin S. Wiener. Provides guidance and information on resources, courses, and other projects in adult Jewish education; prepares and publishes pamphlets, syllabi, study guides, and texts for use in adult-education programs; distributes kinescopes of "Eternal Light" TV programs on Jewish subjects. Adult Jewish Education.


West Coast Talmudical Seminary, Me-Sivya Beth Medrosh Elyon, Inc. (1953). 11027 Burbank Blvd., North Hollywood, Calif. Pres. S. Wasserman; Sec. Sidney Bradpiece. Seeks to promote the teachings of Orthodox Judaism; provides intensive Torah education and rabbinical training in its yeshivah day school, high school for Hebrew and general studies, rabbinical division, and advanced yeshivah.


—- Yavneh, National Religious Jewish Student Association (1960), 84 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Jacques Gorlin; Nat. V. P. David Landau; Coord. Sec. Charlotte Falkin. Seeks to promote religious Jewish education on the college campus, to facilitate full observance of halakhic Judaism, to integrate the insights gained in college studies with the values and knowledge of Judaism, to unite Jewish college students, and to become a force for the dissemination of Torah Judaism in the Jewish community. Jewish Collegiate Observer; Yavneh Review; Yavneh Studies.
Yeshiva University (1886). 186 St. and Amsterdam Ave., N. Y. C, 10033. Pres. Samuel Belkin; Chmn. Bd. of Trustees Max J. Etra. America's oldest and largest university under Jewish auspices, providing undergraduate, graduate, and professional studies in the arts and sciences and Jewish learning leading to 18 different degrees and diplomas; with four teaching centers in Manhattan and the Bronx, it offers preparation for careers in education, social work, the rabbinate, medicine, mathematics, physics, psychology, and other fields; maintains separate high schools for boys and girls, Yeshiva College for Men, Stern College for Women, separate Teachers Institutes for Men and Women, Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, Bernard Revel Graduate School, Harry Fischel School for Higher Jewish Studies, Cantorial Training Institute, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Sue Golding Graduate Division of Medical Sciences, Wurzweiler School of Social Work, Graduate School of Education, Belfer Graduate School of Science. Auxiliary services and special projects include Community Service Division, West Coast Institute of Jewish Studies, Pictorial Mathematics, Psychological and Audio-Visual centers, Israel Institute, National Institute of Mental Health Project, and Teaching Fellowship Program. Bulletin of General Information; Horeb; Inside Yeshiva University; Mathematica Press; Scripta Mathematica; Studies in Torah Judaism; Sura; Talpiot; Y. U. News.


Yeshivath Torah Vodaath and Mesivta Rabbinical Seminary (1918). 141 S. 3 St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11211. Chmn. of Bd. Marvin Herskovitz; Sec. Earl H. Spero. Offers Hebrew and secular education from elementary level through rabbinical ordination and post-graduate work; maintains a teachers institute, religious-functionaries department, and community-service bureau; maintains a dormitory and a nonprofit summer-camp program for boys. Chronicle; Mesivta Vanguard; Thought of the Week; Torah Vodaath News.

ALUMNI ASSOCIATION (1941). 141 S. 3 St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11211. Pres. Isadore Feldman; Exec. Sec. Mendel Weinbach. Promotes social and cultural ties between the alumni and the school; supports the school through fund raising; offers vocational guidance to students, operates Camp Torah Vodaath, and sponsors research fellowship program. Alumni News; Annual Journal; Hamesifta Torah Periodical.

BETH MEDROSH ELYON (ACADEMY OF HIGHER LEARNING AND RESEARCH) (1943). P. O. Box 253, Spring Valley, N. Y. Chmn. of Bd. Meyer A. Shatz; Exec. Dir. H. Waxman. Provides post-graduate courses and research work in higher Jewish studies; offers scholarships and fellowships. Annual Journal.

SOCIAL, MUTUAL BENEFIT


Joseph Heckelman; Nat. Sec. Sidney Rabinovich. Seeks to maintain contact among American veterans of Israel's War of Independence, and to be of service to them. Newsletter.


**Britt Abraham** (1887). 37 E. 7 St., N. Y. C., 10003. Grandmaster Irving L. Hodes; Grand Sec. Louis Clark. Fosters brotherhood, Jewish ideals and traditions, and concern for welfare of Jews; provides fraternal benefits to members; supports camps for underprivileged children and senior citizens. Beacon.


**Central Sephardic Jewish Community of America** (1940). 225 W. 34 St., N. Y. C., 10001.

**Farband—Labor Zionist Order** (1913). 575 Sixth Ave., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Samuel Borchek; Gen. Sec. Jacob Katzman. Seeks to enhance Jewish life, culture, and education in the United States and Canada; supports the State of Israel in keeping with the ideals of labor Zionism; supports liberal causes in the U.S. and throughout the world; provides members and families with low-cost fraternal benefits. Farband News.


**Hebrew Veterans of the War with Spain** (1899). 87-71 94 St., Woodhaven, N. Y. 11421. Commander Samuel J. Semler. Social and fraternal; seeks to fight bigotry.

**International Jewish Labor Bund (Incorporating World Coordinating Committee of the Bund)** (1897; reorg. 1947). 25 E. 78 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Exec. Secs. Emanuel Nowogrudsky, Emanuel Scherer. Coordinates activities of the Bund organizations throughout the world and represents them in the Socialist International; spreads the ideas of Jewish Socialism as formulated by the Jewish Labor Bund; publishes pamphlets and periodicals on world problems, Jewish life, socialist theory and policy, and on the history, activities, and ideology of the Jewish Labor Bund. Bulletin (U. S.); Perspectives (U. S.); Unzer Tsait (U. S.); Foroyes (Mexico); Lebn-Fragn (Israel); Unser Gedank (Argentina); Unser Gedank (Australia); Unser Shitikme (France).


**Mu Sigma Fraternity, Inc.** (1906). 140 Nassau St., N. Y. C., 10038. Sec. Paul M. Hoppe; Exec. Sec. Robert Itzkowitz. Fosters a spirit of brotherhood and fraternalism through organizational, social and athletic activities; fosters programs of community service. Lamp.


**United Hungarian Jews of America, Inc.** (1944). 269 W. 76 St., N. Y. C., 10023.
Pres. Emery J. Worth; Exec. Sec. George Buchsbaum. Founded and maintains Rehabilitation Center in Ramat Ga, Israel; assists Hungarian immigrants in U.S.


UNITED RUMANIAN JEWS OF AMERICA, INC. (1909). 31 Union Square W., N. Y. C, 10003. Pres. I. Glickman; Sec. Samuel Lonschein. Seeks to further, defend, and protect the interests of the Jews in Romania; to work their civic and political emancipation and for their rehabilitation; and to represent and further the interests of Rumanian Jews in the United States. Record.


DIVISION OF JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE (see p. 510)

ENGLISH-SPEAKING DIVISION (1927). 175 E. Broadway, N. Y. C, 10002. Pres. Jacob T. Zukerman; Exec. Sec. Benjamin A. Gabiner; Dir. Membership Activities Nat Peskin. Fosters social, cultural, and educational activities within the program of a Jewish labor and fraternal organization. Workmen's Circle Call; Point of View (with Jewish Labor Committee).


WORLD SEPHARDI FEDERATION, AMERICAN BRANCH (1951). 152 W. 42 St., N. Y. C, 10036; Presidium, Dzentil Sebag-Montefiore, Bohor Shitrit, Simon S. Nessim. Seeks to promote religious and cultural interests of Sephardic communities throughout the world; assists them morally and materially; assists Sephardim who wish to settle in Israel. Judaisme Sephardi; Kol Sephardad.

SOCIAL WELFARE

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM PHILANTHROPIC FUND (1955). 201 E. 57 St., N. Y. C, 10022. Pres. Herbert S. Moyer; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Anna Wellig Matson. Assists Jewish and non-Jewish refugees through relief, resettlement, and rehabilitation programs in Europe, the Middle East, and the U. S.; supports certain institutions in Israel which do not receive funds from United Jewish Appeal or other major fund-raising campaigns.

AMERICAN JEWISH CORRECTIONAL CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION, INC. (formerly NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH PRISON CHAPLAINS) (1937). 10 E. 73 St., N. Y. C, 10021. (Cooperating with the New York Board of Rabbis and Jewish Family Service.) Pres. Erwin Zimet; Sec. Joseph Rothstein. Seeks to provide a more articulate expression for Jewish chaplains serving the needs of Jewish men and women in penal and correctional institutions, and to make their ministry more effective through exchange of views and active cooperation.


BARON DE HIRSCH FUND, INC. (1891). 386 Park Ave., N. Y. C, 10016. Pres. George W. Naumburg; Mng. Dir. Theodore Norman. Supports the Jewish Agricultural Society and gives grants to other agencies in this field; aids Jewish immigrants to secure an education and employment in trades and agriculture.


ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF (see p. 510) AMERICAN JEWISH SOCIETY FOR SERVICE, INC.

HILLEL FOUNDATIONS, INC. (see p. 515)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HILLEL DIRECTORS (see p. 518)

VOCATIONAL SERVICE (1938). 1640 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., Washington,
D. C. 20036. Nat. Chmn. Milton Berger; Nat. Dir. S. Norman Feingold. Conducts occupational and educational research and engages in a broad publications program; also provides direct guidance services through professionally conducted regional offices in many population centers. 

Catalogue of Publications; Counselor's Information Service; B'nai B'rith Vocational Service Newsletter.


— YOUTH ORGANIZATION (see p. 515)


CONFERENCE COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL JEWISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS (1925). 15 E. 84 St., N. Y. C., 10028. Chmn. Mrs. Ferdinand Kaufmann; Sec.-Treas. Mrs. Albert Wald. Promotes interorganizational understanding and good will among the cooperating organizations; brings to attention of constituent organizations matters of Jewish communal interest for their consideration and possible action.


— RETARDED CHILDREN'S CENTER OF (1926). Provides academic and vocational training to mentally retarded children.

FAMILY LOCATION SERVICE (formerly NATIONAL DESERTION BUREAU, INC.) (1905). 31 Union Sq. W., N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Milton B. Eulaul; Exec. Dir. and Chief Counsel Jacob T. Zukerman. Provides location, casework, and legal aid services in connection with problems arising out of family desertion or other forms of marital breakdown; when advisable, assists families in working out plans for reconciliation; in some cases helps to arrange for support payments, preferably on a voluntary basis. Annual Report.


JEWISH NATIONAL HOME FOR ASTHMATIC CHILDREN AT DENVER AND CHILDREN'S ASTHMA RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND HOSPITAL (1907). 3447 W. 19 Ave., Denver, Colo. 80204. Pres. Arthur B. Lorber; Nat. Dir. of Development Jonas Kiken. Maintains a free, nonsectarian medical and research center for children from all parts of the U. S. and Israel who are suffering from chronic intractable asthma and other allergic diseases. News from the Home Front.


LEO N. LEVI MEMORIAL HOSPITAL at Hot Springs National Park, Ark. (sponsored by B'nai B'rith) (1914). 127 N. Dearborn St., Chicago 2, Ill. Pres. Mrs. Louis
H. Harrison; Sec. Bernard Rephan. Maintains a free, nonsectarian, international arthritis medical center for men, women, and children regardless of race, creed, color, religion or geographic location.


**National Council of Jewish Prison Chaplains, Inc.** See American Jewish Correctional Chaplains Association, Inc.

**National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.** (1893). 1 W. 47 St., N. Y. C., 10036. Nat. Pres. Mrs. Joseph Willen; Exec. Dir. Miss Hannah Stein. Sponsors a program of community social service emphasizing youth needs, services for the aging, and mental health programs; sponsors adult-education programs on public affairs; overseas services include fellowships to educators and social workers from Jewish communities abroad for graduate work in the United States and support to the Hebrew University school of education. Council Leader; Council Platform; Council Woman; New Horizons in Community Services; Overseas.


**National Jewish Hospital at Denver (1899).** 3800 E. Colfax Ave., Denver, Colo. 80206. Pres. Edward Miller; Exec. V. Pres. Sanford Solender. Serves as national association of Jewish community centers and YM-YWHA's; authorized by the government to provide for the religious and welfare needs of Jews in the armed services and in veterans hospitals; member of USO, World Federation of YMA's and Jewish Community Centers; sponsors Jewish Book Council, National Jewish Music Council, JWBJ Lecture Bureau. *Program Aids; JWB Year Book.*

**Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy (1940).** 145 E. 32 St., N. Y. C., 10016. Chmn. Israel Miller; Dir. Arhyth Lev. Represents Reform, Orthodox, and Conservative rabbinites on matters relating to chaplaincy; the only government recognized agency authorized to recruit, ecclesiastically endorse, and serve all Jewish military chaplains. *Jewish Chaplain.*

**United HIAS Service, Inc.** (1884; reorg. 1954). 425 Lafayette St., N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Murray I. Gurfein; Exec. Dir. James P. Rice. World-wide organization with offices, affiliates, committees in United States, Europe, North Africa, Latin America, Canada, Australia, Israel, and Hong Kong. Assists Jewish migrants in pre-immigration planning, visa documentation, consular representation and intervention, transportation, reception, sheltering, initial adjustment and reunion of families; carries on adjustment of status and naturalization programs; provides protective service for aliens and naturalized citizens; works in the United States through local community agencies for the integration of immigrants; conducts a planned program of resettlement for Jewish immigrants in Latin America; assists in locating persons abroad for friends and relatives in the United States and overseas; facilitates transmission of funds sent by friends and relatives to families in Israel. *Notes on Immigrant Care; Special Information Bulletin; Statistical Abstract.*

**World Federation of YMHAs and Jewish Community Centers (1947).** 145 E. 32 St., N. Y. C., 10016. Pres. Solomon Litt; Admin. Sec. Philip Goodman. Fosters YM-YWHA and Jewish community center movement in all countries where feasible and desirable; provides opportunities for training and interchange of ideas and experiences among the national organizations. *Ys of the World.*

**Zionist and Pro-Israel**

**America-Israel Cultural Foundation, Inc.** (formerly American Fund for Israel Institutions, Inc.) (1939). 2 W. 45 St., N. Y. C., 10036. Pres. Isaac Stern; Exec. V. Pres. Frederick R. Lachman. Supports projects in 50 Israeli cultural institutions, including the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, the Habimah theater, the Inbal dancers, Bezalel National Museum, and the Rubin Academy of Music; sponsors a two-way program of cultural exchange between the United States and Israel; awards scholarships in the performing arts to talented young Israelis for study in Israel and abroad.


AMERICAN FRIENDS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY (1931). 11 E. 69 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Lionel R. Bauman; Exec. V. P. Seymour Fishman. Fosters the growth, development and maintenance of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, collects funds and conducts program of information throughout the United States, interpreting the work of the Hebrew University and its significance; administers American-student program and arranges exchange professorships in the United States and Israel. AFHU Bulletin; Sco- pus.


AMERICAN JEWISH LEAGUE FOR ISRAEL (1957). 11 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 10036. Pres. Samuel H. Daroff; Chmn. Exec. Com. Samuel Rothstein. Seeks to unite all those who, notwithstanding differing philosophies of Jewish life, are committed to the historical ideals of Zionism; works, independently of class or party, for the welfare of Israel as a whole. Bulletin of the American Jewish League for Israel; American-Israel Review.

AMERICAN PHYSICIANS FELLOWSHIP, INC., FOR THE ISRAEL MEDICAL ASSOCIATION (1950). 1622 Beacon St., Brookline 46, Mass. Pres. Dr. Samuel R. Deich; Sec. Dr. Manuel M. Glazier. Seeks to foster and aid medical progress in the State of Israel; secures fellowships for selected Israeli physicians and arranges lectureships in Israel by prominent American physicians; aids the Israel Medical Association financially and also contributes medical books, periodicals, instruments, and drugs. APF News.


AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL (1939; reorg. 1949). 515 Park Ave., N. Y. C., 10022. Chmn. Max Nussbaum; Chmn. Admin. Comm. Nathaniel S. Rothenberg. Coordinating and public-relations arm of the nine national organizations which comprise the American Zionist movement—the American Jewish League for Israel, Bnai Zion, Hadassah, Religious Zionists of America, Labor Zionist Movement, Progressive Zionist League-Hashomer Hatzair, United Labor Zionist Party, United Zionist Revisionists of America, and the Zionist Organization of America; seeks to conduct a Zionist program designed to create a greater appreciation of Jewish culture within the American Jewish community in furtherance of the continuity of Jewish life and the spiritual centrality of Israel as the Jewish homeland.

ham Schenker. Sponsors programs for American youth in Israel: Israel Summer Institute, Summer in Kibbutz, Institute for Leaders from Abroad, Year Workshops. Maccabeau; Hora.


HADASSAH, THE WOMEN’S ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA, INC. (1912). 65 E. 52 St., N. Y. C., 10022. Pres. Mrs. Mortimer Jacobson; Exec. Dir. Hannah L. Goldberg. In America helps interpret Israel to the American people; provides basic Jewish education as a background for intelligent and creative Jewish living in America; carries on a project for American Jewish youth; in Israel supports Hadassah’s countrywide medical and public-health system, its child welfare and vocational-education projects; provides maintenance and education for youth newcomers through Youth Aliyah; participates in a program of Jewish National Fund land purchase and reclamation. Hadassah Headlines; Hadassah Magazine.


HAGDUD HAIVRI LEAGUE, INC. (AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE JEWISH LEGION) (1929). 426 W. 58 St., N. Y. C., 10019. Nat. Comdr. Judah Lapson; Sec. Joseph Abram. Seeks to uphold the ideals of the Jewish Legion which fought for the liberation of Palestine in World War I and to assist legion veterans in settling in Israel; maintains the Legion House (Bet Hagdudim) which serves as a memorial to the Jewish Legion and as a cultural center for Israeli youth.

HASHOMER HATZAIR, INC. 112 Park Ave., N. Y. C., 10003.

——: AMERICANS FOR PROGRESSIVE ISRAEL (1950). Nat. Chmn. Avraham Schenker; Exec. Sec. Valia Hirsch. Seeks American community support for Israel kibbutz movement; raises funds for Israel, particularly for the pioneer movement; encourages and supports aliya to Israel; participates in the fight for Jewish rights everywhere. Israel Horizons.


——, ZIONIST YOUTH ORGANIZATION OF (1925). Dir. Israel Herz; Sec. Zev Rothman. Educates youth towards an understanding of their Jewishness and modern Israel; maintains the only pioneer training farm in North America; has established nine kibbutzim in Israel. Igeret Hagalil; Lamadrich; Young Guard.

in the United States and abroad. *Hatzad Harishon Newsletter.*


---: **THEODOR HERZL INSTITUTE.** Dir. Emil Lehman. Conducts a Zionist adult education program through classes, lectures, and academic conferences.

---: **HERZL PRESS.** Ed. Raphael Patai. Publishes books and pamphlets on Zionism and Judaism.

**HISTADRUT (see National Committee for Labor Israel below.)**

**ISRAEL MUSIC FOUNDATION (1948).** 731 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Oscar Regen; Sec. Oliver Sabin. Supports and stimulates the growth of music in Israel, and disseminates recorded Israeli music in the U. S. and throughout the world.

**JEWISH AGENCY-AMERICAN SECTION (1929).** 515 Park Ave., N. Y. C., 10022. Pres. Nahum Goldmann; Exec. Dir. Isadore Hamlin. Represents in the U. S. the Executive of the Jewish Agency for Israel, Jerusalem, which is recognized by the State of Israel as the authorized agency to work in Israel for development and colonization, the absorption and settlement of immigrants and the coordination of activities of Jewish institutions and associations operating in these fields. Conducts a worldwide Hebrew cultural program which includes special seminars and pedagogic manuals; disperses information about, and assists in research projects concerning Israel; promotes, publishes, and distributes books, periodicals, and pamphlets concerning developments in Israel, Zionism, and Jewish history; sponsors a radio program "Panoramas de Israel" in the Latin-American countries. *Israel Digest; Israel y America Latina.*

---: **ZIONIST ARCHIVES AND LIBRARY OF THE (1939).** 515 Park Ave., N. Y. C., 10022. Dir. and Librarian Sylvia Landress. Serves as an archive and information service for material on Israel, Palestine, the Middle East, and Zionism.


