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Two decades after the survivors of Nazism began to resume their old lives or build new ones, Arnold Mandel takes stock of the Jewish communities in the free countries of Europe. His article is an assessment of communal institutions and leaders; of the effect of change—not least the creation of the State of Israel—on the young generation of Jews, and of the contribution the European communities are likely to make to Jewish life.

The second major article, "The Purposes of the Jewish Community Center Movement: An Appraisal of Their Operation," is based on an exhaustive study conducted by Dr. Carl Urbont, who directs the YM and YWHA at 92nd Street in New York City, one of the largest and most active community centers in the United States. His findings are important at a time when there is much uncertainty and discussion about the prospects for Jewish commitment, generally, and the center movement, specifically.

Our readers will also find several articles in the Review of the Year of particular interest:

In "Intergroup Relations and Tensions in the United States," Lucy S. Dawidowicz gives a comprehensive picture of the relations and reactions among antisemitism, rightist extremism, the civil-rights movement and its growing militancy, and church-state issues. Her analysis of vandalism and violence for "kicks" and the tolerant passivity with which society tends to treat them is disquieting.

Erich Rosenthal's "Interrmarriage in Indiana," his third study on the subject to appear in the Year Book, shows how such factors as place of residence and previous marital status affect the intermarriage rate.

"The United States, Israel, and the Middle East," by George E. Gruen, is important as a detailed account of conditions leading up to the war in the Middle East in June 1967. The forthcoming volume of the Year Book will deal at some length with this conflict and its repercussions.

Professor Daniel J. Elazar's "Pursuit of Community: Selections from the Literature of Jewish Public Affairs, 1965–1966," is a bibliographical essay on recent Jewish social research. We draw particular attention to his theory
of a Jewish public law. An essay of this character will henceforth replace the “American Jewish Bibliography,” for twenty-four years, until Vol. 66, a staple of the Year Book. The need for change had become increasingly apparent with the steady increase in the number, diversity, and specialization of books in English about themes of direct Jewish interest. We wish to express our gratitude to Miss Iva Cohen, assistant librarian of the Blaustein Library of the American Jewish Committee, for having so exemplarily well discharged the responsibility of selecting, annotating, and presenting the old bibliography for twenty-two years. It is our intention that Vol. 69 will contain an article on recent literature that may be broadly classified as Wissenschaft des Judentums. In future, belles lettres will probably not be included —there simply is too much.

We take this opportunity to express our deep sense of loss at the untimely death of Dessie E. Kushell, director of administration of the American Jewish Committee, a good friend of the Year Book and its editors. They will miss equally her personal warmth and her professional understanding.

We wish to thank our colleagues for their cooperation: Mrs. Stella Ettlinger, for technical assistance and preparation of the directories, necrology, and index, and Harry J. Alderman, director of the Blaustein Library, his staff, and Mrs. Lotte Zajac for their aid in providing reference material. Steven Frieder assisted in editing. Rabbi Naftoli Richter prepared the calendars. Mrs. Marjorie Rader read proof.
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Special Articles
The Jews in Western Europe Today

by Arnold Mandel

The emancipation of the Jews in Europe marked the beginning of an illustrious period of Jewish achievements in all fields of human endeavor. This chapter in Jewish history came to a tragic close with the beginning of the Nazi era and the subsequent massacre of six million Jews, the destruction of their communities and the sequestration of their possessions.

In 1939 Europe’s Jewish population numbered 9.5 million, or 58 per cent of the world total. Today, some four million Jews, or 30 per cent of the total, are scattered in many communities. Of these, the largest part live in the countries behind the iron curtain.

In Western Europe their number had been reduced from 1.3 million in 1939, to an estimated 330,000 shortly after the cessation of hostilities. Survivors were in constant flux, with migration westward and repatriation occurring daily. The return of some West European Jews to their former or new homes and the influx of displaced persons from Eastern Europe raised their number to some 1.2 million today.

The pitiful remnants in the formerly Nazi-occupied countries found themselves deprived of their age-old institutions and of the culture that had been built up throughout centuries. The intellectual elite and the communal leaders were gone. Strenuous efforts were made to rebuild institutions, but the situation in most countries does not augur the return of a vigorous Jewish community life. The Nazi holocaust had brought to an end what Salo Baron calls “the golden age of Ashkenazi Jews” in Europe.

Present Status of the Communities

France

If an entity like a West European Jewish community really existed, its present center would be France. Since, however, there actually is no West European Jewry having common traits, but only some Jews in
Western Europe and some distinctly different Judaisms, the French community does not constitute a center, or it is a center without a periphery.

With some 520,000 Jews, France stands fourth in world Jewish population, immediately after Israel. The state of Judaism in the country is, on the whole, substantially better than it was before the Second World War when its spiritual content was quite superficial, and the intellectual level of its organizational structure extremely low. Yet, the present stirring is not a sign of vigorous recovery which might be expected to go on to new accomplishments. It is rather a new phase in a process which has been a constant feature of French Jewish life: a sudden and unpredictable change, always engendered by a propitious accident, like a last chance given at the very last moment.

At the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, French Jewry seemed doomed to extinction. Then it was replaced—rather than reinforced or consolidated—by successive waves of Jewish migration from Eastern Europe. With the means available, these immigrants, who originally came for political and later for economic reasons, created a new Jewish community, one based on memories of the East European shtetl. By the twenties, the Russian and Rumanian Jews, who had come to France between 1900 and 1914, were already largely assimilated and alienated from Judaism. (The war of 1914-18, with its aura of union sacrée, embracing numerous foreign Jewish volunteers, was a very strong force for accelerated assimilation.) Then came the massive wave of Jewish immigration from Poland. The same process repeated itself; a new contingent of Jews replaced those who had dropped out of the community, only to be themselves diluted. In this respect, the period between 1936 and 1939 was the nadir. Immigration became a transit of frightened and pursued refugees. The German Jews, who then arrived in Paris, were generally badly received, and there was little likelihood that they would revitalize French Jewish life.

After the Second World War, particularly between 1950 and 1962, came the Jews from North Africa. The Moroccan and Tunisian Jews were the first to arrive, and they are still coming in; then followed, at one massive stroke, almost all the Jews of Algeria, at the instant when that country became independent. The conspicuous presence of the North African Jews in France and their numerical predominance (200,000) almost entirely changed the social composition of French Jewry, as well as its geographic distribution. Regions such as the Vendée, Brittany, and Normandy in the West, which had had no Jews since the
Middle Ages, again became centers of Jewish life. So did other areas, such as the Southwest, which had formerly been Sephardi centers, but in which the indigenous Jewish populations had almost entirely vanished. Until quite recently, the Ashkenazi ritual, practiced by the Jews of Alsatian birth or descent, who were to be found in all Jewish centers and constituted the active, influential core of French Jewry, and by the overwhelming majority of immigrants (with the exception of a trickle from the Balkans and the Levant), had been dominant in French Judaism. Today it is Sephardism in its specific North African forms that prevails everywhere. The Alsatian and other communities, which for generations had not seen a Mediterranean Jew even at a distance, now have Sephardi synagogues and North African rabbis.

The entry of a large sector of North African Jews into French Jewish life has its desirable as well as undesirable aspects. On the negative side, for instance, it has been accompanied by a perceptible drop in the community's cultural level. Compared to the Jewish learning of East European Jewish immigrants, even the humblest of them, the confused rudiments which the new arrivals bring with them are insignificant. And because the broad masses of Jews in France now have much less knowledge and a substantially lower intellectual receptivity, the danger of assimilation at the bottom, having a common denominator of inferior quality, is greater than ever before. Nevertheless, North African Jewry does not lack its intellectuals or scholars. Chief among them is Léon Askenazi, the philosopher, Talmudist, and cabbalist, who heads the seminary of Jewish studies at Orsay in the southern suburb of Paris. His students, only a few dozen of the intellectual elite, help make the institute a phenomenon in Europe (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 214, 215; 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 311). But among the North Africans, the gulf between the "bearers of culture" and the majority is much greater than, for example, among the Jews of Eastern Europe, and often the intellectuals are entirely cut off from their popular "base."

The fact that the North Africans do not share the Western Jew's modern experience also separates them from other sectors of the community. If the Algerian Jews, who are gallicized and completely integrated into French culture, did not even approach intellectual participation in the great developments of modern Jewish history—Zionism as a complex ideology; the labor and revolutionary movements; Liberal and neo-Orthodox Judaism; modern Jewish philosophic movements—this was all the more true of the Moroccan and Tunisian Jews.
On the positive side is a great emotional receptivity among these masses, a spontaneous and sensitive pride in their Jewishness which dispenses with all justification and the need for expression or for an intense inner life. To a world of profoundly blasé individuals who have lost the capacity of wonder, these humble people among the North African Jews bring an enthusiasm of which Western Jewry has long been deprived. When one visits their quarters one often has the feeling of returning to a sort of first day of creation, so great and lively are their spirit of enterprise and their truly youthful energy. Indeed, they would be ideally suited to become the disciples of a new form of hasidism.

The general improvement in the basic attitudes of French Jewry finds no expression or reflection in its institutional life. There, we find either ancient and outmoded structures or various types of administrative setups using the latest office equipment and procedures. Yet, on the periphery of this somewhat bureaucratic element, there is evidence of a new Jewish stirring in France. This stirring is perceptible also in the new French Jewish literature—which tends to assess and, indeed, extol the Jewish aspects of the human adventure—as well as in various initiatives and researches spontaneously undertaken. Though often of minor import, these projects are always begun for their potential to help enrich Jewish life, if for no other reason.

But this nascent impulse is already threatened. There is birth and there is death, and it does not follow that the contemplation of the one must keep us from seeing the other. While there are different manifestations of Jewish vitality in the literary, artistic, and scientific spheres, and in religion itself, there also proceeds, with an inexorable automatism and on a massive scale, an assimilation without name or face, anonymous and blind; a meshing of gears. A good number of the new North African immigrants are undergoing automatic assimilation that is terribly rapid, definitive, and irreversible because it is brought about by their proletarianization. At the same time, there is a minority of young university-trained intellectuals with a Talmudic and even cabbalistic education, who have the potentiality to bring about Jewish spiritual and religious renaissance. One may foresee a kind of selection that will set apart a minority capable of carrying on and transmitting Judaism, from a majority which will disappear, insofar as their Jewishness is concerned, more rapidly than did the earlier strata of indigenous French Jews and East European immigrants, simply because everything moves more rapidly today than
in the first half of the “century of speed.” The process is already under way and is accelerating.

The fervor and the intensity of Jewishness among the North African newcomers have not yet found appropriate expression. They have no possibility of continuing the tradition of the old Judaism of the Maghreb, which—especially in Algeria—had already been in an advanced state of decay before the great exodus. At the same time, the Jews from the Maghreb cannot be expected to adhere to the patterns of French Judaism with its weaknesses and unattractiveness. Pending the crystallization of this situation, the vigorous among the young North African Jews are flocking to Orthodox Judaism as well as to Zionist youth groups of the extreme left, particularly Ha-shomer Ha-tza'ir.

One can therefore speak of a movement in France today which has not yet defined itself, a state of receptivity making the French Jewish community a sort of new Jewish missionary territory. But the circumstances are somewhat reminiscent of Pirandello’s *Six Characters in Search of an Author*; the missionaries are not yet at hand. Political developments, unless they involve Israel, seem to have little effect on the thinking and attitudes of the French Jews. They feel a certain hesitation and a sense of discomfort in the face of the anti-Americanism of de Gaulle’s policy and of the extreme left. Allowing for differences in the two situations, the significance for Jews of systematic anti-Americanism can be akin to that of systematic anti-Israelism, since both place them in opposition to a great Jewish center of gravity.

During the June 1967 Middle East crisis, there was in France among Jews of all shades of opinion, including those far removed from Judaism, extraordinary unanimity of disquiet and solicitude and favoritism for Israel. The intensity of this reaction was quite unexpected. It surprised and, at times, also shocked the French non-Jews.

**Belgium**

In its organizational structure, as well as in its approach to the fact and problems of Judaism, the more than 40,000 Belgian Jews have always tended to follow the French example, as indicated by the similarity of the Jewish consistories in Brussels and in Paris. But the destruction of about half of the indigenous Belgian Jewish population and the gradual influx of East and West European displaced persons to fill the void changed the situation, and little similarity exists at present. Above all, the difference is determined by the diversity of Belgian culture which is
shaped by the influences of both the French- and Belgian-speaking sections of the population.

But this diversity also acts as a deterrent to assimilation, particularly among Jews of humble faith, and is partly responsible for the survival of Yiddish among the Jews.

On the whole, the Jews of Antwerp (13,000) are neither culturally nor linguistically gallicized, although French is spoken in most bourgeois circles. They are personified in the familiar and picturesque diamond worker of the Pelikanstraat, the city’s Jewish quarter, who is quite close to hasidism and speaks Yiddish at home. Since Antwerp’s diamond industry is entirely Jewish, he even conducts his business in that language; yet he is not a Yiddishist, for he manifests a total indifference toward Yiddish literature. In his contacts with his non-Jewish neighbors, he speaks Flemish.

The Brussels community consisting of more than half of Belgium’s Jews (24,000) is as different as can be from that of Antwerp. Assimilation, especially in the form of intermarriage, is very strong in the capital—above all among the students. Here can also be found a concentration of some North African Jews who crossed the French frontier, and brought Sephardi Judaism into Belgium. In Antwerp, on the other hand, Orthodoxy and piety are dominant and exert a certain moral pressure that no one can easily escape without putting himself beyond the pale of Jewish society. And in Antwerp this means putting himself beyond the pale of society as a whole, and creating economic difficulties for himself. The smaller Jewish communities, such as Liège and Charleroi, lead a rather vegetative life and are rarely heard from.

Aside from Zionism and pro-Israelism, which occupy a very prominent place, especially in Brussels, major Jewish activities center on antisemitism and its dangers. One turns in different directions to recite the “anti-anti-semite” prayer of exorcism—toward Munich, Moscow, and across the ocean, toward Buenos Aires. Occasion for alarm about the situation within Belgium is not rare, for its powerful and virulent Flemish nationalist movement spreads an atmosphere of “classical” Catholic clericalism of the extreme right which is impregnated with xenophobia and antisemitism.

Luxembourg

In matters Jewish, the little Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is partly dependent on Belgium and partly on neighboring French Lorraine. There
are no more than a thousand Jews in this country, which is under the moral and political dominance of Catholic clericalism.

**The Netherlands**

The Jewish community of the Netherlands was more cruelly tried by the Hitlerite massacres than any other in Western Europe and today it is only a shadow of what it was before the war. But that shadow reproduces faithfully enough, both in form and essence, what it once had been. The traditional structure of institutional Judaism with its strict division into neatly delineated sectors of Orthodoxy, Conservatism, and Liberalism, are maintained. The accent is placed, almost exclusively, on religious life. Even the relative estrangement between the Ashkenazim and the very old Portuguese community has largely remained what it was in the days when the Jewish community of Holland was happy and prosperous. Only the tradition of Sephardi endogamy—the refusal on principle of the Portuguese to enter what they considered a *mésalliance* with members of the Ashkenazi community—has fallen into disuse.

In sharp contrast to the situation in the past, when they were the *avant-garde* elements in literary movements, Dutch Jews today have scant involvement in the great political and literary movements. There was, for example, no Jewish participation in the recent upheaval of Dutch youth, with its tumultuous long-haired protagonists known as Provos, the self-styled "Provocateurs."

**Italy**

The visitor to Italy is astonished at the relative vitality of its small Jewish community (35,000). By and large, the Jews of that country, and especially the indigenous population, have certainly been among the culturally most completely assimilated. Their notable participation in the *risorgimento* made them, in a sense, a constituent and founding element of modern Italian history. Assimilation in Italy seems to have made great strides toward the eradication of Jewish particularism, as witness also the historical fact that Mussolini's fascism—as long as it was able to pass for an Italian political movement—had a strong attraction for a section of the Italian Jewish bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, contrary to the usual inference to be drawn from this sort of calculation, the Italian Jewish community, the oldest in the diaspora, does not seem to have taken the final steps which would have meant its total dejudaization.

The crucial period of World War II was the painful occasion of a new awakening of Jewish consciousness among the Italian Jews, many of
whom died in Hitler's extermination camps. The Italian Jew again realized that he shared a destiny with other Jews. The tales of so profoundly Italian a Jewish writer as Giorgio Basani tell of this awakening of consciousness in a minor key of infinite melancholy. At the present time assimilation in Italy, without ever having retreated, would seem to have come to a halt. It became crystallized at a point short of that fatal limit beyond which the Jewish personality is dissolved and annihilated.

In the northern part of the country, the ancient and traditional Jewish communities of Turin, Genoa, Venice, Florence, and Leghorn continue to preserve their Judaism, a Judaism essentially religious but also leaning toward Israel and generally adhering to Zionism. The Milan Jewish community, with 9,000 members, is an example of modern reconstruction in terms of the wealth of its activities. This kehillah is particularly notable for its high level of Jewish education. The majority of the city's Jewish school children go to Jewish schools, a situation without parallel in Western Europe, with the possible exception of Antwerp whose Jewish population is largely hasidic.

The community of Rome, the largest in Italy with 13,000 members, was cruelly put to the test by Nazi atrocities and murders, bearing most heavily on its poor in the old ghetto. This community, too, has been reorganized during the years since the war and also accomplished much in the field of Jewish education. Zionism and attachment to Israel are the important elements in the life of these Jews, even though some of the poorer Jews, who had emigrated to Israel, could not adapt themselves to living conditions and returned to Italy. The Jewish press is remarkable for its stability. Israel, a good, substantial weekly, is published in Rome, and La Rassegna mensile di Israel, an excellent monthly review on a high intellectual level, currently appears in Milan.

Despite their limited sphere, the institutions and structure of the Italian community seem more real than those in the rest of Western Europe. However, since Italian Jews have remained true to the ancient pattern of the autonomous kehillot, each community varies in keeping with its individual situation and climate. And while one can testify to a certain progress in the communities of the North and of Rome, one can also observe the slow extinction of historic Jewish centers in other parts of the country. In Milan, elegant and animated throngs crowd into Jewish meetings and lectures; the great publishers of that enterprising city put out numerous Jewish works in Italian translations. In Naples, a few timeless phantoms stagger into the synagogue.
When major floods ravaged Florence in late autumn of 1966, causing great damage to its beautiful synagogue, the Jews of Italy showed a profound feeling of solidarity in concrete ways. They helped salvage and restore the damaged scrolls of the Law and gave generously for the repair of the synagogue building.

Italian Zionism, though not very important as an organization, is more effective and more earnest than, for instance, that of France. There is, and always has been, a genuine Italian aliyah, not merely an aliyah of transients coming from Italy.

Switzerland

In June 1966 the Jews of Switzerland celebrated the hundredth anniversary of their achievement of equal rights. It was an occasion for both solemn ceremonies, in which high-ranking officials took part, and for evaluating the situation of Swiss Jews. At the moment, their situation is basically an uneasy one.

The Jewish community in the country, and especially in German Switzerland, is essentially a satellite disoriented by the loss of its center. In cultural and religious matters, the Jews of Zurich and Lucerne, Basle and Saint-Gall, were all dependent on the Jewish community of Germany, which usually also supplied their rabbis. With the disappearance of the Jewish communities in Germany, the Swiss Jews found themselves in a state of confusion and perplexity. Their providential salvation during the war, their preservation from the evils that befell their immediate neighbors, also left them with a certain sensitivity in their relations with less fortunate Jews. The leaders of the Swiss community are aware of this psychological fact and seek to overcome it.

Switzerland has fewer than 20,000 Jews, a comparatively small number when considered in relation to the country's natural rate of population growth. Since the Swiss Jewish community suffered no losses through Nazi persecution or through emigration to Israel or elsewhere, its numerical weakness must be ascribed to the complete assimilation of many of its members, a process that undoubtedly began long ago and is still continuing. The new awakening of Jewish consciousness in a tumultuous Europe is having some effect on the Swiss oasis. An effort is being made by the Swiss Jews to bring about some revival of religious Judaism and, with it, a relative slowing down of assimilation.

The loss of the German Jewish community as its supply base, moved Swiss Jewry to find a new center. Indications are that the Geneva com-
munity and the French-speaking Swiss Jews are about to take the leadership from Zurich and the other German-speaking centers. For some time now, the influence of institutions like the Montreux yeshivah and men like Grand Rabbi Alexander Safran of Geneva has been growing. The new and decisive Sephardi content of French Judaism is also having some effect in Latin Switzerland.

Foreigners form a relatively large sector of the community—and in Switzerland this designation is not meaningless. Since citizenship is not easily obtained, most of these people have been permanent residents of the country for many years. In contrast to the situation in the Jewish communities of Alsace and Lorraine in Eastern France, where for years there has been a total fusion of the indigenous Jews and the immigrants from Eastern Europe, the Swiss community is still formally divided into the old outdated categories of Ostjuden (East European Jews) and Westjuden (West European Jews). They even conduct their religious life separately. The religious communities of the East European Jews in German Switzerland, who call themselves Agudat Ahim, continue to preserve their foreign character, though they were established before World War I. This segregation explains the persistence, in both French and German Switzerland, of a cultural Yiddishism, which groups such as the Yiddisher Kultur Verein in Geneva and Peretz Vereine in the German cities seek to preserve.

There has always been a certain uneasiness regarding the situation of the Swiss Jews, one that is difficult to put into words. Their formal emancipation is still short of full realization in the country where the dominant Protestant sector continues to display an unquestionable distrust of minority or exotic elements. Catholics living among Protestant majorities are also subject to certain restrictions, such as the prohibition of the Jesuit order and a great reluctance to grant authorization for the establishment of convents or monasteries. In general, to use the terminology of the antisemites of German Switzerland, the Jews are resented as wesensfremd—essentially foreign to the traditions and way of life of the indigenous population. This is especially so in the countryside and in small rural centers where provincialism is strongly entrenched. Numerous facts attest to this attitude and atmosphere as, for example, the complete absence of Jews, even those of old Swiss stock, from Swiss political life and their very negligible representation in the German, Italian, and French literature of the country.

Although the Swiss prohibition of shehita—a prohibition which the
extreme antisemitic group in the Polish parliament once unsuccessfully tried to pass into law—is officially motivated by the stand of the Society for the Protection of Animals, it probably would not be in force today but for the presence of something that, since the beginning of the nineteenth century, has been called antisemitism.

**Germany and Austria**

The phenomenon of the return of Jews to the German Federal Republic and to Austria is too special, too filled with psychological complexities, to be fitted neatly into the picture of the reconstruction of the Jewish communities of Western Europe. Although both countries are technically part of Central Europe, the German Jew has for so long been the *Westjude*, the prototype of the Western Jew, that it is impossible to omit him, even in his extreme metamorphosis, from an account of the Jews of Western Europe.

In broad terms, the Jews in West Germany (30,000) can be divided into three categories, each with a distinct attitude toward the country. The first are the well advanced in years, who have returned from Israel or from one of the other countries where German Jews found refuge from Nazi persecution, mainly to die in Germany, as pious old Jews of a past era went to Palestine because they wished to be buried there. These are ultra-assimilated and thoroughly German. Living outside of Germany and threatened by Germany from afar, they nevertheless continued to feel part of it and were never able to come to terms with their exile. Many of them can be found in the model homes for the aged of the reestablished communities of West Germany. These men and women, though they are hardly ever aware of it, are the living expression of the terrible tragedy of ultra-assimilation when, in a given situation, the fires of an apocalypse make it stand out sharply. This sector of the "new" Jewish population of West Germany presents no practical problem, for it is a dying generation, without successors or spiritual heirs.

The second category embraces many Jews in the prime of life, including a good number of *yordim* (returnees) from Israel, for whom economic considerations take precedence over all else. They returned to Germany because they had property to recover and indemnities to secure. Even if they are Jews of pure German stock—which is not always the case, for many are Jews of East European origin who happened to be living in Germany at a particular time—they always are Jews in Germany and not Jews *of* Germany. They have no definite plans, even
for the immediate future. Many of them look upon their stay in the country as temporary; and since temporary residence is frequently synonymous with "temporary" profitability, the stay often tends to be prolonged by circumstance. Of course, these Jews have no positive attitude toward the new Germany. Often enough, they have even remained relatively Germanophobe. Zionism, or at least a proclaimed and publicized pro-Israelism, is the essence of the Jewish atmosphere in which they live. The children of the returnees, born and partly raised in Israel, often continue to speak Hebrew; but this obviously does not interfere with their rapid Germanization or re-Germanization in school.

A third category of the Jews are the completely uprooted, often former concentration camp inmates, for whom a moral code has ceased to exist. They live from day to day and try to wring the maximum benefit from what remains of the power of intimidation that former victims of Nazism still have in Germany today. They are the adventurers of a prolonged epilogue, the seekers after gold in a strange and unspeakable Alaska in the heart of Europe.

For several years now, the leaders of the Jewish communal organizations, who are very much concerned with the menace of a resurgent anti-Semitism, have been insisting that the Jews of Germany, whatever their situation, must no longer consider themselves automatically entitled to privileges. To claim privileges, they argue, is to sanction inequality of rights and to accept, in principle, discrimination.

Taken as a whole, the Jews of the German Federal Republic again constitute primarily an Interessengemeinschaft, a community of interests. As a result, the percentage of those belonging to the major Jewish organizations is extremely high, exceeding that in any other West European country. The reestablishment of Jewish communal, religious, and cultural life has been carried out with the proverbial Germanic thoroughness. In practice, the small number of Jews in the Federal Republic have at their disposal almost everything a living Jewish community needs. There are now a sufficient number of rebuilt synagogues and even rabbis who, as in former times, give spiritual guidance not only to the urban community but to all Jews in the country. And where French Jewry, 520,000 strong, does not have a single publishing house exclusively for Jewish works, there are several such enterprises in West Germany.

Yet one sometimes feels that these edifices are built on sand, that they have not penetrated to any depth or really become an integral part of the new German landscape, and that the Jews, themselves, only super-
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Officially live the Judaism which they have reestablished. Of the two elements that have an impact upon others, the past and the future, the one is too dreadfully dark and the other most definitely nonexistent, or negligible, for German Jews.

The situation of the minuscule new Jewish community of Austria (9,500 registered Jews) almost completely duplicates that in Germany. The major difference is that very few Austrian Jews have returned. The reestablished Vienna community consists almost entirely of new immigrants from Eastern Europe or Israel; the latter, too, are of East European origin. The average age of the Jewish population of Vienna is quite high; about 65 per cent are over 50 years old, and only some three per cent are children below the age of 10.

Scandinavia

The very traditional structures and the very bourgeois composition of the Jewish communities in the three Scandinavian countries reflect a relatively prosperous continuity leaving no room for new developments. Despite the tragedy which befell the Danish community, the Scandinavian Jews, who are largely of German stock, have resumed their communal life under the banner of restoration. The solidarity of most Scandinavian Christians with the Jews, even foreign Jews, during the time of trial has been favorable to assimilation and has eliminated any feeling of uncertainty on the part of Jews toward their non-Jewish neighbors. In this respect the situation of the Jewish community is very similar to that of the Netherland Jews, although these have much darker memories.

Spain

Very recently, Franco Spain's new policy of greater religious tolerance has been reflected in an upsurge in activities of the two principal Jewish communities, in Madrid and Barcelona, both quite small. Until very recently the 7,000 Jews of Spain practiced their religion semi-clandestinely. In 1966, however, Jewish leaders came forward and openly conducted religious services as well as certain Zionist activity—the latter at a time when Spain still had not recognized Israel, although some non-Jewish voices advocated recognition. At present the Council of Jewish communities of Spain puts out a small mimeographed bulletin called *Ha-kesher* (Heb., "Bridge"). Its articles report what appears to be a lively enough, but limited, Jewish life in the Spanish capital.

Although official Spain is carrying on a flirtation with historic Seph-
ardism, regarding it almost as a "blood relation" and as an important world hispanic element, the tiny Jewish community is not entirely Sephardi. The core communities of Madrid and Barcelona have among their members some former German refugees, as well as a very hispanicized sector of Jews from such border areas as Tangiers, former Spanish Morocco, and Gibraltar.

POINT AND COUNTERPOINT

Contrasts in New Consciousness

The Jewish communities of Western Europe still live under the impact of two major historic events, the emancipation and the counter-emancipation. The first, in a sense, shaped not only Jewish society, but the whole of modern Jewish character, since the beginning of the nineteenth century, and thereby, in a way, the essence of being a Jew in modern times. The other, seeking the total annihilation of the Jew, revived the ingrained insecurity of the Jewish people and aroused contrasting reactions: In some it led to bewildered flight from Judaism, in others to Jewish introversion; in some to exaltation of Judaism, in others to a horror of it; in some to resigned or heroic acceptance of a difficult and even tragic destiny, in others to bitter rejection of the Jewish condition, which, for some, ended in conversion to Christianity and, for others, in adherence to a neo-Zionism, which was regarded as an effective means of dejudaiization.

In recent years, the Jewish literature in France has reflected these attitudes, born of perplexity or exasperation. The extreme poles are represented by Jews of the younger generation, Jean François Steiner and Albert Memmi, the first just under 30 years of age and the second just past 40 (AJJB, 1963 [Vol. 64], p. 373; and p. 316). For Steiner, there is no other alternative but a return to an integral diaspora Judaism, with its uncompromising morality running counter to the existing currents of Western Christian civilization. In his book Treblinka, he exalts only authentically Jewish resistance which aspired to nothing but bearing eternal witness—a classic "gesture" of the sanctification of His name—and systematically disparages all those Jewish forces which he believes to have had their origin in the emulation or adoption by Jews of Gentile values, such as spectacular "heroism." Carrying this analysis further, he takes a negative attitude toward the Warsaw Ghetto revolt, whose "Zionist" style he considers essentially non-Jewish. For Memmi,
the situation of the Jews is impossible and unlivable, and one must therefore escape it, whatever the cost. And since all attempts at assimilation are doomed to failure, he argues, the evils of Jewish life can be overcome only by a complete integration with Israel, which means, or should mean, the end of Judaism.

But these expressions of the newly awakened consciousness are also shaped by the impact of emancipation and counter-emancipation, which, however, tend to become more distant and obscure. For the very young generation of Jews, who have not personally experienced the tragedy of their people in Hitler’s Europe and do not feel its effect, its meaning is no longer the same. For this same generation, the emancipation of the Jews, with all it represents in dearly acquired prestige after a past of oppression and denial of rights, cannot evoke the same wonder as for older generations. They no longer feel themselves in any sense the beneficiaries of a measure of justice and a state of grace, which for their predecessors had almost the force of a religious revelation. Auschwitz, Treblinka, and the Warsaw Ghetto are no longer part of the real world; they are nothing more than places mentioned in their history lessons. The absence of philosophical or theological criteria within Judaism for interpreting the meaning and significance of these terrible episodes makes itself seriously felt.

Eight years ago André Schwarz-Bart’s *The Last of the Just* had enormous repercussions. Then, the awakened Jewish consciousness was still directly confronted by Jewish suffering. The situation is no longer the same. One still speaks and writes about the tragic period of the Jews of Europe with much feeling. But most people—and this includes the thinkers and historians—respond to it all as if they looked upon the memorable “days of our death” as nothing more than an accident of history, requiring no change in the body of ideas and concepts which, until then, had influenced the evolution of modern Judaism. This attitude is one of the most critical factors in the “restoration” of the Jews in Europe. It is manifested in the increasing loss of interest among the Jewish youth of France in commemoration ceremonies marking the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, and other demonstrations of this type. These now traditional ceremonies, with their implication of common ties and fundamental truths, are always arranged by Jews of the older generation, whose special brand of traditionalism is not likely to be passed on.

The masses of Jewish youth today are imbued with a psychological and moral outlook that makes for what can be called a sort of evapora-
tion—instant assimilation, without a central movement and without flight. In its extreme form it produces ghettos without Jews. Even in Belgium, the Netherlands, and West Germany, where until very recently Jewish feeling was focused on the era of massacres and deportations, the theme tends to exhaust itself. An examination of the various bulletins of organized Jewish youth of the West German communities bear this out, for they point to the need and desire for a change. It is very understandable that the house of Anne Frank in Amsterdam creates an entirely different image for the 18-year-old girl, even if she is Jewish, than for a 38-year-old woman, who could have been in Anne’s place.

The “Sickness of Youth” and Jewish Youth

Of course, Jewish youth does not escape the climate and the psychoses of the new “sickness of youth,” the nihilist opposition to everything, as embodied in the contemporary European beatnik. The element of global alienation with its loss of confidence in all contemporary values of society, even the allegedly revolutionary ones, is shared by young Jews. It is not shared by all, but rather to a degree approximating the *numerus clausus* which, in times past, was applied against Jewish students at Central European universities. One cannot therefore speak of a particular Jewish aspect within the pattern of the general revolt. Thus, if the beatnik sets himself against society, its institutions, politicians, and moralists, the Jewish beatnik simply attacks the same kind of scapegoats without looking for their particular Jewish counterparts. The impression therefore is that organized and positive Judaism and Jewish society are not important enough to warrant opposition.

Circumstantial Morality

In Judaism, as in other phenomena, judgments are usually a reflection of typical contemporary attitudes, which may be described as circumstantial morality. This means, roughly, that judgments are determined less and less by general principles of moral conduct, and more and more by the possibility of applying a particular morality under given conditions. Then the possibility, itself, becomes the measure of what is or is not moral, somewhat like the “philosophy” emanating from the material on sexual morality in the Kinsey report. No laws, only facts govern judgments, and every judgment must therefore be pragmatic.

The application of this morality to Judaism tends to affirm and to deny Jewish reality at one and the same time. An integrated, organic Jewish
life seems impossible because modern technology, the hedonistic consumer society, the general homogenization of the mode of living, the rise of such new "natural" communities as the business community, by their very existence undermine the ancient and traditional communities. Assimilation, on the other hand, is regarded as just as impossible since antisemitism, or at least a certain form of it, is fundamental to the Christian society of the West. Therefore, in a sense, this morality, as Sartre formulated it in *Reflections on the Jewish Question*, demands that one be a Jew by rejecting the content of Judaism—an attitude shared by some. The approach to Judaism of many young Jews in France today, and of students in particular, is rooted in Sartre's concept.

New Aspects of Intermarriage

Mixed marriage is becoming widespread in all European Jewish communities, no matter what their character. Although French Jewish life bears little resemblance to that in Scandinavia, intermarriages are a conspicuous feature of both. And intermarriage is found in all Jewish groups, not merely among the "assimilated." It is also common among Zionists and among Jews who basically consider themselves traditionalists. The Orthodox, a tiny minority and sharply set apart, are the sole exception. It should be noted that Orthodox Jews usually do not marry outside their immediate circle; they practice a much more restricted endogamy than is generally found among Jews. Ideological objections to intermarriage are gradually disappearing in the other sectors of Jewry. Arguments against it are often vitiated by the contradictory behavior of their advocates. The eclectic nature of present-day Judaism, in definition as well as in practice, no longer permits strong arguments against the temptation of intermarriage. It stands to reason that the purely religious argument, when used by people who themselves are not truly religious, is rejected as false. The more frequently advanced argument that there is in a mixed marriage sufficient incompatibility of customs and character to interfere with conjugal and family harmony, is not confirmed by daily experience; far from it. An added drawback of this reasoning is that it smacks of a sort of racism, and it is often rejected precisely for this reason. The rather sentimental broad argument that a Jew must not break faith with the Jewish collectivity by contracting a mixed marriage—in short, the specter of "treason"—also loses validity because it is no longer necessary for the Jewish partner, who has not already broken with Judaism before contemplating intermarriage, to do so now. The high
rate of intermarriage has created a state of implicit tolerance for it in
diverse European Jewish circles, and Jews who marry non-Jews no
longer find themselves excluded from a given Jewish group, even a
strictly religious one like the synagogue. To a degree, this tolerance ex-
tends also to the Orthodox, although, of course, they do not permit
Jewish partners in mixed marriages to join their community (difficulties
arise even where the non-Jewish partners convert to Judaism). They do,
however, consider them equal to other non-Orthodox Jews, with whom
they cooperate on inter-organizational and other levels.

Partners in mixed marriages are to be found in religious communities
other than the Liberal synagogue which plays only a minor role in
Western Europe. (It is nonexistent and even inconceivable in Italy, very
weak in Switzerland, relatively weak in France, and has some standing
only in the Netherlands.) This is particularly so in France where large
numbers of intermarried North African Jews observe kashrut. They do
not really feel that a marriage to a European non-Jew is a mixed marri-
age in the conventional sense. For them the "outsider," the "goy," is the
Moslem, the Arab, and not the Christian, the Frenchman. One of Lyons
Grand Rabbi Jean Kling's parishioners was a very pious young Algerian
Jew who daily visited the office of the synagogue. When Rabbi Kling
learned that this pillar of the faith was about to marry a Christian, he
reproached him: "You, with a goy!" "She is not a goy," the man replied.
"She's French!"

Some of the Zionist and pro-Israeli activists, as well as leaders and
staff members of Jewish organizations, are intermarried. There probably
is not a single Jewish family in France, with the exception of recent
arrivals from Tunisia and Morocco, which has no non-Jewish members.
(Among the Algerian Jews, numerous intermarriages between Jews and
Christians—very rarely between Jews and Moslems—took place even
before the exodus; their proportion was especially high in Algiers.) The
Orthodox, too, have their share of intermarriages through their less
Orthodox or non-Orthodox relatives, and "the relatives of our relatives
are our relatives."

Within West European Jewry as a whole there has been an important
change in attitude toward intermarriage. Since such marriages have be-
come general and are therefore accepted, they no longer have their
former significance nor necessarily the same consequences, as in the past.
Although intermarriage certainly is a result of assimilation, it does not
necessarily lead to more radical assimilation. The act of intermarrying,
as such, no longer constitutes a break with Judaism. One very rarely finds Jews who decide to marry outside their faith, without first having chosen a marriage partner, simply because they wish to separate themselves from the Jewish community and to dissolve or dilute their ethnic character. The respective marriage partners—and even their respective "ethnic groups"—no longer take account of such contingencies. In the past, there often was pressure from the family of the non-Jewish husband or wife for the complete dejudaization of the Jewish spouse. This is no longer true, partly because of growing religious indifference, partly because there has been a revaluation of Judaism on the part of Christians, and, finally, because one now has not merely the legal, but also the moral right to be or to remain a Jew.

In the very conservative circles of the great Jewish families in France, it is permissible for the son, but not for the daughter, to marry a non-Jew. It is important, then, that the line perpetuates itself in a Jewish name, that it does not disappear.

The unequal distribution of the sexes among Jews made intermarriage unavoidable in some European countries, even if the wish to remain endogamous had been very strong—which was not the case. This situation prevailed in the Scandinavian countries, in the German Federal Republic, and especially in Spain, and to some extent also in Switzerland and Italy.

In France members of the North African Jewish proletariat, the factory workers, find it difficult to marry Jewish women also for social and economic reasons. A young Jewish girl, even one of poor Moroccan or Tunisian parents, will not voluntarily marry a low-paid factory worker with no possibility for advancement.

**MAJOR ASPECTS OF JEWISH CULTURE**

**Yiddishism**

Yiddishism, which regards the Yiddish language and literature as major components of Jewish culture and rejects the existence of a Jewish culture in which Yiddish plays no part, is closely linked with old Jewish folk movements, such as the Bund, which can no longer maintain itself in Western Europe. The Jews of Europe have so completely adopted the languages of their host countries that they soon became their mother tongues. The fact that most of these languages are quite adequate for expressing and communicating Jewish thought and for creat-
ing a Jewish literature, appears to be a thorough refutation of the fundamental postulates of Yiddishism.

However, since Yiddish literature is still regarded as a very important aspect of recent Jewish life, interest in Yiddish has not diminished. Today non-Jews, especially in literary circles, know more about it than ever before. The somewhat paradoxical result is that, while Yiddish is losing ground among Jews, it is gaining in the non-Jewish world among those who are interested in creativity, folklore, and exotic literature. It should be added that West European interest in Yiddish culture is related to the growing interest of the intellectual world in Judaism. The relative popularity of hasidism outside the limits of the Jewish world, for example, led to a study of the language and idiom of its leaders and their disciples.

Compared to the interest of European intellectuals in the mother tongue of the East European Jews, the current in the other direction—the interest in and receptivity to contemporary Western thought by Jews who still speak and write Yiddish—is unfortunately very slight. In such Yiddishist circles or clubs as exist in Paris, Brussels, or Zurich, there is almost no understanding of contemporary thought. There is only a walled-off world without any opening to new horizons, a situation which is all the more deplorable since Yiddishism developed out of the definite desire for a modern Jewish instrument capable of absorbing European humanism. This is the meaning of the famous weltliche Yiddishkeit, the secular and cultural Judaism which was to replace religion as the unifying element. But the European and universal values on which Yiddishism relied—as propounded by Emile Zola and Romain Rolland, Knut Hamsun, and others—no longer meet the needs and aspirations of the new generations. There is not even the faintest trace of such modern movements as surrealism and existentialism in what today passes for Yiddish literature. Neither are there movements or stylistic developments within that literature; it remains a product of the romantic realism of the Peretz era.

There are still some Yiddish writers and literary activity in Western Europe, particularly in Paris, which, before the war, was a relatively important center of Yiddish literature. Yet, the Yiddish literary review Kiyum ("Existence") which had been purely intellectual in tone and traditionally published significant Yiddish literature, was recently forced to cut its size, popularize its content, and reduce the frequency of its publication.
Mendel Mann, the Parisian Yiddish novelist and author of a series of novels dealing with the Russian campaigns in World War II, is always translated into French and enjoys some success with the non-Jewish public. His style combines realism with broad canvases à la Tolstoi.

Except for the continuing efforts, particularly in France and Belgium, of the Bundist groups to make Yiddish literature attractive to Jewish youth, hardly anything is done along this line. The numerous supplementary Yiddish-language courses, formerly available to students in French and Belgian secular schools, have almost entirely ceased to exist. In France, the Jewish Communists, who once vigorously cultivated Yiddishism in competition with the Bund, have now abandoned this activity and preach linguistic assimilation. Yet, for the first time, Yiddish is being taught at an institution of higher learning, the Paris School of Oriental Languages. One can also view on French television scenes from Sholem Aleichem's stories in Yiddish.

In France, Belgium, and in West Germany (there is a Yiddish periodical, the Neue jüdische Zeitung, in Munich), Yiddish newspapers are losing their readers. Some of them try to bolster circulation by carrying some French or German, as the case may be.

**Sephardism**

Sephardism has always existed among the French Jews. It has left an important mark on Italian Jewry, as well, although the community is neither Sephardi nor Ashkenazi in origin, but autonomous.

The old French Sephardism, with its "Portuguese" sector in Southwest France (Bordeaux and Bayonne are its traditional centers), has long since lost its significance in French Jewish life. During the period between the two world wars, it was replaced by the Sephardism of immigrants from Salonika, other parts of the Balkans, and Turkey, who tended to concentrate in Marseilles and Paris. At that time, they constituted about 15 per cent of the French Jewish population. Their Sephardism was limited to the synagogue ritual; attempts to develop Ladino (Judaeo-Spanish) culture or to encourage an interest in its folklore failed. The Salonican Jews in France and in other countries of emigration were particularly hard hit by Nazi deportations. Although, on the whole, they showed a particularly strong tendency to assimilation, some notables of Sephardi origin, such as Edgar Abravanel, are among the leaders of the French Jewish community.

The new North African immigrants, who are called Sephardim, are
very different from the European and Turkish Sephardim. Actually, the Jewish masses of North Africa are largely of Berber descent and were Sephardized by the Spanish immigrants who came to North Africa during the sixteenth century. Thus North African Sephardism is of a special type, more properly Maghrebian than Spanish Jewish. Ladino, the language of the Balkan and Near Eastern Jews, is unknown to the North African Jews; their natural idiom, insofar as it has not become French, is Judaeo-Arabic. And while the Judaeo-Spanish culture and folklore, based on the great European culture of the Iberian peninsula, had been easy enough to communicate and transmit, the same is not true of North African "Sephardism," with its deep roots in ancient Arab culture. When, under the influence of French rule, the North African Jews in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia abandoned Arab culture, they lost also a large part of the specifically Jewish patrimony which was indivisible from it. As a result, North African Jews, even the traditionalist ones, no longer know Judaeo-Arabic literature and poetic folklore. They retained primarily what is related to religious life and ritual, especially the specifically North African "hazanouth" and, with it, a whole tradition of musical folklore, with which many are quite familiar and to which North African Jewish scholars have devoted their studies. The newcomers from North Africa, therefore, cannot be considered as the custodians of a living Sephardi cultural patrimony. Neither in France nor in other European countries to which they came, and where they reintroduced a certain primarily liturgical Sephardism, has their presence brought a revival of Sephardi culture. Such a revival is nothing but a claim of Spain's tourist propaganda. It is also the subject of very limited research and of monographs by scholars in the field of hispanic studies.

As for the Portuguese Jewish community of Amsterdam, it is completely Dutch in language as well as in temperament and behavior. Only its ritual contains some vestiges of Portuguese idiom.

**Jewish Studies**

Western Europe was once the major center of Jewish learning, especially biblical exegesis and Bible criticism. Germany had its impressive store of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, while France had its *Revue des Études juives* and its learned men; Darmstetter, Munk, and Reinach made a major contribution to this field of knowledge. The pursuit of nineteenth century-steeped "science of Judaism" continues under the auspices of universities and research institutes. France still has some
distinguished specialists in this field: the historian Bernard Blumenkrantz in the rich medieval history of the Jews in France and the scholar George Vajda in the history and interpretation of classical Jewish philosophy.

On the whole, however, Jewish scholarship now has a quite different orientation, representing divergent approaches. There is a new type of apologetics which more or less accepts the Bible and the Talmud as real and probative, and while not excluding Bible criticism, does not make it central to the study of Judaism. Though much of the work of André Neher, professor of Judaic studies at the University of Strasbourg, is on this level, it is sufficiently impressive to attract disciples. There is also a veritable flood of young investigators in the expanding field of Jewish sociology, which does not confine itself to Jewish demography but frequently extends to the psychological and religious spheres. A Jewish sociology of religion, modeled on Christian sociology of religion, is in the developing stage.

The State of Israel is very much a factor in all these studies. In France, scientific research is being conducted on attitudinal changes toward Israel. The quite new and not yet fully crystallized French Jewish literature is also being examined for sociological data. A few years ago, for example, the non-Jewish author Pierre Aubery wrote an important doctoral thesis on the contemporary Jewish environment, as found in French Jewish literature.

**In Summary**

It is difficult to speak of the Jews of Western Europe in our time as an entity and in terms of characteristics common to all. Differences among them are, in fact, very great, and these are psychological as well as environmental. If certain aspects of an emerging Jewish spirituality can be found almost everywhere in Europe (as they can be found almost anywhere in the world) these too, depend in large measure on the intellectual, moral, and social environment, and are therefore dissimilar.

Broadly speaking, one can perhaps divide the Jews into two categories. Some West European Jewish communities can be described as having freedom of initiative and permitting neither the spiritual content of their Judaism nor its orientation to be determined by others. Of course, the criteria and prevailing practices of the outside world exert an influence; but they are not recognized as having the force of directives. Indeed, they may even produce a reaction and a countercurrent. The existing freedom of initiative is relatively favorable to the development of new
forces and new ideas, but it can also be dangerous because it has neither a framework nor boundaries. Present-day French Jewry, on its higher intellectual levels, falls within this group. Other Jewish communities must remain within prescribed limits of a conservatism that is not only religious, but social and, in its extreme form, also political, because this role has been assigned to them by the society in which they live and of which they are an organic part. Such communities are, in a sense, under surveillance even though this may not be apparent. They cannot permit themselves excesses and can embark on a daring course only with difficulty. To some degree, this applies to the Italian Jews and even to the Jews in the Netherlands.