**LABOR ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA—PAOLE ZION (1905).** 200 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Hyman R. Faine; Exec. Dir. Daniel Mann. Aids in building the State of Israel as a cooperative commonwealth and national and spiritual home of the Jewish people. Seeks to establish a democratic society throughout the world based on individual freedom and equality and social justice; to strengthen Jewish education and communal life and further the democratization of Jewish community organization in the U. S.; to promote the welfare of Jews in all lands. *Jewish Frontier; LZOA News Letter; Yiddisher Kemfer.*

---: **ICHUD HABONIM LABOR ZIONIST YOUTH (1935).** 200 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003. Exec. Sec. Alan Silver (Abba Caspi). Trains Jewish youth to become halutzim in Israel; stimulates study of Jewish life, history, and culture; sponsors work-study programs in Israel and ten summer camps in the U. S. *Furrows; Habonah; Hamaapil; Hamadrich; Iggeret L'Chaverim.*

---: **PIONEER WOMEN, THE WOMEN'S LABOR ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA, INC. (1925).** 29 E. 22 St., N. Y. C., 10010. Pres. Mrs. Blanche Fine; Nat. Sec. Vivienne Zalkind. In the U. S., promotes creative Jewish living, participating in civic and service activities and Jewish cultural programs; in Israel, provides child care, agricultural and vocational training, rehabilitation services, and special instruction for newcomers and Arab women in over 1,000 installations. *Pioneer Women.*


**NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR LABOR ISRAEL (ISRAEL HISTADRUT CAMPAIGN) (1923).**
33 E. 67 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Joseph Schlossberg; Exec. Dir. Sol Stein. Provides funds for the social welfare, vocational, health, and cultural institutions and other services of Histadrut to benefit workers and immigrants and to assist the integration of new comers as productive citizens in Israel; promotes an understanding of the aims and achievements of Israel labor among Jews and non-Jews in America. *Histadrut Foto-News.*

**FOR HISTADRUT**


Poale Agudath Israel of America, Inc. (1948). 147 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 10036. Presidium, Alexander Herman, Samuel Schonfeld, Samuel Walkin; Exec. Dir. Shimshon Heller. Aims to educate and prepare youth throughout the world to become Orthodox *halutzim* in Israel. *Achdut; Yedioi PAI.*

---


---

**RELIGIOUS ZIONISTS OF AMERICA.** 200 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003.

---

**ZIONISTS OF NORTH AMERICA.** 200 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003. Nat. Nat. Sec. Yehudah Henkin; Shaliach Zvi Kra. A religious Zionist youth organization seeking to instill a love for Torah Judaism and the land of Israel; encourages and educates toward *aliyah* as the way to rebuild Israel as loyal adherent to the principles of Torah. *Mizrachi; Daf LaChanich; Daf Lamadrich.*

---

**LEAGUE OF RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENTS—CHEVRE KIBBUTZIM (1951).** 147 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 10036. Pres. Aaron Blasbalg; Sec. David Schachter. Seeks to further religious *aliyot* to Israel and to establish homes and *kibbutzim* for new immigrants.

---

**WOMEN'S DIVISION OF (1948).** 1480 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10036. Pres. Mrs. Rosaline Abramczyk; Sec. Mrs. Miriam Lubling. Assists Poale Agudath Israel to build and support children's homes, kindergartens, and trade schools in Israel. *Yediot PAI.*

---

**MIZRACHI-HAPOEL HAMIZRACHI** (co-sponsored by Mizrachi Women's Organization of America and Religious Zionists of America) (1952). 200 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003. Nat. Sec. Yehudah Henkin; Shaliach Zvi Kra. A religious Zionist youth organization seeking to instill a love for Torah Judaism and the land of Israel; encourages and educates toward *aliyot* as the way to rebuild Israel as loyal adherent to the principles of Torah. *Mizrachi; Daf LaChanich; Daf Lamadrich.*

---

**WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION OF HAPOEL HAMIZRACHI (1948).** 45 East 17 St., N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Mrs. Morris Teichman; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Jack Singer. Affiliated with the National Religious Women's Organization in Israel, helps support and maintain over 160 kinder-


**Women's League for Israel, Inc.** (1928). 1860 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10023. Pres. Mrs. Jack Starr; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Regina Wermiel. Provides shelter, vocational training, and social-adjustment services for young women newcomers to Israel through its five homes; has built student center, women's dormitories and cafeteria and endowed a chair in sociology at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. *Israel Newsletter; Women's League for Israel News Bulletin.*


**Zionist Organization of America** (1897). 145 E. 32 St., N. Y. C., 10016. Pres. Max Nussbaum; Nat. Sec. Leio Ilutovich. Seeks to safeguard the integrity and independence of Israel as a free and democratic commonwealth by means consistent with the laws of the U. S.; to assist in the economic development of Israel; and to strengthen Jewish sentiment and consciousness as a people and promote its cultural creativity. *American Zionist; Zionist Information Service; ZOA in Review; ZOA News Report.*

**PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS**

**American Conference of Cantors (Religious, Educational)**

**American Jewish Correctional Chaplains Association, Inc.** (Social Welfare)

**American Jewish Press Association** (Cultural)


**Association of Jewish Chaplains of the Armed Forces** (Religious, Educational)

**Association of Jewish Community Relations Workers** (Community Relations)

**Cantors Assembly of America** (Religious, Educational)

**Council of Jewish Organizations in Civil Service** (Community Relations)

**Educators Assembly of the United Synagogue of America** (Religious, Educational)

**Jewish Ministers Cantors Association of America, Inc.** (Religious, Educational)

**Jewish Occupational Council, Inc.** (Social Welfare)

**Jewish Teachers Association—MORIM** (Religious, Educational)

* For fuller listing see under categories in parentheses.
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HILLEL DIRECTORS (Religious, Educational)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SYNAGOGUE ADMINISTRATORS, UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA (Religious, Educational)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEMPLE ADMINISTRATORS, UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS (Religious, Educational)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEMPLE EDUCATORS, UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS (Religious, Educational)

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICE (Social Welfare)

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF YESHIVA PRINCIPALS (Religious, Educational)

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF HEBREW TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS (Religious, Educational)

NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD COMMITTEE ON JEWISH CHAPLAINCY (Social Welfare)

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF JEWISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

B'NAI B'RITH WOMEN (Social Welfare)

CONFERENCE COMMISSION OF NATIONAL JEWISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS (Social Welfare)

HADASSAH, THE WOMEN'S ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA, INC. (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

MIZRACHI WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA, INC. (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

NATIONAL BUREAU OF FEDERATED JEWISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS. Pres. Mrs. Arthur E. Lebovitz, 1 Hemlock Ct., Maplewood, N. J. 07040; Cor. Sec. Mrs. S. Jerome Greenfield. Links local women's federations, conferences, and leagues through the mutual exchange of ideas and experiences. Bureau Facts.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN (Social Welfare)

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEMPLE SIBERHOODS, UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS (Religious, Educational)

PIONEER WOMEN, THE WOMEN'S LABOR ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

UNITED ORDER OF TRUE SISTERS (Social, Mutual Benefit)

WOMEN'S AMERICAN ORT, AMERICAN ORT FEDERATION (Overseas Aid)

WOMEN'S BRANCH OF THE UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF AMERICA (Religious, Educational)

WOMEN'S DIVISION OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS (Community Relations)

WOMEN'S DIVISION OF THE JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE (Community Relations)

WOMEN'S DIVISION OF POALE AGUDATH AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR ISRAEL, INC. (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION OF HAPOEL HAMizrachi (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

Yeshiva University Women's Organization (Religious, Educational)

YOUTH AND COLLEGE ORGANIZATIONS *

AMERICAN ZIONIST YOUTH FOUNDATION, INC. (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

— AMERICAN ZIONIST YOUTH COUNCIL —

STUDENT ZIONIST ORGANIZATION

ATID COLLEGE AGE ORGANIZATION, UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA (Religious, Educational)

B'NAI B'RITH HILLEL FOUNDATIONS, INC. (Religious, Educational)

B'NAI B'RITH YOUTH ORGANIZATION (Religious, Educational)

B'NEI AKIVA OF NORTH AMERICA, RELIGIOUS ZIONISTS OF AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

DROR HECHALUTZ HATZAIR (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

EZRA-IRGUN HANOAR HACHAREIDI, AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

FEDERATION OF JEWISH STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS (Religious, Educational)

INTERCOLLEGIATE COUNCIL—YOUNG ADULTS, NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR YOUNG ISRAEL (Religious, Educational)

ICHUD HABONIM LABOR ZIONIST YOUTH (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

JUNIOR HADASSAH, HADASSAH—WOMEN'S ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

MIZRACHI HATZAIR, MIZRACHI WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA AND RELIGIOUS ZIONISTS OF AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SYNAGOGUE YOUTH, UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF AMERICA (Religious, Educational)

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF BNOS AGUDATH ISRAEL, AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA (Religious, Educational)

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEMPLE YOUTH, UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS (Religious, Educational)

* For fuller listing see under categories in parentheses.
NATIONAL YOUNG JUDAEA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

UNITED SYNAGOGUE YOUTH, UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA (Religious, Educational)

YAVNEH, NATIONAL RELIGIOUS JEWISH STUDENTS ASSOCIATION (Religious, Educational)

YOUNG CIRCLE LEAGUE, WORKMEN'S CIRCLE (Social, Mutual Benefit)

ZEIREI AGUDATH ISRAEL, AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

ZIONIST YOUTH ORGANIZATION, HASHOMER HATZALAH (Zionist and Pro-Israel)

CANADA


CANADIAN JEWISH CONGRESS (1919; reorg. 1934). 493 Sherbrooke St., W., Montreal, 2. Nat. Pres. Michael Garber; Exec. V. Pres. Saul Hayes. As the recognized national representative body of Canadian Jewry, seeks to safeguard the status, rights, and welfare of Jews in Canada; to combat antisemitism and promote understanding and goodwill among all ethnic and religious groups; cooperates with other agencies to improve social, economic, and cultural conditions of Jews and to rehabilitate Jewish refugees and immigrants; assists Jewish communities in Canada in establishing central community organizations to provide for their social, philanthropic, educational, and cultural needs. Congress Bulletin; Bulletin de Cercle Juif.

CANADIAN YOUNG JUDAEA (1917). 1247 Guy St., Montreal, 2. Pres. Russell Stone; V. Pres. Marsha Ablowitz. Seeks to imbue its membership with the necessity for the spiritual and physical perpetuation of the Jewish people, emphasizing the centrality of Israel. Dugma; Newsletter; Judaean Telegram; Junior, Inter, and Senior Judaean.


JEWISH COLONIZATION ASSOCIATION OF CANADA (1907). 493 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal, 2. Pres. Samuel Bronfman; Mgr. M. J. Lister. Promotes Jewish land settlement in Canada through loans to establish farmers; helps new immigrant farmers to purchase farms or settles them on farms owned by the Association; provides agricultural advice and supervision.


JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE OF CANADA (1934). 5165 Isabella Ave., Montreal. Nat. Chmn. Michael Rubinstein; Dr. David Orlikow. Fights for human rights and against racial discrimination and antisemitism, with the strong support of the Canadian labor movement.


JOINT COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF CANADIAN JEWISH CONGRESS AND B'NAI B'RITH IN CANADA (1936). 150 Beverley St., Toronto. Chmn. Sydney M. Harris; Nat. Exec. Dir. Ben G. Kayfetz. Seeks to safeguard the status, rights, and welfare of Jews in Canada; to combat antisemitism and promote understanding and
goodwill among all ethnic and religious groups. Congress Bulletin.

Joint National Committee on Community Services of the Canadian Jewish Congress and Canadian Committee of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (1959). 150 Beverley St., Toronto, 2B. Chmn. D. Lou Harris; Dir. Florence Hutner. Serves as a field service to aid Canadian Jewish communities in community organization, fund raising, budgeting, health and welfare planning, and the development of regional and national intercity programs.

Keren Hatarbut—Canadian Association for Hebrew Education and Culture. 5234 Clanranald Ave., Montreal. Pres. S. S. Gordon; Asst. Nat. Dir. Edmond Y. Lipsitz. Seeks to promote Hebrew education and culture, to stimulate study of the language, and to serve as cultural bridge between Canada and Israel and as a unifying factor in the spiritual and cultural life of Canadian Jewry. Serves as coordinating body for affiliated schools.


Jewish Federations,
Welfare Funds,
Community Councils

In the main these central agencies have responsibility for some or all of the following functions: (a) raising of funds for local, national, and overseas services; (b) allocation and distribution of funds for these purposes; (c) coordination and central planning of local services, such as family welfare, child care, health, recreation, community relations within the Jewish community and with the general community, Jewish education, care of the aged, and vocational guidance, to strengthen these services, eliminate duplication, and fill gaps; (d) in small and some intermediate cities, direct administration of local social services.

In the directory, the following symbols are used:
(1) Member agency of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds.
(2) Receives support from Community Chest.

UNITED STATES

ALABAMA

BIRMINGHAM
Jewish Community Council (1962); 3960 Montclair Rd. (35223); Pres. Alex Rittenbaum; Exec. Dir. Harold E. Katz.

MOBILE
1 United Jewish Fund (incl. Ensley, Fairfield, Tarrant City) (1937); P. O. Box 9157, 3960 Montclair Rd. (35223); Pres. Ralph Aland; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Benjamin A. Roth.

MONTGOMERY
1 Jewish Welfare Federation; 1769 Springhill Ave. (36607); Chmn. Max Mutchnick; Sec. Mrs. Ronnie Cale.

UNITED STATES

PHOENIX
1 Jewish Community Council (incl. surrounding communities) (1940); 1718 W. Maryland Ave. (85015); Pres. Philip Taxman; Exec. Dir. Albert M. Stein.

TUCSON
1, 2 Jewish Community Council (1942); 102 N. Plumer; Pres. Marvin H. Volk; Exec. V. Pres. Benjamin N. Brook.
ARKANSAS

LITTLE ROCK
1, 2 Jewish Welfare Agency (incl. North Little Rock and area surrounding Little Rock) (1911); 5904 W. Markham St. (72205); Pres. Joseph J. Kaufman; Exec. Sec. Miss Isabel Cooper.

CALIFORNIA

BAKERSFIELD
Jewish Community Council of Greater Bakersfield (incl. Arvin, Delano, Shafter, Taft, Wasco) (1937); P. O. Box 3211; Pres. Oscar Katz.

BAY CITIES
Jewish Community Council of the Bay Cities (incl. Pacific Palisades, Malibu, Santa Monica, Venice, and Mar Vista) (1944); 309 Santa Monica Blvd., Santa Monica (90401); Pres. Robert M. Aran; Exec. Dir. Sidney Michaelson.

FRESNO
1, United Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Fresno, Madera Counties) (1931); (sponsored by Jewish Welfare Federation); P. O. Box 1328 (93715); Pres. Dr. Marvin Simmons; Exec. Dir. David L. Greenberg.

LONG BEACH
1 Jewish Community Federation (1946); (sponsors the United Jewish Welfare Fund); 2601 Grand Ave. (90815); Pres. Max Z. Wisot; Exec. Dir. Morton J. Gaba.

LOS ANGELES
1, 2 Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles (1912; reorg. 1959) (sponsors United Jewish Welfare Fund); 590 N. Vermont Ave. (90004); Pres. Max W. Bay; Exec. Dir. Isidore Sobeloff.

OAKLAND
1, 2 Jewish Welfare Federation of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties (1918); 3245 Sheffield Ave. (94602); Pres. Aaron Greenberg; Exec. Dir. Oscar A. Mintzer.

SACRAMENTO
1 Sacramento Jewish Federation (Formerly Jewish Community Council) (1935; reorg. 1961); 1011-22 St. (16); Pres. Seymour Lewis; Exec. Dir. Nathan Rothberg.

SALINAS
Monterey County Jewish Community Council (1948); 326 Park St.; Pres. Dr. Edward Hirschberg; Sec. Mrs. A. Haselkorn.

SAN BERNARDINO
1 San Bernardino Jewish Welfare Funds, Inc. (incl. Colton, Redlands) (1936); 4740 Genevieve (92407); Pres. S. Bud Goldman.

SAN DIEGO
1 United Jewish Federation (incl. San Diego County) (1935); 4079-54 St. (92105); Pres. Maury B. Novak; Exec. Dir. Louis Lieblich.

SAN FRANCISCO
1, 2 Jewish Welfare Federation of San Francisco, Marin County and the Peninsula (1910; reorg. 1955); 230 California St. (94111); Pres. Samuel A. Ladar; Exec. V. Pres. Sanford M. Treguboff; Exec. Dir. Louis Weintraub.

SAN JOSE
1, 2 Jewish Community Council of San Jose (incl. Santa Clara County) (1930; reorg. 1950); 678 N. First St. (95112); Pres. Michael Garetz; Exec. Dir. Sidney Stein.

STOCKTON
Jewish Community Council (incl. Lodi, Sonora, Tracy) (1948); 5105 N. El Dorado; Pres. Gerald Sapper; Sec. Mrs. Barton Warshauer.

VENTURA
1 Ventura County Jewish Council—Temple Beth Torah (incl. Camarillo, Fillmore, Moorpark, Oakview, Ojai, Oxnard, Point Mugu, Port Hueneme, Santa Paula, Santa Susana, Simi, Somis, Thousand Oaks, Ventura) (1938); 7620 Foothill Rd. (93003); Pres. Jack W. Pavin; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Lee L. Lizer.

COLORADO

DENVER
1 Allied Jewish Community Council (1936); (sponsors Allied Jewish Campaign); 400 Kittredge Bldg. (80202); Pres. Michael J. Baum, Jr.; Exec. Dir. Nathan Rosenberg.

CONNECTICUT

BRIDGEPORT
1 United Jewish Council of Greater Bridgeport (incl. Easton, Fairfield, Stratford, Trumbull) (1936); (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); 4200 Park Ave. (06604); Pres. Henry Katz; Exec. Dir. Nathan Skolnick.

DANBURY
1 Jewish Federation of Danbury (1945); Juniper Ridge, Danbury; Pres. A. I. Feinson; Treas. Sidney Sussman.

HARTFORD
1 Jewish Federation (1945); 333 Bloomfield Ave., W. Hartford (06117); Pres. Louis K. Roth; Exec. Dir. Bernard L. Gottlieb.

MERIDEN
1 Meriden Jewish Welfare Fund, Inc. (1944); 127 E. Main St.; Pres. Jacob Gottlieb; Sec. Harold Rosen.

NEW BRITAIN
1 New Britain Jewish Federation
NEW HAVEN
1 Jewish Community Council (incl. Hamden, W. Haven) (1928); (sponsors Jewish Welfare Fund) (1939); 152 Temple St. (00610); Pres. Irving Enson; Exec. Dir. Benjamin N. Levy.

NEW LONDON
Jewish Community Council of New London (1951); 11 Woodland Rd.; Pres. Dr. Alec R. Shapiro; Cor. Sec. Mrs. Arnold Cohen.

NORWALK
1 Jewish Community Council of Norwalk; Jewish Community Center, Shorehaven Rd., East Norwalk (06855); Pres. Frank Winer.

STAMFORD
United Jewish Appeal; 132 Prospect St. (06902); Admn. Chmn. Harry Rosenbaum; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Leon Kahn.

WATERBURY
1, 2 Jewish Federation of Waterbury (incl. Middlebury, Naugatuck, Waterbury) (1938); 34 Murray St. (06710); Pres. Dr. Joseph J. Gaber; Exec. Dir. William Cohen.

DELAWARE
WILMINGTON
1, 2 Jewish Federation of Delaware (statewide) (1935); 900 Washington St. (19801); Pres. Sam Eisenstadt; Exec. Dir. Harold Nappan.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
WASHINGTON
Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington (1938); 1420 New York Ave., N. W. (20005); Pres. Louis C. Grossberg; Exec. Dir. Isaac Franck.

UNITED JEWISH APPEAL OF GREATER WASHINGTON, INC. (1935); 1529—16 St., N. W. (20036); Pres. Hymen Goldman; Exec. Dir. Meyer H. Brissman.

FLORIDA
HOLLYWOOD

JACKSONVILLE
1 Jewish Community Council (incl. Jacksonville Beach) (1935); 3731 Hendricks Ave.; Pres. George Richter; Exec. Dir. Robert I. Marcus.

MIAMI
1 Greater Miami Jewish Federation (incl. Dade County) (1938); 1317 Biscayne Blvd., Miami Beach (33132); Pres. Sidney Lefcourt; Exec. Dir. Arthur S. Rosichan.

ORLANDO
CENTRAL FLORIDA JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL, INC. (1949); P. O. Box 976 (32801); Pres. Mort Wolf.

PALM BEACH
1 Jewish Federation of Palm Beach County (1938); 303 Citizens Building, W. Palm Beach (33401); Pres. Robert S. Levy; Exec. Dir. Sol J. Silverman.