One negative characteristic, common to all West European Jewish communities, is the almost complete disappearance of the "classic" Western Jew who had a strong inclination toward a symbiosis of the great currents of Western humanism and those elements in Jewish tradition which conform to or converge with them.

The various Jewish "folkisms," not merely the Yiddish "folkism," are also disappearing. Folklore and folk idiom are in decline, along with the provincialism of which they are a part. The distinct Judaeo-Alsatian dialect of the Alsatian Jews is now on the verge of extinction, as are the dialects of their analogues in the Netherlands and Provence.

Another very important general trend, mentioned earlier, is the growing remoteness and disappearance of the two great landmarks of modern Jewry—the emancipation and the Hitler era. The young Jew in Paris, Brussels, and Rome no longer regards himself as a child of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the achievement of legal equality by his forebears. Nor can he long continue to find in the apocalypse of Auschwitz the sole basis and justification for his Jewish consciousness. And since no one has as yet adequately dealt with this aspect of Judaism, he will not know how to transmit it some day to his own son, as countless generations of fathers had passed to their sons the history of the slavery and suffering of the children of Israel in Egypt, which ended with the redemption of the Exodus and Sinai.

The problem of assimilation has changed its face and form. Being for or against it no longer has meaning. No one is really "for" it, except certain backward elements in non-Jewish circles of the old Left, such as the old-style radicals and Freemasons in France. The Jews who are assimilated or on the way to assimilation are not "assimilators" or "assimilationists," but rather unwitting objects of an assimilation that is
nonspecific, "innocent," and fatal. It takes place as part of a general process of homogenization, and is related to the depersonalization of groups other than Jews, e.g., the West European working classes who are ceasing to be "working-class" and are becoming increasingly embarrassed at the still formally accepted idea of "class consciousness" as the basis of a so-called internationalism. This process affects also intellectuals among whom there is a growing tendency to leave the domain of "mind" for the technical world, who cease to be thinkers in order to become "organization men." In view of this irreversible evolution, the problem of preserving the continuity of West European Judaism and of bringing about its eventual renascence presents an alternative. Shall we adapt the values of Judaism to this development, go beyond it here and there insofar as the general leveling process will permit, and introduce, so to speak, some Hebraisms into the Esperanto or basic English of the new Babel? Or shall we return, with all the risks and perils involved—and doing without the participation of the majority—to the old Jewish countercurrent with its long history and its antihistoric essence and meaning? This will mean rejecting not merely "assimilation," but the world itself insofar as its deeds and postures, its thoughts and visions, its truths and errors, are conditioned by time.

West European Jewry lacks intellectual and spiritual guidance, the spokesmen and, even more, the moral and sociopolitical leadership essential for making an unambiguous choice between these alternatives, or even to begin moving toward one of them. Essentially, the communities are still provincial in spirit, and it is in the nature of provincialism to impose strict checks on the ways of the capital. This then explains the formal persistence in the communities of the so-called elective affinity between Judaism and an outdated and sometimes confused liberalism, the preservation of a tacit and absurd "Holy Alliance" between the sons of Jacob and the spiritual heirs of Voltaire and Edouard Herriot. It explains also the persistent identification of the Jewish leaders in West Germany with the literary glories of the Weimar Republic, and their great faith in Carl von Ossietzki, the leader of the German peace movement after the First World War. Even in Paris, where people think much more freely, one still asserts one's Judaism by talking about the theater of Berthold Brecht.

A new and major psychological manifestation that is doubtless shared by Jews throughout the world and cuts across all Jewish communities in Western Europe, is the substitution, as a bond uniting all Jews, of a sentiment for Israel and anything affecting the state, for religious feel-
ing, which actually continues to live in the hearts of only a small number of Jews. As a matter of fact, the sentiment for Israel can be regarded as religious, for its content and expression are of a truly religious character.

The old religious sentiment shared by the Jews was not always an expression of the same degree of faith and fervor, but at times contained elements of criticism and scepticism, and even of indifference, disillusion, and bitterness. In the same way, the current pro- or para-Israelism of the Jews, though including all nuances from enthusiastic and unconditional approval to deprecating irony, always fulfills the function of moral unification. The rare Jews who are outspoken and categorical in their opposition to Israel play the same roles of foils and sacred monsters, as did the apikorsim of long ago in the integral religious community or those described by tradition and in rabbinic literature as kofer ba-'ikkar, the negators of the Principle.

This like-mindedness exists everywhere. It shows itself at the inauguration of a community center in Bordeaux, where the mayor speaks beneath a large tricolor flag flanked by small Israeli flags; at the meeting of a group of half-Jews in Hamburg, where the subject heading the agenda is the number of Israeli students attending the city's university; in the almost depopulated ancient ghetto of Amsterdam, where the only Jewish butcher shop is decorated with the Israeli colors; in the tourist agency of the little Norman port city of Dieppe, where the manager, who happens to be a Jew, displays in the window a disproportionate number of views of Israeli landmarks.

In France, Belgium, and Italy, the Jewish Communists flirt with Israel, and sometimes go there. Since the Israeli Communist party (the Jewish one) has become patriotic, pro-Israelism has been growing among the Jewish Communists of the West and sometimes finds open expression.

Automatic and massive assimilation! Spontaneous and unanimous pro-Israelism! Jewish consciousness and the search for it, often fragmented, sometimes spectral! Points and counterpoints. In spite of it all and without forcing things too much, the final words of Simon Dubnow may still be cited: "Jewish history continues." * But a slightly different quotation from another ending may also be appropriate. Before the curtain falls on the protagonists of the continuous interplay of horrors and torments in Jean-Paul Sartre's No Exit, one of the characters announces from the top of the stage, "It continues!"

---

The Purposes of the Jewish Community Center Movement: An Appraisal of Their Operation

by Carl Urbont

There is much data in the literature of social institutions to show how complicated is the search for a definition of purpose. This search assumes major importance for Jewish institutions facing ever greater challenges because of the complex changes within the Jewish community of contemporary America.

The majority of American Jews are now native-born, and masses of them are college educated. They have access to almost every sphere of American society, are free to enjoy a life of dignity and, in consequence, feel free to choose to retain or to give up their group identity. Thus, paradoxically, it is free society, the very thing Jews everywhere have labored to achieve, that is now challenging their group survival. The ensuing problem facing the Jewish community underlines the need for a reexamination of the vitality of its institutions. Among these the Jewish community center movement holds a strategic position.

The forerunners of the Jewish community center were the first Young Men’s Hebrew Associations, established during the second half of the nineteenth century as a counter influence to the Christian missionary work of the Young Men’s Christian Association. The movement grew rapidly as it attracted increasing numbers of Jews who had come to the United States from all parts of Europe to escape persecution. They were of very diverse background, Orthodox and Reform, Sephardi and Ashkenazi, traditional and “worldly.”

By the beginning of the 20th century, the Y’s, settlements, and Jewish neighborhood centers concentrated on the “Americanization” of the newcomers, and tried to protect them, through social action programs, from many injustices suffered by immigrants during the industrial expansion of this country. In a certain sense, these agencies also met the newcomers’
group urge to survive as Jews in their new environment. In New York and Philadelphia, courses were offered in vocational training of unskilled Jews, as well as in the arts, literature, English, and foreign languages. Formal Jewish education programs for young children and adults were also provided.

The trend toward a national organization of Y's was initiated in 1913, and the newly established Council of Young Men's Hebrew and Kindred Associations gave impetus everywhere to the spread of the centers.

During World War I, the Y's, with the aid of the Jewish Welfare Board which came into being in 1917, extended services to Jews in the United States armed forces. The JWB then mobilized Jewish communities throughout the country to develop effective cooperative social and hospitality programs for soldiers and sailors in local Y's. This cooperation was a strong unifying influence and aroused widespread interest in the Jewish community for the continuation of such joint efforts on a permanent basis after the war. In 1921 JWB and the Council of Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations merged and the new agency, the National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB), set about strengthening the then existing Y's. Under the impact of the depression of the 1930's, they began to refer to themselves as Jewish community centers. They sought to reach into many new areas of community service to meet new needs.

When the enormous dimensions of the tragedy the Jews suffered at the hands of the Nazis became known, a deep sense of responsibility for the perpetuation of Jewish life was felt by large sections of the American Jewish community. The Jewish community centers, too, considered it their primary function "to serve as a reservoir of Jewish life and influence in the community, and more particularly to help bring our youth nearer to Jewish life in sentiment, thought, and action." ¹ In recent years, however, certain spokesmen of the movement have sensed a complacency within the community which has weakened the Jewish orientation of the centers. The movement has grown rapidly, serving today more than 700,000 members in some 300 centers throughout the country, with an aggregate annual budget of approximately $32,500,000 in 1965. Its great potential—the size of its membership and representation in most communities throughout America—make the undeniable absence of a clear direction of purpose in its work disquieting to many of its leaders. A

movement, especially one within a minority group, that does not shape its own program through its own sense of purpose is bound to drift, and may eventually become engulfed by the values, interests, and events of the majority culture.

This study was undertaken to determine the stated Jewish and general purposes of the center movement today, and to examine the relative expenditure of energies and resources for their implementation in the centers. An attempt was also made to determine the underlying causes for some of the movement's problems, as reflected in the findings, and to touch upon possible remedial action.

**Basic Aims for Center Movement**

The following assumptions were established in the study, against which Jewish community center purposes could be tested:

1. It is a Jewish institution;
2. The public, which supports it, considers it primarily an institution of Jewish identification, as well as an instrument for Jewish group survival;
3. Its purposes should therefore promote group cohesiveness among Jews;
4. The character of its present purposes should set it apart as a unique institution in a free society.

These, in broad outline, are also based on the recommendations made by Oscar Janowsky in his famous "Statement of Principles" which attempted to develop some ground rules for the Jewish community centers, the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations, and other kindred agencies seeking affiliation with JWB.

Its specific guidelines stressed the necessity for injecting Jewish spiritual values into all programs, including recreation, and for stressing individual as well as group needs. Janowsky also saw the center as a means for furthering the democratic way of life, and as an instrument for integration of the individual Jew and the Jewish group into the total American community, without loss of their identity as Jews.

He thus saw the centers serving in the dual role of guardians of Jewish group loyalties and of protagonists of the free society that tends to weaken these very loyalties. The community's growing need for Jew-
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ish group identification made it all the more necessary to establish whether, after a lapse of almost 20 years, such purposes were still to be found among the centers' stated aims and, more significantly, among the aims actively implemented today.

Janowsky's major contribution was that his report aroused a preoccupation with the purposes of the center movement.

Over the years, numerous pronouncements have been made about purpose, which were doubtless motivated by the malaise of thoughtful center leaders over problems caused by various changes in the Jewish community: shifts of large segments of the Jewish population to suburban areas and the ensuing disintegration of old ethnocentric Jewish neighborhoods; the reported increase in the incidence of intermarriage among Jews, and the loss of numerous professional center workers to other fields. Expressions of doubt as to whether the "working aims" of the centers were sufficiently focused to cope with these problems became more frequent. Statements on what ought to be the purposes had to be related to the actual state of affairs in the center.

The present study provided no easy answers. But though its limitations are possibly not very much different from those of the Janowsky report of 1948, it has shed some light on the current relationship between center avowals of aims and implementations. In doing so, it has raised and sharpened the edges of many issues which should disturb complacency if, indeed, such complacency exists, about the certainty of a future of the movement as a significant factor in American Jewish life.

METHODOLOGY

The Jewish community centers have exercised wide latitude in the use of such terms as purposes, objectives, aims, methods, goals, principles—a difficulty that had been largely overcome by initial definitions of the terms "purpose" and "aim." Purpose was defined as a philosophical system of ideas which serves as a guide for the behavior of those functioning within the organization. Aims were identified as the component unit parts of a purpose, motivating the organization's leadership to strive toward specifically desired goals.

With these definitions as a basis, the study, concluded in 1964, was conducted in the following phases:

1. An inventory of the current stated aims was compiled from responses to an open-ended questionnaire to executive directors, request-
ing institutional documents containing statements of purpose. This first questionnaire was mailed to 151 representative centers in large, intermediate, and small communities. From the 55 responses and documents received, 66 discrete aims were culled, refined, the frequency with which they were mentioned was noted, and they were then incorporated into an inventory. Brevity of the inventory required the combination of certain like aims: i.e., "knowledge of Jewish history" and "languages," were recorded as Jewish knowledge; "spirituality," "spiritual welfare," and "religion," as Judaism; "athletics" and "sports," as physical growth.

2. These 66 aims were then listed in a second questionnaire and mailed to the executive directors of the original 151 centers. The directors were requested to scale the degree of implementation of the aims in their own center by encircling any one of the following values for each: 1) high degree of implementation; 2) moderate; 3) low; 4) not implemented at all. In a concluding question the participants were also asked to add any aim that might have been inadvertently omitted from the list, and to suggest one or two ideal priority aims that should be operating in their individual center. Responses to the second questionnaire were received from 108 executive directors. (See Appendix A.)

3. A hierarchy, or ranking, of the operating aims in the entire country was developed from the responses to the second questionnaire, starting at the high of rank one, and descending to the lowest rank of 52. The list was arranged in a manner arbitrarily defining the upper half of ranked aims as receiving strong-to-moderate implementation in the country as a whole, and the lower half as getting little or no implementation. The midpoint was rank 24. The analysis that followed was based upon this ranking order. (See Appendix B, Column 1.)

**GENERAL AIMS vs. JEWISH AIMS**

Before the ranking procedure, the numerical "votes" received from 108 centers reflected a general belief on the part of executive directors that their agencies strongly implemented their stated aims, with high expenditure of staff energy and agency resources. The numerical responses also suggested the existence of an idealistic belief in the practicability of the center movement's aims. However, the grouping of the aims and their ranking according to the strength of their implementation showed some significant revelations, such as the higher ranking value of a general, rather than a Jewish orientation (Appendix B).
General Aims

RECREATION

The most significant finding in the study was that the overwhelming majority of directors (89) voted the aim "to provide recreation for its members" as commanding the greatest degree of staff energies and resources. A close correlation existed between the evaluation of this aim in the country as a whole and in communities of all sizes, although it was ranked first in intermediate and small communities and second in the large communities, including Metropolitan New York. A further analysis revealed that this recreation aim, grouped with two others relating to the use of leisure and "opportunities for deriving fun," averaged the highest ranking of all groupings of aims, both general and Jewish.

There was, however, contradiction between the high degree of implementation of recreational aims and the executive directors' written responses to the concluding question of the second questionnaire. This question, it will be remembered, was designed to invite a narrative value judgment regarding the one or two most important aims in each center. A tabulation of responses to this question (Appendix C) rated these aims in the following order: "Development of the personality," and "personality development of the Jew" were the two of highest priority in all the respondent centers. "Recreation" was ranked here as fifth in order of priority.

There may have been procedural as well as conceptual reasons for this difference in treatment of the recreational aims by the same respondents. Approximately 30 per cent of the executives did not answer the concluding question at all, and those who did respond seemed not to put their best effort forward. It appeared as though many of them scanned at random the list of aims in the questionnaire, in order to find and record "one or two most important aims." Since the eye tended to rest on page two of the questionnaire, where the concluding one was found, only seven aims, or 26 per cent of those listed on page two, were "forgotten." On page one, 20, or 50 per cent of those listed, were "forgotten." One may further speculate that the treatment of the recreational aim in the last question was implicitly a reflection of the subjective feelings of the executives about recreation in the center. While they originally "voted" that this group of aims was the most highly implemented, they seemed to agree that recreational purposes should not have priority
value. They appeared to reveal a subjective devaluation of the recreational aims because they preferred to remember personality development ideals as "most important."

PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT

In the responses to the concluding question general personality development was ranked higher than the Jewish aspect of this development, and this tended to confirm the assumptions of such a spokesman for the movement as Sanford Solender, that center objectives focus more upon the "total personality" than upon any sectarian aspect of it.

If in the ranking of all 66 aims of the questionnaire recreation had any "competitor" at all, it was the aim related to the "value and dignity of the individual," which emerged at second place in the hierarchy. In the order of 52 ranks into which all the aims were classified, the difference between ranks 1 and 2 was as indistinguishable as two runs due to a single lucky hit at a baseball game. The executives did not agree on which of the two aims was to be ranked first. In the large communities, "the value and dignity of the individual" took precedence over "recreation," 77 respondents ranking it as highly implemented, and 29 as moderately implemented.

It was interesting to note that the more general the language used in phrasing each of the ten personality development aims, the higher their ranking tended to be. Thus, the five higher ranking aims were broad generalizations, such as "value and dignity of the individual"; "opportunities for growth"; "interests of participants"; "further personality development," and "self-expression." The remaining aims, more specific in definition, were placed lower in the hierarchy: "to encourage creativity"; "improve character"; "improve social skills"; "improve physical capabilities," and "promote mental and intellectual growth."

The inference is that the respondents seemed to be less sure about the degree of implementation of aims with more specific meaning than of those phrased more rhetorically, even where these appeared to have the same intent. This suggests a permissive, informal attitude toward program in the centers, as well as a vagueness about objectives. It would be fair to postulate that the center movement's goals would be more concrete if the value attached to implemented aims moved from higher
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for the specific, to lower for rhetorical generalizations. On the other hand, one can also understand the tendency of the center field to establish the broadest operational policies, thus permitting the inclusion of a wide variety of program preferences.

It should also be mentioned that a negative correlation was found between the averaged judgments of the executive directors respecting all 66 aims, and the frequency with which they were mentioned in the examined center literature. For example, the ten personality aims had high ranks in the judgment of the executives, but they received relatively infrequent attention in the literature. In other words, high frequency of mention in center documents is not to be misconstrued as high priority in practice, nor does low frequency in the literature imply low implementation.

JEWISH IDENTIFICATION

The center movement's high implementation of aims having to do with intergroup and intragroup relations, in combination with those dealing with Jewish personality development, underscores the center's apparent high and continuing degree of sensitivity about accommodating Jews to the American scene. This is equivalent to a throwback to an earlier period in the history of the Jewish community center movement (1880 to 1920), when the YMHA's had geared themselves to the "Americanization" and adjustment needs of the immigrant. Its emphasis today may be due to the continued influence of earlier decades. Since "Americanization" needs are now academic, there may be an implicit recognition of the desirability of stressing the acculturation process. The higher ranking of intergroup rather than intragroup relations aims indicates a deeper concern about accommodating to the outgroup and to the general culture. What was the intent of the aims dealing with Jewish internal relations?

The intragroup category included specialized Jewish welfare aims whose intent is to meet particular needs of the Jewish community, for the implicit survival of the Jewish group. This category of aims averaged from high to moderate implementation in the movement, and included: "to provide leadership for, and identification with, the Jewish community" (ranks 5 and 6); "to promote the members' self-acceptance as Jews" (rank 9); "to minister to the welfare and social needs of the members" (rank 10); "to provide opportunities for their participation in the Jewish
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4 Janowsky, op. cit., p. 239.
community” (rank 15); “to develop understanding among the various subcultures of the Jewish community” (rank 24), and “to contribute to the stability of the Jewish family” (rank 20). These objectives suggest the center’s desire to condition the individual to identify with the Jewish community. Presumably, if it succeeds along this line, it may then try to work with him toward meeting the welfare needs of the Jewish group. But can the center successfully instill Jewish attitudes and a sense of Jewish identification, considering its latent tendencies toward acculturation, as revealed in this study? Within and outside the center, many Jews today are alienated, lacking Jewish sentiments, knowledge, a sense of tradition, or Jewish aspirations.

**Aims Getting Little or No Implementation**

In a figurative sense, the aims which fell below rank 24 were considered to be in the lower half of the ranking column. These were understood in terms of a descent to levels of decreasing effectiveness. In the same sense, all aims below rank 40 were assumed to be in the “lowest of the low” category, reflecting relatively no implementation.

Considerable disparity was found to exist between the stated and operating aims. For example, although the formal literature of the agencies attached great importance to aims related to the “democratic ethos of America,” they were “demoted” to the lower half of the ranking column wherein the weakness of their implementation was shown. It is likely that the vote of the executives on these aims is a reflection of the fact that Jews today feel quite secure in America and that, therefore, the respondents found it unnecessary to profess their center’s dedication to democratic ideals in responding to a questionnaire that was internal to the Jewish group. It seemed to be taken for granted. The formal documents of the centers, on the other hand, stressed such goals as “community betterment” and “democracy,” probably because of a concern about the institutional image in the eyes of the outgroup. Another possibility is that such stated aims may have been retained by a conservative institutional leadership that was generally disinclined to change formal documents deriving from a time, at the turn of the century, when “Americanization” programs had been rife in Jewish social agencies.

Almost all the general aims in the lower half of the ranking hierarchy were related to social action, among which were such processes as “community betterment,” “enhancement of American culture,” “strengthening the democratic process,” and “improving world social conditions.”
The latter aim fell all the way to the bottom of the "lowest of the low" category. In spite of all that had been said for years by leaders in the field about the important role of the center in social action or public affairs, such aims proved impotent.

"To help its participants relax from tensions" was classified as a recreation-oriented aim in the study, but its rank contrasted strongly with the other three aims mentioned earlier in the recreation group ("recreation," "leisure," "fun"). It was ranked 27, falling into the category of poorly implemented aims. One may conclude that tensions require a therapy approach, and such techniques of social work are not employed to a significant degree in the center movement today.

JEWISH TRADITION

It is surprising to find evidence of interest in Jewish tradition in the Jewish community center movement, where the name of God has rarely been mentioned in agency pronouncements. While some tradition-oriented aims were getting moderate implementation, others emerged weakly—a manifestation of inherent inconsistencies.

Aims ranked by the respondents as getting moderate implementation in the upper half included "identification with Jewish ideals"); "appreciation of Jewish values," and "preservation of the Jewish heritage." The traditional aims grouped in the lower half, getting poor implementation were: "appreciation of the Jewish tradition" (rank 25); "develop an appreciation for Jewish ethics" (rank 28); "encourage practices in accordance with Jewish morality" (rank 29); "promote a Jewish way of life" (rank 30); "stimulate Jewish thought and ideas" (rank 36).

The quality of language employed for the tradition aims in the higher ranks seems to express a passive tolerance and respect for the Jewish values transmitted from generation to generation. However, the phrasing of the tradition aims in the lower half, characterized by the use of active pragmatic verbs, seems to manifest an intention to perpetuate these values. As the eye scans down the ranks of the "activist" aims, the language phrasing them gathers word-power progressively, from appreciate to develop, to encourage, to promote, to stimulate. However, in reality, the ranking order of these aims actually operates in inverse proportion to their semantic strength; the stronger the language, the weaker the rank. While these aims reflect the center movement's literal respect for Jewish law, culture, customs, and social and religious institutions, their

ranking reveals little purposeful activity to perpetuate them. Indeed, if this were otherwise, averaged opinion throughout the country would not have permitted the aim "to impart Jewish knowledge," which is a strategic way of perpetuating tradition, to slip down to the low implementation rank of 37.

The evaluation of some of these aims showed further inconsistencies in the movement. While, for example, "identification with Jewish ideals" (rank 16) seemed to be operating strongly, by contrast, such related aims as "to promote a Jewish way of life" (rank 30); "to promote identification with world Jewish community" (rank 44); "to teach principles of Judaism to center participants" (rank 45), and "to promote closer ties with the State of Israel" (rank 47), were among the lowest ranked. One may speculate that perhaps the center workers are "practice" oriented and are vague about how to make tradition a significant part of the lives of their agency memberships.

It is evident from the weak implementation of "activist" aims related to tradition that the teaching of prophetic Judaism, an important part of the Jewish tradition, cannot be conceived as a center purpose; nor is the propagation of the message in the daily \textit{Shema}', which three times daily enjoins the believing Jew to "... teach them [the traditions of the Torah] diligently unto thy children, and ... speak of them when thou sittest in thy house, when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up."

The findings do suggest that there is more consciousness of Jewish tradition in centers serving large communities than in those in small communities. For the country as a whole, it may be generalized that there is neither a marked tendency to reject Jewish tradition nor an active program to propagate it.

Certain groups of aims, related to intragroup relations and to community betterment, found themselves at the very bottom of the hierarchy (with averaged ranks of 41 and 45 respectively) and, according to the criteria employed in this study, are evidently not being implemented. Among the particular aims in these groups were further inconsistencies. The center may be a "common meeting ground" (rank 24) for Jews of different ideologies, for example, but that does not mean that "unity" (rank 30) is being fostered among the various Jewish subcultures. While the use of the center as a common meeting ground fosters the creation of a hospitable climate of receptivity for members of all denominations, orientations, beliefs, and non-beliefs, the movement's composite pro-
gram, as seen in this study, reflects little effort in developing unity among the subcultures around some common rallying point or cause.

**INGROUP MARRIAGE**

In view of the Jewish community’s deep anxieties over the growing rate of intermarriage the failure of the center movement to implement the aim “to provide opportunities for ingroup marriage” is surprising. Its rank (43) seems to indicate that the movement provides for a long list of welfare needs of the Jewish group, but not for the one directly related to its biological and cultural survival. The existing disparity becomes even more perplexing in the light of the high-to-moderate implementation (rank 19) of such a related aim as the “social needs of the Jewish community.” One might draw the inference that the center field prefers to assume no ideological position with regard to ingroup marriage, and to operate, as do many Jewish agencies, on the neutralist assumption that the biological or cultural survival of the Jews as a group is possible as long as they are left alone in a free society.

This assumption, which follows the thinking of such founders of the contemporary Jewish community as Isaac Mayer Wise and Solomon Schechter, is seriously questioned by Marshall Sklare, who states:

... having finally established themselves in such a society, Jews are now coming to realize that their survival is threatened—not by Gentile hostility, but by Jewish indifference. This is what finally makes intermarriage so bitter a dilemma to confront. ... In short, it casts into doubt American Jewry’s dual ideal of full participation in the society and the preservation of Jewish identity. And once the rate of intermarriage is seen to be growing, the contradiction in the basic strategy of American Jewish adjustment is nakedly exposed.6

Whether or not the Jewish community center movement can or wishes to do something about this problem today, is not clear. An examination of the attitudes of the movement’s power structure and memberships on the subject of ingroup marriage would shed more light on this question.

**THE JEWISH PEOPLE**

It was confusing to find the aim “to promote identification with the world Jewish community” at the bottom of the lower half, with a rank of 44, while the related aim “to promote a sense of identification with the Jewish People,” by contrast, showed strong implementation, with a rank of 13. Although both aims apparently have the same intent, the center
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movement probably views the latter as being in consonance with an important social-work objective—identification with people, with Jewish people in this instance. The concept of "the Jewish People," as espoused by Mordecai Kaplan,\(^7\) views peoplehood, or Jewish spiritual nationalism, as being essentially a state of mind, an act of consciousness, which is indispensable for the continued "identity of the Jewish people." Kaplan's definition is cited here only to contrast it with the center movement's apparent disinclination to commit itself on an internationally constituted community of the Jewish People and its probable desire to confine its interest to Jewish people in America. This inference is reinforced by the center movement's implied tepid attitude toward the World Federation of Jewish Community Centers and YM and YWHA's, founded by JWB to promote a cooperative and inspirational tie between the American movement and Jewish centers, and youth groups in many countries abroad.

**The State of Israel**

The center field's attitude toward "closer ties with the State of Israel," an aim which found itself among the least implemented (ranked 47, sixth from the lowest), does not reflect the positive attitude of most American Jews toward Israel. Marshall Sklare and Benjamin Ringer, in their study of Baltimore, Md., residents in 1948, found that virtually all had endorsed the establishment and United States recognition of Israel.\(^8\) In 1952 Sklare and Vosk also interviewed 200 Jewish families in Riverton, and their findings supported the earlier study.\(^9\)

In searching for an explanation of the center movement's obvious lack of interest in promoting some sort of relationship with Israel one might consider the possibility whether a special institutional factor operating within the movement may not make this aim so inoperative.

**Institutional Aims**

Among the aims ranked in the lower half of the scale were three in the category "Ends Related to the Existence of a Jewish Community


Center Movement,” which the respondents doubtless associated with the Janowsky Survey.\(^\text{10}\) These were: “to promote institutional identification with the Jewish community center movement” (rank 34); “to uphold Janowsky’s ‘Statement of Principles’ ” (rank 37), and “to achieve primacy of Jewish content in the program” (rank 38). Although many other aims listed in the questionnaire had also been mentioned by Janowsky, these three evidently triggered direct associations with his report. In effect, they almost consistently triggered a negative reaction on the part of the respondents. It may, therefore, be assumed that the Janowsky “Principles,” as such, receive little, if any, implementation in the center movement today. Their formal adoption by agencies most likely signifies little more than a desire on the part of center boards to conform, at least outwardly, to JWB’s institutional expectations. It is possible that a more vigorous and sustained espousal of the Janowsky “Statement of Principles” by JWB and the National Association of Jewish Center Workers would have moved the centers to give these concepts more adequate implementation.

**IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Despite the admitted limitations of the study and the inherent ambiguity and lack of philosophical precision of the stated purposes, certain conclusions can be drawn from the data. Chief among them are the contradictions inherent in the center movement’s avowed purposes, as opposed to its “working” purposes.

**The Center as a Movement**

To begin with, the movement’s lack of emphasis on many center-related aims gives rise to the basic question whether the centers are concerned to any appreciable degree with the propagation of the movement, as such. If the operational budgets of the centers were dependent upon a central national source, their ideology and attitudes would probably come under closer country-wide scrutiny, and this would ensure some degree of institutional direction. But allocations for operating expenses come from local fund-raising resources. And while fund-raising leaders often exercise some indirect, subtle control over the local center, they evidently are not sufficiently center movement oriented to guide the im-

\(^\text{10}\) Janowsky, *op. cit.*
plication of the broader principles that should govern community center work.

What Makes for Jewishness?

The acculturation process in American society, which increasingly numbs the sense of group cohesion of many Jews, tends to intensify their alienation from any Jewish institution seeking to hold them, unless that institution succeeds in evolving more positive values and successful techniques. It has been inferred that the center movement accommodates more to acculturation by emphasizing the easily attainable objectives of recreation, leisure, fun, and personality development, and less to purposes dealing with the survival of the Jews as a group. It has also been inferred that its quest for Jewish group identity may be losing ground, as is its role as a cohesive force within its own ranks and within the Jewish community.

On the surface, the primacy of implemented recreation and leisure aims seems to correlate closely with Solender’s view that the center "posit its program on the great values to be derived from the constructive use of what we term people’s leisure.” But the center field is not strongly committed to Solender’s further view of “the use of a portion of this free time for positive purposes related to the Jew and his group.”

The aims have a vague, nonideological base, and are geared to satisfying interests and needs related to pleasure-seeking and “deriving fun from center activities.” The activity itself, rather than the institution, becomes the focus of the individual member’s attention. The past and the future of the center and the Jewish community are overshadowed by the here and now, with minimal obligation or commitment to ideology or long-range institutional purposes.

Rabbi Kaplan criticized this very tendency in the Jewish community some 20 years ago:

American Jewish life seethes with activity. Federations, welfare funds, community chests, United Jewish Appeals, hospitals, orphan asylums, homes for the aged, fraternal orders, public relations agencies, . . . make quite a clatter. What permanent significance, if any, do they have? Are all these efforts with their vast expenditure of energy part of the advance or of the retreat of our inner forces?

This criticism is obviously directed to most agencies serving the Jewish community, and, as such, applies also to the center field. While center emphasis on recreation may be a reflection of the fact that Jews feel at home in the general culture of America, it cannot be considered a reflection of the Jewish "inner forces" of which Kaplan speaks.

**Vagueness of Purposes**

The ambiguous, uncritical use of language in expressing aims also is a failing that is not confined to the center alone. As a matter of fact, one suspects that the center has borrowed its language from the constitutions or publications of kindred organizations. Alfred Jospe points to this very difficulty in his essays on Hillel activities on the college campus:

There is no dearth of definitions of Hillel's purposes. If you ask students, as we have frequently done, what they conceive Hillel's main purpose to be, you get an enormous variety of answers, thoughtful or crude, perceptive or superficial, some phrased beautifully and some put in a way to take you flinch.\(^\text{13}\)

The universality of the problem is underlined by the fact that the San Francisco branch of the YMCA in a self study\(^\text{14}\) referred to manifold difficulties in defining its purpose. Even the President's Commission on National Goals abundantly documented in a report its struggle in defining goals for the American people in the 1960's.\(^\text{15}\)

**Neutrality**

The center movement is also hampered in achieving clarity of purpose because, aside from difficulties in formulation, its basic purposes are, or have become, unclear.

Although the center has been exposed over the years to a profusion of ideologies in the Jewish community, it has not specifically accepted and championed any. Nor has it developed an ideology uniquely its own. As Benjamin Halpern\(^\text{16}\) cautioned not so long ago at the Lakewood Con-
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ference, the center movement needs "a clear articulation of the specific form of Judaism" with which it can "identify itself, which it can defend as its own cause."

Neutral Position of Center Movement

The data of the study indicate that the center's failure to adopt a positive program of its own stems from its inclination to reject any ideology having a seemingly polarized end, survivalist or assimilationist. The movement's weak implementation of Jewish aims was established; but its rejection of assimilationist aims was just as strong. The reaction to an aim that inadvertently won notoriety as a result of a typographical error in the second questionnaire may serve as illustration. It read "To facilitate the adjustment of Jews to American society with (should have read without) loss of their Jewish identity." In this form, it clearly advocated assimilation. The vast majority of respondent executive directors ranked it very low. In rare instances, only where the respondents took the trouble to change the wording to read "without loss," was it rated as highly or moderately implemented. The centers were less severe, but also negative, in ranking "integration of the Jew into American society" as well as most other intergroup and intercultural aims. While it has been the policy of the movement to welcome non-Jews as members, it would almost appear as though integration, intergroup, and intercultural aims were looked upon as steps toward assimilation and, as such, were overtly rejected as inactive.

Center executives in the smaller communities were more sensitive about relations with the non-Jewish community than were those in Metropolitan New York and other large urban areas. It may be, therefore, that the smaller the community, the greater is its concern about good relations with the non-Jewish community; the larger the concentration of Jews, the greater their sense of security about their image among non-Jews.

The center movement's apparent assumption that Jewish survival is possible by following a dual course of full participation in the majority culture and the simultaneous preservation of Jewish identity is entirely in keeping with its neutralist position. The study suggested, however, that the dual strategy, as presently implemented, is not working to the advantage of the Jewish community. The study also established that the preponderance and diversity of the stated Jewish aims do not necessarily mean that they are more actively implemented than its general aims. It
does suggest, however, a larger variety of concerns for the survival of the Jewish group in America.

The general trend in the country toward the growing dependence of the family on all types of communal agencies for services which formerly were in its own province,¹⁷ seems to indicate that the Jewish family, too, is growing increasingly dependent upon Jewish community agencies, including the center. As the American Jewish family becomes increasingly alienated from its past, it becomes more dependent upon agencies like the center to give it a rational basis for identification with the Jewish group and culture. But Jewish knowledge and Jewish experiences are basic to the development of this sense of identification. If the center field is not offering these today, will it be willing or able to do so tomorrow?

The growing forces for the integration of other minorities in America may also impose increasing pressures on the center movement to place greater stress on intergroup relations. In this event, the center will be particularly vulnerable because it lacks a strong ideological base to preserve its identity as a Jewish institution.

Centrality of Individual and Accommodation

It is consistent with the stated purposes of the center field that most of its major aims were found to be focused upon the individual who is served primarily in groups. This is based on the assumption by the ideologists of the movement that the center group work experience will bring about the kind of changes in the personality and values of the individual that will increase his emotional identification with the Jewish community.¹⁸ This remains to be proved. A further assumption is that the goals of the individual member or of the group are consistent with the goals of the center and with the needs of both the general and Jewish community. This assumption must be subjected to the test of further study. Center ideology was interpreted by Bertram H. Gold at the Lakewood Conference as follows:

Most of us saw the Center’s "ideology" not as a simple catch word, but as arising out of the total context of what we stand for and what we believe in; the things we do and the ways in which we do them. Seen in this way, our ideology stems from the dedication to the quest for Jewish identification and justification.

The question arises whether the major responsibility for finding a definition of purposes rests on the institution or on the individual. If the individual is primarily responsible, the institution is relieved of the obligation of presenting an ideology, and anything the individual accepts for himself is presumably acceptable to the center.

Leadership Development

According to the findings, the Jewish community center field has been expending major efforts to develop leadership for the Jewish community, a task of utmost importance for its future. Who are the leaders now being developed, and what are their goals? Are they lay leaders of center boards whose talents, once recognized in local communities, are sought by Jewish federations and national Jewish agencies? Are they staff members of centers, who are receiving on-the-job professional training and experience; or social-work students on supervised field work assignments in centers; or outstanding members of center groups, accepting leadership responsibility for the first time? Is the primary objective of such a program to provide lay and professional leadership only for centers, or also for the rabbinate, for Jewish education, and for the various national Jewish agencies and their fund-raising bodies? In this context, a review of the center training program for lay and professional people seems indicated. Once “trained,” what is the nature of their commitment to the Jewish community? How does their leadership compare with that found in other Jewish institutions?

Professionalization and Center Values

With the professionalization of agency staffs, the movement’s perception of its purposes undoubtedly underwent many subtle changes, for it entrusted its value system to workers whose training and philosophy are not necessarily rooted in the Jewish community, nor necessarily in keeping with center intentions. Since World War II, these workers have recognized social group work, with its emphasis on the individual, the group,

---


20 It should be made clear that the term “group work” was not included among the aims of the Jewish community center in this study, because it suggested a method rather than a goal. For similar reasons, “adult education,” “physical education,” and “Jewish education” were also omitted.
and the process of personality development, as their core discipline. As a result one may surmise that they generally have a stronger loyalty to broader social-work aims, as espoused by their national professional organizations, than they do to center purposes.

As Harleigh B. Trecker described it,

Group workers believe that the person is more important than the activity. Group workers believe in the dignity and worth of every human personality. Group workers believe in the infinite capacity of people to grow and change. They recognize that growth comes from within and that growth opportunities must be provided so that these capacities for growth can be realized. Group workers believe, furthermore, that people have the capacity to make wise judgments and when people are given an opportunity to accept responsibility they tend to behave in a responsible manner.21

The evolution and implementation of basic center objectives have been left to the chance that somehow the workers' orientation and center objectives would converge at a point in time, or at least follow a parallel course. But the data show that there is little likelihood of an adjustment of differences between the avowed purposes of the agencies and the perceptions of their executive directors. There is reason to speculate that this has been equally true of boards of directors.

The center movement has apparently borrowed heavily from American social work philosophy, especially in the use of noncontroversial generalizations, which tend to demonstrate that agency purposes are in keeping with the objectives of American democracy. But, at the same time, purposes that have been deemed unique to the center movement appear to be growing vaguer, and there is no indication that a drastic change is imminent. An apparent loss of direction has resulted, causing a sense of malaise on the part of numerous center leaders. Herman Stein22 feels that "inherent strains will continue" (and, he hopefully adds, so will "efforts to resolve" them). The center movement, through a unique and particularistic program for the education of its workers, may be able to assure them the Jewish knowledge and active commitment to Jewish ideals, in addition to social-work training, with which they may fulfill expectations. It should be remembered, however, that the implementation of center purposes, as examined in this study, was based upon the perceptions of the executive directors. They do not com-


pletely represent the agency's collective will or consensus. Purposes may be strongly influenced by such variables as the recipients of center services, the power structure of the board, turnover in staffs, sources of support, the surrounding community, and the prevailing culture, or any combination of these factors. The study of the attitudes of each of these in relation to the program and purposes of centers would add to our knowledge.

Social Action

Despite the fact that social workers have regarded social action as a deeply rooted responsibility of their profession, the low ranking of social action aims indicates feeble, almost nonexistent, activity of this character. Failure in this sphere may, in part, be ascribed to the fact that the center has come to be associated primarily with recreation. For where people play in their leisure hours, they do not seem to respond to the challenge of causes or social issues requiring the investment of time, energy, commitment, and devotion. And, as an agency dedicated to the democratic process, the center can rarely undertake social action that will be representative of its membership because consensus is difficult to achieve among the varied groups it serves. At best, a consensus is difficult to achieve because of the diverse viewpoints on any one issue among the different groups, subgroups, and individuals within any one center. There are, however, other reasons why social action aims were found to be fairly inoperative. There seems to be doubt in the movement as to which social action is appropriate to the center, what form such action should take, and how to go about it. In addition, there appears to be a general disinclination on the part of the administration, both lay and professional, to permit the center to become embroiled in public controversy. A final aggravating factor probably is the tendency of boards of directors, largely drawn from affluent sectors of society, to maintain a conservative outlook on crucial questions of a social and political nature.

Future of Center Movement

In the light of the composite picture of the operating and non-operating purposes of the contemporary Jewish community center movement which emerged from the study, one may ask those concerned with its mission where they wish to go from here. Perhaps they are content with the status quo, with neutrality, with the center's seemingly compromised
objectives that have displaced the earlier goals of Jewish identification. The operating purposes today indicate a more generalized level of operation in the form of recreation and personality development for Jews. The leadership may, on the other hand, come to realize that the vitality of the movement depends on its retreat from neutrality; that its service to the Jewish community depends on a more definitive Jewish program.

It is hoped that the findings presented here will spur the center movement to a reexamination of its goals. The author recognizes that the purposes of social institutions operate in subtle ways, often affected by latent forces of which even their leaders may not be aware, and that it is generally difficult to predict how their stated purposes will operate. It is therefore all the more important for a thriving movement periodically to evaluate its position and to highlight its future course. The center movement's leadership and its following will have to venture out of their safe moorings, and examine their will, or lack of it, to survive as part of the Jewish group. If they wish to survive, the question remains under what conditions they wish to do so.

Whatever the decision, the Jewish community center movement will inevitably face changes. Do those associated with it wish to control the changes? An institution seeking definition, understanding, and control of its situation cannot be satisfied with the kind of neutrality about which Thoreau once mused:

Well, we are safe and strong, for now we sit
Beside a hearth where no dim shadows flit,
Where nothing cheers nor saddens, but a fire
Warms feet and hands—nor does to more aspire:
By whose compact utilitarian heap
The present may sit down and go to sleep.23

# APPENDIX A

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Using the scale on the right, please encircle the appropriate number showing the degree to which, in your judgment, each listed aim is actually implemented in your agency.

(Definition of the word “implementation”: the extent of effort, energy and resources expended by your staff in attempting to achieve each aim.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Aim of the Jewish Community Center Is:</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Mod-er-ate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To help its participants relax from tensions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To uphold the JWB “Statement of Principles” by Oscar I. Janowsky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To foster the arts of the general community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To develop an appreciation of the Jewish tradition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To develop an appreciation of Jewish ethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To promote a Jewish way of life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To promote the welfare of the general community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To help in education of the general community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To encourage Jewish culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To preserve the heritage of America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To encourage acceptance of differences among individuals and groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. To teach the principles of Judaism to Center participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To advance integration of the Jew into American society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. To provide recreation for its members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. To stimulate identification with Jewish ideals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. To encourage social action for improvement of social conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. To help promote the democratic process in America</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. To encourage involvement in local general civic affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. To promote opportunities for Jewish group survival</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. To encourage membership’s identification with the Jewish community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. To preserve the heritage of the Jewish group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. To develop the social skills of its participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. To stimulate Jewish thoughts and ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. To promote the mental and intellectual growth of its participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Aim of the Jewish Community Center Is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Aim of the Jewish Community Center Is:</th>
<th>Degree of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. To serve as the meeting place of local general organizations</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. To encourage creativity of the individual</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. To facilitate the personality development of the Jew</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. To help improve world social conditions</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. To promote a sense of identification with the Jewish People</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. To promote the stability of the Jewish family</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. To promote the proper exercise of American citizenship</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. To assist in the improvement of the character of the individual</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. To promote closer ties with the State of Israel</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. To provide opportunities for growth of individual personality</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. To encourage self-expression of the individual</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. To encourage intercultural relations between Jews and other groups</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. To promote the purposeful use of one's leisure time</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. To impart Jewish knowledge to its participants</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. To promote the health of the general community</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. To promote the welfare of the Jewish community</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. To meet the social needs of the Jewish community</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. To provide opportunities for participation in the Jewish community</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. To meet the interests of the participants</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. To promote identification with the world Jewish community</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. To help improve social conditions in the general community</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. To develop unity among the sub-cultures of the Jewish community</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. To stress the value and dignity of the individual</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. To encourage self-development of the Jewish personality</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. To foster appreciation of the Jewish group and its culture</td>
<td>High 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The questionnaire was circulated with the item reading as misprinted here. It should have read "without loss."
## The Aim of the Jewish Community Center Is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Aim of the Jewish Community Center Is:</th>
<th>Degree of Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50. To facilitate the adjustment of Jews to American Society with loss of their Jewish identity *</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. To help the individual accept himself as a Jew</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. To develop leadership for the Jewish community</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. To encourage inter-group relations between Jews and other racial and cultural groups</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. To promote an institutional identification with the Jewish Community Center movement</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. To provide its participants with opportunities for deriving fun</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. To encourage an appreciation of Jewish values</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. To encourage practices in accordance with Jewish morality</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. To develop the physical capacities of the individual</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. To promote self-fulfillment of the individual Jew and satisfaction with his being a Jew</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. To further the development of the personality of the individual</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. To achieve the primacy of Jewish content in the program</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. To encourage contributions of the Jewish group to American culture</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. To raise the cultural level of the general community</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. To develop a common meeting ground for Jewish sub-cultures</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. To serve as a meeting place for local Jewish organizations</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. To provide opportunities for in-group marriage</td>
<td>High Moderate Low Not All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Concluding Question:

If you had to choose one or two aims representing the most important current purpose(s) of your agency, write the one or two you would choose in the order of their priority.
### APPENDIX B

Average ranking of aims from high to low based upon judgment of executive directors.