PENSACOLA
1 Pensacola Federated Jewish Charities (1942); 1320 East Lee St.; Pres. Irwin Kaye; Sec. Mrs. Harry Saffer.

ST. PETERSBURG
Jewish Community Council (1950); P. O. Box 12868 (33733); Pres. Mrs. Marion B. Ross; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Irving Sohon.

SARASOTA

TAMPA
1 Jewish Welfare Federation of Tampa (1941); 2808 Horatio (33609); Pres. Charles J. Adler.

ATLANTA
ATLANTA JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1945); 41 Exchange Pl. S. E. (30303); Pres. Max M. Cuba; Exec. Dir. Max C. Gettinger.

ATLANTA JEWISH WELFARE FUND, INC. (incl. Metropolitan Atlanta area) (1936); 41 Exchange Pl., S. E. (30303); Pres. Abe Goldstein; Exec. Sec. Max C. Gettinger.

1, 2 Jewish Social Service Federation of Atlanta, Inc. (1905); 41 Exchange Place, S. E. (30301); Pres. Herman Heyman; Exec. Dir. Max C. Gettinger.

AUGUSTA
1 Federation of Jewish Charities (1943); P. O. Box 3251, Hill Station (30904); Pres. Maurice Steinberg; Exec. Dir. Abraham Mintz.

COLUMBUS
1 Jewish Welfare Federation, Inc. (1941); P. O. Box 1303; Pres. Maurice M. Shapiro; Sec. Herbert Kohn.

MACON
Federation of Jewish Charities (1942); P. O. Box 237; Pres. Alvin Koplin.

SAVANNAH
1 Savannah Jewish Council (1943); (sponsors UJA-Federation Campaign); P. O. Box 6546 (31405); Pres. Sol B. Minkovitz; Exec. Dir. Irwin B. Giffen.
IDAHO

BOISE

ILLINOIS

AURORA
Aurora Jewish Welfare Fund (1935); 215 Alshuler Dr.; Pres. Morris Bender.

CHAMPAIGN-URBANA
1. Federated Jewish Charities (1929); 1911 Bellamy Dr., Champaign, Ill. 61822; Pres. Edward Blum; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Bernard Singer.

CHICAGO
1. Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago (1900); 1 S. Franklin St. (60606); Pres. A. D. Davis; Exec. V. Pres. Samuel A. Goldsmith.
1. Jewish Welfare Fund of Metropolitan Chicago (1936); 1 S. Franklin St. (60606); Pres. Morris Glasser; Exec. V. Pres. Samuel A. Goldsmith.

Sub-Federation of Northwest Suburbs of the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago; 7870A N. Lincoln Ave., Skokie; Pres. Marvin J. Berger; Dir. Eugene J. Bender.

DECatur
1. Jewish Federation (1942); 469 Delmar; Pres. Alfred Tick; Sec. Mrs. Ben Miller.

ELGIN

JOLIET

PEORIA
1. Jewish Community Council, Inc. (incl. Canton, E. Peoria, Morton, Pekin, Washington) (1933); 613 Citizen’s Bldg., 225 Main St. (61602); Pres. Irwin B. Zeisel.

ROCK ISLAND—MOLINE
1. United Jewish Charities of Rock Island County (1938); 2713 32 Ave. Court; Pres. Benjamin Friedman; Sec. Benjamin Goldstein.

ROCKFORD
1, 2. Rockford Jewish Community Board (1937); 1502 Parkview Ave. (61107); Pres. Udi J. Sloan; Exec. Dir. Leon Goldberg.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS
1. Jewish Federation of Southern Illinois (incl. all of Illinois south of Carlinville and Cape Girardeau, Missouri) (1942); 417 Missouri Ave., Rm. 1004, East St. Louis (62201); Pres. Isadore Shulman; Exec. Dir. Hyman H. Ruffman.

SPRINGFIELD
1, 2. Jewish Federation (incl. Ashland, Athens, Atlanta, Jacksonville, Lincoln, Pana, Petersburg, Pittsfield, Shelbyville, Taylorville, Winchester) (1941); 730 E. Vine St. (62703); Pres. James E. Myers; Exec. Dir. Miss Dorothy Wolfson.

INDIANA

EVANSVILLE

FORT WAYNE
1, 2. Fort Wayne Jewish Federation (incl. surrounding communities) (1921); 227 E. Washington Blvd. (46802); Pres. Frederick R. Tourkow; Exec. Dir. Joseph Levine.

GARY

INDIANAPOLIS
1. 2. Jewish Welfare Federation, Inc. (1905); 615 N. Alabama St. (46204); Pres. Ben Domont; Exec. Dir. Frank H. Newman.

LAFAYETTE
1. Federated Jewish Charities (incl. Attica, Crawfordsville) (1924); 26 S 28 St.; Pres. Jack Mazor; Fin. Sec. Mrs. Rozella Pearlman.

MICHIGAN CITY
1. United Jewish Welfare Fund; 2800 Franklin St. (46361); Pres. Richard Rosenberg; Sec. Mrs. Morris Kohn.

MUNCIE

SOUTH BEND

Jewish Welfare Fund (1937); 312 Commerce Bldg. (46601); Pres. Marcus Gilman; Exec. Dir. Bernard Natkow.
TERRE HAUTE

IOWA

CEDAR RAPIDS

DAVENPORT

DES MOINES
1. Jewish Welfare Federation (1914); 315 Securities Bldg. (50309); Chmn. Robert E. Mannheimer; Exec. Dir. Samuel Soifer.

SIOUX CITY
1. 2. Jewish Federation (1923); 525-14 St. (51102); Pres. Harold B. Goldstein; Exec. Dir. Oscar Littlefield.

WATERLOO
1. Waterloo Jewish Federation (1941); 400 Derbyshire; Chmn. Joseph Weissman.

KANSAS

TOPEKA
1. Topeka-Lawrence Jewish Federation (incl. Emporia, Lawrence, St. Marys) (1939); 116-120 Kansas Ave.; Pres. Sam Cohen.

WICHITA

KENTUCKY

LOUISVILLE

LOUISIANA

ALEXANDRIA
1. The Jewish Welfare Federation and Community Council (1938); 4606 Wendover Blvd. (71303); Pres. Nathan Kaplan; Sec.-Treas. Sam Rubin.

MONROE
1. United Jewish Charities of Northeast Louisiana (1938); P.O. Box 2596 (71204); Pres. Ralph Raphael; Sec. Mrs. A. J. Heinberg.

NEW ORLEANS
1. 2. Jewish Welfare Federation of New Orleans (1913; reorg. 1962); 211 Camp St. (70130); Pres. Edward M. Heller; Exec. Dir. Harry I. Barron.
1. New Orleans Jewish Welfare Fund (1933; reorg. 1962); 211 Camp St. (70130); Pres. Edward M. Heller; Exec. Dir. Harry I. Barron.

SHREVEPORT
1. Shreveport Jewish Federation (1941); 525 Marshall St., Rm. 229 (71101); Pres. Myron Dorfman; Exec. Dir. Morton R. Adell.

MAINE

BANGOR
1. Jewish Community Council (incl. Old Town, Orono, and outlying towns) (1949); 28 Somerset St. (04401); Pres. Leonard Minsky; Exec. Dir. David Shuer.

LEWISTON—AUBURN
Jewish Federation (1947); c/o Jewish Community Center, 134 College St. Lewiston (04240); Pres. Bernard Appelbaum; Exec. Sec. Leonard Nemeth.

PORTLAND
1. Jewish Federation (1942); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal); 341 Cumberland Ave. (04111); Pres. Benjamin Zolov.

MARYLAND

ANNAPOLIS
Annapolis Jewish Welfare Fund (1946); 67 West St. (21401); Pres. Allen J. Reiter; Treas. Elerk Rosenbloom.

BALTIMORE
1. Associated Jewish Charities of Baltimore (1920); 319 W. Monument St. (21201); Pres. Louis B. Kahn II; Exec. Dir. Harry Greenstein.
1. Jewish Welfare Fund of Baltimore, Inc. (1941); 319 W. Monument St. (21201); Pres. Abraham Mahr; Exec. Dir. Harry Greenstein.

CUMBERLAND
Jewish Welfare Fund of Western Maryland (incl. Frostburg and Oakland, Md., Keyser and Romney, W. Va.) (1939); P.O. Box 327; Pres. Benjamin Feldman; Sec. Robert Kaplon.

MASSACHUSETTS

BOSTON
1. Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, Inc. (merger of Associated Jewish Philanthropies and Com-
bined Jewish Appeal of Greater Boston) (1895; reorg. 1961); 72 Franklin St. (02110); Pres. Sidney Stoneman; Exec. Dir. Benjamin B. Rosenberg.

JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN BOSTON (1944); 72 Franklin St. (02110); Pres. Herman Snyder; Exec. Dir. Robert E. Segal.

BROCKTON
1 United Jewish Appeal of the Brockton Area (incl. Rockland, Stoughton, Whitman) (1939); 71 Legion Pkwy. (02401); Pres. Allen H. Wolozin; Exec. Dir. Herman Rubin.

FALL RIVER
1 Fall River Jewish Community Council; 130 S. Main St.; Pres. Nathan J. Sokoletsky.
1 Fall River United Jewish Appeal, Inc.; 41 N. Main St., Rm. 310; Treas.-Fin. Sec. Louis Hornstein.

FITCHBURG
1 Jewish Federation of Fitchburg (1939); 66 Day St. (01420); Pres. Felix Heimberg; Exec. Dir. Lester Nelinson.

HAVERHILL
Haverhill United Jewish Appeal; 514 Main St.; Pres. Louis Kleven; Exec. Sec. Milton Lincoln.

HOLYOKE
1 Combined Jewish Appeal of Holyoke (incl. Easthampton) (1939); 378 Maple St.; Pres. Herbert Goldberg.

LAWRENCE

LEOMINSTER
1 Leominster Jewish Community Council (1939); 30 Grove Ave.; Pres. Bertram Cohen; Sec.-Treas. Mrs. Edith Chatkis.

LYNN
1 Jewish Community Federation of Greater Lynn (incl. Lynnfield, Marblehead, Nahant, Saugus, Swampscott) (1938); 45 Market St. (01901); Pres. Aaron J. Bronstein; Exec. Dir. Morris Stern.

NEW BEDFORD
Jewish Welfare Federation; 388 County St. (02740); Pres. David Cohen; Sec. Gerald Klein.

PITTSFIELD
Jewish Community Council (incl. Dalton, Lee, Lenox, Stockbridge) (1940); 235 East St. (01202); Pres. Edwin E. Reder; Exec. Dir. Herman Fink.

SPRINGFIELD
1 Jewish Community Council (1938); (sponsors United Jewish Welfare Fund); 1160 Dickinson; Pres. Hugo Roth; Exec. Dir. Donald Weisman.

WORCESTER
1 Worcester Jewish Federation, Inc. (1947; inc. 1957); (sponsors Jewish Welfare Fund); 274 Main St. (01608); Pres. Morris Boorky; Exec. Dir. Melvin S. Cohen.

MICHIGAN

BAY CITY
Northeastern Michigan Jewish Welfare Federation (incl. East Tawas, West Branch) (1940); 411 Phoenix Bldg. (48706); Pres. Dr. Milton J. Miller; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Dorothy B. Sternberg.

DETROIT
1, 2 Jewish Welfare Federation (incl. Pontiac) (1926); (sponsors Allied Jewish Campaign); Fred M. Butzel Memorial Bldg., 163 Madison (48226); Pres. Hyman Safran; Exec. Dir. William Avrumin.

FLINT
1 Jewish Community Council (1936); 912 Sill Bldg. (48502); Pres. Gilbert Y. Rubenstein; Exec. Dir. Irving Geisser.

GRAND RAPIDS
1 Jewish Community Fund of Grand Rapids (1930); 1121 Keneberry Way, S. E.; Pres. Sam Kravitz; Sec. Mrs. William Deutsch.

LANSING
1 Jewish Welfare Federation of Lansing (1939); 2910 S. Cambridge; Pres. Maurice Tanenbaum; Sec. Judson Werbelow.

SAGINAW
Jewish Welfare Federation (1939); 1424 S. Washington (48607); Pres. Erwin Myers; Fin. Sec. Mrs. Henry Feldman.

MINNESOTA

DULUTH
1 Jewish Federation & Community Council (1937); 1602 E. 2nd St. (55812); Pres. Sherman Levenson; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Melvin Gallop.

MINNEAPOLIS
1 Minneapolis Federation for Jewish Service, Inc. (1929); 635 2nd Ave. N., Rm. 300 (55403); Pres. Samuel Shapiro; Exec. Dir. Norman B. Dockman.

ST. PAUL

MISSISSIPPI

GREENVILLE
Jewish Welfare Fund of the Greenville Area (1952); 512 Main St.; Pres. Irving Sachs; Sec. Harry Stein.
JACKSON
Jewish Welfare Fund (1945); P. O. Box 4766, Fondren Station (39216); Exec. Sec. Perry E. Nussbaum.

VICKSBURG
1 Jewish Welfare Federation (1936); Pres. Richard Marcus; Exec. Sec. Robert Blinder, 1209 Cherry St. (39180).

MISSOURI
JOPLIN
1 Jewish Welfare Federation, Inc. (incl. surrounding communities) (1938); P. O. Box 284; Pres. Jack Fleischaker; Sec. Robert Klein.

KANSAS CITY
1, 2 Jewish Federation & Council of Greater Kansas City (incl. Independence, Mo., and Kansas City, Kan.) (1933); 1211 Walnut St., Kcm. 701 (64106); Pres. Elliot L. Jacobson; Exec. Dir. David Rabinovitz.

ST. JOSEPH
1 United Jewish Fund of St. Joseph, Mo. (1915); 6 Wishbone (64506); Pres. Marvin R. Nelson; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Burton H. Alberts.

ST. LOUIS
1, 2 Jewish Federation of St. Louis (incl. St. Louis County) (1901); 1007 Washington Ave. (63101); Pres. Alfred Fleishman; Exec. Dir. Herman L. Kaplow.

NEBRASKA
LINCOLN
1, 2 Lincoln Jewish Welfare Federation (incl. Beatrice) (1931); 809 Federal Securities Bldg. (68508); Pres. Irwin Dubinsky; Sec. Louis B. Finkelstein.

OMAHA
1, 2 Jewish Federation of Omaha (1903); (sponsors Jewish Welfare Fund [1930]); 101 N. 20 St. (68102); Pres. Arthur H. Goldstein; Exec. Dir. Paul Veret.

NEW HAMPSHIRE
MANCHESTER
1, 2 Jewish Community Center (1913) (sponsors United Jewish Appeal); 698 Beech St. (03104); Pres. Arnold Cohen; Exec. Dir. Ben Rothstein.

NEW JERSEY
ATLANTIC CITY
1 Federation of Jewish Agencies of Atlantic County (1924); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal of Atlantic County); 5321 Atlantic Ave., Ventnor City; Pres. Arthur Peskoe; Exec. Dir. Irving T. Spivack.

BAYONNE
1 Jewish Community Council (1938) (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); 1050 Boulevard (07002); Pres. Emanuel Posnock; Exec. Dir. Barry Shandler.

BERGEN COUNTY
1 Jewish Welfare Council of Bergen County, Inc. (incl. most of Bergen County) (1953); 201 Essex St., Hackensack (07601); Pres. Benjamin Labov; Exec. Dir. Max M. Kleinbaum.

CAMDEN
1, 2 Jewish Federation of Camden County (incl. all of Camden County and adjacent areas of Burlington County) (1922); (sponsors Allied Jewish Appeal); 2395 W. Marlton Pike, Cherry Hill (08034); Pres. Joseph LeBow; Exec. Dir. Bernard Dubin.

ELIZABETH
1 Eastern Union County Jewish Council (incl. Elizabeth, Roselle, Roselle Park, Union) (1940); (sponsors Eastern Union County United Jewish Appeal); 1034 E. Jersey St. (07201); Pres. Irving Chvat; Exec. Dir. Samuel J. Rosenthal.

JERSEY CITY
1 United Jewish Appeal (1939); 604 Bergen Ave. (07304); Chmn. William Swid; Sec. Mrs. Jeanne Schleider.

NEW BRUNSWICK
1, 2 Jewish Federation of New Brunswick, Highland Park and Vicinity (1948); 2 S. Adelaide Ave., Highland Park (08904); Pres. Samuel I. Hoddeson; Exec. Dir. Fred A. Liff.

NEWARK
1, 2 Jewish Community Council of Essex County (1923); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal of Essex County [1937]); 32 Central Ave. (07102); Pres. Charles Stern; Exec. Dir. Abe L. Sudran.

PASSAIC

PATERSON
1 Jewish Community Council (1933); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal Drive); 390 Broadway (07501); Pres. Oscar Berman; Exec. Dir. Sam A. Hatow.

PERTH AMBOY
1 Jewish Community Council (incl. South Amboy) (1938); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal); 316 Madison Ave. (08861); Pres. Zvi Levavy; Exec. Dir. Israel Silver.

PLAINFIELD
1 Jewish Community Council of the Plainfields (1937) (sponsors United Jewish Appeal); 403 W. 7th St.; Pres.
Herzl Rosenbaum; Exec. Dir. Maurice Solomon.

SOMERVILLE
1. 2 Jewish Federation of Somerset County; 761 Tolomini Rd.; Pres. Charles E. Camins.

TRENTON
1 Jewish Federation of Trenton (1929); 999 Lower Ferry Rd. (08628); Pres. Erwin P. Sacks-Wilner; Exec. Dir. Milton A. Feinberg.

NEW MEXICO
ALBUQUERQUE
1 Jewish Welfare Fund (Albuquerque and vicinity) (1938); Korber Bldg., Rm. 256, 200 Block 2nd St., N. W. (87101); Pres. Sanford Rogoff; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Rana Adler.

NEW YORK
ALBANY
1 Albany Jewish Community Council, Inc. (1938); (sponsors Jewish Welfare Fund); 90 State St., Rm. 1401 (12207); Pres. Seymour Pearlman; Exec. Dir. Ed Phillips.

BINGHAMTON
1 The Jewish Federation of Broome County (1937); 155 Front St. (13905); Pres. Alec Rosefsky; Exec. Dir. Maurice M. Finkelstein.

BUFFALO
1, 2 United Jewish Federation of Buffalo, Inc. (1903); 615 Sidway Bldg., 775 Main St. (14203); Pres. Irving Levick; Exec. Dir. Sydney S. Abzug.

ELMIRA
1 Elmira Jewish Welfare Fund, Inc. (1942); Federation Bldg. 115 Church St. (14911); Pres. Irving Sandler; Exec. Dir. Ronald H. Miller.

GLENS FALLS
Glens Falls Jewish Welfare Fund (1939); 68 Bay St.; Chmn. Arnold Russ.

GLOVERSVILLE

HUDSON
1 Jewish Welfare Fund of Hudson, Inc. (1947); 414 Warren St. (12534); Pres. Dr. David R. Levine.

KINGSTON
1, 2 Jewish Community Council, Inc. (1951); 96 Maiden Lane (12402); Pres. Robert A. Ronder; Exec. Dir. Robert Kurland.

MIDDLETOWN
1 United Jewish Appeal of Middle- town, N. Y. (1939); c/o Middletown Hebrew Assn., 13 Linden Ave.; Chmn. Owen Falk; Sec. Joseph Herman.

NEW YORK CITY
1, 2 Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York (incl. Greater New York, Nassau, Queens, and Westchester Counties) (1917); 130 E. 59th St. (10022); Pres. Irving M. Felt; Exec. V. Pres. Maurice B. Hexter, Joseph Willen.

1 United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York (incl. New York City and Metropolitan areas and Nassau, Queens, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties) (1939); 220 W. 58th St. (10019); Pres. Monroe Goldwater; Exec. V. Pres. Henry C. Bernstein, Samuel Blitz.

NEWBURGH

NIAGARA FALLS
1 Jewish Federation of Niagara Falls, N. Y., Inc. (1935); 685 Chilton Ave. (14301); Pres. Norton Shapiro; Exec. Dir. Mrs. May Chinkers.

PORT CHESTER
1 Jewish Community Council (1941); (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); 258 Willett Ave. (10573); Pres. Joseph Jacobs; Exec. Dir. Aaron Grodsky.

POUGHKEEPSIE
Jewish Welfare Fund (1941); 110 Grand Ave. (12603); Pres. Maurice Sito- mer; Exec. Dir. Julius Dorfman.