#### Ranks of Aims in Communities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Large N.Y. Cities</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>To provide recreation for its members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#47</td>
<td>To stress the value and dignity of the individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34</td>
<td>To provide opportunities for growth of individual's personality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#43</td>
<td>To meet the interests of the participants</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#60</td>
<td>To further development of personality of individual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#52</td>
<td>To develop leadership for the Jewish community</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>To encourage identification with the Jewish community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#35</td>
<td>To encourage self-expression of the individual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37</td>
<td>To promote the purposeful use of one's leisure time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#51</td>
<td>To help the individual accept himself as a Jew</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>To encourage creativity of the individual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#55</td>
<td>To provide its participants opportunities for deriving fun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>To assist in improvement of character of individual</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td>To facilitate personality development of the Jew</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>To promote sense of identification with the Jewish People</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>To encourage acceptance of difference among individuals and groups</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>To develop the social skills of its participants</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ranks of Aims in Communities:

The table below ranks the aims of the Jewish Community Center based on their importance across different categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>N.Y.</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#42</td>
<td>To provide opportunities for participation in the Jewish community</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>To stimulate identification with Jewish ideals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#58</td>
<td>To develop the physical capacities of the individual</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#59</td>
<td>To promote self-fulfillment of the individual Jew and satisfaction with his being a Jew</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#40</td>
<td>To promote the welfare of the Jewish community</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#49</td>
<td>To foster appreciation of Jewish group and its culture</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#41</td>
<td>To meet the social needs of the Jewish community</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td>To promote the stability of the Jewish family</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td>To promote mental and intellectual growth of participants</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>To encourage Jewish culture</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#48</td>
<td>To encourage self-development of the Jewish personality</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#56</td>
<td>To encourage an appreciation of Jewish values</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>To promote opportunity for Jewish group survival</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>To preserve the heritage of the Jewish group</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td>To serve as the meeting place for local Jewish organizations</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#64</td>
<td>To develop common meeting ground for Jewish sub-cultures</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>To develop an appreciation of the Jewish tradition</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>To help promote the democratic process in America</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ranks of Aims in Communities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Large N.Y.</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>To help its participants relax from tensions</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>To develop an appreciation of Jewish ethics</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#57</td>
<td>To encourage practices in accordance with Jewish morality</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>To promote a Jewish way of life</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#46</td>
<td>To develop unity among subcultures of Jewish community</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>To promote welfare of the general community</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>To preserve the heritage of America</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td>To serve as the meeting place of local general organizations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#54</td>
<td>To promote an institutional identification with the Jewish Community Center movement</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>To advance the integration of the Jew into American society</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>To promote the proper exercise of American citizenship</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>To stimulate Jewish thoughts and ideas</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>To uphold the JWB “Statement of Principles” by Oscar I. Janowsky</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38</td>
<td>To impart Jewish knowledge to its participants</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#61</td>
<td>To achieve the primacy of Jewish content in the program</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#62</td>
<td>To encourage contributions of the Jewish group to American culture</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B (Cont'd)

#### Ranks of Aims in Communities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Large N.Y. Cities</th>
<th>Intermediate N.Y.</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># 3</td>
<td>To foster the arts of the general community</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#63</td>
<td>To raise the cultural level of the general community</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36</td>
<td>To encourage intercultural relations between Jews and other groups</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#53</td>
<td>To encourage inter-group relations between Jews and other racial and cultural groups</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#66</td>
<td>To provide opportunities for in-group marriage</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>To encourage involvement in local general civic affairs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#44</td>
<td>To promote identification with the world Jewish community</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>To teach the principles of Judaism to Center participants</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#50</td>
<td>To facilitate the adjustment of Jews to American society with loss of their Jewish identity</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>To promote closer ties with the State of Israel</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>To help in the education of the general community</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>To encourage social action for improvement of social conditions</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#45</td>
<td>To help improve social conditions in the general community</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#39</td>
<td>To promote the health of the general community</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28</td>
<td>To help improve world social conditions</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Frequency and ranking of choices of all executive directors in response to concluding question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number in Questionnaire</th>
<th>Mentioned Aim</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#60</td>
<td>To further development of the personality of individual</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td>To facilitate personality development of the Jew</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>To encourage membership's identification with the Jewish community</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#46</td>
<td>To develop unity among sub-cultures of the Jewish community</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>To provide recreation for its members</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#51</td>
<td>To help individual accept himself as a Jew</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>To promote opportunities for Jewish group survival</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>To preserve the heritage of the Jewish group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#41</td>
<td>To meet social needs of the Jewish community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#52</td>
<td>To develop leadership for the Jewish community</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#56</td>
<td>To encourage appreciation of Jewish values</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>To promote a Jewish way of life</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37</td>
<td>To promote a purposeful use of one's leisure time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38</td>
<td>To impart Jewish knowledge to its participants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#58</td>
<td>To develop physical capacities of the individual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#59</td>
<td>To promote self-fulfillment of the individual Jew and satisfaction with his being a Jew</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>To promote a sense of identification with the Jewish People</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#42</td>
<td>To provide opportunities for participation in the Jewish community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#47</td>
<td>To stress the value and dignity of the individual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>To uphold the JWB &quot;Statement of Principles&quot; of Oscar I. Janowsky</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#43</td>
<td>To meet the interests of the participants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#49</td>
<td>To foster appreciation of the Jewish group and its culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#53</td>
<td>To encourage inter-group relations between Jews and other racial and cultural groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#62</td>
<td>To encourage contributions of the Jewish group to American culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#64</td>
<td>To develop common meeting ground for Jewish subcultures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#66</td>
<td>To provide opportunities for in-group marriage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>To help its participants relax from tensions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>To encourage Jewish culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>To accept differences among individuals and groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in Questionnaire</td>
<td>Mentioned Aim</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>To teach the principles of Judaism to Center participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>To stimulate identification with Jewish ideals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>To encourage social action for improvement of social conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>To encourage involvement in local general civic affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>To stimulate Jewish thoughts and ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>To promote proper exercise of American citizenship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#41</td>
<td>To meet social needs of the Jewish community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#61</td>
<td>To achieve the primacy of Jewish content in the program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#65</td>
<td>To serve as a meeting place of local Jewish organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNITED STATES

OTHER COUNTRIES
Intergroup Relations and Tensions in the United States

In 1966 intergroup relations showed marked variations. The areas in which discrimination against Jews was manifested became fewer. Overt antisemitism was rare, despite disquieting incidents and portentous possibilities. There were few signs of organized antisemitism. Several important studies probing antisemitism and anti-Jewish attitudes were published during the year. The relative tranquility of the Jewish situation contrasted sharply to that of Negroes. Their accelerated drive for civil rights, marked by violence and counterviolence, exacerbated Negro-white tensions, especially in the period preceding the November elections. Relations between Negroes and Jews grew noticeably acrimonious. Interreligious relations, principally between Catholics and Jews, which had been improving as a consequence of the ecumenical movement among all religious groups, suffered a setback because of tensions generated by explosive differences over church-state issues.

Antisemitism

The constant preoccupation of American Jews with discrimination and antisemitism often appeared neurotic and obsessive to non-Jews. They saw Jews as mainly well-to-do, highly educated, and standing relatively high in socioeconomic status and occupational rank. Nevertheless, Jews themselves believed that in the perspective of Jewish history and with the memory of the annihilation of six million European Jews still painfully alive, their concern with antisemitism was rational and precautious. The immensity of the United States and the diversity of its people made it possible for the country to harbor simultaneously contradictory and antithetical attitudes of acceptance.

Note: I wish to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Mrs. Lotte Zajac, of AJC's Clipping Service, in the preparation of this review.

and rejection, of tolerance and hostility towards Jews. This coexistence of good and bad, this ambiguity reinforced Jewish feelings of insecurity and intensified the desire among Jews to fathom the mysteries of non-Jewish attitudes towards them.

Executive-Suite Discrimination

The extent to which Jews have been accepted in the United States was dramatically evident in the access they gained to institutions and occupations that in earlier times were barred to them. Quotas restricting the enrolment of Jewish students at prestige schools, colleges, and universities became curiosities of the past. Jews were occasionally excluded from living in some upper-class communities dominated by America's untitled Protestant aristocracy, and seldom had entrée to the social clubs of this elite group; but in most other places they were accepted. In employment, most barriers have fallen, even in fields once closed to Jews. This change was effected partly by the greater tolerance in American society, and partly by the changing character of the American economy in which more people were now employed in service industries than in manufacturing. The explosion of the knowledge and information industry pushed open occupational doors previously closed to Jews as, for instance, in publishing and in the universities.

Yet the employment of Jews in managerial and executive positions in various fields of business and industry lagged. The American Jewish Committee and, subsequently, other Jewish organizations undertook programs to combat this type of anti-Jewish discrimination. By 1966 these efforts had already achieved some success.

Early in 1966 federal agencies began a quiet campaign against religious discrimination in executive positions in insurance companies in response to a complaint filed in 1965 by the American Jewish Committee with Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz. The Social Security Administration, in its relations with insurance companies selected to distribute Medicare funds, also began to require the same compliance procedures with regard to religious affiliation, as for race, color, and national origin.

On May 14, 1966 the AJCommittee released a study showing that, though Jews made up 10–12 per cent of the student bodies and faculties at 775 non-sectarian senior colleges and universities, fewer than one per cent of the presidents of these institutions were Jewish. The study concluded that, in the absence of any other conclusive factor, bias was at work. It showed that almost a generation had elapsed since Jews in significant numbers had begun to attain full professorships—the rank from which deans and college presidents were chosen. Hence, the earlier exclusion of Jews from faculties and the ensuing time lag did not sufficiently explain the paucity of Jews among top college and university administrators.

2 The American Jewish Committee, Jews in College and University Administration (New York: Institute of Human Relations, May 1966), 9 pp. (Processed.)
Another American Jewish Committee study, released September 1, 1966, investigated the virtual absence of Jews from executive positions in America's 50 leading commercial banks. According to the study, 45 of these banks had no Jewish senior officers; four banks had one each, and one bank had four Jewish senior officers. The study further identified only 32 Jews out of 3,438 executives in the middle-management level. Therefore the conclusion was inescapable that bias was one of the factors at work in keeping Jews from policy-making positions in commercial banks. The study was made public a few days after the United States Treasury Department announced that approximately 95 per cent of the nation's 15,000 commercial banks would be considered government contractors under federal fair-employment regulations to go into effect November 30, 1966 and, as such, would be required not to discriminate in their hiring policies for reasons of race, color, creed, or national origin.

Discrimination against Jews in executive posts in New York City commercial banks was regarded as particularly extreme. Nine of the 50 banks under study were in New York, and in these only one of 173 senior officers and only nine of 927 middle-management executives were identified as Jewish. Reacting to the study's findings, New York City Finance Administrator Roy M. Goodman proposed on the WNBC-TV "Direct Line" program on September 4 that the city withhold the millions of dollars of city funds from deposit in commercial banks found to be practicing discrimination. On September 24 two New York City council members announced that they would introduce in the city council a proposal to amend section 421 of the city charter. Hearings on the bill were held in November, but no action was taken by the council.

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL) announced in October that it would work jointly with the Bell Telephone System to end the "under-utilization of Jews" in the company's executive and managerial positions. The plan involved ADL participation in Bell's recruitment programs, "educating its recruitment staff to the best potential available among Jewish college students."

On October 26 John R. Bunting, Jr., executive vice-president of the First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company, announced at a meeting of AJCommittee's Philadelphia chapter that his bank, the largest in that city and the nineteenth largest in the country, was actively looking for Jewish applicants who might eventually qualify for top positions.

New York City's 50 mutual-savings banks were the subject of a follow-up review by AJCommittee's New York chapter, released October 30. This review charged that a year after the publication of the original study showing de facto discrimination against Jews in their executive posts, the mutual-sav-

---

3 The American Jewish Committee, Patterns of Exclusion from the Executive Suite: Commercial Banking (New York: Institute of Human Relations, August 1966), 12 pp. (Processed.)
ings banks had increased the number of their Jewish trustees, but the number of their Jewish executive officers remained substantially the same.

A quite different area of executive-suite discrimination receiving public attention in 1966 was top administration of art museums. A leading publication in the field editorialized:

Because most American museums were founded by Old Money—the town's country-club set, established bankers, merchants, landlords—their boards of trustees retain a distinctive coloration chiefly marked by a suspicion of—let's say, snobbishness to—the New Rich. Which suggests a reason for one of the more curious anomalies in the museum world: its anti-semitism—the most widely known, unspoken fact in the field.5

**Surveys and Studies of Antisemitism**

A survey of religion in the United States and of attitudes of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews towards each other, conducted by George Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion in 1966 on behalf of the Catholic Digest, revealed considerable distrust among the religious groups for one another.6 In the main, more Protestants than Catholics thought ill of Jews or expressed hostility to them. Only 70 per cent of Protestants thought Jews were as loyal to the United States as they, or more loyal, compared to 85 per cent of Catholics. Only 74 per cent of Protestants said they would just as soon live next to Jews, compared to 88 per cent of Catholics. Only 51 per cent of Protestants said they would vote for a Jew as president, compared to 83 per cent of Catholics. Unreciprocally, Jews were far more distrustful of, and hostile to, Catholics than they were to Protestants.

A sample survey of Lutheran youth in St. Louis and Detroit showed that 20.3 per cent felt Jewish businessmen to be not as honest as other businessmen.7 No appreciable difference in attitude was evident between young Lutherans who had received all their education in Lutheran parochial schools and those who had attended public schools.

Two surveys of Catholic parochial-school students exposed considerable anti-Jewish bias, though the surveyors could not determine whether home, school, church, society, or a combination of these shaped or encouraged that bias.8 The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) study found that

---


6 Published in monthly instalments beginning June 1966, and continuing well into 1967. Four articles dealt with intergroup attitudes: "Who is Loyal?" (August 1966); "What We Think of Each Other" (November 1966); "Do Americans Get Along Together?" (February 1967); and "Religion in American Politics" (April 1967).


only 40–45 per cent of parochial students expressed tolerant attitudes towards Jews, but that public-school Catholics were even less tolerant. The Notre Dame study, based on a questionnaire administered to parochial-school students, found that only 47 per cent of their respondents disagreed with the statement that "there is something strange and different about Jews; it is hard to know what they are thinking or planning, or what makes them tick." The study disclosed also that persons of high social class and high education had less bias toward both Jews and Negroes than those of low social class and low education.

In April Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism by Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark (Harper & Row, xxi, 266, 24 pp.), the first book in a series of studies on prejudice and antisemitism, sponsored by ADL and produced by the University of California Survey Research Center, appeared. This study was based on responses of a random sample of nearly 3,000 North California church members, who filled out a questionnaire about their religious beliefs, reinforced by nearly 2,000 interviews, representing a modified random sample of the national adult population, which asked about some of the more important items in the written questionnaire. The study concluded that 25 to nearly 50 per cent of the respondents held hostile religious images of modern Jews, regarding them as Christ-killers, beyond salvation, and in need of conversion to Christianity. While these views were rather uncommon among more liberal Protestant groups, they were almost unanimously held among more conservative Protestant groups like Missouri Synod Lutherans and Southern Baptists. The authors concluded that religious hostility toward the modern Jew provided the link between religious dogmatism and antisemitism, that the "contemptuous religious image of Jews predisposes Christians to embrace a purely secular variety of antisemitism as well."

A second ADL-sponsored study analyzed the public response to the Eichmann trial. In 1961, when the Eichmann trial was nearly over, 436 persons in Oakland, Cal., (a representative sample) were interviewed about their familiarity with the trial and their attitudes towards Jews. The findings were inconclusive: "Anti-Semitism seemed to play no role in determining respondents' over-all evaluations of the trial." The investigators found, however, that only 36 per cent of the white respondents knew the official estimate of the number of Jews killed by the German (six million), and that only about half of these regarded that estimate as valid. The authors concluded that antisemitism in some way accounted for the rejection of that particular item of knowledge, among both informed and uninformed alike.

The AJCommittee sponsored a two-part study on antisemitism in the United States, entitled Jews in the Mind of America (New York, 1966; xiv, 413 pp.). The first part, by Charles Herbert Stember, analyzed public-opinion polls from 1937 to 1962 that directly or indirectly probed attitudes towards Jews. The second part consisted of papers presented at a conference of social

---

scientists to discuss Stember's findings and a summary of the conference proceedings. From his analysis of the polls Stember concluded that "anti-Semitism in all its forms massively declined in the United States between the prewar or war years and the early 1960s." However, conference participants were reluctant to accept at their surface level these public-opinion findings of a 25-year period, in the light of the 2000-year persistence of antisemitism in the Western world and of the historic tensions between Jews and gentiles. Thomas F. O'Dea, professor of sociology in the department of religion at Columbia University, asserted that the poll findings represented merely a temporary lull in the long history of antisemitism, a lull characteristic also for past periods in European history, and that the possibility of renewed antisemitism still lurked in the background. Ben Halpern, associate professor of Near Eastern and Judaic studies at Brandeis University, expressed the view that the striking changes in attitudes, as registered in the polls, reflected not the prevalence of antisemitism, but rather its lack of respectability. Halpern advanced the concept of the perennial "hostility-tolerance syndrome" which determined the conditions of Jewish existence. Viewed in this historical perspective, the situation of Jews in America, however unique it has appeared in comparison to European Jewish history, remained, according to Halpern, "confined within the traditional framework of ambivalence between anti-Semitism and toleration."

Vandalism and Violence

No reliable estimate of the extent of antisemitic vandalism and violence could be made, partly because the data were imprecise and insufficient, and the social and psychological factors involved were often obscure. From time to time, most public, identifiably Jewish institutions have been defaced; synagogues and other Jewish buildings have been smeared with anti-Jewish and obscene slogans. Only a very small proportion were reported to the police or publicized since they were generally regarded as trivial and yet also inevitable and, except when repeated persistently, aroused relatively little anxiety. Year after year, vigilant Jewish organizations reported that there was no evidence to indicate the existence of an organized antisemitic conspiracy behind these incidents, which were attributed to "crackpots," "nuts," the mentally unstable, and to irresponsible and/or delinquent teenagers bent on "kicks."

Vandalism was presumed to fall into two categories: (1) vindictive antisemitic vandalism, usually perpetrated by organized youth gangs, and (2) wanton vandalism, more likely committed by less closely knit groups, usually neighborhood cliques. The perpetrators were seldom found. Property damage was generally insubstantial and seldom commensurate with the police work required to track down the offenders.

A list of some of the antisemitic incidents reported in the press in 1966 showed the usual pattern.

**January:** Swastikas and antisemitic slogans were painted on the Liberty Jewish Center in Baltimore, Md.

**March:** Fires were set to three synagogues and two hospitals under Jewish auspices in Chicago, Ill.; antisemitic slogans were smeared on the walls of the Chizuk Amuno synagogue in Baltimore, Md.

**April:** Garages and automobiles were smeared with swastikas and obscene antisemitic slogans in Oak Park, a predominantly Jewish suburb of Detroit, Mich.; vandals damaged a menorah on the outside wall of Congregation B'nai Jacob in Jersey City, N.J.

**May:** The homes of two Jewish refugees from Germany, the only Jews in a rural area north of Utica, N.Y., were daubed with swastikas and Nazi slogans; vandals set fire to Congregation Beth Israel in the East Flatbush section of Brooklyn, N.Y.

**June:** A Jewish War Veterans post in Queens, N.Y., was stoned and smeared with swastikas; vandals desecrated the Blue Hill Shul in Boston, Mass., and then assaulted a synagogue official who came upon them; the Petah Tikvah synagogue and the building of the Independent Order Brith Sholom in Baltimore were defaced with antisemitic and obscene inscriptions and burglarized.

**July:** For the second time in six months, the Hebrew Congregation synagogue in Somers, N.Y., was desecrated and defaced with swastikas and obscene antisemitic slogans.

**August:** The Young Israel Shomrai Emunah synagogue in Hyattsville, Md., was vandalized four times in a five-day period; four teenagers were arrested for defacing and painting swastikas on Congregation Beth Sholom synagogue in Teaneck, N.J.

**October:** Vandals set small fires in the Beth Israel synagogue in Vineland, N.J., and scrawled swastikas and antisemitic slogans on its walls.

**November:** For two months the hasidic Vurka synagogue in the Flatbush-Borough Park area of Brooklyn, N.Y., was stoned and vandalized.

**Antisemitism for “Kicks”**

The increasing restiveness among youth and the accelerated craving for “kicks” appeared to have had an impact on anti-Jewish vandalism of a more serious nature. On January 25 Thomas Alfred Ruppert, a 17-year-old Youth Corps enrollee, was arrested and accused of having set fire, on December 20, 1965, to the Yonkers Jewish Community Center in which nine children and three adults were burned to death. Ruppert confessed having started the fire for a thrill. On May 19 he was indicted for murder and arson by a Westchester county grand jury.

The quest for “kicks,” multiplying violence, vandalism, as well as antisemitism, has been received in some quarters with permissiveness and unex-
pected tolerance. Riots, violence, and looting among Negroes have been con-
donned, and even praised, by some segments of the civil-rights movement as liberating expressions of selfhood. Elsewhere, the sit-ins, lie-ins, and demon-
strations characteristic of leftist-student movements have been justified as exercises of liberty. Violence and lawlessness among lower-class whites—
motorcycle gangs, for example—have been analyzed, and even romanticized, as an escape from the boredom and emptiness of their lives. Antisemitism has been a perceived factor among some of these groups; others have ex-
exploited antisemitism as a perverse amusement.

George Lincoln Rockwell, founder and leader of the American Nazi party, who has called for the mass-murder of the Jews and whom New York's former mayor, Robert F. Wagner, once characterized as a "half-penny Hitler," continued to accept invitations from college students to address ("enter-
tain" and "instruct") campus groups. In 1966 Rockwell's college tour in-
cluded Rice University, Houston, Tex.; Columbia University, New York City (where he was arrested on an old charge before he could speak); New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas, N.M.; Harvard Law School, Cam-
bridge, Mass.; Brown University, Providence, R.I.; Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; and New York State University College, Oneonta, N.Y. (He had been invited to speak at several other colleges, but the invitations were subsequently canceled.)

For about five years, Rockwell has enjoyed some popularity on college campuses. He was invited usually by liberal student groups and advocates of unlimited free speech, who got their "kicks" from the outrage with which their invitation to Rockwell has been greeted by Jews (parents, faculty, other students) and university officials. As a "compromise" or a "concession" to "fairmindedness," some student groups offered a platform also to Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist party, U.S.A. Max Lerner commented on Rockwell's appearance in the Harvard Law School auditorium:

I wondered what we were all doing there, and how insane a people could get in a democracy, to have the flower of their youth listening to plans for mass murder, and treating him as if he represented some substantial body of rational if wrong-headed opinion.11

Georgetown University's basketball team provided another example of perverted student humor. A Nazi-uniformed cheerleader accompanying the team closed his performance with a Nazi salute and "Sieg Heil" cheer. This particular brand of humor was lost on New York University students, many of them Jewish, who played Georgetown on February 5. (But the Rev. An-
thony Zeits, director of Georgetown's student personnel, thought the "Nazi" cheerleader amusing.) More than a week later the Georgetown students, in a burst of ecumenism, apologized to the NYU students, describing the incident as "innocent in origin, but which had possibly offensive implications."

Among lower-class youth, German and Nazi insignia and slogans have

become status symbols. Motorcycle gangs, particularly, have appropriated many elements of Nazi youth groups that proliferated some years ago, especially in big-city high schools. The more notorious of these lawless, disreputable, and irresponsible motorcycle gangs, which intermixed lawlessness and violence with elements of Nazism, included the Pagans of Newark and Washington, D.C., the Misfits of New York, the Aliens of Queens, the Deuces of Cleveland, and Hell's Angels and Satan's Slaves of California. On November 27 members of the New York-based Misfits wearing helmets with Nazi emblems marched in front of a Jewish restaurant in Los Angeles's predominantly Jewish neighborhood of Fairfax, shouting "Heil Hitler." They were arrested and served an 82-day jail term. An investigation into antisemitic activity in the Fairfax area was authorized by the Los Angeles city council.

The Cleveland Deuces, whose leader calls himself Adolf Hitler, vowed allegiance to George Lincoln Rockwell's American Nazi party. Their activities have aggravated racial disturbances in Cleveland's central city.

In New York, a police raid on a Greenwich Village apartment, on December 9, uncovered hundreds of thousands of dollars of stolen goods, burglars' tools, pornographic photographs and films, marijuana, torture devices, and Nazi literature and paraphernalia. The apartment itself was decorated with Hitler's photograph and a huge Nazi flag. One of the arrested men, a German-born, naturalized American citizen, belonged to the Hell's Angels motorcycle gang. Hell's Angels have been described as desperate men, without education, jobs, status, mobility (despite their motorcycles), and without a future: "In a world increasingly geared to specialists, technicians, and fantastically complicated machinery, the Hell's Angels are obvious losers, and it bugs them." 12

These motorcycle gangs disturbingly recall the motorcycle cult of pre-Hitlerian Germany, the uprooted jobless and violent men of the Frei Korps, the toughs, drinkers, and brawlers, with a yen for pornography and blood, who became the brawn of Hitler's first army, the brown-shirted Sturmabteilung. In 1966 the violent motorcycle gangs were numbered in the hundreds, perhaps a few thousands, 13 but they may be the warning signals of a changing society. In an increasingly technological society, in which education more than any other single factor determines mobility, the lazy, the stupid, the incompetent, the dropouts are consigned to the dreariest jobs or left without jobs. Automation, also, gives them more leisure than they can consume. The boredom of their existence, then, drives them to sadism in sex, spurred by the rise in sadistic-pornographic literature, to drug addiction, and to violence in politics. 14 The relationship between pornographic sadism and

13 The American Motorcycle Association, with a membership of over 75,000, claims that these gangs are only one per cent of all motorcycle riders.
political sadism brought about the "cult of despotism" among early Italian Fascist and German Nazis. George Steiner calling attention to the coincidence in time of "the new barbarism and the breakdown of verbal and pictorial taboos" cited the enormous mass of sadistic and antisemitic erotica which preceded the Nazi period. Céline, "the virtuoso of scatological narrative" was also Céline, "the prophetic advocate of the 'final solution.'"  