ROCHESTER

1 United Jewish Welfare Fund of Rochester, N. Y., Inc. (1937); 129 East Ave. (14604); Pres. Emanuel Goldberg; Exec. Dir. Elmer Louis.

SCHENECTADY
1 Jewish Community Council (incl. surrounding communities) (1938); (sponsors Schenectady UJA and Federated Welfare Fund); 300 Germania Ave. (12307); Pres. Benjamin Flax; Exec. Dir. Harry Friedgut.

SYRACUSE
1 Jewish Welfare Federation, Inc. (1918); (sponsors Jewish Welfare Fund [1933]); 201 E. Jefferson St. (13202); Pres. Louis A. Yaffee; Exec. Dir. Norman Edell.

TROY
1 Troy Jewish Community Council, Inc. (incl. Green Island, Mechanicville, Waterford, Watervliet) (1936); 7 S. Lake Ave. (12180); Pres. Irving H. Myers; Exec. Dir. Irwin Lasky.
UTICA
1. Jewish Community Council of Utica, N. Y., Inc. (1933); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal of Utica); 1703 Genesee St. (13501); Pres. David Gross; Exec. Dir. James M. Senor.

YONKERS
2. Jewish Federation of Yonkers, N. Y., Inc. (1920); 122 S. Broadway (10701); Pres. Leon A. Lauterbach; Sec. Mrs. Bernard T. Silverman.

NORTH CAROLINA

ASHEVILLE
Jewish Community Center; 236 Charlotte St.

CHARLOTTE
1. Federation of Jewish Charities (1940); P. O. Box 2612 (1); Pres. Harry S. Swimmer.

FAYETTEVILLE
Beth Israel Federated Charities of Fayetteville, N. C.; P. O. Box 406; Chmn. A. M. Fleshman; Co-Chmn. Irvin A. Fleishman.

GASTONIA
Jewish Welfare Fund (1944); c/o Temple Emanuel, 320 South St. (28053); Pres. Cy Girard; Sec. Abe Slutzky.

GREENSBORO
1. Greensboro Jewish United Charities, Inc. (1940); P. O. Box 3112 (27402); Pres. Herman Cone, Jr.; Sec. Herbert Fauk, Jr.

HIGH POINT
1. United Jewish Charities; P. O. Box 1047; Chmn. Leonard J. Kaplan.

WINSTON-SALEM
Jewish Community Council of Winston-Salem, Inc. (1937); 201 Oakwood Dr. (5); Pres. Philip A. Michalove; Sec. David Rose.

NORTH DAKOTA

FARGO
Fargo Jewish Federation (incl. Jamestown, Moorhead, Valley City, Wahpeton & Detroit Lakes, Minn.) (1939); P. O. Box 1974; Pres. Julius Sgutt; Sec. Paul P. Feder.

OHIO

AKRON

CANTON

CINCINNATI
1. 2. Associated Jewish Agencies (1896; reorg. 1956); 2905 Vernon Pl. (45219); Pres. A. Marcus Levy; Exec. Dir. Martin M. Cohn.

1. Jewish Welfare Fund (1930); 2905 Vernon Pl. (45219); Pres. James L. Magrish; Exec. Dir. Martin M. Cohn.

CLEVELAND
1. 2. Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland (1903); 1001 Huron Rd. (44115); Pres. M. E. Glass; Exec. Dir. Henry L. Zucker.

COLUMBUS
1. United Jewish Fund and Council (1925; merged 1959); 40 S. Third St., Rm. 330 (43215); Pres. Abe I. Yenkin; Exec. Dir. Ben M. Mandelkorn.

DAYTON
1. Jewish Community Council of Dayton (1943); Community Services Bldg., 184 Salem Ave., Rm. 240 (45406); Pres. Harry E. Weprin; Exec. Dir. Robert Fitterman.

LIMA
1. Federated Jewish Charities of Lima District (1935); 321 W. High St.; Pres. Nathan Levy; Sec. Sam Stambor.

STEUBENVILLE
1. Jewish Community Council (incl. Mingo Junction Toronto) (1938); P. O. Box 536 (43952); Pres. Meyer Denmark; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Joseph Friedman.

TOLEDO

WARREN

YOUNGSTOWN
1. 2. Jewish Federation of Youngstown, Ohio, Inc. (incl. Boardman, Campbell, Girard, Lowellville, Struthers) (1935); P. O. Box 447 (44501); Pres. Leslie W. Spero; Exec. Dir. Stanley Engel.

OKLAHOMA

ARDMORE
Jewish Federation (1934); Co-Chmn. Sidney Yaffe, P. O. Box 1868; Max Roberson, 412 1st St., S. W.

OKLAHOMA CITY
1. Jewish Community Council (1941); 618 Sooner Bldg. (73102); Pres. Joe L. Singer; Exec. Dir. Leonard Lieberman.
TULSA
1 Tulsa Jewish Community Council (1938); (sponsors Tulsa United Jewish Campaign); 203 Howard Bldg., 424 S. Cheyenne St. (74103); Pres. Maurice Sanditen; Exec. Dir. Irving Antell.

OREGON

PENNSYLVANIA
1 Jewish Federation of Allentown (1948); 22nd and Tilghman Sts.; Pres. Bernard Kobrovsky; Exec. Dir. George Feldman.

1, 2 Federation of Jewish Philanthropies (1920; reorg. 1940); 1308—17th St. (16601); Pres. Samuel B. Maximon; Exec. Dir. Irving H. Linn.

1 Butler Jewish Welfare Fund (incl. Butler County) (1938); 148 Haverford Dr.; Chmn. Saul J. Bernstein; Sec. Maurice Horwitz.

Coatesville Jewish Federation (1941); Pres. Milton Margolis; Sec. Benjamin Rabinowitz, 1104 Sterling St.

1, 2 Jewish Community Council of Easton and Vicinity (1939); (sponsors Allied Welfare Appeal); 660 Ferry St.; Exec. Sec. Jack Sher.

1, 2 Jewish Community Welfare Council (1946); 110 W. 10th St., Pres. Barney R. Radov; Exec. Dir. I. Edward Adler.

1 United Jewish Community (incl. Carlisle, Lykens, Middletown, Steelton) (1933); 100 Vaughn St. (17110); Pres. Horace S. Goldberger; Exec. Dir. Albert Hursh.

Hazelton Jewish Community Council (sponsors Federated Jewish Charities Drive); Laurel and Hemlock Sts.; Pres. Bernard Kline; Exec. Dir. Isidore Kornzweig.

1 Jewish Community Council; Pres. Dr. Meyer Bloom, 1412 Luzerne St. Ext.

1 United Jewish Community Council of Lancaster, Pa. (incl. Lancaster County excepting Ephrata) (1928); 219 E. King St. (17602); Pres. Arthur Price.

Levittown
1 Jewish Community Council of Lower Bucks County (1956); 6912 Emilie Road (19057); Chmn. Samuel Glantz.

Norristown
1, 2 Jewish Community Center (1936); Brown and Powell Sts.; Pres. Emanuel Katz; Exec. Dir. Harold M. Kamsler.

Philadelphia
1, 2 Federation of Jewish Agencies of Greater Philadelphia (1901; reorg. 1956); (a consolidation of the former Allied Jewish Appeal and Federation of Jewish Charities); 1511 Walnut St. (19102); Pres. Nochem S. Winnet; Exec. Dir. Donald B. Hurwitz.

Pittsburgh
1, 2 United Jewish Federation of Pittsburgh (1912; reorg. 1955); 234 McKee Pl. (15213); Pres. Lester A. Hamburg; Exec. Dir. Robert I. Hiller.

Pottsville
1, 2 United Jewish Charities (incl. Minersville, Pine Grove, St. Clair, Schuylkill Haven) (1935); 23rd and Mahantongo Sts. (17901); Chmn. Saul Anton; Chmn. Arnold Delin; Exec. Sec. Gordon Berkowitz.

Reading
1 Jewish Community Council (1935); (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); 134 N. 5th St. (19601); Pres. Norman B. Dunitz; Exec. Sec. Harry S. Sack.

Scranton
1 Scranton-Lackawanna Jewish Council (incl. Lackawanna County) (1945); 601 Jefferson Ave. (18510); Pres. Arthur Abrams; Exec. Sec. George Joel.

Sharon
1 Shenango Valley Jewish Federation (incl. Greenville, Grove City, Sharon, Sharpsville) (1940); Pres. Harold Rosenberg; Sec. Francis Miller, 450 Fairfield Rd. (16147).

Uniontown
1 United Jewish Federation (incl. Masontown) (1939); Pres. Herbert C. Gottfried; Sec. Morris H. Samuels, c/o Jewish Community Center, 406 W. Main St. (15401).

Wilkes-Barre
1 The Jewish Federation of Greater Wilkes-Barre of the Wyoming Valley Jewish Committee (1935); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal); 60 S. River St.; Pres. Morton Blum; Exec. Sec. Louis Smith.

York
Jewish Organized Charities (1928); 120 E. Market St.; Pres. Mose Leibowitz; Exec. Sec. Joseph Sperling.
RHODE ISLAND

PROVIDENCE

WOONSOCKET
Woonsocket United Jewish Appeal, Inc. (1949); P. O. Box 52; Chmn. Samuel J. Medoff; Sec. Mrs. Paul Bernon.

SOUTH CAROLINA

CHARLESTON
1. Jewish Welfare Fund (1949); 90 Hasell St. (29401); Pres. Jack Brickman; Exec. Sec. Nathan Shulman.

SOUTH DAKOTA

SIOUX FALLS
1. Jewish Welfare Fund (1938); National Reserve Bldg. (57102); Pres. Isadore Pitts; Exec. Sec. Louis R. Hurwitz.

TENNESSEE

CHATTANOOGA

KNOXVILLE

MEMPHIS
1. Jewish Service Agency (incl. Shelby County) (1906); 93-10 North Main Bldg. (38103); Pres. Herbert Shainberg; Exec. Dir. Jack Lieberman.

NASHVILLE
1. Jewish Community Council (incl. 19 communities in Middle Tennessee) (1936); (sponsors Jewish Welfare Fund); 3500 West End Ave. (37205); Pres. B. B. Steiner; Exec. Dir. Nisson Pearl.

TEXAS

AUSTIN
1. Jewish Community Council of Austin (1939; reorg. 1956); 206 West-ern Republic Bldg. (78762); Pres. John Hurwitz; Sec. Elycoan H. Saulson.

CORPUS CHRISTI
1. Corpus Christi Jewish Community Council (1953); 750 Everhart Rd. (78411); Pres. Leslie Simon; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Lillian Racusin.

1. Combined Jewish Appeal (1962); 750 Everhart Rd. (78411); Pres. Abe Katz; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Lillian Racusin.

DALLAS
1. Jewish Welfare Federation (1911); 209 Browder Bldg., Rm. 403 (75201); Pres. Nolan Glazer; Exec. Dir. Jacob H. Kravitz.

EL PASO

FORT WORTH
1. Jewish Federation of Fort Worth (1936); 6801 Granbury Rd. (76133); Pres. Louis Bockstein; Exec. Dir. Abraham Kastenbaum.

GALVESTON
1. Galveston County United Jewish Welfare Association (1936); P. O. Box 146 (5); Pres. Jack Miller; Sec. Mrs. Ray Freed.

HOUSTON
1. Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Houston (incl. neighboring communities) (1937); (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); 2020 Hermann Drive (77004); Pres. Harold M. Falik; Exec. Dir. Albert Goldstein.

PORT ARTHUR
Federal Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); P. O. Box 442 (77641); Pres. Dr. Milton Getz; Treas. Robert Diamond.

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Arthur L. Riklin; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

TYLER
Federal Jewish Welfare Fund (1938); Pres. Isadore Roosth; P. O. Box 934 (75702).

WACO
1. Jewish Welfare Council of Waco and Central Texas (1949); P. O. Box 2214, Rm. 302 Liberty Bldg. (76703); Pres. Walter P. Kochman.

UTAH

SALT LAKE CITY
HAMPTON
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (incl. Phoebus) (1944); B’nai Israel Synagogue, 3116 Kecoughton Rd. (23369); Pres. Arthur Markowitz; Sec. Allan Mirvis.

NEWPORT NEWS
1 JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1942); 98—26th St.; Pres. Albert T. Brout; Exec. Dir. Charles Olshansky.

NORFOLK
1 NORFOLK JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL, INC. (1937); 700 Spotswood Ave. (23517); Pres. Paul M. Lipkin; Exec. Dir. Ephraim Spivek.

PETERSBURG
UNITED JEWISH COMMUNITY FUND (1938); Co-Chmn. Louis Hersh and Morton Sollod; Sec. Alex Sadle, 1651 Fairfax Ave.

PORTSMOUTH
1 JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL; New Kim Bldg., Rm. 419; Pres. Sol Brewer; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Ruth Silverman Scher.

RICHMOND
1 JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1935); 5403 Monument Ave. (23226); Pres. Jack Paul Fine; Exec. Dir. Julius Mintz.

WASHINGTON

SEATTLE
1 FEDERATED JEWISH FUND AND COUNCIL, INC. (incl. surrounding communities) (1926); 1017—46th Ave. (98104); Pres. Ben Bridge; Exec. Dir. Albert A. Dornner.

SPOKANE
1 JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (incl. Spokane County) (1927); (sponsors UNITED JEWISH FUND) (1936); 725—726 Paulsen Bldg. (1); Pres. Philip Seltzer; Sec. Robert N. Arick.

TACOMA
1 TACOMA FEDERATED JEWISH FUND (1936); Co-Chmn. Norman Kleinman, Eugene Pease; Treas. Jerry Brieger, 1124 Parkway.

WEST VIRGINIA

CHARLESTON
1 FEDERATED JEWISH CHARITIES OF CHARLESTON, INC. (incl. Dunbar, Montgomery, and South Charleston) (1937); 804 Quarrier St., Rms. 407—8 (25301); Pres. Alex Schoenbaum; Exec. Sec. Charles Cohen.

HUNTINGTON
1 FEDERATED JEWISH CHARITIES (1939); P. O. Box 947 (25713); Pres. Jack Hyman; Sec.-Treas. E. Henry Broh.

WHEELING
1 JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF WHEELING (incl. Moundsville) (1933); Pres. S. Arthur Rybeck, Jr.; Sec.-Treas. Irvin Clark, 883 Addit Ave.

WISCONSIN

APPLETON
1 UNITED JEWISH CHARITIES OF APPLETON; 1607 Carver St.; Chmn. T. Agnon; Exec. Sec. Bernard P. Ziven.

GREEN BAY
1 GREEN BAY JEWISH WELFARE FUND; Pres. Norman Mitter, 1566 N. Mason St.

KENOSHA
1 KENOSHA JEWISH WELFARE FUND (1938); 6537—7th Ave. (53140); Pres. Howard J. Brown; Sec.-Treas. Mrs. S. M. Lapp.

MADISON
1 MADISON JEWISH WELFARE COUNCIL, INC. (1940); 611 Langdon St. (53703); Pres. Dr. H. K. Parks; Exec. Dir. Kenneth Wasser.

MILWAUKEE
1 MILWAUKEE JEWISH WELFARE FUND, INC. (1938); 710 N. Plankinton Ave., Rm. 435 (53203); Pres. Marvin E. Klitsner; Exec. V. P. Melvin S. Zaret.

RACINE
1 RACINE JEWISH WELFARE COUNCIL (1946); Pres. Alex Dorman; Sec. Mrs. Myron Schuster, 2726 Green Haze Ave.

SHEBOYGAN
1 JEWISH WELFARE COUNCIL OF SHEBOYGAN (1927); 1404 North Ave.; Pres. Mayer Alpert; Sec. Mrs. Abe Alpert.

CANADA

ALBERTA

CALGARY
CALGARY JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1962); 18th Ave. and Center St. S.; Pres. Morris Hector; Exec. Dir. Harry S. Shatz.

EDMONTON
1 EDMONTON JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1954); 305 Mercantile Bldg., 102nd Ave., and 103 St.; Pres. Mickey Dein; Exec. Dir. Morris A. Stein.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

VANCOUVER
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF VANCOUVER (incl. New Westminster) (1932); 950 W. 41 (9); Pres. William Gelmon.
MANITOBA

WINNIPEG
1. JEWISH WELFARE FUND (1938); 370 Hargrave St., Rm. 204 (2); Pres. Harold Schwartz; Exec. Dir. Aaron B. Feld.

ONTARIO

HAMILTON
COUNCIL OF JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS (1934); 57 Delaware Ave.; Pres. Max Stein; Exec. Dir. William I. Stern.
1. 2. UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND (1939); 57 Delaware Ave.; Pres. Morley Goldblatt; Exec. Dir. William I. Stern.

KINGSTON
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1947); 117 King St., W.; Pres. Sheldon J. Cohen; Sec.-Treas. Jacob Bassan.

LONDON

NIAGARA FALLS
NIAGARA FALLS JEWISH FEDERATION (1941); 1328 Ferry; Pres. Harold D. Rosberg; Sec. I. I. Ackerman.

OTTAWA
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF OTTAWA (1935); 151 Chapel St. (2); Pres. Mervin Mirsky; Exec. Dir. Hy Hochberg.

ST. CATHARINES
UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND OF ST. CATHARINES; c/o JEWISH COMMUNITY Centre, Church St.; Pres. B. I. Cooper- man; Sec. Dan Monson.

TORONTO
1. UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND OF TORONTO (1937); 150 Beverley St. (2B); Pres. Arnold A. Epstein; Exec. Dir. Benjamin Schneider.

WINDSOR
1. 2. JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1938); 1641 Ouellette Ave.; Pres. Sidney Lazarus; Exec. Dir. Joseph Eisenberg.

QUEBEC

MONTREAL
1. COMBINED JEWISH APPEAL (1940); 493 Sherbrooke St. W. (2); Pres. Moe Levitt; Exec. Dir. Alvin Bronstein.
1. FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES (1916); 493 Sherbrooke St. W. (2); Pres. Lavy M. Becker; Exec. Dir. Alvin Bronstein.
Jewish Periodicals

UNITED STATES

ALABAMA

ARIZONA

CALIFORNIA


COLORADO

CONNECTICUT

DELAWARE

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1 Periodicals which have been in existence at least one year prior to June 30, 1964, are included in this directory. Information is based upon answers furnished by the publications themselves, and the publishers of the Year Book assume no responsibility for the accuracy of the data presented; nor does inclusion in this list necessarily imply approval or endorsement of the periodicals. The information provided here includes the year of organization and the name of the editor, managing editor, or publisher; unless otherwise stated, the language used by the periodical is English. An asterisk (*) indicates that no reply was received and that the information, including name of publication, date of founding, and address, is reprinted from AJYB, 1964 (Vol. 65). For organizational bulletins, consult organizational listings.


FLORIDA


GEORGIA


ILLINOIS


INDIANA


KENTUCKY


MARYLAND


MASSACHUSETTS


MICHIGAN


MINNESOTA


MISSOURI


NEBRASKA


NEW JERSEY


NEW YORK


NEW YORK CITY


INTERRELIGIOUS NEWSLETTER (1955). 165 E. 56 St., 10022, 515 Madison Ave.,


*JEWISH FORUM (1917). 100 Fifth Ave., 10011.


KINDER JOURNAL (1920). 41 Union Sq., 10003. S. Goodman, I. Goichberg. 6 times a year; Yiddish. Farlag Matones Assoc., Sholem Aleichen Folk Institute, Inc.


KULTUR UN DERTZIUNG—CULTURE AND EDUCATION (1930). 175 E. Broadway, 10002. Z. Yefroikin. 7 times a year; Yiddish. Education Dept., Workmen's Circle.


NATIONAL JEWISH MONTHLY. N. Y. office, 315 Lexington Ave., 10016. (See District of Columbia.)


SEVEN ARTS FEATURE SYNDICATE. See News Syndicates, p. 408.


YIDISHE SHPRAKH (1941). 1048 Fifth Ave., 10028. Yudl Mark. 3 times a year; Yiddish. Yivo Institute for Jewish Research, Inc.


ZUKUNFT (1892). 25 E. 78 St., 10021 Hyman Bass, Shlomo Bickel, Moshe Crystal, Eliezer Greenberg, Jacob Pat. Monthly; Yiddish. Congress for Jewish Culture and CYCO.

NORTH CAROLINA


OHIO


OKLAHOMA


PENNSYLVANIA


RHODE ISLAND


TENNESSEE


TEXAS


TEXAS JEWISH POST (1947). P. O. B. 742, Fort Worth, 1; 1000 Main St., Dallas. Jimmy Wisch. Weekly.