Passivity and "Tolerance"

The passivity and tolerance with which democratic society treated extreme antisemites was evident in February, when J. Lee Rankin, New York City corporation counsel, informed the Board of Education that, under its regulations, it had to extend its facilities for after-class-hours meetings to the National Renaissance party, a miniscule but viciously Nazi and antisemitic group. The rationale for the ruling was that the group was a political party. ADL attacked this decision: "To accept this lunatic-fringe clique's definition of itself as a political party is to pervert the meaning of the term" (New York Times, February 16, 1966). The National Renaissance party used the auditorium of a junior high school, on March 18, for a meeting at which its founder and leader, James H. Madole, denounced Jews, Negroes, Communists and the United States.

Another instance of democratic permissiveness was a decision handed down, June 19, by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to renew the license of radio station KTYM in Inglewood, Cal. A complaint had been filed by ADL that the station had broadcast several antisemitic programs and that its owners declined to halt these programs. By a 5 to 1 vote, the commissioners held that radio was "a medium of free speech" and that they could not censor programming. They also denied a public hearing on the issue. Nevertheless, they admitted that the broadcasts "did contain statements that can be regarded as anti-Semitic, and that will surely be highly offensive to many persons of the Jewish faith as well as to fair-minded people of other faiths." Kenneth A. Cox, the dissenting commissioner, termed the decision "incredible," declaring that "in light of the history of the world in our century, these programs stand as a bald attack upon the lives, the fortunes, and the sacred honor of our fellow countrymen."

A month later, in a similar case, the FCC ruled to renew provisionally for one year the license of radio station WXUR at Media, Pa., a Philadelphia suburb, and agreed to hold a public hearing on the charges that the station broadcast antisemitic and anti-Negro programs.

An editorial in AJCommittee's Newsletter (November-December 1966) called attention to the "talk-back" radio and television programs which, in their desire for sensationalism, provided large audiences to bigots, racists, antisemites, and a variety of questionable characters. The editorial stated: "We bar the airwaves to frauds, slanderers and pornographers. Why, then, open

---

them to bigots, who often represent no one but their own warped selves, and whose invited appearances on certain programs are meant only to irritate, not educate?" In one of the programs cited, a notorious bigot had said that Jews had plotted to drag the United States into World War I so as to win support for the idea of a Jewish homeland! Another program broadcast crude antisemitic propaganda, ostensibly in a discussion of Negro antisemitism.

**Racism and Antisemitism**

Anti-Negro demonstrations provided an avenue for open antisemitism. In Baltimore, July 28, the racist Maryland National States Rights party held a rally at which the speakers made anti-Negro and antisemitic remarks and incited gangs of white youths to riot. During racial disorders in July in Brooklyn, N.Y., James Madole made an appearance to harangue white customers in a tavern. In Chicago, August 20–21, counter-demonstrants to Martin Luther King's open-housing marches openly derided and reviled Jews. In working-class areas where residents of Lithuanian, Polish, Bohemian, and Italian background predominated, local speakers and outside agitators called to arms against "nigger scum" and "Jew Commies." One native Chicagolan of German descent told a reporter: "All these whites in these demonstrations are Communists, and I've noticed that a lot of them are Jews. The only loyalty Jews have is to Israel" (New York Times, August 21, 1966). The following day George Lincoln Rockwell and leaders of the National States Rights party and the Ku Klux Klan were haranguing white mobs in Chicago's Marquette park. Robert Jacobs, a reporter for Columbia Broadcasting System, became the target of a volley of bricks thrown by an angry crowd after someone shouted, "He's a dirty Jew—get him."

Rockwell was arrested on August 29 in Chicago for disorderly conduct, and on September 10 for marching without a permit. On September 11 Christopher Vidnjevich, Chicago leader of the American Nazi party, threatened to lead a march into a Jewish neighborhood: "The Jews are the real troublemakers." Rockwell himself subsequently announced plans to march into Jewish neighborhoods during the High Holy Days to "convince the Jews not to support the Negroes and the Communists." On the petition of the Jewish War Veterans, Federal District Judge Joseph Sam Perry issued first a temporary and then, on September 30, a permanent restraining order forbidding the Nazis to parade near synagogues on the Sabbath and Jewish holidays. Rockwell then asked for, and received, assistance from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) to appeal the order. (Rabbi Ralph Simon, leading Conservative rabbi of Chicago, resigned from the ACLU when he learned of its "regrettable decision" to defend Rockwell. Jay A. Miller, the local union's executive director, deplored Simon's resignation and argued that the best defense against fascism would be to devote "all of our resources
to alleviating the underlying causes of poverty, ignorance and lack of identification that produce this dangerous condition." 16)

Racial troubles in the North and South boosted the membership of Ku Klux Klan organizations throughout the country and multiplied their activities. An ADL report, released in September, claimed that Klan membership rose by about 10,000 since the beginning of 1966 to a new high of nearly 30,000. Some of the new recruits were in the North and the West.

Antisemitism has been a staple in Southern racism; 17 it manifested itself also in other places. At a rally of a revived KKK in Soledad Canyon, Los Angeles county, Klan leader William V. Fowler rallied his small following against the "dirty kikes" and "niggers," and promised: "Jesus beat the Jews from the market steps and we're going to beat the Jews out of the Federal Reserve System." 18

The Radical Right

Racial issues dominated the activities of radical-right organizations and sparked their membership recruitment. Before the November elections, the John Birch Society released a 75-minute film it had produced, Anarchy, U.S.A., whose purpose was to smear the civil-rights movement as influenced and directed by Communists. It insinuated that the sympathy of high government officials (President Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey, the late President John F. Kennedy) for the civil-rights movement involved them in a "communist conspiracy." 19

Concern about the growth of extremism, particularly by organizations in the orbit of the Birch Society, led to the formation of the Institute for American Democracy on November 18. Its committee consisted of 48 prominent leaders in church affairs, business, education, labor unions, and public service, under the chairmanship of Iowa Wesleyan College President Franklin H. Littell. Jewish leaders on the committee included Morris B. Abram, president of the AJCommittee, and Dore Schary, chairman of ADL.

The radical right was the subject of several scientific papers published in 1966. These included: Irving Crespi, "The Structural Basis for Right-wing Conservatism: The Goldwater Case," Public Opinion Quarterly, Winter 1965-66, pp. 523-543; James McEvoy, Letters from the Right: Content-Analysis of a Letter Writing Campaign (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, University of Michigan, April 1966), 58 pp. (processed); Lawrence F. Schiff, "Dynamic Young-Fogies—


Meanwhile, more evidence accumulated to indicate that, despite its denials to the contrary, the Birch Society harbored antisemites and used antisemitic propaganda. Early in 1966 ADL released a study on the Birch Society which charged that the society was strongly "contributing to anti-Semitism and waging an all-out war against the civil-rights movement." Birch Society publications contained the writings of antisemites and and the society's bookstores distributed antisemitic books and pamphlets. On July 28 Alan Cranston, then California controller, released a report which charged that the Birch Society was soiled "with the muck of anti-Semitism and racism, and a smattering of anti-Catholicism," and that "anti-Semitism and racism, intentional or inadvertent, abound at all levels of the society and in all its outlets—from its founder on down." To discredit charges of its antisemitism, the society tried to organize a Jewish branch, the Jewish Society of Americanists, but only seven Jews turned up at the first national meeting called in Chicago in April.

The annual New England Rally for God, Family, and Country, held in Boston, July 2, 1966, was dominated by Bircher, in addition to Klansmen and Southern racists. One of the rally's main speakers was Revilo P. Oliver, one of the Birch Society's original eleven founders, a member of its governing council, and an associate editor of its monthly *American Opinion*. Oliver addressed the rally on a subject he has written frequently about in *American Opinion*—the "Jewish conspiracy," which he believed to be the conspiracy behind the conspiracy. Shortly thereafter, Oliver resigned from the society, presumably in a dispute with Robert H. W. Welch over the public and undisguised expression of antisemitism (New York Times, August 16, 1966).

The Minutemen, a paramilitary racist and antisemitic spinoff of the Birch Society, believed its members must be armed to ward off the "Communist conspiracy." Robert B. DePugh, founder and head of the Minutemen, also attempted to form his own party. In July he held a convention in Kansas City, where he founded the Patriotic party. Kenneth Goff, a notorious antisemite and former aide of Gerald L. K. Smith, was a featured speaker. (Goff heads his own extremist, paramilitary Soldiers of the Cross, which is closely associated with the Minutemen.)

On October 30 New York City and upstate police raided the Minutemen's New York organization. They arrested nineteen Minutemen and seized an enormous arsenal of rifles, bombs, mortars, machine guns, hand guns, knives,

---

grenades and grenade launchers, mortar shells, and more than one million rounds of ammunition. (Minutemen are advised to join the National Rifle Association and to form or join NRA clubs, so they can buy weapons below market price and be eligible for free ammunition.) Besides the arms cache, the police seized large quantities of racist literature and the classic antisemitic "document," *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion.* California police have several times confiscated large weapons arsenals collected by Minutemen.

On November 14 DePugh was convicted in Kansas City of conspiracy and violation of the National Firearms Act. A prosecution witness in the case testified that his membership application was accepted after he declared that he was already a Birch Society member, and that it was his opinion that "the last Jew administration started selling us down the tube and the present one will complete the job." 23

The disclosure, on January 26, of an antisemitic and racist clique, called Rat Finks, within the New Jersey Young Republicans proved even more disquieting to Jews than the arsenals of the Minutemen. The existence of the Rat Finks documented the intimate, indeed integral, relationship between antisemitism and the political right. A year earlier, at a New Jersey state convention and at a national convention of Young Republicans, the Rat Finks amused themselves with their own mimeographed antisemitic and racist songbooks and songfests. The lyrics to one such song, to the tune of "Jingle Bells," were:

Riding through the Reich in a Mercedes-Benz,
Shooting all the kikes, making lots of friends.
Rat tat-tat-tat-tat, mow the bastards down,
Oh what fun it is to have the Nazis back in town.

Investigations were started by the Young Republicans on state, regional (Mid-Atlantic), and national levels of their organization and also by New Jersey Attorney General Arthur J. Sills (Democrat). Sills had recently been investigating the state's Minutemen, who were reportedly associated with the Rat Finks. Thomas Van Sickle, Young Republican national chairman, was himself accused of having been closely associated with the Rat Finks. On February 23 Episcopal Bishop Alfred L. Banyard threatened possible excommunication for any member of the diocese (14 southern N.J. counties) who had participated in distributing or singing the antisemitic and racist Rat Fink songs. In June the state Young Republicans expelled seven county units for being controlled by the Rat Finks. Sharply divided but under continued public pressure to purge itself of the Rat Finks, the executive committee of the national Young Republican Federation, on August 13, reached a compromise by a vote of 25 to 19. Richard F. Plechner, leader of the New Jersey faction, was absolved of charges of racism and bigotry, but his resignation as vice chairman of the national Young Republican Federation was

demanded in return for the conditional reinstatement of the seven expelled New Jersey county units. To be eligible for reinstatement, each unit had to resolve, by at least a two-thirds vote, to dissociate itself from the Rat Finks, Exterminators (anti-Rat Fink), John Birch Society, or any other factional group.

**Negro Antisemitism**

Antisemitism among Negroes erupted as a serious concern in 1966. It exploded publicly on February 3, when Clifford A. Brown, a Westchester county probation officer and educational chairman of the Mount Vernon chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), shouted at a meeting of the Mount Vernon Board of Education that “Hitler made one mistake when he didn’t kill enough of you [Jews].” The occasion was an ongoing dispute on school policies to end *de facto* segregation in the public schools. Four days later, James Farmer, then CORE’s national director, termed Brown’s antisemitic remark “intolerable,” said an investigation had been ordered to determine the context in which the remark had been made, and added that “also intolerable” were the school board’s “delaying tactics” on racial imbalance in the schools.

The slowness of CORE’s repudiation of Brown’s antisemitism and Farmer’s equation of Auschwitz with Mount Vernon served to intensify Jewish reaction against CORE. Will Maslow, executive director of the American Jewish Congress, resigned his membership on CORE’s national board, accusing it of a “trepid and ambiguous response” to Brown’s “horrifying” remark. “I cannot continue,” Maslow said, “an association with a group whose moral fiber is so flabby as to respond in an equivocal manner to the horrifying and racist public statement” made by Brown. On February 9, after Farmer’s intervention, CORE’s Mount Vernon chapter accepted Brown’s resignation “with great sadness.”

The only public Negro response criticizing Brown came from Jackie Robinson in his column “We Also Have Black Bigots” (*Amsterdam News*, February 19, 1966), in which he deplored also the absence of any “spontaneous rebuke from other Negro leaders and civil rights organizations.”

Finally, on May 27, after continued dissension over antisemitism, CORE expelled its Mount Vernon chapter, which meanwhile had moved to reelect Brown as an officer. CORE’s dilatory responses resulted in the substantial withdrawal of financial support by CORE’s Jewish contributors. Lincoln Lynch, CORE’s associate national director, admitted that contributions had fallen sharply after the Mount Vernon incident. About 80 per cent of CORE’s support came from the white community and, Lynch added, “you could say that Jewish contributions have been predominant.”

---

tute, told the national executive committee of the Jewish Labor Committee that he was deeply ashamed of the antisemitism among Negroes, but urged Jews to continue to give their support to the civil-rights movement.

Negro accusations against merchants, mostly Jewish, of unfair marketing and pricing practices, coupled with Negro looting and burning of white-owned (mostly Jewish-owned) retail stores in Negro neighborhoods, focused attention on the economic aspects of Negro-Jewish tensions. Populist Negro leaders like Stokely Carmichael of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), with anti-capitalist and anti-urban views, agitated their Negro followers against the Jewish shopkeepers: "It was . . . the exploitation by Jewish landlords and merchants which first created black resentment toward Jews—not Judaism." 25 Negro author LeRoi Jones threatened: "It is almost common knowledge that the Jews, etc., will go the next time there's a large 'disturbance,' like they say." 26

In Chicago on January 7, Donald Jackson, a Negro with a criminal record, shot and killed Sidney and Edward Fohrman, brothers in the used-car business, and Albert Sizer, their salesman. Jackson had been in three accidents and had become involved in a dispute with the Fohrman brothers over a $100-deductible insurance policy. A Chicago Negro alderman and Negro press and TV commentators justified the brutal murders and cheered the murderer because used-car dealers charged high interest rates. 27

The defense made by some Negro writers and radicals on behalf of six Negro boys found guilty of murdering, without any apparent motive, Mrs. Margit Sugar, a Hungarian Jewish refugee, in her tailor shop was even more implausible. William Epton, a leader of the Maoist Progressive Labor party, became involved in the belated defense and appeal of the six, who were believed to have been connected with a terrorist group called the Five Percenters. In November James Baldwin wrote a petition, opening the drive for a new trial, which declared that "what is at issue here is not their guilt or innocence" but "the manner of their arrest." 28

Another senseless action against Jewish merchants was a SNCC-led boycott of their shops in Washington, D.C., protesting the failure of Congress to vote home rule for residents of the District of Columbia. On March 21 the Jewish Community Council of Washington, D.C., criticized SNCC and the Free D.C. Movement for boycotting these merchants. While the Metropolitan Board of Trade had opposed home rule, the boycott of the local merchants, the council said, was irrelevant to the issue and a violation of their privacy.

Looting, burning, and destruction of many Jewish businesses in Negro neighborhoods continued during the 1966 summer riots (pp. 83–84). De-

spite reports by Jewish community organizations in Chicago and Cleveland that antisemitism was not a factor, Jewish businessmen suffered considerable property losses and were subjected to physical danger. In Minneapolis, following rioting in August in a Negro area once predominantly Jewish, many Jewish businessmen began to display “for sale” signs. The American Jewish World, Minneapolis’s Jewish weekly, editorially commented that while everything possible was being done to aid the Negro residents, nothing was being done to help the victimized businessmen, nearly all of whom were Jewish.

The greater awareness of Negro antisemitism pointed up the lack of hard data about Negro attitudes towards Jews and whether present feelings represented a rise in hostility or merely its more public, uncontrolled expression. A preliminary report on an ADL-sponsored study underway at the University of California Survey Research Center in Berkeley showed that more Negroes preferred to do business with Jews than with non-Jews; but most Negroes saw no difference between Jews and non-Jews.29 Midstream published a symposium on Negro-Jewish relations, with twenty-four Jewish participants, most of whom were actively engaged in the Jewish community; a few were primarily associated with labor or civil-liberties institutions. Only two symposiasts were Negroes, and one was a white Protestant. Diverse assessments about Negro antisemitism were made, and many contributors probed the historical, economic, and religious causes for Negro-Jewish tensions.30

PRESIDENT JOHNSON, AMERICAN JEWS, AND VIETNAM

The greatest disquiet experienced by American Jews in 1966 came as a consequence of President Johnson’s criticism of Jewish attitudes towards the war in Vietnam. The incident began on September 6, when Malcolm A. Tarlov, newly elected national commander of the Jewish War Veterans (JWV), and several other JWV officers paid a courtesy call on President Johnson as commander-in-chief of the Armed Forces.31 The JWV delegation used this routine occasion to express to the President its organization’s support of the government’s policies in Vietnam. In his response, President Johnson voiced his disturbance over the lack of support for the war among the Jewish community. According to Tarlov, who reported the conversation to the JTA (September 7, 1966), President Johnson compared American commitments to Vietnam with those to Israel, and drew a parallel between the political principles involved in American relations with both countries. He seemed also to have suggested that American support for Israel would de-

pend on Jewish support of administration policies in Vietnam. A substantiating account in the *New York Times* (September 11) of this meeting intensified Jewish anxiety, consternation, and also outrage over the President's remarks and his singling out the Jews as a group to be a target of his displeasure.

A flurry of denials and counterdenials followed; a B'nai B'rith delegation, which had called on the President for clarification, issued a vague but reassuring statement. In an effort to learn what the President had actually said and what the implications of that statement were, the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations met on September 13 with U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur Goldberg. Ambassador Goldberg reportedly reassured the Jewish delegation that no government official had intended to stifle dissent over Vietnam, and that no *quid pro quo* had been expected or desired when the President had compared American responsibilities toward Vietnam with those toward Israel. (Ambassador Goldberg said then, and several times later repeated, that he acted entirely on his own, that he had not discussed this matter with President Johnson, and that he was in no way the President's intermediary.32)

The only word from the White House came in a letter written by Harry C. McPherson, Jr., special counsel to the President, in response to an inquiry by a Cleveland college student and reported in the *JTA*, October 7, 1966: "Any inference in news stories that the President linked American Jewish support for this country's struggle in Vietnam with continued United States support for Israel is wholly fanciful."

On November 5 the Texas White House (President Johnson was in Johnson City for the weekend) announced that the United States would lend Israel $6 million for expansion of electric-power facilities. The release specifically stated that President Johnson had made the decision in an apparent effort to prove that the President's unhappiness over Jewish attitudes towards the war in Vietnam did not affect his commitments to Israel.

The anxiety provoked by the episode found little public expression. Jews limited themselves almost entirely to insisting on their right to dissent and to disclaiming any monolithic Jewish position on Vietnam. As proof they cited a Gallup poll, released September 21, which showed that national opinion was about evenly divided on the Vietnam war and that the Jewish respondents did not differ significantly from the national or Protestant sample. Jewish fears that criticism by the highest official in the country of political views held by some or many of them could open the floodgates of prejudice went unvoiced. (The incident, however, created a comic-pacifist button slogan: "You don't have to be Jewish to be against the war in Vietnam.")

The public positions taken by some Jewish organizations on the war in

Vietnam remained unaffected by the incident. Politically and religiously liberal organizations, like the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (UAHC) and the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR), continued to oppose the war, and justified their position by recourse to Jewish ethical teachings. Politically and religiously conservative groups, like JWV and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America (UOJCA), supported the war. UOJCA, at its national biennial convention in November, adopted a resolution supporting the war and America's determination to resist Communist aggression anywhere in the world.

**RACIAL TENSIONS**

Public-opinion polls conducted in the second half of 1966 showed a continuing decline in discriminatory attitudes on the part of most white people (including Southerners) toward Negroes, but increasing resentment and opposition to civil-rights demonstrations and racial violence. A midsummer public-opinion survey by Louis Harris of white and Negro attitudes showed that 46 per cent of white respondents would mind if a Negro family moved next door (51 per cent in 1963). But it also showed that 63 per cent of whites thought all civil-rights demonstrations were harmful (50 per cent in 1963). In contrast, most Negroes thought demonstrations were helpful. Furthermore, over 75 per cent of the whites said riots had harmed the Negro cause, and 70 per cent thought Negroes were “trying to move too fast” (64 per cent in 1963).

A Gallup poll, released September 28, showed that 52 per cent of a national sample (the highest since May 1962) thought the Johnson administration was pushing integration too fast. Only 5 per cent of the Negro respondents thought so. According to a Harris poll conducted in October, 59 per cent of white respondents in big cities felt personally uneasy over racial violence; 85 per cent of all whites thought Negro demonstrations hurt the civil-rights cause. A survey of 8,500 United Church of Christ members in 151 congregations found that 62 per cent of metropolitan-area church members felt Negroes were moving too fast in demanding their civil rights, but only 45 per cent of the Great Plains church members (where Negroes were fewer and less militant) felt that way.

This growing disaffection of whites was widely attributed to the emergence of “black power” as a slogan and philosophy in the civil-rights movement and to an increase in racial violence.

**Black Power**

“Black power” as a civil-rights slogan first made headlines in the nation’s press during the second lap of the James H. Meredith march into Mississippi.

---

Meredith, the first Negro to attend the University of Mississippi from which he was graduated in 1963, began the march on June 5 to inspire Mississippi Negroes to conquer their fear of living in that state and to register to vote. The next day, just south of Hernando, Miss., he was shot in the back from ambush and wounded. Within a day, the march was resumed by the Rev. Martin Luther King, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC); Floyd McKissick, national director of CORE, and Stokely Carmichael, chairman of SNCC, though they had not responded to Meredith's original call. Enlarging on Meredith's purpose of a "march against fear," these leaders introduced a more militant tone in their demands. In the course of the march, which many youthful Southern Negroes joined, Carmichael introduced the simplistic and appealing slogan of "black power," which the marchers appropriated as a chant.\(^38\)

It was often not clear what "black power" meant or what it was intended to achieve. McKissick, who first introduced the concept as a militant racial philosophy at a CORE convention in 1965, defined it as a form of social and political autonomy: "Black people should have the right to determine what courses" of action they were going to take, he said. "We're going to control our movement, and we're going to call the shots."\(^37\) Carmichael, too, defined black power as "nothing more than black people coming together as a political, economic and social force and forcing their representatives or electing their representatives to speak to their needs." Notwithstanding these unexceptionable definitions, this do-it-yourself philosophy articulated also more strident and discordant outlooks: racism, black separatism, and, above all, a mystique of violence. A position paper prepared some months earlier by dissidents in SNCC, which had been used to exclude whites from policy-making and organizational positions in the organization, had expressed this extremist position.\(^38\) Black-power advocates were ambiguous about the use of violence. Carmichael put it this way:

As for initiating the use of violence, we hope that such programs as ours will make this unnecessary; but it is not for us to tell black communities whether they can or cannot use any particular form of action to resolve their problems. Responsibility for the use of violence by black men, whether in self-defense or initiated by them, lies with the white community.\(^39\)

This ambiguity exacerbated the distrust and cleavage already marked in the civil-rights movement and intensified suspicion and alarm among whites, particularly among Jews grown sensitive to the antisemitism within militant civil-rights groups. "Black power is a dangerous and retrogressive step cre-

\(^36\) For a sympathetic account of the march, see "Talk of the Town," *The New Yorker*, July 16, 1966, pp. 21–25.