WASHINGTON

TRANSCRIPT (1933)—Rm. 201, 1017 Fourth Ave., Seattle, 98104. Sylvia Caler. Fortnightly.

WISCONSIN


NEWS SYNDICATES


CANADA


CANADIAN JEWISH WEEKLY (VOCHENBLATT) (formerly DER KAMPF; reorg. 1941). 271 College St., Toronto, 2b, Ont. Joshua Gersman.


DAILY HEBREW JOURNAL (1911). 409 College St., Toronto, 2b, Ont. S. B. Rose. Daily; Yiddish.


JEWISH DAILY EAGLE (1907). 4075 St. Lawrence Blvd., Montreal, 1, P.Q. Israel Rabinovitch. Daily; Yiddish.


HISTORY AND ARCHEOLOGY

AGUS, JACOB BERNARD. The meaning of Jewish history. Foreword by Salo W. Baron. New York, Abelard-Schuman, 1964. 2 v. (Ram's horn books)

An interpretation, from ancient to modern times.


The leader of an expedition into the Desert of Judah tells of some of the finds, which included relics of the Jewish revolt in 132-35.


A nontechnical explanation of the scroll, which purports to be an inventory of the buried treasure from the Temple.


A classic.


An anthology.


GOODENOUGH, ERWIN RAMSDELL. Jewish symbols in the Greco-Roman period; v. 9-11, Symbolism in the Dura synagogue. New York, Pantheon Books, 1964. 3 v. (Bollingen series, 37)

The concluding publication in the study. A final volume of summary and conclusions is contemplated to close the series.


A study of the "relevance of prophetic ethics to Israel's conduct with other nations."

HABEL, NORMAN C. Yahweh versus Baal; a conflict of religious cultures; a study in the relevance of Ugaritic materials for the early faith of Israel. Pub. for the School for Graduate Studies, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis. New York, Bookman Associates, 1964. 128 p. (Concordia Seminary. Graduate studies series)

Intended to show how and to what extent the Ugaritic texts are relevant to an understanding of the fundamentals of the Israelite religion.


A study of chapters 12-50 of Genesis, considering recent archeological findings.

Records in tabular form all matters pertaining to Jews during the period of the Inquisition.

LONGHURST, JOHN E. The age of Torquemada. 2d ed. Lawrence, Kans., Coronado Press, 1964. xii, 146 p.
The fate of Jews and Judaism during the Spanish Inquisition. Material for the study was derived from primary sources.

In the spirit of Freud's Totem and Taboo and Moses and Monotheism.

Examines the religious situation of the time which set the stage for the Inquisition and its effects on Protestants and Jews.

A study of Ashkenazi Jewry between the 11th and 16th centuries.

Documents relating to Jews and Judaism in Hellenistic Egypt, with English translations and commentaries.

Findings of the Drew-McConnick expedition and excavation of the city.

JEWS IN THE UNITED STATES


Includes both public and private documents.

Incorporates material from scarce sources. Posthumously published.

Rabbis, communal leaders, artists, and writers are quoted.

GOLSTEIN, PHILIP REUBEN. Centers in my life; a personal profile of the Jewish center movement. New York, Bloch, 1964. xii, 185 p.
A pioneer in the field tells of the beginnings of the movement and its subsequent development.

A sociological study of the Jewish community in a small midwestern city.

A study of the American Jewish community by specialists in various fields.


Articles by rabbis and social workers demonstrating the benefits that ensue through cooperation.

The story of the thirteen voluntary Jewish hospitals of New York from their beginnings to the present.

Traces the process of integration and participation of the Jew in American life.
MODERN HISTORY AND SOCIOLOGY


Seven papers on Germany during the period of Jewish emancipation.


A monograph on the Jews of Ghardaia, Algeria.


Full text of the controversial drama in which Pope Pius XII is criticized for not doing all that he might have done to save the Jews of Europe.


Discusses the case, the problems that arose, and the indictment.


A selection of poetry and drawings by some of the child victims of Nazism. The originals are in the archives of the State Jewish Museum in Prague.


Declares that the character of the anti-Semitic movement was established during the period from 1867 to 1918; the Nazis exploited what already existed.


One of the very few to escape from Auschwitz, Mr. Vrba succeeded in reaching Hungary where he endeavored to alert authorities to the true nature of the concentration camps.


An account of the circumstances leading to the settlement of East European Jews on the land, and the largely unsuccessful results of the attempt.

ISRAEL, ZIONISM, AND THE MIDDLE EAST


A specialist in government summarizes the historical precedents which led to the founding of the state and discusses its political structure and the pressures to which it is subject.


The wife of the president of Israel tells about the Zionist movement in Russia and experiences during the early days of British rule in Palestine.


Examines the role of the United Nations from 1949 to 1959.


Observations made in 1962 during a survey of the development of penal policy in Israel.

Facsimile reproductions of the handwritten letters exchanged between Theodor Herzl, his friend and early fellow-Zionist W. H. Hechlcr, the Grand Duke of Baden, and the Grand Duke's nephew, the German Emperor, William II. The correspondence is in German; the foreword, introd., and list of documents are in English and Hebrew.


Experiences in the Jewish Legion during World War I.


The introduction and the concluding section have been omitted. The chapter dealing with certain trends in contemporary Arabic literature has been rewritten.


KREININ, MORDECHAI ELIHAU. Israel and Africa, a study in technical cooperation. New York, Praeger, 1964. 206 p. (Praeger special studies in international economics)

Shows why Israel was in a favorable position to supply assistance and describes the various kinds of cooperation involved.


Aaron David Gordon, a Russian Jew, is credited with being the founder of the Kibbutz movement in Israel.


More case studies of the diverse population composing the State of Israel, begun in Aliyah.


A study of 93 members of the Israeli parliament intended to show how the leadership responds to changes as the nation develops.

BIBLE, TALMUD, AND DEAD SEA SCROLLS


Professor Speiser is also a member of the committee that is preparing the new Jewish Publication Society translation of the Bible.


Intended primarily for specialists, but also useful for others knowing little or no Hebrew.

BIBLE. Pentateuch. Torah yesharah; a traditional interpretative translation of the Five Books of Moses and an introduction to each Haftorah, based on Talmudic and Midrashic sources, as well as from medieval and modern commentators. Tr. and ed. by Chas. Kahane. New York, S. Rabinowitz Book Concern, 1964. 388, 109 p. (Torah Yesharah publication)

Text in English and Hebrew on facing pages.


Rendered in modern English.


Based on the King James version.


Retold for readers of all ages.


Establishes the sequence of biblical dates from 605 B.C.E. onward.


The author, a psychiatrist and rabbi, examines the psychological behavior of characters in Genesis.


Interpretations deriving from anthropology and the study of folklore.

By the great intellectual and spiritual guide of German Jewry in its last years.


Not only concepts, but also names of prayers, the Jewish months, classics of Jewish literature, etc.—defined and discussed.


A synthesis of lectures delivered over 40 years.


For boys and girls of bar mitzvah age.


Philosophy as it found expression in the Hebrew Bible.


By the president of UAJHC.


Presents the doctrines of, and discusses the strengths, weaknesses, and contributions of each religious philosopher.


A modernist-traditionalist synthesis.


The unity of the ethical and the ritual in classical Jewish thought and practice.


A chapter-by-chapter discussion of each Commandment and its meaning for the present.

KAPLAN, Mordecai Menahem. The purpose and meaning of Jewish existence; a people in the image of God. Philadel-

An epitome of Hermann Cohen's Religion der Vernunft, concluding with a section on modern rationales of Judaism.


Educators, religious leaders, and sociologists discuss the principal ideas of Judaism and the challenges which confront Jews and Judaism in modern times.


Analysis of the personalities and issues that created the Conservative movement. Expansion of articles that appeared originally in Conservative Judaism.


Kant, Hegel, and Toynbee.


Brief explanations of Orthodox, Hasidic, Reform, Conservative, and Reconstructionist concepts, interpreted for the layman.


A little book culled from the Bible, Talmud, and other sources.

EDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL AIDS


Nineteen authorities discuss issues confronting the modern Jew in an adult-education program given at Congregation B'nai B'rith in New York City.


Intended primarily for specialists.


Intended primarily for educators, but useful also for concerned laymen.


The third in a series of "Readings" intended to complement the Jewish Education Committee's teaching series. Additional titles are contemplated.


A text for young people.


Attempts to provide answers to some of the questions posed by young people.


A collection of essays examining the ideas of famous Jewish educators, scholars, and philosophers from the 18th century to the present.


Revised and updated edition of a history for secondary-school students, first pub. in 1928.


A study of six of the major institutions.


The first comprehensive history.


The first of two contemplated volumes on modern Jewish history for Jewish schools.


Intended as a text for high-school and adult-education courses in Judaism.

SERMONS AND HOMILETIC ESSAYS


A compilation of short statements by Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis, as well as by some Christian clergymen.


A study of the prophetic portions (haftarot) recited in the synagogue on the Sabbaths.


A selection of sermons, essays, and articles by a rabbi to a Sephardi community of Syrian Jews.


Vol. 7 of a collection of sermons by Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform rabbis.


LITURGY AND RITUAL


A reproduction of one of the most famous Hebrew illuminated manuscripts of the medieval period.


Annotations on the Haggadah from the collection of Harry J. Hirschhorn, and addenda to extensive scholarly bibliographies.

INTERFAITH AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS


Dynamics of prejudice was first pub. in 1950, as one of the Studies in prejudice, sponsored by the American Jewish Committee. Conclusions arrived at at that time have been reassessed.


A sociological study of a Negro sect.


Analysis of views on intermarriage of more than 5000 college students across the nation and interviews in depth with seventeen who had intermarried.

Discusses some of the themes conducive to anti-semitism most often reiterated in Christian teachings.


Labels anti-semitism the oldest and most comprehensive of modern political neuroses and treats the subject from its psychological, political and intergroup relations aspects.


Includes chapters on group prejudice and religious conflict.


Based on the Cornell Studies in intergroup relations, conducted between 1948 and 1956.

ART AND MUSIC


An illustrated account of ceremonial objects used in both synagogue and home.


A comprehensive album, demonstrating the Russian-born Jewish artist's versatility. Profusely illustrated in black and white and in color.


Examples of the work of individual artists and brief biographical sketches.


A popular treatment, making use of recent archeological discoveries and biblical research.


POETRY, DRAMA, ESSAYS, LITERARY CRITICISM


Includes essays on American Jewish writing and writers.


An exposition of the writings of Bacon, Milton, Hobbes, Blake, etc., to show the influence of Hebraic style and imagery on their work.


A play concerning a man who is persecuted because he is presumed to be a Jew.


An anthology of stories, poetry, and nonfiction.

A modernized version of the 16th-century play.


A selection of prose and verse to reflect the spirit which pervaded the Journal.


A young Jewish lawyer tries to understand why he has failed in his relationships to his mother, his wives, and his friends.


Includes poems that have appeared in various periodicals since the publication of the first edition in 1946.


A long poem written in 1926 commemorating an attack against the Jews of Rome following the attempted assassination of Benito Mussolini.


As told to the author by Dr. Kahana, biblical scholar and collector of such material.


Analyzes the play in the light of the medieval legends and myths about the Jews then current.

FICTION


A young woman who has hated being a Jew from childhood finally comes to terms with herself and her religion after the death of her father.


The marriage of a Jewish girl and a young man of Italian background comes to grief.


A petty gambler, an English Jewish counterpart of one of Damon Runyon's characters, tells his story.


A Jewish professor, trying to find himself in modern society, tells his story by means of flashbacks, recitals of immediate experiences, reflections, and letters composed but not sent. Winner of the National Book Award.


A Jewish girl who has survived the concentration camp, marries a former officer in the German army, only to discover horror once again.


A retired Yiddish actor and his friends, facing eviction from the tenement in which they have lived for many years, react strongly to the indignity.


A picture of Jewish life in small Polish towns before their destruction by the Nazis.


The daughter of a much-married French Jewish actor meets and falls in love with a Prussian officer in 1932. They take a terrible revenge on the S. S. officer who is responsible for the death of their son.


An allegory in which a soldier who had participated in the massacre of the Jews relives his experiences.


Concerned with a lonely thirty-seven year old woman in New York and the other people in her life, all of whom are seeking solace for their own loneliness.


A novel about the beautiful Queen Berenice, great-granddaughter of Herod, whose husband was killed during the Civil War in Jerusalem and who later was loved by Titus.


A possessive mother follows her son everywhere, even to college.


Twins, dressed in animal skins, manage to secrete themselves aboard the Ark.
They escape, mate with grandsons of Noah, and found the Greek people.


A young girl's flight to return to the world of reality in a hospital for the mentally ill.


A group of students and faculty members at New York University in the Spring of 1939, and the ways in which their lives are affected by the political atmosphere of the time.


A writer engaged to do a history of a North Carolina Jewish family is hampered by disputes between the principals.


The romance between a Swiss deserter from the German Army and a Jewish girl during the last days of World War II.


The experiences of a German Jew working for American intelligence.


A Long Island community just before and during World War I, is the setting for the interrelationships between a Unitarian family of New England stock, and one of Russian Jewish background.


The members of two well-to-do New York families, one partly-Jewish, are brought together by the intended marriage of the daughter of one to the son of the other.


A murder mystery with a rabbi as the amateur-sleuth hero.


The determination of a yacht-club official to effect a change in the club's discriminatory policies disrupts the community.


A manuscript left by a gifted writer, a concentration-camp victim, is protected from would-be exploiters by a young American rabbi.


Refugees, Jewish and non-Jewish, in the postwar European world.


Crises in the relationships between several people, Jewish and non-Jewish, Negro and white, come to a head during the course of one evening at a night club.


A Jewish storekeeper in a New England town, who had always been somewhat timid in his relations with his Gentile neighbors, is forced to reconsider his attitude when his son returns from college.


Fiction, based on fact, of a year spent in the Russian Army by a Polish Jew. As a Jew he encountered considerable antisemitism; as an officer he was treated politely.


Four Jewish intellectuals confronted by the death of a fifth.


A stage architect in a Red Army theater where he is confined in a Communist prison during the Revolution. He is married to a young Jewish girl.


One of two survivors of a wrecked refugee ship, an Austrian Jew suffers the final disintegration of his personality when he comes to live in a London rooming house peopled with eccentrics.


A survivor of three concentration camps tells of what he saw and experienced. Awarded the Prix Rivarol prize in France.


The story of a love great enough to induce a Jewish refugee to risk capture when he returns to Germany in order to see his non-Jewish wife.

A young woman who has married a non-Jew and moved to a Gentile community finds she cannot escape her past when her mother comes to live with her.


A man claiming to be the Messiah attempts to set himself up as redeemer of the Marranos in Portugal.


Sixteen tales, some with East European settings and others about East European Jews in the United States.


Mister Jack is a short novel about a thoroughly exasperating, yet lovable worker in the garment industry; The Coming of Monsieur Alazay is a tale of an Alsatian Jew who converted to Catholicism and became a religious fanatic.


Encounters between a skeptical Catholic and a Jewish orderly in a Catholic hospital affect the lives of both.


A Jewish physician in a Boston hospital encounters considerable prejudice.


An Englishman, an Irishman, and a Jew become firm friends in a Scottish regiment sent across the sea to fight in the French and Indian wars.


A Jew returns to his birthplace in Hungary in order to confront another man who had been indifferent while the Jews were being sent to concentration camps. There he is captured and tortured by the Russians.


A five-year-old boy's recital of life with mother in a Jewish neighborhood in Brooklyn during the 1930's.


A fictionalized account of the life of the Italian Jewish painter, based on letters, family papers, and interviews with the Modigliani family.

Biography, Autobiography, Correspondence


Memoirs of an Austrian Jewish physician who was imprisoned by the Nazis, lived successively in Paris and Africa, and who is now in the United States, practicing his profession after many tribulations.


The autobiography of a Catholic priest who converted to Judaism.


Continues the reminiscences of the late, noted pianist and music critic, begun in A Lost Paradise.


Continuation of the autobiography begun in People and Life, 1891–1921.


The stories of 18 rabbis, Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform, who contributed largely both to Judaism and to American society.


The first translation into English of the author's memoirs published in the Jewish Daily Forward several years ago under the title Vos ikh gedenk fun mayn lebn.

Hilf, Mary Asia, as told to Bourns, Barbara. No time for tears. New York, Yoseloff, 1964. 271 p.

Recollections of life as a child in Russia, adjustment to conditions as a newcomer to the United States, and participation in a number of charitable and social causes.

Thirty-one essays presenting the ideas and activities of great rabbis and religious leaders of the past 3 centuries.


The almost incredible story of how a 21-year-old Jewish girl from Brooklyn and her Mormon companion managed to survive for more than forty days after their light plane crashed in the Yukon wilderness.


The story of a man who was crippled by polio when he was 11. Describes the reactions of his family and friends to his illness, his experiences at high school and college and, later, marriage.


A comprehensive portrait of a man who was a physician, educator, pioneer in the Zionist movement, and collector of rare books.


Tells why the family emigrated to the United States from Switzerland, how the Guggenheim fortunes were amassed, and the activities of the various foundations they established.


Statesmen, prominent legal figures, and others, pay their respects upon the associate justice's retirement from the Supreme Court.


A history of the well-known investment firm founded by the German Jewish Seligman brothers. No descendant of the founders is with the firm today.


Recollections of the childhood and youth of the noted Polish Jewish writer.


Autobiography of a man who endured five years of the German occupation of Poland, the first three in various ghettos and the last two hidden in a pit underneath a Polish peasant's barn.


The distinguished author and poet presents a one-volume edition of the stories of his father and mother which were published earlier separately.


A daughter's recollections of her mother, the guiding spirit of a small neighborhood fur business.


As a young Viennese Jewish child the author begins the odyssey which took her first to England, then to the Dominican Republic and, finally, to the United States.

TENEBEL, JOHN. David Sarnoff; putting electrons to work. Chicago, Encyclopaedia Britannica Press, 1963. 191 p. (Britannica bookshelf; Great lives)

The story of the immigrant boy, now chairman of the board of Radio Corporation of America.


An account of the prejudice that was manifested when President Woodrow Wilson sent to the Senate the name of Louis D. Brandeis, the first Jew nominated to the Supreme Court.


Recollections of a former banker, public servant, and outspoken commentator on the political scene.


Biography and literary analysis.

ZIMMERMANN, ISIDORE, with BOND, FRANCIS. Punishment without crime; the true story of a man who spent twenty-four years in

The author's death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment. Later he was able to prove his innocence and was released.

COOKERY AND HOMEMAKING


The culinary adviser for El Al has collected recipes from immigrants to Israel, representing some seventy nations.

EDLIN, ROSABELLE, and SPECTOR, SHUSHANAH. My Jewish kitchen; the momene's ta'am cookbook. New York, Liveright, 1964. 480 p.

Recipes incorporating the rules of kashrut for meats and poultry.


Shows how to make the appropriate flower arrangements and table decorations for each festival, for both private and public functions.


Recipes from many nations, adapted to dietary laws.


Recipes for 60 dishes using kosher ingredients.


Recipes for kosher dishes based on Italian specialities.


Discusses customs and holidays and includes recipes. First published in 1959 by Farrar, Straus, under the title Across the Threshold: A Guide for the Jewish Homemaker.


Ideals of marriage and family life as set forth in traditional sources.

BOOKS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE


An account of the life of the Jews of Central Europe just before Emancipation as told through the story of a man who was a financial advisor to emperors and princes and, at the same time, chief rabbi of Hungary.


A fictionalized biography of the famous English Jewish philanthropist who was knighted by Queen Victoria.


The life of twins living in a colony in Israel.


Among the joys and tribulations of a young Jewish girl are preparations for her Bat Mitzvah and looking after the neighbors' cats.


Includes descriptions of important finds in some of the ancient lands in which Jews lived, as well as in Israel.


An account of the progress made since independence in 1948.


A biography of the late, noted physicist.


The life of a pioneer in the American labor movement, founder of the American Federation of Labor.

WEILERSTEIN, SADIE ROSE. K'tonton in Israel. Illustrations by Elizabeth Safian.

Further adventures of a Jewish Tom Thumb.

REFERENCE WORKS, ANNUALS, FESTSCHRIFTEN, MEMORIAL VOLUMES


The Jewish encyclopedia; a descriptive record of the history, religion, literature, and customs of the Jewish people from the earliest times. Prepared under the direction of Cyrus Adler and others. Isidore Singer, projector and managing ed., assisted by American and foreign boards of consulting editors. New York, Ktav Pub. House, 1964. 12 v. Originally pub. in 1901-06 by Funk and Wagnalls, this classic has not been superseded.