\(^39\) Stokely Carmichael, *loc. cit.*
ating a vacuum in the civil-rights movement,” one well-to-do white contributor explained the withdrawal of her rather extensive support of CORE.\(^{40}\)

The deleterious effect of the black-power slogan on the civil-rights movement and the fear that it would provoke political backlash in the elections spurred responsible Negro leaders to repudiate it. On October 14 the leaders of seven major Negro national organizations issued an anti-black-power manifesto.\(^{41}\) Entitled “Crisis and Commitment,” the statement rejected violence and strategies of violence, and reaffirmed their commitment to the democratic process and to integration as a goal of American Negroes.

**Racial Violence**

In 1966 racial violence was more widespread and turbulent in the North than in the South. Except for the violence endemic to Mississippi (visible even in the beating of little Negro children trying to attend a white public school in Grenada in September) and incidents in St. Petersburg and Atlanta, the most rampant racial strife in the North was that of Negroes rioting in their own neighborhoods. On a smaller scale, less destructive but equally deplorable, were anti-Negro disturbances perpetrated by bigots and youth gangs.

The Negro riots during the long, hot summer of 1966 were, in most cases, touched off by tensions between Negroes and the police or between Negro and white teen-agers. In most instances, the rioting and consequent looting and burning appeared to be nothing more than irresponsible, criminal behavior, though civil-rights leaders, sociologists, and social workers tried to interpret that behavior as the distress signal which inarticulate and disorganized Negro masses used to call attention to their plight. In many communities in which rioting and looting occurred, the National Guard was called in to reinforce the police. Serious racial outbreaks took place in Brooklyn, N.Y.; Benton Harbor, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Cleveland and Dayton, Ohio; Jackson, Mich.; Los Angeles, Cal.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Muskegon, Mich.; North Amityville, L.I.; Omaha, Neb.; St. Louis, Mo.; San Francisco, Cal., and Waukegan, Ill.

White counter-rioting occurred in Baltimore, Md., Brooklyn, Chicago, Cleveland, and Kensington, Pa.\(^{42}\) The whites involved were mostly low-income workers living near Negro neighborhoods. In the Northern industrial

---


\(^{41}\) The signers were: Dorothy Height, president, National Council of Negro Women; A. Philip Randolph, president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL-CIO; Bayard Rustin, director, A. Philip Randolph Institute; Roy Wilkins, executive director, NAACP; Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League; Amos T. Hall, executive secretary, Conference of Grand Master of Prince Hall Masons of America; and Hobson R. Reynolds, Grand Exalted Ruler, Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks of the World.

Martin Luther King did not sign the statement, but, at a news conference in Atlanta on October 14, he said he endorsed its principles.

\(^{42}\) For an analysis of the last, see Murray Friedman, *The Kensington Riot of 1966—A Look at the Underlying Factors*, paper read at the Lutheran Settlement House, Kensington, Pa., February 8, 1967. (Mimeographed.)
cities, they were predominantly Catholics of Irish, Italian, and Polish origin. The white Chicago rioters against Martin Luther King's open-housing demonstrations were overwhelmingly Catholic.43 Their furious anti-Negro hostility was believed to have accounted for Archbishop John Patrick Cody's plea on August 10 to desist, addressed not to the rioters, but calling on the Chicago Freedom Movement to suspend their civil-rights marches.

President Johnson himself appealed to these groups to resist prejudice and extend a helping hand to Negroes. Addressing the annual Columbus Day dinner of the Italian-American Professional and Businessmen's Association on October 12 in Brooklyn, N.Y., he said that "it hasn't been too many years since Italian-Americans felt the raw pain of discrimination in America." On October 16 in Doylestown, Pa., the President participated in a ceremony consecrating the new Roman Catholic Shrine of Our Lady of Czestochowa. On that occasion, he reminded his predominantly Polish-American audience that Thaddeus Kosciusko, the Polish volunteer who had fought in the American Revolution, had bought slaves only in order to free them. "We need that spirit in America today—perhaps more than ever before," he said.

On November 19 the National Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a pastoral statement on race relations and poverty, reaffirming Catholic teachings that discrimination was "contrary to right reason and to Christian teaching" and stressing that "we are all the children of God."

Civil-Rights Legislation

The stridency of the black-power advocates and racial violence frustrated the passage of the civil-rights bill of 1966 in the Senate. (The House had passed the bill August 9, by a vote of 259 to 157, in the full awareness that it would not emerge from the Senate.) On September 19, after twelve days of debate over a motion to consider the bill, the Senate failed for the second time to obtain the necessary two-thirds majority for cloture. (Two years earlier the less liberal Senate of the 88th Congress had mustered more than the required two-thirds vote, had ended the filibuster, and passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964.) The most controversial section of the 1966 bill was its open-housing provision. Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D., Mont.), unwilling to blame Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen (R., Ill.), who had opposed that section of bill, for the failure to shut off debate, singled out for censure the "demagogues" on both sides of the civil-rights struggle, and the "rioting, marches, shootings and inflammatory statements which have characterized this simmering summer." He strongly attacked also the black-power advocates who "in the name of racial equality or perhaps more accurately in the name of a new racial superiority, have not advocated further civil-rights legislation, but, in fact, have actively spoken and fought against it."

Nevertheless, the 90th Congress passed other bills designed to help Negroes,

particularly the poor. These represented a pragmatic economic approach rather than the political-legal. Two rent-supplement appropriations were approved (for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for fiscal 1967), providing subsidies to enable poor families to live in decent housing outside the slums. On September 7, 1966, when President Johnson signed the 1967 appropriations bill containing the $22-million rent-supplement program, he praised it as "the single most important breakthrough in the history of public housing." On October 20 Congress gave final approval to three important measures: an extension of the Economic Opportunity Act (anti-poverty program) for one year; an authorization of $6.2 billion in federal aid, extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for two more years, and the new Demonstration Cities Act of 1966, providing $1.3 billion to fight urban blight and suburban sprawl. The law provided that funds would be distributed over a five-year period to some 60 or 70 cities meeting a set of federal criteria. The thrust of the law was to bring together a wide variety of resources, and to apply them to a program for the combined physical, social, and economic rehabilitation of a single blighted neighborhood.

**Social and Community Action**

In 1966 there was a growing awareness that many problems facing American Negroes were more susceptible to solution by economic, social, and community action than by political or legislative action. A leading advocate of this shift in civil-rights strategy was Bayard Rustin, who conceived the grandiose Freedom Budget. Released in October by the A. Philip Randolph Institute over the signatures of nearly 200 Americans, white and Negro, the Freedom Budget asked the federal government to provide an additional $185 billion in the federal budget in the next ten years to achieve "freedom from want" by 1975.\(^4\) Its basic objectives included full employment, with a federal minimum wage, a new farm program, a guaranteed annual income for those who could not or should not be employed, and demands for decent housing, medical care, and education. It was not clear what steps were being planned to implement these demands.

Three related proposals for slum rehabilitation emerged late in 1966, all combining the efforts of private business with federal financial backing. On November 4 the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) submitted a plan to the President for a nationwide, nonprofit corporation which would merge private and public resources to rehabilitate urban slums. Established and staffed by HUD, this corporation would operate like the Communications Satellite Corporation (Comsat), in that its board would be headed by industrial management, and labor, academic and government leaders. On December 16 Senator Robert F. Kennedy (D., N.Y.) announced

the impending formation of two corporations, one of community leaders and the other of businessmen, to cooperate in the redevelopment of Bedford-Stuyvesant, a heavily Negro neighborhood in Brooklyn, N.Y. Besides housing, this plan incorporated also a variety of social and economic programs (anti-poverty, job training, recreational facilities, etc.), a thrust similar to that envisaged in the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966. Senator Jacob E. Javits (Rep., N.Y.) also proposed a plan which emphasized greater utilization of business and which provided financing of the corporation's program through sales of shares to the public.

The question of equal educational opportunities for Negro and other minority children continued to agitate the civil-rights movement. In New York City, Philadelphia, and elsewhere, militant black-nationalist groups demanded control over both personnel and educational policies in schools attended mostly by Negro children. In many instances they demonstrated, demanding the replacement of white (Jewish) school principals with Negroes. In New York City, parents and community groups organized mass demonstrations and a short-lived boycott at the opening in September of Intermediate School 201, a new, air-conditioned school in Harlem, with many features designed to bring superior education to its pupils. Because no white children were attracted to the school, the parent-community groups (including black-nationalist and Maoist elements) demanded first the resignation of the Jewish principal (antisemitic remarks were common in the controversy), and then communal control over the school. After some negotiations, the Board of Education proposed to set up an advisory panel of parents, community representatives, teachers, and supervisors. The parent-community group rejected this and also a subsequent board proposal to establish a task force of educators, public officials, and community leaders to recommend ways of improving Negro schools. By the end of the year, this dispute had not been resolved and no action had been taken. The Jewish principal remained.

In July United States Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II released a survey, authorized under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to assess "the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities" by reason of "race, color, religion, or national origin" in the country's public schools. Entitled *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, the study was conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics of the United States Office of Education, with Professor of Sociology James S. Coleman of Johns Hopkins University largely responsible for its design, administration, and analysis.45

The findings were based on responses to questionnaires by, and educational tests of, over 645,000 public-school pupils in 4,000 schools in five different grades in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, as well as on questionnaires answered by 60,000 teachers, principals, and district school superintendents. The survey analyzed six racial and ethnic groups: Negroes, American Indians, Oriental Americans, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and

---

whites. It made important regional, urban-rural, and class distinctions. Its unprecedented scope and seriousness of purpose made it perhaps the most significant piece of educational research in recent years, but it appeared to have been little noticed.

The findings of the study indicated that "the sources of inequality of educational opportunity appear to lie first in the home itself and the cultural influences immediately surrounding the home; then they lie in the schools' ineffectiveness to free achievement from the impact of the home, and in the schools' cultural homogeneity which perpetuates the social influences of the home and its environs." One important finding was that Negroes who had self-confidence and a sense of control of their own fate did better on tests than whites who had less self-confidence; this attitude was more highly related to achievement than any other factor in the student's background or school. Professor Coleman concluded, therefore, that "internal changes in the Negro, changes in his conception of himself in relation to his environment, may have more effect on Negro achievement than any other single factor."

The reluctance of most civil-rights groups to deal with the internal social problems of the Negro community was most apparent in the controversy surrounding the Moynihan report (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], pp. 99-101). The White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights," held June 1-2, had originally been conceived to deal with problems arising from the pathology of the Negro family and its impact on the fulfilment of Negro equality. But the violent objection of civil-rights leaders and social workers to this approach turned the conference into a more traditional and familiar civil-rights meeting presenting a bulging package of recommendations on employment, education, housing, and legal justice.

The conference, generally regarded as ineffective, represented an artificial consensus on civil rights. Boycotted by SNCC pickets on the outside, it failed to generate interest, discussion, or a true interchange of ideas inside. Daniel P. Moynihan, whose report was not mentioned at the conference, later charged that the civil-rights movement had lost an opportunity for an unparalleled national effort to deal more effectively with the problems of Negro equality. A study of this controversy concluded that the Moynihan report had provided a strong justification for a government that wanted to move vigorously on social and economic reform to benefit Negroes, but that the Moynihan controversy justified the government's inaction and its withdrawal from expanded commitments.

46 James S. Coleman, "Equal Schools Or Equal Students?" The Public Interest, Summer 1966, pp. 70-75.
Racial Tensions in Politics

"White backlash," reprisal by white voters against pro-civil-rights candidates, was widely predicted as a major factor in the 1966 election. Backlash in the North had been provoked chiefly by open-housing legislation, school busing, concern over crime and public safety, black-power militancy, and Negro riots and violence. Backlash in the South had been exacerbated by conflicts over federal guidelines for school desegregation issued under the 1964 Civil Rights Act and by the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Nevertheless, a study of the results of the election showed that backlash materialized only in the Deep South, where race still remained the salient issue in politics. The study found that the white backlash succeeded in electing governors in Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. It failed dramatically in the gubernatorial races in Arkansas and Maryland, and in the senatorial race in Massachusetts. There, 61 per cent of the voters in a normally Democratic stronghold elected Republican Edward W. Brooke, a Negro, to the Senate. He was the first Northern Negro senator in the nation's history and the first Negro elected since Reconstruction.

The election in Maryland was a dramatic illustration of group tensions over racial issues. The conflict began in September in the Democratic primary. In the rough-and-tough power struggle between two contending Democratic slates, a third contender, George F. Mahoney, a millionaire paving contractor who six times before had unsuccessfully run for state office, managed to win the party's gubernatorial nomination with a minority of the votes. A racist, Mahoney appealed to the same body of voters who had given Wallace over 44 per cent of their vote in Maryland's Democratic presidential primary in 1964.

In the primary, Mahoney received 46 per cent of the white vote in Baltimore city and Baltimore county, 60 per cent of the labor vote, and 68 per cent of the Slavic (Polish) vote. Jews gave Mahoney only 15 per cent, with 50 per cent voting for Rep. Carlton R. Sickles and 22 per cent for Maryland's Attorney General Thomas B. Finan. Negroes gave Sickles nearly 70 per cent of their vote.

Mahoney targeted his campaign in the general election to the potential backlash vote. His slogan was "Your home is your castle," and his crude bigotry provoked nearly all important Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish clergymen to denounce him. Responsible, civic-minded Democrats, moderates and liberals alike, switched to the Republican candidate Spiro T. Agnew, chief executive of Baltimore county and a racial moderate with political experience and competence. A third, independent, candidate was City Con-

50 Lucy S. Dawidowicz, The 1966 Elections: A Political Patchwork (New York: The American Jewish Committee, April 1967), 26 pp. (Processed.) Much of the following section is drawn from this study.

51 Robert D. Loevy, Computer Analysis of 1966 Democratic Gubernatorial Primary in Baltimore City and Baltimore County (Maryland: Field Politics Center, Goucher College, October 3, 1966), 3 pp. (Processed.)
controller Hyman C. Pressman, a racial liberal. The gubernatorial race brought out over 913,000 voters, a record for a nonpresidential year. Agnew won with 49 per cent of the vote; Mahoney drew about 41 per cent, and Pressman about 10 per cent.

Mahoney's support came from two types of backlash voters. One consisted predominantly of white working-class voters in and around Baltimore, overwhelmingly native-stock Southern migrants, Poles, Italians, and Irish, poorly educated, with incomes in the low-middle range. The second group was made up of white voters in Maryland's southern and Eastern Shore counties. These counties had given Wallace substantial majorities (69 to 82 per cent) in 1964. Now they voted for Mahoney, but not quite so heavily as they had for Wallace. The fall-off was most marked in the Eastern Shore counties which were solidly Fundamentalist and anti-Catholic. Thus, Roman Catholic Mahoney himself became a victim of sub-backlash from the backlashers. In the southern counties, however, two of which were predominantly Catholic, the vote for Mahoney remained solid.

Other normally Democratic voters, including Jews, Negroes, middle- and upper-middle-income white Protestants, government officials, and professionals, voted overwhelmingly for Agnew. Montgomery county (suburban Washington), normally narrowly Republican, gave Agnew over 70 per cent of its vote. In 24 predominantly Jewish precincts, 46 per cent voted for Agnew, 23 per cent for Mahoney, and 31 per cent for Pressman. Some Jews no doubt voted for Pressman because he was a Jew, but Pressman probably benefited from the votes of Democrats who could not bring themselves to vote for Mahoney, but for whom voting Republican would have been equally traumatic. They solved their dilemma by voting for Pressman.

In 19 of 26 contests for House seats where backlash had been predicted, the more liberal candidates on civil rights were elected, though in some cases with diminished margins. The impotence of backlash as the decisive factor was particularly evident in four Chicago congressional races, mainly in working-class districts where civil-rights marches and violence had occurred and which were sensitive to backlash. In these districts the four liberal Democratic incumbents were reelected, three of them by a large margin. All had voted for the 1966 civil-rights bill, with its open-housing provisions. In the 3rd C.D., Democrat William T. Murphy defeated Albert F. Manion, with 52 per cent of the vote. In the 6th C.D., Democrat Daniel J. Ronan defeated Samuel A. Decaro, with 57 per cent of the vote. In the 8th C.D., Democrat Daniel D. Rostenkowski defeated John H. Leszynski, with 60 per cent of the vote. In the 11th C.D., Democrat Roman G. Pucinski squeaked by with less than a 4,000-vote plurality over Chicago's most indefatigable backlasher, John J. Hoellen, who had inherited his aldermanic seat from his father and, for 19 years, had been the "vigilante alderman."

It could not be stated categorically that backlash accounted for the defeat of other liberal candidates. In most contests, party loyalty, economic interest, and voting traditions were more persuasive factors than racial bias. This was
especially apparent in the contest for the House seat in the 6th congressional district in Wisconsin's dairyland territory. The Republican candidate William A. Steiger, a state assemblyman for six years and a racial liberal, had been co-author of Wisconsin's 1965 fair-housing law. The Democrat, incumbent John A. Race, had barely won the 6th C.D.'s House seat in the 1964 anti-Goldwater landslide, with 50.7 per cent of the vote. That was the first time since the 1930's that the district had sent a Democrat to Congress. In his eagerness to build up voter support, Race began to vote against the policies and programs of the man on whose coattails he had been elected. He voted against foreign aid, and was the only congressman in the Wisconsin delegation (6 Democrats and 5 Republicans) to vote against the 1966 civil-rights bill. The 6th C.D., with only about 100 Negroes, had been one of three that had given Wallace substantial support in the 1964 primary. Presumably counting on that backlash vote, Race used the slogan popularized by Mahoney in Maryland, "A man's home is his castle." But Steiger won the election, with 52.4 per cent of the vote and a plurality of about 7,000. Party loyalty reasserted itself in the 6th C.D. and that, along with class interest, was more decisive than the racial issue in determining the outcome of the election.

Attention had focused also on the referendum in New York City to abolish civilian review of the police. The campaign reflected tensions between Negroes and police and also the widespread concern among all New Yorkers about crime and the need for greater police protection. A survey conducted in August among New York Negroes found that the 1,200 respondents were concerned more about police protection than about police brutality. But the campaign, as conducted by the proponents of civilian review, turned it into an issue of symbolic significance to the Negroes, while the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association conducted an emotional campaign around the issue of crime in the streets and confidence in the police. Thus, both sides contributed to the polarization of attitudes which seemed to pit the Negroes against the police and, hence, against law and order. The results were disastrous for supporters of civilian review: 63 per cent of the voters favored abolishing the civilian-review board.

About six weeks before the election, a public-opinion poll was conducted for Federated Associations for Impartial Review (FAIR), the organization campaigning for civilian review. That poll showed that two-thirds of the respondents thought safety in the streets a most important city problem, while only a little over one-third thought the civilian-review board a most important problem. Only the Irish among the various ethnic, religious, and racial groups thought that the civilian-review-board issue was the most important issue. They listed safety in the streets as second most important. But most Italians, Puerto Ricans, Jews, and Negroes uniformly cited safety in the streets as the most important city problem. Out of nine issues, civilian

review was rated fourth by the Italians, fifth by the Puerto Ricans, and sixth by both Jews and Negroes. The Irish, then, perceived civilian review of the police as a most threatening issue. After all, most policemen are Irish and the Irish in America have had long and intimate associations with both police and politics. These, they felt, were now endangered.

Civilian review had been introduced and was being vigorously defended by a reform Republican mayor who had upset the traditional political arrangements in New York. John V. Lindsay was not merely Republican, but also Anglo-Saxon and Protestant. This mayor had challenged the historic Irish Catholic hegemony in New York City's police department. On the issue of civilian review, he forced out Police Commissioner Vincent L. Broderick. Then, the new Police Commissioner Howard B. Leary, shortly after taking office, promoted Sanford D. Garelik, a Jew, to chief inspector of the police department and Lloyd G. Sealy, a Negro, to assistant chief inspector, giving rise to accusations that the promotions were directed by City Hall. The Irish began to feel beleaguered.

While less than 10 per cent of all respondents perceived the civilian-review board as an instrument "to protect or satisfy minority groups," 22 per cent of the Irish perceived that as the board's purpose. Eighty-six per cent of the Irish respondents said they would vote against the civilian-review board, as compared with 72 per cent of the Italians, 50 per cent of the Jews, 30 per cent of the Puerto Ricans, and 10 per cent of the Negroes.

The actual vote generally bore out the poll's findings. German, Irish, and Italian voters voted heavily to abolish the civilian-review board. Jewish voters split. The more affluent, more educated, and younger Jews tended to vote on principle (or ideology), and supported civilian review. The poorer, older, and less educated voted against—they wanted more police protection. The civilian-review board lost by considerably smaller margins in districts with large numbers of Jews than in densely Irish, German, or Italian districts.53 There was a correlation between a high vote to abolish the civilian-review board and a high vote for the Conservative party (mostly German and Irish voters). Similarly, a low vote against civilian review was often paired with a high vote for the Liberal party (mostly Jewish voters). Major-party affiliations, however, had no bearing on how people voted.

**INTERRELIGIOUS TENSIONS ON CHURCH-STATE ISSUES**

Efforts at mutual understanding between Catholics and Jews, growing out of Vatican Council II, were often canceled by Catholic-Jewish tensions over questions of church and state. These were particularly rancorous in the conflict over federal and state aid to sectarian nonpublic schools. Protestants were divided among themselves denominationally and on issues. Some liberal

---

Protestant church groups favored federal aid and opposed prayer in the schools, while conservative (Fundamentalist) groups adamantly opposed federal aid to parochial schools and vigorously argued for prayer and Bible reading in public schools. Within the Jewish community, the most bitter divisions were between Orthodox organizations ranged in favor of federal aid, and nearly all other Jewish organizations who opposed it. An off-the-record church-state conference, convened by the joint advisory committee of the Synagogue Council of America and the National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), reinforced that division. The proceedings revealed deep divisions between Orthodox and non-Orthodox and angry suspicion on the part of the secularists and non-Orthodox that the Orthodox, in insisting on their need for federal funds to support their institutions, were intent on robbing the public treasury.

The strongest Jewish criticism of the Jewish separationist position was made by Milton Himmelfarb in *Commentary* and aroused critical comment from separationists. Himmelfarb provided his own summary of his views: "It is not true that freedom is most secure where church and state are separated; separation and separationism are not the same; even in America, separationism is potentially tyrannical; separationism needlessly repels some from the democratic consensus; it is harsh to those who prefer nonpublic schools for conscience' sake; and it stands in the way of a more important good (and a more important safeguard of Jewish security), the best possible education for all."

**Federal Aid to Education**

Separationists, who had given only reluctant support to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 because of its provisions for federal aid to children attending nonpublic schools (*AJYB*, 1966 [Vol. 67], pp. 133–141), in 1966 viewed all such aid with the utmost suspicion. They believed that such aid was given at the expense of children in public schools. In fact, according to an early report of the Office of Education's accomplishments in distributing grants, only seven per cent of the children receiving such aid were in sectarian nonpublic schools, though these schools accounted for 15 per cent of the total school population. (Reliable statistics about the proportion of nonpublic-school pupils receiving federal aid were generally unavailable.)