In addition to lists, reports, resolutions, etc., the following addresses and papers are included: A special ingredient: The heritage of Solomon Schechter, by Bernard Mandelbaum.—Preaching Schechter, by Abraham Karp.—Wage peace or . . . , by M. M. Kaplan.—War and peace, by W. C. Davidon and Herman Kahn.—The bias against man, by H. M. Schulweis.—The research of the Institute for Righteous Acts, by Perry London.—The intellectual and the rabbi, by Milton Himmelfarb.

—Proceedings, v. 28, 64th annual convention, April 19-April 23, 1964, Gros-
In addition to lists, reports, resolutions, etc., the following addresses and papers are included: Israel symposium: The impact of the Conservative movement in Israel, by Myron Fenster.—The impression of one rabbi after a year in Israel, by Simcha Kling.—The relationship of the Conservative movement in Judaism to the Zionist movement, the Zionist Organization of America, the State of Israel, the World Zionist Organization and to Klal Yisrael, by Simon Greenberg.—Address in honor of Professor Louis Ginzberg, by Eli Ginzberg.—On serving fifty years in the rabbinate, by I. H. Levinthal.—The quest for Jewish unity, by M. J. Routtenberg.—Intermarriage, by Albert Gordon.


English and Hebrew.

MISCELLANEOUS

Observations on a number of subjects.

A tongue-in-cheek presentation of the Jewish mother's trials and tribulations with her offspring.

Jewish maritime activities over 3,000 years.

In English and Hebrew.

Iva Cohen
ABELEN, ALTER, rabbi, poet; b. Mariampolé, Lithuania, July 17, 1880; d. N. Y. C., Dec. 20, 1964; in U. S. since 1887; hospital chaplain, N. Y. Bd. of Rabbis, 1947-60; former rabbi Temple Beth-El, Jersey City, N. J.; tr. into Eng. works of Judah Ha-levi, Hayyim Nahman Bialik; wrote many vols. poetry, incl. Sambatyon (1931); Sonnets of Motherhood (1938); Songs of Labor (1948); Helen and Shulamith (1951).


ASCHE, NATHAN, au.; b. Warsaw, Poland, July 10, 1902; d. San Francisco, Calif., Dec. 23, 1964; in U. S. since 1915; son of Sholem Asch; novelist and short-story writer; motion-picture script writer, 1931-33; special asst. WPA in Washington, 1937-39; au. Payday (1930); The Valley (1935); The Road: In Search of America (1937); numerous stories, articles pub. in literary magazines.


BERLIN, LOUIS, ed., pub.; b. Nemeroff, Russia, April 15, 1884; d. Chicago, Ill., Nov. 13, 1921; in U. S. since 1915; made caricature integral part of U. S. daily press; awards from: San Francisco Exposition, 1915; Chicago Soc. of Etchers, 1918; Nat. Academy, 1921; Internatl. Printmakers, 1923; Pa. Acad., 1927; Guggenheim fellowship, 1928; Salmagundi prize for figure painting, 1952; au. Is That Me, A Book About Caricature (1948); The Art of Caricature (1951).


BILAVSKY, GLICKA, lecturer, Yid. actress; b. Gechline, Poland, Jan. 23, 1884; d. N. Y. C., Apr. 4, 1946; in U. S. since 1915; made caricature integral part of U. S. daily press; awards from: San Francisco Exposition, 1915; Chicago Soc. of Etchers, 1918; Nat. Academy, 1921; Internatl. Printmakers, 1923; Pa. Acad., 1927; Guggenheim fellowship, 1928; Salmagundi prize for figure painting, 1952; au. Is That Me, A Book About Caricature (1948); The Art of Caricature (1951).

BLITZSTEIN, MARC, comp., playwright; b. Philadelphia, Pa., Ma. 2, 1905; d. Mar-


Cantor, Eddie, actor, singer, author; b. N. Y. C., Jan. 31, 1892; d. Hollywood, Calif., Oct. 10, 1964; debut in vaudeville, N. Y., 1909; appeared on stage in Ziegfield Follies, 1917-20; Broadway Brevities, 1920; Make It Snappy, 1922; Kid Boots, 1923-26; Whoopie, 1928-30; motion pictures: Palmy Days; The Kid from Spain; Strike Me Pink; Ali Baba Goes to Town; entertained to raise funds for Jewish refugees from Nazism; Palestine; Christian and non-denominational causes; U. S. War Bonds; created March of Dimes for Infantile Paralysis Fdn.; a fdr. Actors' Equity; Screen Actors Guild; Amer. Fed. of Radio Artists; Jewish Theatrical Guild; awards: UJA humanitarian award, 1947; U. S. Congress citations, 1952, 1953; service medal from Pres. Johnson, 1964; au. My Life Is in Your Hands; Caught Short; Yoo-Hoo Prosperity, As I Remember Them.


Einbinder, Gershon (pseud. Chaver Paver), Yid. writer, novelist, playwright; b. Bershad, Ukraine, Jan. 6, 1901; d. N. Y. C., Dec. 7, 1964; in U. S. since 1923; feature writer, N. Y. Freiheit; au. of children’s books Lebens oifn vogshol (1944); Vovik (1947); Gibotirim Fun der nakhti (1950); Gershon Meir dem blindens (1958), and others.

Eisenman, Aaron, rabbi; b. N. Y. C., Mar. 13, 1879; d. N. Y. C., Oct. 28, 1964; rabbi, Mt. Neboh Temple, N. Y. C., 1919–31; called “marrying rabbi,” officiated at more than 2,000 marriages a year; U. S. army hosp. chaplain, World War II; fdr. nat. beta Beta Tau Fraternity; a fdr. JWB.


Fabian, Ilona, writer, communal worker; b. Budapest, Hungary, Apr. 12, 1901; d. N. Y. C., Mar. 15, 1964; in U. S. since 1948; former pres. women’s sect. Hungarian Jewish War Veterans, supplying food and clothing to Jews in labor camps during World War II, est. and financed hosp. for 1,100 typhoid patients among them; mem. Hungarian underground; au. Sing Along With Khrushchev (1962).


Fink, Joseph Lionel, rabbi; b. Springfield, O., May 12, 1897; d. Buffalo, N. Y., Nov. 26, 1964; rabbi, 1924–59, after ret. rabbi emeritus Temple Beth Zion, Buffalo; leading spokesman for Reform
FISHZOHN, SAMUEL, social worker; b. Warsaw, Poland, Jan. 10, 1899; d. N. Y. C., Aug. 28, 1964; in U. S. since 1907; dir. Children's Hospital, 1940; Museum of Science, 1950; trustee N. Y. State Univ. for Teachers, 1951; bd. mem. Community Chest, Red Cross; au. A Critique of the Philosophy of Pragmatism with Special Reference to the Nature of Truth (1935).

FISHZOHN, SAMUEL, social worker; b. Warsaw, Poland, Jan. 10, 1899; d. N. Y. C., Aug. 28, 1964; in U. S. since 1907; dir. Children's Hospital, 1940; Museum of Science, 1950; trustee N. Y. State Univ. for Teachers, 1951; bd. mem. Community Chest, Red Cross; au. A Critique of the Philosophy of Pragmatism with Special Reference to the Nature of Truth (1935).


FREUDENTHAL, JOSEF, scholar, educ.; b. Bielitz-Biala, Poland, Apr. 30, 1881; d. N. Y. C., July 5, 1964; in U. S. since 1938; prof. of Indology and Tibetan, Asia Institute, N. Y.; visiting prof. of Indo-Iranian languages, Columbia Univ. until 1956; special decoration from Shah of Iran for contrib. to study of Iranian culture, 1949; au. The Ameza Spentas (in German, 1925-30); Iranian Loan Words in the Talmud (in Hebrew, 1935); Pahelevi Inscriptions of Dura-Europos (1955).


GOLDBERG, ISRAEL (pseud. Rufus Learsi), historian, writer; b. Suras, Russia, Oct. 6, 1887; d. N. Y. C., Aug. 1, 1964; in U. S. since 1892; former techr. N. Y. C. school system; au. Kasriel the Watchman and Other Stories (1925); Outline of Jewish Knowledge (3 vols., 1929-31); The Wedding Song, A Book of Chassidic Ballads (1939); Shimmene (1940); Israel: A History of the Jewish People (1949); Fulfillment, the Epic Story of Zionism (1951); Ritual of Remembrance (1953); The Jews in America: A History (1954); Filled with Laughter (1960).

GOLDSCHMIDT, CHONE, lawyer, au., comp.; b. Przemysl, Poland, May 15, 1892; d. N. Y. C., Jan. 27, 1964; in U. S. since 1910; humor ed. Jewish Daily Forward since 1917; contrib. Yid. press and mags. in Cleveland and Philadelphia; former pres., v. pres. until 1964, Yid. Writers Union; au. Broadway and Tel-Aviv (in Yid., 1951); Tales of the Old World and the New (1964); plays: Vn shitratbe r (1922); Kornose (1924); Angels on Earth (1930); Mekhatonim (1936), among others.

GOREVITCH, BORIS, au., journalist, poet; b. Uman, Russia, July 8, 1889; d. N. Y. C., Apr. 4, 1964; in U. S. since 1939; during World War II fdr. Com. for the Rights of Jews in Central and Eastern Europe; Union for the Protection of Human Freedom; later, fdr. and v. pres. Union for Protection of the Human Person; au. The Road to Peace and to Moral Democracy (2 vols., 1955); French, Russian, English pamphlets, articles on pacifism, Jewish culture.

GROSS, LOUIS, mfr., communal leader; b. Boston, Mass., Dec. 20, 1900; d. W. Palm Beach, Fla., Mar. 24, 1964; starred on Yid. stage in Motke from Slobodke; Women of New York; Wish Me Luck; The Wedding March; It's a Funny World; Nice People; pres. Hebrew Actor's Union, 1952-55.


GROSSINGER, HARRY, hotel owner, philanthropist; b. Brest Litovsk, Poland, Nov. 24, 1894; d. N. Y. C., June 1, 1964; in U. S. since 1941; ed. staff, Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, 1942-43; counselor Jewish Affairs to Polish Interior Ministry; Polish government's rep. on minorities problems to League of Nations; awards: Internat. Conf. World Peace gold medal, Geneva, 1933; Polish Cross of Merit; co-pub., polit. ed. Encyclopedia of Polish Jews (2 vols. in Polish, 1933); co-ed. The Jews in Poland Reborn (2 vols. in Polish, 1933).


HECHT, BEN, novelist, playwright; b. N. Y. C., Feb. 28, 1894; d. N. Y. C., Apr. 18, 1964; newspaper correspondent, Chicago Journal, 1910; Chicago Daily News, 1914-23; charge of Berlin office, 1918-19; fdr., pub. Chicago Literary Times, 1923-25; au. Erik Dorn (1921); Count Bruga (1926); The Front Page (1928); A Jew in Love (1930); Twentieth Century (1933); The Champion from Far Away (1937); Guide for the Bedevilled (1944); A Child of the Century (1954); Charlie (1957); The Sensualists (1959); Perfidy (1962); Hollywood script writer of The Scoundrel; Wuthering Heights; Scarface; a fdr. Emergency Com. to Save the Jews of Europe, 1940.


KATZ, HAYYIM MORDECAI, rabbi; b. Lithuania, 1894 (?); d. Cleveland, O., Nov. 16, 1964; in U. S. since 1941; noted talmudic scholar; fdr. in 1941, dean Telshe Rabbinical Coll., Cleveland; headed yeshiva in TelSiai, Lithuania, until destroyed by Nazis; a leader Grand Council of Torah Sages.

KATZ, SAMUEL, mfr., philanthropist; b. Russia, May 14, 1887; d. N. Y. C, Dec. 4, 1964; a fdr. Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva Univ.; Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Fdn.; est. scholarships at Hebrew Univ., Technion, Israel Inst. of Technology, Weizmann Inst. and Bar-Ilan Univ.


KAYSER, RUDOLF, scholar, educ.; b. Parichim, Germany, Nov. 28, 1889; d. N.Y.C., Feb. 1964; in U. S. since 1935; prof. of Germanics, later prof. emeritus, Brandeis Univ.; lecturer Hunter Coll.; articles in...
Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, National Encyclopedia, Encyclopaedia Judaica, Philo-Lexikon; au. Stendhal oder das Leben eines Égoïsten (1928); Spinoza, Bildnis eines geistigen Helden (1932); Kundera (1935); ein Leben und Tinti di Jehudah Halevi (1949); Die Heiligen von Qumran-Hier bin ich (1964); numerous articles in lit., philosophical mags. here and abroad.

KINSMAN, ARTHUR J., mfr., philanthropist; b. N. Y. C, 1887 (?); d. N. Y. C, June 12, 1964; a fdr. of UJA; former v. pres., Jewish Memorial Hosp.


KOSLOWSKY, AARON JACOB, rabbi; b. Poland, 1864 (?); d. Woodmere, N. Y., May 26, 1964; in U. S. since 1910; talmudic scholar, exec. dir. Slubodka Yeshiva; fdr. Ezzas Torah Nat. Soc.; former sec. UOR; sponsored pub. of a North Amer. ed. of Babylonian Talmud during World War I.

KRANZER, HERBERT C., corp. exec., communal leader; b. 1905 (?); d. Athens, Greece, Sept. 20, 1964; v. pres. and treas. of HIAS; leader of UJA, JDC.

KURTZ, AARON, Yid. poet, lecturer, ed.; b. Osue, Russia, July 28, 1891; d. Long Beach, N. Y., May 30, 1964; in U. S. since 1911; ed., pub. poetry mag. Haintike Lider; au. Khaos (1920); Figaro (1924); Plakatn (1927); Di goldene shtot (1935); No Pasaran (1938); Marc Chagall (1947).


LEHRER, LEIBUSH L., educ., writer; b. Warsaw, Poland, Apr. 6, 1887; d. N. Y. C, Sept. 17, 1964; in U. S. since 1909; former teacher of hist. of educ. Jewish Teachers Seminar; fdr. Sholem Aleichem Folk Inst., YIVO Inst. for Jewish Research, Vilna, 1925; co-fdr., former research sec., exec. comm. mem., bd. of dir., chmn. research comm. YIVO, N. Y. C; co-ed. YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science, YIVO Bleter; ed. News of the YIVO; au. in Yid. The Modern Jewish School (1927); Psychology of Literature (1926); So are People (1934); essays on philosophy and religion, incl. Jewishness and Other Problems (1940); From Generation to Generation (1959); Man and Ideas (1960).


MARX, HARP0 (ARTHUR), comedian; b. N. Y. C, Nov. 21, 1893; d. Hollywood, Calif., Sept. 28, 1964; ret. since 1963; known for complete silence throughout acting career; with brothers Gummo, Zeppo, Chico, and Groucho, began in
vaudeville; Broadway plays: *Coconuts*, *Animal Crackers*; films: *Coconuts*, *Animal Crackers* in early 1930s; later, *A Night at the Opera*, *A Day at the Races*, *At the Circus*, *Go West*, *The Big Store*, *Love Happy*; team split up, 1949; since then appeared in night clubs, occasional harp soloist with TV symphony orchestra.


MELLER, ESTHER KANDEL, philanthropist; b. N. Y. C, 1924; rabbi, Temple Beth El, Elizabeth, since 1957; authority on Christianity and intergroup relations; civil rights advocate; au. textbooks, plays, and articles on drama, literature; co-au. *Our Religion and Our Neighbors* (1963).


NEUFHOF, HAROLD, surgeon; b. N. Y. C., May 23, 1884; d. Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 7, 1964; leading thoracic surgeon; chief of surgery Mt. Sinai Hosp. 1930–46, later consultant; until recently dir. surgery, Beth El Hosp. Bklyn.; chief, surgical dept. and later consultant surgeon, Montefiore Hosp. and Brookdale Hosp. Center; developed many concepts of chest surgery that are now estab. practice; au. of standard works and articles for surgeons on control of infection, thermoembolisms, transplanting of tissue.
RAPPAPORT, AARON, philanthropist; b. N. Y. C., Nov. 24, 1896; d. N. Y. C., July 10, 1964; prin. fdr., and bd. mem. women's div. Jewish Guild for the Blind; estab. program of med., psychiatric, recreational, and physical rehabilitation for elderly blind at Home for the Aged Blind, Yonkers; org. Youth Aliyah of Hadassah in 1930s; headed South Shore, L. I., orgs. for N. Y. Fed. of Jewish Philanthropies and UJA; bd. mem. N. Y. Y. Shakespeare Festival; recd. certificate of merit for work with Office of Price Administration during World War II.

NISSENSON, AARON, Yid. poet, essayist, journalist; b. Slutzk, Russia, Oct. 9, 1897; d. N. Y. C., May 1, 1964; in U. S. since 1911; au. 8 vols. poetry, many translated into Eng., French, Russ., incl. The Road to Man (1934); The Promised Land (1937); In the Footsteps of the Righteous (1950); My Sorrow Swings a Cane (English tr., 1937); novel in Eng. Song of Man (1964); Yid. pub. dir., JDC, since 1955; staff mem. Jewish Morning Journal, 1924–53.


RAPPAPORT, Aaron B., Yid. poet, au.; b. Minsk, Russia, Jan. 15, 1895; d. N. Y. C., Aug. 31, 1964; in U. S. since 1911; au. verse vols., Durch Feier Vent (1925); Mayse-Shop (1935); Dvoyre Haneviye (1965; pub. posthumously); inventor of technical devices used by Army in World War II; co-pub., monthly Nay-Yidish (1922).

Reiss, Samuel, philologist, tr.; b. Lwow, Poland, Mar. 15, 1905; d. Cleveland, O., July 20, 1964; in U. S. since 1914; polyglot (32 languages); technical tr. for Lewis Research Center of NASA; au. Rise of Words and Their Meanings (1950); Universe of Meaning (1953); Language and Psychology (1959); The Basis of Scientific Thinking (1961).


Robinson, Nehemiah, jurist, org. exec., writer; b. Vištytis, Lithuania, June 7, 1898; d. Lakewood, N. J., Jan. 11, 1964; in U. S. since 1940; expert on Ger. war crimes and reparations; chief researcher, 1941–45, and since 1948 dir. WJC Inst. of Jewish Affairs; first dir. WJC Off. for Indemnification, 1946; key witness Nuremberg war crimes trials; helped West German govt. locate witnesses against former Nazi criminals; chief legal adv. CJMCAG and its negotiator for restitution at the Hague, 1952; au. numerous books, pamphlets, articles, incl. Indemnification and Reparations. Jewish Aspects (1944); Spoliation and Remedial Action. The Material Damage Suffered by Jews under Persecution (1962); Ten Years of German Indemnification (1964); under UN auspices: Genocide Convention (1949); Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1950); Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1953).


SchlIcKRAuT, Joseph, actor, dir., prod., writer; b. Vienna, Austria, Mar. 22, 1896; d. N. Y. C., Jan. 21, 1964; in U. S. since 1921; appeared in more than 24 plays incl. Clash by Night (1941), Uncle Harry (1942), The Green Bay Tree (1951), Love's Labor Lost (1953); more than 60 motion pictures, incl. King of Kings (1927); Viva Villa (1934); Garden of Allah (1936); The Life of Emile Zola (1938); Idiot's Delight (1939); Rangers of Fortune (1940); The Tell-Tale Heart (1942); The Cheaters (1945); Monsieur Beauregard (1946); Diary of Anne Frank (1959); The Greatest Story Ever Told (1964); host.
SEGAL, LOUIS, Jewish labor leader; b. Lowicz, Poland, July 4, 1894; d. N. Y. C., June 16, 1964; in U. S. since 1912; gen. sec., Farband-Labor Zionist Order since 1926; mem. exec. WZO, Jewish Agency for Israel; contrib. to Yid. and other publications.

SENNET, SAMUEL, business exec.; b. Buebrich, Germany, Nov. 29, 1888; d. N. Y. C., June 26, 1964; in U. S. since 1935; AFL rep., UN Economic and Social Council; lobbyist Int. Confed. of Free Trade Unions; senior economist UNRWA during war; staff mem. OSS; mem. German Reichstag; au. Autobiography of a German Rebel (1939).


SOKAL, SAUL, communal worker; b. Austria, 1889 (?); d. N. Y. C., Sept. 6, 1964; in U. S. since 1939; staff mem. WJC-Institute of Jewish Affairs; a fdr. Labor Zion. movement in Austria; perm. mem. WJC Court of Honor.

SOKOL, ABRAHAM, rabbi, author; b. Germantown, Pa., June 22, 1892; d. N. Y. C., Sept. 6, 1964; in U. S. since 1939; staff mem. WJC-Institute of Jewish Affairs; a fdr. Labor Zion. movement in Austria; perm. mem. WJC Court of Honor.


SONDERLING, JACOB, rabbi; b. Lipny, Poland, Oct. 19, 1878; d. Los Angeles, Calif., Sept. 30, 1964; in U. S. since 1923; an early co-worker of Theodor Herzl; rabbi, Fairfax Temple Soc. for Jewish culture, Los Angeles, 1934-64; prof. of Jewish thought and homeletics Calif. School of Hebrew Union Coll.; former dir. Los Angeles Jewish Community Council; au. works on philosophy.
of rel. and Jewish art; au. of autobiography *American Jewish Archives* (1964).


**Szilard, Leo,** physicist; b. Budapest, Hungary, Feb. 11, 1898; d. La Jolla, Calif., May 30, 1964; in U. S. since 1937; helped develop atomic bomb; with Enrico Fermi, created first nuclear chain reaction, Univ. of Chicago, 1942; shared with him first U. S. patent for nuclear reactor; with Albert Einstein and others, convinced Pres. Franklin D. Roosevelt of atomic energy's military potential; devised method of extracting plutonium in large quantities from uranium; led scientists' appeal to Pres. Harry S. Truman for advance warning of plan to drop atomic bomb on Hiroshima; later, with Einstein and others, est. Emergency Com. of Atomic Scientists to arouse world to nuclear war threat; gave up work in nuclear physics, joined Chicago Univ. faculty as prof. of biophysics, research in molecular biology incl. theory of aging process and work on memory, 1946–63; joined Salk Inst. for Biological studies, 1964; awards: Atoms for Peace, 1959; Albert Einstein medal.


**Weiss, Bernyce Schaviern,** communal worker; b. 1902 (?); d. N. Y. C., June 17, 1964; since 1948 exec. dir., District 1, B'nai B'rith Women; former exec. with UJA and Amer. Jewish Conf.; pres. Sisterhood of Union Temple, Bklyn.


**Winarick, Arthur,** hotel owner; b. Novograd-Volinski, Russia, 1889 (?); d. Kiamesha Lake, N. Y., Nov. 21, 1964; in U. S. since 1911; owner Concord Hotel; patron and sponsor of JTS, B'nai B'rith, UJA, Israel Bonds.

**Zuckenberg, Regine,** Yid. actress; b. 1889 (?); d. Jersey City, N. J., Oct. 4, 1964; in U. S. since 1919 (?); brought to U. S. by Boris Thomashefsky; starred in *Farblondzhete Shefele; Pintl Yid; Shema Yisrael; Wandering Jew.*
Calendars
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLIDAY</th>
<th>5725</th>
<th>5726</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosh Ha-shanah, 1st day</td>
<td>M Sept. 7</td>
<td>M Sept. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosh Ha-shanah, 2nd day</td>
<td>T Sept. 8</td>
<td>T Sept. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of Gedaliah</td>
<td>W Sept. 9</td>
<td>W Sept. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yom Kippur</td>
<td>W Sept. 16</td>
<td>W Oct. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukkot, 1st day</td>
<td>M Sept. 21</td>
<td>M Oct. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukkot, 2nd day</td>
<td>T Sept. 22</td>
<td>T Oct. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoshana'na Rabba'</td>
<td>Su Sept. 27</td>
<td>Su Oct. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shemini 'Azeret</td>
<td>M Sept. 28</td>
<td>M Oct. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simhat Torah</td>
<td>T Sept. 29</td>
<td>T Oct. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Heshvan, 1st day</td>
<td>T Oct. 6</td>
<td>T Oct. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Heshvan, 2nd day</td>
<td>W Oct. 7</td>
<td>W Oct. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Kislev</td>
<td>F Nov. 6*</td>
<td>Th Nov. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanukkah, 1st day</td>
<td>M Nov. 30*</td>
<td>Su Dec. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Tevet, 1st day</td>
<td>Sa Dec. 5</td>
<td>F Dec. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Tevet, 2nd day</td>
<td>Su Dec. 6</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of the 10th of Tevet</td>
<td>T Dec. 15</td>
<td>Su Jan. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Sheva'</td>
<td>M Jan. 4</td>
<td>Sa Jan. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamishshah-'asar bi-Sheva'</td>
<td>M Jan. 18</td>
<td>Sa Feb. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Adar I, 1st day</td>
<td>T Feb. 2</td>
<td>Su Feb. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Adar I, 2nd day</td>
<td>W Feb. 3</td>
<td>M Feb. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Adar II</td>
<td>F Mar. 5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of Esther</td>
<td>W Mar. 17</td>
<td>Th Mar. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purim</td>
<td>Th Mar. 18</td>
<td>Su Mar. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shushan Purim</td>
<td>F Mar. 19</td>
<td>M Mar. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Nisan</td>
<td>Sa Apr. 3</td>
<td>T Mar. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover, 1st day</td>
<td>Sa Apr. 17</td>
<td>T Apr. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover, 2nd day</td>
<td>Su Apr. 18</td>
<td>W Apr. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover, 7th day</td>
<td>F Apr. 23</td>
<td>M Apr. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover, 8th day</td>
<td>Sa Apr. 24</td>
<td>T Apr. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Iyar, 1st day</td>
<td>Su May 2</td>
<td>W Apr. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Iyar, 2nd day</td>
<td>M May 3</td>
<td>Th Apr. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lag bo-'Omer</td>
<td>Th May 20</td>
<td>S May 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Siwan</td>
<td>T June 1</td>
<td>F May 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shavu'ot, 1st day</td>
<td>Su June 6</td>
<td>W May 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shavu'ot, 2nd day</td>
<td>M June 7</td>
<td>Th May 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Tammuz, 1st day</td>
<td>W June 30</td>
<td>Sa June 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Tammuz, 2nd day</td>
<td>Th July 1</td>
<td>Su June 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of the 17th of Tammuz</td>
<td>Su July 18</td>
<td>T July 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Av</td>
<td>F July 30</td>
<td>M July 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of the 9th of Av</td>
<td>Su Aug. 8</td>
<td>T July 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Elul, 1st day</td>
<td>Sa Aug. 28</td>
<td>T Aug. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Elul, 2nd day</td>
<td>Su Aug. 29</td>
<td>W Aug. 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Second Day of New Moon
### Condensed Monthly Calendar (1965-1966)

#### 1965, Jan. 4—Feb. 2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>Sabbaths, Festivals, Fasts</th>
<th>Pentateuchal Reading</th>
<th>Prophetic Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Shevat 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Be-shallah (Shabbat Shirah)</td>
<td>Exod. 13:17-17:16</td>
<td>Judges 5:1-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hamishshah-asar bi-Shevat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yitro</td>
<td>Exod. 18:1-20:23</td>
<td>Isaiah 6:1-7:6; 9:5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mishpatim</td>
<td>Exod. 21:1-24:18</td>
<td>Jeremiah 34:8-22; 33:25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic minhag.*

#### 1965, Feb. 3—Mar. 4]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>Sabbaths, Festivals, Fasts</th>
<th>Pentateuchal Reading</th>
<th>Prophetic Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Adar 1 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tezawweh</td>
<td>Exod. 27:20-30:10</td>
<td>Ezekiel 43:10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ki tissa</td>
<td>Exod. 30:11-34:35</td>
<td>I Kings 18:1-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wa-yakhel, Shekalim</td>
<td>Exod. 35:1-38:20</td>
<td>II Kings 12:1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 4</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Date</td>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td>Jewish Date</td>
<td>SABBATHS/FESTIVALS, FASTS</td>
<td>PENTATEUCHAL READING</td>
<td>PROPHETICAL READING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Adar II 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pekude</td>
<td>Exod. 38:21-40:38</td>
<td>I Kings 7:51-8:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wa-yikra, Zakhor</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Samuel 15:2-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fast of Esther</td>
<td>Exod. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55:6-56:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Purim*</td>
<td>Exod. 17:8-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Shushan Purim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremiah 7:21-8:3; 9:22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Zaw</td>
<td>Levit. 6:1-8:36</td>
<td>Ezekiel 36:16-38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Book of Esther is read.

* Italics are for Sephardic minhag.
### 1965, April 3—May 2] NISAN 30 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mezora' (Shabbat ha-Gadol)</td>
<td>Levit. 14:1-15:33</td>
<td>Malachi 3:4-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fast of Firstborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Passover, First Day</td>
<td>Exod. 12:21-51; Num. 28:16-25</td>
<td>Joshua 5:2-6:1, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td>Exod. 13:1-16; Num. 28:19-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td>Exod. 22:24-23:19; Num. 28:19-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td>Exod. 34:1-26; Num. 28:19-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td>Num. 9:1-14; Num. 28:19-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ahare Mot</td>
<td>Levit. 16:1-18:30</td>
<td>I Samuel 20:18-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*
### 1965, May 3—31

#### IYAR 29 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FARSTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Emor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremiah 32:6-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lag Ba'-Omer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremiah 16:19-17:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Be-har</td>
<td>Levit. 25:1-26:2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Be-hukkotai</td>
<td>Levit. 26:3-27:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1965, June 1—30

#### SIWAN 30 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FARSTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Siwan 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td>Hosea 2:1-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Be-midbar</td>
<td>Num. 1:1-4:20</td>
<td>Ezekiel 1:1-28; 3:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shavu'ot, Second Day</td>
<td>(Deut. 15:19-16:17, Num. 28:26-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Naso</td>
<td>Num. 4:21-7:89</td>
<td>Judges 13:2-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Be-ha'alotekha</td>
<td>Num. 8:1-12:16</td>
<td>Zechariah 2:14-4:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*
### TAMMUZ 29 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>Sabbaths, Festivals, Fasts</th>
<th>Pentateuchal Reading</th>
<th>Prophetical Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Tammuz 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Korah</td>
<td>Num. 16:1-18:32</td>
<td>I Samuel 11:14-12:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Balaak</td>
<td>Num. 22:2-25:9</td>
<td>Micah 5:6-6:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fast of the 17th of Tammuz</td>
<td>Exod. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55:6-56:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pineḥas</td>
<td>Num. 25:10-30:1</td>
<td>Jeremiah 1:1-2:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AV 30 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>Sabbaths, Festivals, Fasts</th>
<th>Pentateuchal Reading</th>
<th>Prophetical Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Av 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mataḥot, Máse'</td>
<td>Num. 30:2-36:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 7</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Devarim (Shabbat Hazon)</td>
<td>Deut. 1:1-3:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wa-ethannan (Shabbat Nahamu)</td>
<td>Deut. 3:23-7:11</td>
<td>Isaiah 40:1-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>'Ekev</td>
<td>Deut. 7:12-11:25</td>
<td>Isaiah 49:14-51:3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*
### Monthly Calendar

#### 1965, Aug. 31—Sept. 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 29</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Elul 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shofetim</td>
<td>Deut. 16:18-21:9</td>
<td>Isaiah 51:12-52:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ki tavo</td>
<td>Deut. 26:1-29:8</td>
<td>Isaiah 60:1-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jewish Date**

- **Elul 1**: New Moon, Second Day
- **Elul 7**: Shofetim
- **Elul 14**: Ki teše
- **Elul 21**: Ki tavo
- **Elul 28**: Nizgavim

**SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS**

- New Moon, Second Day
- Shofetim
- Ki teše
- Ki tavo
- Nizgavim

**PENTATEUCHAL READING**

- Num. 28:1-15
- Deut. 16:18-21:9
- Deut. 21:10-25:19
- Deut. 26:1-29:8
- Deut. 29:9-30:20

**PROPHETICAL READING**

- Isaiah 51:12-52:12
- Isaiah 54:1-10 or 54:1-55:5
- Isaiah 60:1-22
- Isaiah 61:10-63:9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tishri 1</td>
<td>Rosh Ha-shanah, First Day</td>
<td>Gen. 21:1-34, Num. 29:1-6</td>
<td>I Samuel 1:1-2:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fast of Gedaliah</td>
<td>Exod. 32:11-14, 34:1-10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55:6-56:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wa-yelekh (Shabbat Shuvah)</td>
<td>Deut. 31:1-30</td>
<td>Hosea 14:2-10, Micah 7:18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ha' azinu</td>
<td>Deut. 32:1-52</td>
<td>II Samuel 22:1-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sukkot, Second Day</td>
<td>Levit. 22:26-23:44, Num. 29:12-16</td>
<td>I Kings 8:2-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td>Exod. 33:12-34:26, Num. 29:26-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hoshana Rabah</td>
<td>Num. 29:26-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Shemini 'Ageret</td>
<td>Deut. 14:22-16:17, Num. 29:35-30:1</td>
<td>I Kings 8:54-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*
## 1965, Oct. 27—Nov. 24  
### HESHWAN 29 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lekh lekha</td>
<td>Gen. 12:1-17:27</td>
<td>Isaiah 40:27-41:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS
- New Moon, Second Day
- Noah
- Lekh lekha
- Wa-yera
- Hayye Sarah

### SABBATHS
- New Moon
- Second Day

### PENTATEUCHAL READING
- Num. 28:1-15
- Gen. 6:9-11:32
- Gen. 12:1-17:27
- Gen. 18:1-22:24
- Gen. 23:1-25:18

### PROPHETICAL READING
- Isaiah 54:1-55:5
- Isaiah 40:27-41:16
- II Kings 4:1-37
- I Kings 1:1-31
- Malachi 1:1-2:7
- Hosea 12:13-14:10
- Hosea 11:7-12:12
- Hosea 11:7-12:12
- Obadiah 1:1-21
- Amos 2:6-3:8

### Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.

## 1965, Nov. 25—Dec. 23  
### KISLEW 29 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kislew</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wa-yeze</td>
<td>Gen. 28:10-32:3</td>
<td>Hosea 12:13-14:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Wa-yishlah</td>
<td>Gen. 32:4-36:43</td>
<td>Hosea 11:7-12:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obadiah 1:1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-23</td>
<td>Su-Th</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>Hanukkah, First to Fifth Day</td>
<td>Su Num. 7:1-17</td>
<td>Amos 2:6-3:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M Num. 7:18-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T Num. 7:24-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W Num. 7:30-41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Th Num. 7:36-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SABBATHS
- New Moon
- Toledot
- Wa-yeze
- Wa-yishlah
- Wa-yasheh

### PENTATEUCHAL READING
- Num. 28:1-15
- Gen. 25:19-28:9
- Gen. 28:10-32:3
- Gen. 32:4-36:43
- Gen. 37:1-40:23

### PROPHETICAL READING
- Malachi 1:1-2:7
- Hosea 12:13-14:10
- Hosea 11:7-12:12
- Hosea 11:7-12:12
- Obadiah 1:1-21
- Amos 2:6-3:8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FARST</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Tevet 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Hanukkah, Sixth Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15; 7:42-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mi-kez; Hanukkah, Seventh Day</td>
<td>Gen. 41:1-44:17; Num. 7:48-54</td>
<td>Zechariah 2:14-4:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hanukkah, Eighth Day</td>
<td>Num. 7:54-8:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fast of the 10th of Tevet</td>
<td>Exod. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55:6-56:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wa-yehi</td>
<td>Gen. 47:28-50:26</td>
<td>I Kings 2:1-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*
### 1966, Jan. 21—Feb. 20 [5726]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 22</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Shevat 1</td>
<td>Wa-era; New Moon</td>
<td>(Exod. 6:2-9:35)</td>
<td>Isaiah 66:1-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Num. 28:9-15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 5</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Be-shallah (Shabbat Shirah) Hamishshah-’asar bi-Shevat</td>
<td>Exod. 13:17-17:16</td>
<td>Judges 4:4-5:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judges 5:1-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mishpatim, Shekalim</td>
<td>Exod. 21:1-24:18</td>
<td>II Kings 12:1-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*

### 1966, Feb. 21—Mar. 21 [5726]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Terumah</td>
<td>Exod. 25:1-27:19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fast of Esther</td>
<td>Exod. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55:6-56:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tezawweh, Zakhor</td>
<td>(Exod. 27:20-30:10)</td>
<td>I Samuel 15:2-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Purim</td>
<td>(Deut. 25:17-19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Shushan Purim</td>
<td>Exod. 17:8-16</td>
<td>Book of Esther is read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ki tissa, Farah</td>
<td>(Exod. 30:11-34:35)</td>
<td>Ezekiel 45:16-46:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Num. 19:1-22)</td>
<td>Ezekiel 36:16-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Wa-yakhel, Pekude, ha-Hodesh</td>
<td>Exod. 35:1-40:38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:1-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*
1966, Mar. 22—April 20] NISAN 30 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 22</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Nisan 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td>Isaiah 43:21-44:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wa-yikra</td>
<td>Levit. 1:1-5:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Zaw (Shabbat ha-Gadol)</td>
<td>Levit. 6:1-8:36</td>
<td>Malachi 3:4-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fast of Firstborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Passover, First Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Passover, Second Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Passover, Seventh Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Samuel 22:1-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Passover, Eighth Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaiah 10:32-12:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.
### 1966, April 21—May 29

#### IYAR 29 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Iyar 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tazria', Mazora'</td>
<td>Levit. 12:1-15:33</td>
<td>II Kings 7:3-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ahare Mot, Kedoshim</td>
<td>Levit. 16:1-20:27</td>
<td>Amos 9:7-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Emor</td>
<td>Levit. 21:1-24:23</td>
<td>Ezekiel 44:15-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lag ba-'Omer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*
### 1966, May 20—June 18] SIWAN 30 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 20</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Siwan 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shavu'ot, Second Day</td>
<td>{Deut. 15:19-16:17; Num. 28:26-31}</td>
<td>Habakkuk 3:1-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Naso</td>
<td>Num. 4:21-7:89</td>
<td>Judges 13:2-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Be-ha'atotekha</td>
<td>Num. 8:1-12:16</td>
<td>Zechariah 2:14:4:7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*

### 1966, June 19—July 17] TAMMUZ 29 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 19</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Tammuz 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Balaq</td>
<td>Num. 22:2-25:9</td>
<td>Micah 5:6-6:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fast of the 17th of Tammuz</td>
<td>Exod. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55:6-56:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pinehas</td>
<td>Num. 25:10-30:1</td>
<td>Jeremiah 1:1-2:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ma'atot, Mas'ei</td>
<td>Num. 30:2-36:13</td>
<td>Jeremiah 2:4-28; 4:1-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*
### 1966, July 18—Aug. 16] AV 30 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Av 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Devarim (Shabbat Hazon)</td>
<td>Deut. 1:1-3:22</td>
<td>Isaiah 1:1-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wa-ethannan (Shabbat Nahamu)</td>
<td>Deut. 3:23-7:11</td>
<td>Isaiah 40:1-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 6</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>'Ekev</td>
<td>Deut. 7:12-11:25</td>
<td>Isaiah 49:14-51:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Re'eh</td>
<td>Deut. 11:26-16:17</td>
<td>Isaiah 66:1-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Previous Evening: Book of Lamentations is Read

### 1966, Aug. 17—Sept. 14] ELUL 29 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Elul 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shofetim</td>
<td>Deut. 16:18-21:9</td>
<td>Isaiah 51:12-52:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ki teze</td>
<td>Deut. 21:10-25:19</td>
<td>Isaiah 54:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 3</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ki tavo</td>
<td>Deut. 26:1-29:8</td>
<td>Isaiah 60:1-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Nizzavim Wa-yelekh</td>
<td>Deut. 29:9-31:30</td>
<td>Isaiah 61:10-63:9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVAL, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 15</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Tishri 1</td>
<td>Rosh Ha-shanah, First Day</td>
<td>Gen. 21:1-34</td>
<td>I Samuel 1:1-2:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 29:1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 29:1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ha'azinu</td>
<td>Deut. 32:1-52</td>
<td>Hosea 14:2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Shabbat Shuvah)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Micah 7:18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joel 2:15-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hosea 14:2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Micah 7:18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34:1-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yom Kippur</td>
<td>Morning:</td>
<td>Isaiah 57:14-58:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levit. 16:1-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 29:7-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Afternoon:</td>
<td>Jonath 1:1-4:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levit. 18:1-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 29:12-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sukkot, Second Day</td>
<td>Levit. 22:26-23:44</td>
<td>I Kings 8:2-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 29:12-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 1</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td>Exod. 33:12-34:26</td>
<td>Ezekiel 38:18-39:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 29:17-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>S-T</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>Hol ha-Mo'ed</td>
<td>S Num. 29:20-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M Num. 29:23-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T Num. 29:26-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hosh'a'na Rabbah</td>
<td>Num. 29:26-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Shemini 'Azeret</td>
<td>Deut. 14:22-16:17</td>
<td>I Kings 8:54-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 29:35-30:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Simhat Torah</td>
<td>Deut. 33:1-34:12</td>
<td>Joshua 1:1-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen. 1:1-2:3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 29:35-30:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Be-reshit</td>
<td>Gen. 1:1-6:8</td>
<td>Isaiah 42:5-43:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaiah 42:5-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.*
### 1966, Oct. 15—Nov. 13 | HESHWAN 29 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 28:9-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lekh lekha</td>
<td>Gen. 12:1-17:27</td>
<td>Isaiah 40:27-41:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 5</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hayye Sarah</td>
<td>Gen. 23:1-25:18</td>
<td>I Kings 1:1-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Toledot</td>
<td>Gen. 25:19-28:9</td>
<td>I Samuel 20:18-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.

### 1966, Nov. 14—Dec. 13 | KISLEW 30 DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hosea 11:7-12:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wa-ye'ese</td>
<td>Gen. 28:10-32:3</td>
<td>Hosea 11:7-12:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wa-yishlah</td>
<td>Gen. 32:4-36:43</td>
<td>Obadiah 1:1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 3</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Wa-yeshev</td>
<td>Gen. 37:1-40:23</td>
<td>Amos 2:6-3:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>Th-F</td>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>Hanukkah, First to Second Day</td>
<td>Th Num. 7:1-17</td>
<td>Zechariah 2:14-4:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Num. 7:18-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mi-kez; Hanukkah, Third Day</td>
<td>Gen. 41:1-44:17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Num. 7:24-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>S-M</td>
<td>28-29</td>
<td>Hanukkah, Fourth to Fifth Day</td>
<td>S Num. 7:30-41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M Num. 7:36-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day; Hanukkah, Sixth Day</td>
<td>Num. 28:1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Date</th>
<th>Day of the Week</th>
<th>Jewish Date</th>
<th>SABBATHS, FESTIVALS, FASTS</th>
<th>PENTATEUCHAL READING</th>
<th>PROPHETICAL READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hanukkah, Eighth Day</td>
<td>Num. 7:54-8:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wa-yiggash</td>
<td>Gen. 44:18-47:27</td>
<td>Ezekiel 37:15-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fast of the 10th of Tevet</td>
<td>Exod. 32:11-14; 34:1-10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55:6-58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Italics are for Sephardic Minhag.
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The seventy-sixth annual meeting of The Jewish Publication Society of America was convened at three o’clock in the afternoon on Sunday, June 7, 1964, in the JPS Building, 222 N. 15th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Mr. Sol Satinsky, President of the Society, presided at the meeting, with an audience of approximately 150 members and officials in attendance.

The invocation was delivered by Dr. Solomon Grayzel, Editor of the Society. Mr. Satinsky then extended greetings on behalf of the Officers and Trustees and proceeded with the business of the Annual Meeting.
Report of the Committee on Nominations and By-Laws

It is a pleasure to rise to present, for the first time in this splendid new building of the Society, the Report of the Committee on Nominations and By-Laws.

In last year's Report of this Committee, special mention was made of the facts that the Honorable Horace Stern was being nominated for his 51st term as an officer of the Society, and that plans were being made to honor, with appropriate ceremonies, Justice Stern's notable service to the Society during more than a half century.

This year, your Committee has concluded that after 51 terms as Vice President (interrupted only by service as President during a brief interim period), Chief Justice Stern is entitled to a change in office. It is with great pride, therefore, that we shall place him in nomination today as an Honorary President of the Society. And as all of you know, we shall have an opportunity to express our admiration, affection and esteem for him at the dinner this evening.

We have had a vacancy in the office of Vice President for some time, and the election of Justice Stern as an Honorary President will create a second one. In its nominations for these two posts, your Committee is rewarding particularly outstanding service performed for the Society by two of its Trustees. Both are busy men of affairs and we are highly gratified that they have agreed to permit our Committee to nominate them. I refer to Joseph M. First and David C. Melnicoff.

Last year, I reported for the Committee that we were exploring the question whether to limit the number of successive terms to which any officer, other than our Editor, our Chairman of the Publication Committee, and our Executive Director could be elected, and I mentioned some of the benefits which we might expect from such action. The subject is still under study, and we hope to present a definitive recommendation in the year ahead.

This has been a productive year in the life of the Society. The splendid, and obviously well planned, new building in which we meet today is typical of the laudable results we have been enjoying from the solid leadership and the dedicated efforts of our President, Sol Satinsky, and the work and cooperation of our officers and Board of Trustees. Mr. Satinsky is once again most desirous of relinquishing the Presidency, on the ground that even four terms are too many. After considerable persuasion by our Committee, Mr. Satinsky finally agreed to postpone for one more year only his resolve to step down from the Presidency.

Our Committee is especially gratified, too, to present for reelection our Editor, Dr. Solomon Grayzel, who has completed a quarter of a century of distinguished and productive service in this office, the Chairman of our Publication Committee, Mr. Edwin Wolf, 2nd, and our Executive Director, Mr. Lesser Zussman; their contributions to the work of the Society during the past year have met and even exceeded the high standards these men have established in past years.

To fill two vacancies in the Board of Trustees, your Committee is nominating Harold L. Zellerbach of San Francisco, one of that city's most active citizens in civic, communal, and philanthropic activities, who, as a Trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, has occasion to come to Philadelphia from time to time; and Edward H. Rosen, one of the most active and promising younger men in the Philadelphia community, who already has made most creditable contributions to charitable and fraternal activities in our City.

Mr. President, I have the pleasure to present to you, for a unanimous Committee, the following nominations for the Officers and Honorary Officers to serve for the ensuing year, and for Trustees to be reelected, and new Trustees to be elected, for terms of three years each:
OFFICERS

President:  SOL SATINSKY (5th term)
Vice Presidents:  DR. JACOB R. MARCUS (10th term)
               BERNARD L. FRANKEL (5th term)
               BERNARD G. SEGAL (5th term)
               JOSEPH M. FIRST (1st term)
               DAVID C. MELNICOFF (1st term)

Chairman, Publication Committee:  EDWIN WOLF, 2nd (4th term)
Treasurer:  MYER FEINSTEIN (12th term)
Secretary:  JEROME J. SHESTACK (5th term)
Editor:  DR. SOLOMON GRAYZEL (26th term)
Executive Director:  LESSER ZUSSMAN (15th term)

HONORARY PRESIDENTS

JACK SOLIS-COHEN, JR.
HONORABLE LOUIS E. LEVINTHAL
HONORABLE HORACE STERN

TRUSTEES

For reelection to three-year terms:
HONORABLE DAVID L. BAZELON, Washington
ROBERT J. BLOCK, Seattle
HONORABLE PHILLIP FORMAN, Trenton
LEO GUZIK, New York
MAXWELL M. RABB, New York
FRANK J. RUBINSTEIN, Baltimore
HONORABLE SIMON SOBELLOFF, Baltimore
ADMIRAL LEWIS L. STRAUSS, Washington
SAUL VIENER, Richmond

For election as new Trustees to three-year terms:
HAROLD L. ZELLERBACH, San Francisco
EDWARD H. ROSEN, Philadelphia

Respectfully submitted,
BERNARD G. SEGAL, Chairman
JOSEPH M. FIRST
DAVID C. MELNICOFF
JEROME J. SHESTACK
EDWIN WOLF, 2nd
LESSER ZUSSMAN, Secretary
SOL SATINSKY, Ex Officio

Treasurer's Report

Mr. Myer Feinstein, Treasurer, reported as follows:

It is good to be able to report that the Society had the highest income in its
history during the year 1963, due to publication of the new translation of THE
TORAH. This one title brought in a total of $203,943 against expenditures for
production and promotion of $178,569, so that a net gain of $25,374 was added
to the Bible Fund.
Income from sources other than THE TORAH amounted to $438,677 compared with $464,556 in 1962. Of this amount, $134,830 came from membership dues—a 4% gain over the amount of $129,299 in 1962. Income from the sale of books and bibles amounted to $246,918, a decrease of 17% when compared with $295,959 in 1962—no doubt accounted for by sales of THE TORAH, since combined income amounted to $450,861—a gain of 52% over 1962. Miscellaneous income in 1963 was $56,929 compared with $39,298 in 1962. This substantial difference is due to our publication of four books from the Jacob R. Schiff Fund in 1963 compared with one in 1962.

Expenditures for the year 1963, again exclusive of THE TORAH, amounted to $446,806 compared with $461,817 in 1962. Expenses of administration and distribution remained fairly level, so that practically all of the decrease was accounted for by lower book manufacturing costs based on decreased sales.

It is also good to be able to report that we received two substantial bequests during the year. The first, in an amount of $100,000 from the Adolph Amram Estate, will provide an annual grant of $4,000 for the writing of a scholarly book. The second, from the estate of former Trustee Howard W. Levy in an amount of $30,000, provides that the income may be used for the general purposes of the Society. We treasure the memories of both donors.

Executive Director’s Report

Mr. Lesser Zussman, Executive Director, presented an informal report dealing with the planning and activities which went into construction of the new building. He also discussed the hope of the Society that the building would become a cultural center and that visitors from all over the world would be attracted to the exhibits, displays and events which are projected. Thanks were extended to the officers and members of the staff for their cooperation during the rebuilding experience.

Publication Committee Report

Mr. Edwin Wolf, 2nd, Chairman of the Publication Committee, reported as follows:

The aim of any publisher is to get the most books into the hands of the most people. There are some publishers who strive to achieve this goal without regard to the quality of the work they disseminate. A high proportion of today’s best-sellers is the result of our age’s characteristic chase after the dollar. About the only question the entrepreneur of this kind of reading matter asks is “Will it sell?” Consequently, bookstores are flooded with the cheap, tawdry, meretricious and well-advertised writing tricks of the moment.

The Jewish Publication Society has exactly the same aim as the most venal publisher of borderline pornography: we want to get the maximum number of books into the hands of readers. Our ultimate aim is not, however, merely the profit which will accrue—although we are not averse to financial success—but the knowledge of Jews, Judaism and Jewishness which will be spread. Our planning must, therefore, be different from that of the purely commercial house.

We have had as our motto for many decades: “Jewish Books in Jewish Homes.” And we have thereby implicitly meant good Jewish books. Yet, we have been faced with what has always been a difficult matter of judgment concerning the type—but not the quality—of the books we publish. Among our members are those who are beginning their search into the meaning of their Jewish heritage, men and women who are not accustomed to the weighty building of sound scholarship, who want and need a text which explains its subject simply, easily and clearly. At the other extreme we have a Jewishly very sophisticated readership. They are knowledgeable about history, philosophy, religion, sociology, anthropology, archaeology,
art and literature. Bookishly speaking, they have strong digestive tracts. They are seeking the esoteric, the scholarly, the original work.

Between these two extremes the Society is forced to operate, looking with one eye towards a group of readers who are just beginning to learn about the complicated, composite background of Jews and with the other eye to those who want a serious addition of a highly technical nature to their already considerable knowledge.

In one year, as that just past, we seem to lean in our choice to the latter, and when we do, the former group expresses its discontent in no uncertain terms. Davis's history of the Conservative movement, Guttmann's account of Jewish philosophy, Kaplan's interpretation of Hermann Cohen and Blau's and Baron's documentary compilation of early American history are not children's books. They are nuts hard to crack, but filled with the sweet meat of sound scholarship. We consider them important contributions to the world literature on the Jew. We have no apologies to make for having published them.

Yet, we are aware that works such as these sit unread on the shelves of many of our members. It is our hope that over a period of years they may, by regular intellectual exercise, gain the strength to enjoy what now seems beyond their strength. Thoughtful reading is not a gift. It is rather a skill that comes from practice. It is like skiing. You learn techniques and gain confidence on gentle slopes to enable you to enjoy the thrill of a mountain trail. We can assure you that books for beginners have been and will be published by the Society, and many books for those a bit more advanced.

In the coming year a number of good books will appear which our average reader can enjoy and our academic reader equally appreciate. Two art books, on the architecture of the European synagogue (from last year's list) and on art in the modern American synagogue (to come next year), are pioneer works which should have a wide appeal. Alexandra Levin's biography of Harry Friedenwald is in the same warm, personal vein as her excellent life of Henrietta Szold. An anthology of articles from the once highly influential Menorah will revive and give permanence to many essays on Jewish life which influenced the past generation, but which the present generation has never read. A collection of American Jewish autobiographies, edited by Harold Ribalow, will make vivid our past in this country. And most timely, in view of the critical situation at the present time, will be Joseph Bentwich's survey of education in Israel.

Our president's annual report in the next Year Book will list in formal fashion the books published and to be published. It is my responsibility only to explain, to philosophize and to speak for about ten minutes. Some explanation of our difficulties in the selection of books I have given. I have philosophized about American Jewish life, at length and elsewhere, and would only repeat myself by continuing my dialogue with myself here. I cannot, however, permit this occasion to pass without paying tribute to the Society as one of the major forces in this country for the preservation and dissemination of what is the best in our Jewish heritage.

If American Jewry is to survive, it will be because Jews have a knowledge of their heritage and consider it a privilege to share in it. I know of no better way of acquiring that knowledge than through the reading of books. Part of my prescription for the maintenance of American Jewry is then to support the Jewish Publication Society not only financially but—even more important—by reading its books. A significant by-product of the kind of quality publishing we do is the encouragement of Jewish scholarship. The building blocks of our Jewish future will be the scholars who write and are published and an informed laity who will respect them and read their writings. This has been one of the elements of Jewish strength in the past. It must be assured for the future. With your help the Jewish Publication Society will continue to make its contribution.
And now I have philosophized, and I have also spoken ten minutes. My immediate responsibilities are ended. I can assure you, however, that the work of the Publication Committee will go on. Even now manuscripts are in the hands of intelligent and faithful readers who recommend that we do or do not publish them. Even now our hard-working editor is struggling with books in various states of production. And continually we are thinking and planning for new projects which we hope will meet your pleasure and make—as so many of our books have made—a worthy contribution to Jewish life.

Report of the President

Mr. Sol Satinsky, President, presented his report for the year 1963 as printed below.

Program

Dr. Solomon Grayzel read a paper titled "Renewal and Dedication" in honor of the new building. The paper was enthusiastically received by the audience and a suggestion was made that the paper be published in The Bookmark. (Printed in issue dated September, 1964.)

The meeting was adjourned at five o'clock and was followed by a reception.

Respectfully submitted,
JEROME J. STESTACK, Secretary

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT
FOR THE YEAR 1963

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Our reports at these annual meetings are divided into facts, figures and interpretations. The figures have been presented by the treasurer and the interpretation of our program by the chairman of the Publication Committee. It is now my job to give you a condensed report of the Society’s life this past year.

1963 Publication Program

During the past year, we published a total of seventeen volumes, of which thirteen were hardbound and four were paperback reprints. The titles, with the statistical record of month published, quantity printed, and distribution during the calendar year, are:

- Essays and Portraits in Anglo-Jewish History by Cecil Roth  Jan. 4,250 2,126
- The Pharisees (Third Edition, Revised) by Louis Finkelstein 2 volumes  Feb. 3,825 sets 2,954 sets
- A Treasury of Responsa by Solomon B. Freehof  Feb. 4,250 3,489
- In the Thicket by Solomon Simon  June 4,000 2,039
- The Emergence of Conservative Judaism by Moshe Davis  Sept. 4,350 3,907
- Isaiah: The Mighty Voice by Miriam Gilbert (A Covenant Book)  Sept. 4,550 1,969
American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 64 edited by Morris Fine and Milton Himmelfarb. (Co-published with the American Jewish Committee)

The History of the Jews of Milwaukee by Louis J. Swichkow and Lloyd P. Gartner

Philosophies of Judaism by Julius Guttmann. (Co-published with Holt, Rinehart and Winston)


PAPERBACKS: (Co-published with Meridian Books of The World Publishing Co.)

The Wild Goats of Ein Gedi by Herbert Wiener

Jewish Magic and Superstition by Joshua Trachtenberg

The Earth Is the Lord's and The Sabbath by Abraham J. Heschel

A Rabbinic Anthology edited by C. G. Montifiore and H. Loewe

1963 Reprints

We reprinted ten titles during the year, with the statistical record of number of volumes reprinted and total in print as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Torah: A New Translation</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Holy Scriptures (1917 translation)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>978,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Through the Bible by Mortimer J. Cohen</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>167,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A History of the Jews by Solomon Grayzel</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>65,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Book of Ruth by Jacob Steinhardt</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Book of Psalms</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>32,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legends of the Bible by Louis Ginzberg (J.P.S. Edition)</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>15,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Exiled and the Redeemed by Izhak Ben-Zvi</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>10,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Prophets by Abraham J. Heschel (J.P.S. edition)</td>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>5,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Einstein by William Wise (A Covenant Book)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publication Distribution

Our 1963 distribution was the highest in the Society's history, due to The Torah, of which 112,151 copies were distributed. In addition, we distributed 149,192 copies of other books, with 46,226 selected by members, 99,881 to bookstores and other customers, and 3,085 distributed as free books.

Bible sales in 1963 declined by 3%, with 42,106 copies distributed compared with 43,448 in 1962. Distribution of Pathways Through the Bible also declined, with 12,921 volumes in 1963 compared with 13,363 in 1962—a decrease of 3%.
Membership Statistics

Our membership enrollment increased by 3% during 1963—from 11,152 to 11,524—so that we have enjoyed increases in enrollment during eight of the past nine years.

The details on our enrollment are: 3,949 new members (including 2,586 gift members) and 7,575 renewals. Of the total, 5,697 were enrolled at the $6.00 level, 4,099 at $12.50, 1,040 at $25.00, and 688 at $30.00 and higher. In addition, we enrolled 284 children as Covenant Book members.

Bible Translation

Several references to the new Bible translation have been made in this report, but the project merits special mention. It is the most eventful undertaking in the Society’s recent history and the international acceptance and acclaim which The Torah received proves that a long-felt need has been met and that completion of the work is eagerly anticipated by both scholars and laymen. In this connection, I can report that the work of the Bible Translation Committee is continuing and that we hope to publish The Torah with Haftarot and the Megillot in Hebrew and English during the year 1967. Before then, it is our hope that Dr. Ephraim Speiser will complete the book of “Notes on the New Translation of The Torah” which he is editing in cooperation with the Translation Committee, and that this important volume will be published in 1967. After publication of The Torah in Hebrew and English, we look forward to completion of The Prophets, The Writings, and other books which will materialize as a result of the Translation Committee’s work.

Our sincere appreciation is extended to Doctors Ginsberg, Speiser, Orlinsky, Arzt, Bamberger, Freedman and Grayzel. May God grant them good health and strength as they continue with this important work.

Before leaving this subject, I should like to extend thanks to Mr. Harry Scherman and his associates at The-Book-of-the-Month Club. They gave extensive publicity to publication of The Torah and succeeded in distributing a very substantial number of volumes to their subscribers. Their advertisements were widespread and included such periodicals as Fortune and Life, so that the new translation received publicity in media which we couldn’t possibly have afforded on our own.

Bible Fund

We launched the Second Bible Fund at the end of 1962 to raise funds for continuation of the work of translation. Our goal is $500,000.00, which amount is estimated as needed to complete the work. Thus far (as of May 1, 1964) we have received $122,225.00 in pledges, so that a substantial portion of our goal has been reached. We are confident that the full amount will be obtained with the continued help of those who are interested in assuring the successful completion of this monumental undertaking.

Necrology

Four valued colleagues were lost to us during the past year: Izhak Ben-Zvi, President of the State of Israel and author of The Exiled and the Redeemed which we published in 1957; Dr. Franz Landsberger, author of Rembrandt, The Jews and the Bible which we published in 1946; Rev. Dr. Felix A. Levy, rabbi and educator, was a member of the Publication Committee since 1939; Rev. Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, communal leader and author, was a member of the Board of Trustees from
1925 to 1949 and author of *Where Judaism Differed* which we published in 1957. Their memories will be cherished among us.

Such, in brief, is the story of an eventful year in the Society's history. Behind this story lie the increasing efforts of our officers, trustees, publication committee and staff—efforts directed not only to make our work more effective, but also to expand it and make our institution more vital and dynamic. You can take it for granted that we have explored every avenue that opened up, and we hope to continue to do so in the years to come. Thus, we shall fulfill the Society's purpose of promoting and enhancing our Jewish culture and religion through the publication of good books.
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