Representatives of the National Council of Churches and of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs met with U.S. Commissioner of Education Howe in April to ask for firmer federal guidelines and regulations regarding funds allocated for pupils in sectarian nonpublic schools. The AJCongress, ACLU, and Protestants and Other Americans United for the


Separation of Church and State (POAU) continued their unyielding opposition to any form of aid to pupils in these schools. Leo Pfeffer, special counsel of the AJCongress, testifying before the education subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, April 19, charged there was "grave reason to fear" that federal aid was being used "to finance a private and parochial school system paralleling the American public school system." The aggressive attacks of these three organizations against all forms of aid to parochial-school children earned them the opprobrium of both Catholic and Orthodox Jewish groups. Father Virgil C. Blum, professor of political science at Marquette University, described AJCongress, ACLU, and POAU as "doctrinaire separationists" who were "carrying forward the crusade of the 19th-century Nativists and Know-Nothings." 56

Tensions over the distribution of federal funds to nonpublic sectarian schools were particularly abrasive in New York. The Board of Education was subjected for several months to intense pressure about a proposed allocation of $65 million in federal funds under Title I of ESEA. About $15 million had originally been earmarked for 213 nonpublic sectarian schools, mostly Catholic, but including also fifty or more Jewish day schools and some Greek Orthodox, Lutheran, and Episcopalian schools. After months of haggling, the Board of Education approved the program on August 31, with criteria that restricted aid to the nonpublic-school pupils more than originally planned and with considerably reduced allocations to them. As a consequence, both the opponents and supporters of federal aid to nonpublic-school pupils were dissatisfied.

On June 13 the POAU chapter in Dayton, Ohio, filed suit in the U.S. District Court, aimed at declaring unconstitutional ESEA's Title II (provision of books and library materials to nonpublic-school pupils). On November 14 a group of taxpayers, sponsored by POAU, filed suit in Philadelphia, attacking Title I's provisions of aid to nonpublic-school pupils.

On December 1 Leo Pfeffer, on behalf of the AJCongress, the New York CLU, the United Parents Associations, and the United Federation of Teachers, filed two suits in New York state and federal courts. One charged that ESEA's aid to pupils in sectarian nonpublic schools was unconstitutional. The other charged that New York City public-school officials, in administering programs under ESEA, discriminated in favor of nonpublic-school pupils. Both suits provoked angry statements from Orthodox Jewish organizations and an announcement that they would defend the education program against these suits. Rabbi Morris Scherer, director of Agudath Israel of America, charged that the AJCongress was damaging Jewish interests and that its court action would "serve as grist for the mills of those elements who would defame the Jewish people by characterizing it as a nonreligious secularist group."

A bill to permit judicial review of nine specifically designated acts pro-

viding federal funds to sectarian institutions was passed by the Senate by voice vote on July 29, but died in the House judiciary committee. Its chairman, Rep. Emanuel Celler (Dem., N.Y.) had long opposed such a measure on the ground that, under existing law, public agencies could obtain a Supreme Court test on the constitutionality of these laws. The AJCommittee, AJCongress, and many other Jewish organizations favored judicial review and submitted statements to that effect during the Senate hearings. The National Jewish Commission on Law and Public Affairs (COLPA), representing the interests of Orthodox Jewish organizations, submitted a statement opposing judicial review.

State Aid

Early in 1966 the school board of East Greenbush, N.Y., filed suit in the State Supreme Court, challenging the constitutionality of the New York State Textbook Loan Law of 1965, to go into effect September 1, 1966. Under that law, school boards were required to supply nonpublic-school pupils in grades 7 to 12 with textbooks requested from a list of approved public-school textbooks. The school boards were to be reimbursed by the state up to $10 per pupil. (After that suit had been filed, the New York State legislature, on May 18, passed a bill providing an increase in the state's reimbursement to school boards to $25 for each pupil's first year in school and $10 for each year thereafter. Under pressure from the bill's separationist opponents and then from its supporters, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, on June 27, prevailed upon the legislature to amend the bill to provide a maximum state reimbursement of $15 per pupil for the first three years in school and $10 thereafter.)

On August 19 New York State Supreme Court Justice T. Paul Kane, ruling on the East Greenbush suit, declared the textbook-loan law unconstitutional and "in violation of both the establishment clause and the free-exercise clause." The following week Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz appealed the decision to the Appellate Division of the State Supreme Court. The state meanwhile received a stay on the court's restraining order to carry out the law. On September 1 New York State school districts were informed they could receive funds under the law; two weeks later, the New York City Board of Education announced that it would purchase textbooks for parochial-school pupils under the law, at an estimated cost of $2,250,000.

Amicus curiae briefs in support of the state's appeal were filed by the Agudath Israel of America and COLPA. On December 31 all five justices of the Appellate Division of the State Supreme Court declared the Textbook Loan Law constitutional. Because they held that the plaintiffs had no standing to bring suit, three justices did not base their decision upon constitutional arguments, though they said they believed the law was constitutional. The other two justices supported the law's constitutionality primarily on the basis of the child-benefit theory: "The availability of books to students at nonsecular schools is little different from the availability of books in the
Public-bus transportation for parochial-school pupils was at issue in several states. On January 20 the New York State Supreme Court expanded the public-school district's obligation to provide transportation to pupils in parochial schools, even outside their own school district. In March four organizations (Jewish, Unitarian, Baptist, and Presbyterian) filed suit, contending that the 1965 Pennsylvania School Bus law was unconstitutional in its provision of service to parochial-school pupils. On February 2 Delaware Governor Charles L. Terry vetoed a bill that would have provided transportation for parochial- and private-school pupils who lived along established bus routes. He based himself upon a State Supreme Court advisory opinion that the law would violate the state constitution. In a Nebraska statewide referendum, November 8, a bill proposing local options for the public transportation of nonpublic-school pupils was defeated 250,000 to 190,000. The campaign was marked by crude anti-Catholic propaganda including a cartoon of the Pope driving a bus.

Prayer in the Schools

Except for the Bible-belt Southern states, most schools were complying with the Supreme Court rulings forbidding Bible reading and prayer in the public schools. On September 13 Oklahoma's State Attorney General Charles Nesbitt ruled that the continuing Bible reading and prayer in Oklahoma City's public schools were unconstitutional. (He added that he personally did not agree with the Supreme Court decisions.) His ruling did not appreciably affect school boards in Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and elsewhere in the state, which continued their practices of school prayer and Bible reading.

On September 21 the Senate failed to provide the necessary two-thirds majority to pass Senator Everett M. Dirksen's (Rep., Ill.) constitutional amendment to permit prayer in the public school.

Higher Education

On June 2 the Maryland Court of Appeals handed down a ruling on the constitutionality of state grants of $2.5 million to four church-related colleges, two Catholic, one Methodist, and one United Church of Christ. In 1965 a lower court had upheld the grants as constitutional (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 142). The Court of Appeals, in 4–3 decision, held that the grants to the Catholic and Methodist colleges were invalid because of the schools' pervasively sectarian character. The grant to Hood College (United Church of Christ) was ruled constitutional: "We are unable to say that the college is sectarian in a legal sense under the First Amendment, or to a degree that renders the grant invalid." State Attorney General Thomas B. Finan then appealed the case to the Supreme Court. But, on November 14, the Supreme Court declined to review the case, leaving in effect the Court of
Appeals ruling that public grants to sectarian colleges, even for nonreligious purposes, were unconstitutional. The next day the legislative specialist of the U.S. Office of Education said that the Supreme Court's refusal to review the Maryland case did not affect federal-aid programs to church-affiliated colleges and universities and that such programs would continue as before. The Maryland case involved only Maryland law, he ruled, and the federal government had not been a party to the litigation.

In July Michigan Governor George Romney signed a law designed to equalize tuition costs for students at private and public colleges. Sponsored by the predominantly Catholic Citizens for Educational Freedom and endorsed by the state Board of Education as well as the state's Protestant and Catholic colleges, the law provided tuition grants of $100 to $500 a year, based on need. Opponents of the law had included the Michigan and Detroit Council of Churches, various Protestant groups, JWV, and ACLU.

**Sabbath Observance**

On March 28 a Jewish employee of New York City's Department of Welfare since 1938 brought suit in the State Supreme Court against the city, challenging the scheduling of civil-service examinations on Saturday. He complained that, as an Orthodox Jew, he had unfairly been denied promotion because he was unable to take the examinations on the Sabbath. On May 11 Justice Samuel J. Silverman dismissed the case on the grounds that the city authorities had not violated the constitutional or statutory rights of the petitioner.

The state legislature, on May 22, enacted a law providing that Sabbath observers be permitted to take civil-service examinations scheduled for the Sabbath or a religious holiday on some other, mutually convenient, day.

The federal Equal Opportunity Commission issued, in June, guidelines on Sabbath observance, declaring that it was not religious discrimination for an employer to require his employees to work on Saturday. This ruling was issued in response to about 70 complaints received by the commission during the first year of its operation under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In August a delegation from the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada met with Dr. Luther Holcomb, chairman of the commission, requesting him to revise the guidelines in such a way that Sabbath observers might be enabled to adhere to their day of rest without being dismissed from their jobs.

_LUCY S. DAWIDOWICZ_
The United States, Israel, and the Middle East

In the Middle East, in 1966, prospects of Arab unity once again dwindled, as conflicting national interests reasserted themselves.

The increasing division of the Arab world into opposing camps presented the United States government with a difficult dilemma: If it maintained its traditional policy of nonintervention in local disputes, it ran the risk of having friendly regimes overthrown and important American interests jeopardized. If, on the other hand, it gave them the needed military and diplomatic support, it ran the risk of becoming identified with one side, a situation that would have exacerbated local and great power rivalries and thus furthered the very polarization that it had striven to avoid. The pressure of events forced the United States to take a more active role than it may have desired.

Revolution vs. Tradition in the Arab World

At the beginning of the year King Faisal of Saudi Arabia embarked on a personal diplomatic offensive, visiting the Middle East and North Africa, from Morocco to Pakistan and from Turkey to the Sudan, in an effort to promote a vague and loosely structured Islamic alignment as a counterweight to the Egyptian-centered Arab League. He found varying degrees of support and common interest among the more conservative, pro-Western states, such as Iran, Jordan, Kuwait, and Tunisia. These shared Saudi Arabia's concern over President Gamal Abdel Nasser's regional ambitions and his heavy dependence on Soviet arms and political support.

Nasser quickly responded by branding Faisal a tool of reactionary elements and an agent of Western imperialism which, he charged, was using the Islamic coalition to block the path of revolutionary Arab socialist regimes. He declared, in February, that "progressive forces must increasingly unite and be vigilant" in order to counteract the reactionary alignments in the Arab world and beyond.

The break became even sharper when Nasser, on June 15, announced the end of the policy of peaceful coexistence among all Arab states irrespective of ideology, a policy he had championed since early 1964 when he convened the first of a series of Arab summit conferences to coordinate Arab policy against Israel. He had now become convinced, he said, that the "progressive forces," among which he usually counted the United Arab Republic (Egypt), Algeria, Syria, and Iraq, could no longer march together with "Arab reactionary elements" (an obvious allusion to Jordan and Saudi Arabia), "even if the road leads to the liberation of Palestine." Nasser regarded the reactionaries as "a danger even greater than Israel itself," and stressed the need to "liquidate Arab reaction, Arab reactionary regimes and reactionary lead-
ers” before Palestine could be liberated. Subsequently, the 1966 Arab summit erupted into a heated dispute, fanned by Cairo and Damascus propaganda and countercharges by Riyadh and Amman, in which Nasser was accused of subservience to Soviet Communist policy and abandoning the struggle against Israel.

South Arabia—New Focus of Middle East Rivalry

While Nasser’s hostility to Israel in no way diminished, his preoccupations multiplied in 1966. The British decision to cut its commitments east of Suez and to withdraw from Aden in 1968 had greatly raised the stakes in the stalemated civil war in neighboring Yemen. In an August 1965 agreement with Saudi Arabia, Nasser had promised to withdraw his troops (reported to number 50,000), which were keeping in power an Egyptian-picked Republican regime. But in March 1966 Nasser reversed himself and announced that he would not do so “until the Yemeni revolution is able to defend itself against the conspiracies of imperialism and reaction,” and declared his readiness to stay in Yemen for five and even twenty more years, if necessary. (What he did not announce was that he intended to defend Yemen not only against the Royalist faction supported by Saudi Arabia, but also against prominent Yemeni Republican leaders who had become disillusioned with Egyptian domination and who found themselves placed under house arrest when they came to Cairo in September to plead for greater independence.)

The international scramble to fill the vacuum being left by Britain’s disengagement in Aden intensified in 1966. A look at the map reveals the reasons. Strategically placed, Aden controls the southern exit from the Red Sea and thus the passage to East Africa, India, and the Far East. Moreover, Aden, as well as the South Arabian Federation of sultanates and sheikhdoms with which it is being united, border on both Yemen and Saudi Arabia. A firm foothold in Yemen and Aden could serve as a useful base for extending influence and eventual control to the oil-rich regions of the Arabian peninsula and the Persian Gulf. The Cairo-backed Front for the Liberation of Occupied South Yemen increased three-fold its terrorist campaign in Aden, and toward the end of the year a series of explosions, for which Saudi officials held pro-Nasserist Yemeni infiltrators responsible, occurred within Saudi Arabia itself, in Jidda, Riyadh, and along the Arabian American Oil Company (Aramco) pipeline.

The great powers did not remain indifferent. The removal of Western bases from the strategic Middle East had long been a basic aim of Moscow’s policy, and Nasser’s decision to remain in Yemen was widely rumored to have been reached with Soviet approval. Massive shipments of modern Russian arms into Egypt continued, and Moscow joined Cairo in condemning Faisal’s diplomatic initiative as a new version of the unsuccessful Baghdad Pact, engineered by Washington and London.

For its part, the United States on several occasions reaffirmed its opposi-
tion to the use of force, or the threat of force, to change the status quo in the Middle East. The American commitment to the preservation of Saudi Arabia’s independence and her territorial integrity was dramatized by the official state visit of King Faisal to the United States in June. It was given concrete expression by the start of delivery in 1966 of U.S.-Hawk anti-aircraft missiles (together with British Lightning and Hunter fighter planes) in a $400 million Saudi air defense system. The United States also agreed, in September, to sell Saudi Arabia $100 million in armored personnel carriers, trucks, and other vehicles for the modernization of the Saudi army. (The extent of international rivalry for influence in southern Arabia is also indicated by the competition in providing aid and “advisors” in Yemen. The Soviet Union has built a hospital, a school, an airfield and a port; the United States has built roads and installed waterworks; Communist China has built a textile factory and some roads, and East Germany and India have furnished telecommunications and water-pumping equipment.)

The polarization of the Arab world was increased by the February military coup in Syria, which brought into power the most leftist elements of the army and the Ba’ath party. The new regime, which accused ousted President Amin Hafez of having abandoned socialism and watering down the earlier nationalization decrees, was Marxist in ideology and almost Maoist in its doctrinaire style and militant fervor. It received substantial military aid and diplomatic support from the Soviet Union.

Syria’s relations with Egypt had been strained since the dissolution of the United Arab Republic in 1961, and relations with Iraq (which was still pre-occupied with the Kurdish rebellion) and with Jordan were hardly better. The Soviet Union was eager to help Syria break out of its isolation, and Nasser was looking for allies to bolster the revolutionary camp. Accordingly, during Syrian Premier Yussuf Zu’ayen’s visit to Moscow, in April, and Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin’s journey to Cairo, in May, Kosygin worked to bring about a reconciliation which culminated in November in an Egyptian-Syrian mutual defense pact. While some observers feared that Syria would move Egypt to adopt a more militantly anti-Israel posture, others saw in this agreement less of a commitment by Nasser to aid Syria, than an attempt to restrain the hotheads in Damascus from prematurely embroiling the Arab world in a clash with Israel.

There was also some evidence that the Soviet Union, while continuing to denounce the policies of Israel, was not prepared to support the extreme Arab demands for its liquidation. Soviet opposition to any renewal of hostilities in the Middle East was emphasized in a communiqué issued on December 27 at the conclusion of Premier Kosygin’s visit to Turkey.

**Anti-Israel Terrorist Activities**

Nasser’s indefinite postponement of the war against Israel brought no decline in Arab-Israeli tension. On the contrary, the Arab states’ realization that
they were not ready to attack Israel led to an intensification of terrorist activities by paramilitary guerrilla bands. While disclaiming official responsibility for these activities, Syria espoused the doctrine of a people’s war and gave aid and support to various Palestinian Arab terrorist bands, the most active of which was al-Fatah. Meanwhile, the United Arab Republic continued to support the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) of Ahmed Shukairy, although the United Nations Emergency Force in Gaza served as a buffer between his men and Israel.

The other “revolutionary” Arab states, Algeria, Iraq, Syria, and Republican Yemen, also gave varying degrees of support to the PLO. Indeed, one point they shared in common was a sympathy for “liberation” movements. Thus, in 1966, they all issued statements supporting the South Vietnamese Liberation Front (Vietcong) and condemning American policy in Vietnam. These were usually reciprocated by Communist Chinese and Vietcong statements of support for the Arabs’ struggle against “Western imperialism” and for the “Palestine Arab liberation” movement. Egypt continued to be a major foreign diplomatic outpost for the Vietcong, and the Vietnamese Liberation Front, in October, increased to eight the staff of its political office in Cairo, headed by a member of the Vietcong Central Committee. Shukairy announced, in June, that members of his Palestine Liberation Army (PLA) would go to North Vietnam for guerrilla training and, in December, he stated that PLA trainees had returned from Communist China. Western journalists reported from Cairo that Communist China had been supplying Shukairy with light weapons under a 1965 agreement.

United States Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, in a June 1966 statement to the Jewish Press Association, confirmed the presence of “a militant type of Communist action in the Middle East, much of it directed from Peking,” with which “Communist China seeks to infiltrate, to assist, to generate more trouble in the Palestine Liberation movement.” The State Department, however, stated that it had no evidence Shukairy was receiving substantial Chinese support. The PLA also had some Soviet equipment, but it was not clear whether it was obtained directly from Moscow or from Nasser’s stockpiles.

The PLO and Jordan

In the Arab world Shukairy found growing opposition from some of the more pro-Western Arab states. Tunisia continued publicly to disassociate itself from the “unrealistic” plans to destroy Israel. Although King Hussein of Jordan had originally welcomed the PLO and allowed it to establish headquarters in Jordanian Jerusalem, he and Shukairy soon clashed over PLO plans to impose its own taxes on Palestinians in Jordan and to set up a separate PLA among the refugees. Both Jordan and neighboring Lebanon refused to allow Shukairy to establish training camps or to recruit refugees.

In January Hussein attacked the PLO for its “treasonable” attempts to
undermine Jordanian unity. A pro-PLO demonstration in Jericho a few days later and the discovery of arms caches in Hebron and Jerusalem led to the arrest of some PLO supporters. Discussions, in March, between Shukairy and Hussein led to an agreement giving the PLO facilities and quasi-diplomatic status in Jordan. But the basic differences could not be resolved, and, in April, scores of PLO officials were arrested on charges of illegal activities.

In June King Hussein publicly denounced the PLO leaders and their Arab supporters for their "subservience to international communism." He ruled out cooperation with the PLO because of its attempts to destroy the unity of the Jordanian people "who constitute the majority of Palestinians." (Jordan has more Palestinian Arabs than all the other Arab states combined; two-thirds of its population is of Palestinian origin.) Shukairy replied in a Cairo radio broadcast, calling for the overthrow of the Jordanian government.

In October Hussein sent Nasser an official protest against PLO use of Egyptian territory to launch its attacks on Jordan. Following widespread anti-government demonstrations, triggered by an Israeli retaliatory raid and fanned by PLO agitators, King Hussein in November ordered the arrest of hundreds of suspected PLO followers and the seizure of PLO headquarters in Jerusalem and branches in other cities. Shukairy responded by announcing, at the end of December, that he was creating an underground revolutionary council whose membership and activities would be secret. He called for a virtual holy war against Hussein, the "tyrant of Amman who has betrayed God, the Prophet and Palestine."

The rapprochement with Egypt moved Syria to intensify its anti-Hussein stand. At a rally of Palestinians in Damascus in December, Syrian President Nureddin Attassi urged all "revolutionary forces in Jordan" to close ranks in the "decisive battle against the traitor king." He pledged support and "sufficient arms" to bring about "today the liberation of Jordan; tomorrow, the liberation of Palestine." Early in December King Hussein reported the capture of several Syrian infiltrators, identified as al-Fatah "stormtroopers," after clashes with Jordanian troops. At year's end explosions were set off near government buildings in Amman and Jerusalem, and three members of a Syrian army patrol were arrested. In an interview with *U.S. News and World Report* (December 26, 1966) King Hussein called the infiltration of Syrian commandos via Jordan into Israel "contrary to what was agreed on at Arab summit conferences," that the Arab states were to "prevent anyone from crossing into Israel at this stage." Hussein noted that, for some time, these activities were being directed against Jordan even more than against the Israelis. "We have captured shipments of arms coming into Jordanian territory," he said, "and people have crossed over the border to create trouble here to spread the idea of assassination... to create chaos wherever and whenever possible." As a result, Hussein warned, Soviet Communist influence was coming in "through the back door," and posing a "very serious threat to the future of Arabism." He claimed that Moscow had already achieved a position of substantial control over Egypt and Syria.
United States Military Aid

The United States announced in December the shipment of additional arms "to strengthen the defensive capability of the Jordanian armed forces" and to enable Jordan "to assure its security, and thus to contribute further to the stability of the area." The new arms reportedly consisted of $5 million worth of armored trucks and related equipment to increase the army's strength and mobility along the borders with Israel and Syria. The State Department also let it be known that the United States would expedite the delivery of 36 supersonic F-104 fighter-bombers, which it had agreed to sell to Jordan in April, but which had not yet been shipped because of the exigencies of the Vietnam war. Shukairy denounced the United States for its continued support of Jordan.

In addition to the arms supplies to Jordan and Saudi Arabia, the United States in 1966 significantly increased its arms sales to Israel. State Department announcements during the year continued to repeat that the established United States policy was "to refrain from becoming a major supplier of arms" to Middle East countries. Exceptions were made, the Department explained in an official statement on February 5, only for "occasional, selective sales," which were deemed necessary to a state's defense and which "would not be a destabilizing factor." However, in response to developments in the Middle East and the reported overriding of State Department objections by the Pentagon and the White House, sufficient exceptions were made to transform the United States into an important, if not a major, supplier of arms to Israel and the pro-Western Arab states.

In January 1966 the shipment of American Patton tanks to Jordan and of Hawk missiles to Saudi Arabia, as well as the continued flow of Soviet arms to Egypt, evoked public demands by 75 congressmen and 21 major American Jewish organizations for American action to assure Israel's security. As a result, the State Department officially disclosed in February that the United States had, in fact, recently supplied Israel with various items of military equipment "to meet modernization requirements," including the same type Patton tanks furnished to Jordan in 1965. In response to the oft-repeated proposal that the United States seek to persuade the Soviet Union and the other arms suppliers to end the Middle East arms race, the Department revealed that the United States had, over the years, made "repeated quiet efforts" to limit arms buildups in the area. Until those efforts bore fruit, however, the United States could not be indifferent to "the potentially destabilizing effect of massive Soviet sales of arms to the area."

The State Department announcement was welcomed in Israel and denounced by the Arab League in Cairo. Egypt's anger was also aroused by a similarly worded statement, in April, announcing the supply of jets to Jordan, in accordance with "our policy of preventing instability developing" in the Middle East and of maintaining an arms balance. An editorial in the authoritative Egyptian newspaper Al Ahram expressed "surprise and resentment"
at the American action. Cairo was most offended by United States expression of continued regret at "the massive Soviet sales of arms to certain countries of the Near East which have intensified the arms race in that area"—an obvious allusion to Egypt. Al Ahram also took umbrage at the implication that the United States was concerned with "the arms balance between the UAR and Jordan." The United States-Jordan transaction marked the failure of Cairo's efforts to convince Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Lebanon to switch to Soviet arms, ostensibly in order to unify all Arab weapons systems. (Lebanon had just purchased French Mirage jet fighters.)

In mid-May it was revealed that the United States had also agreed to sell Israel some "tactical" jet bombers, of the kind given to Jordan, to serve as a deterrent to the numerically superior air power of the Arab states. The State Department had urged that the transaction be kept secret, and reluctantly acceded to Israel's request to make the sale known when Premier Eshkol's government came under opposition fire for not reacting to the American arms shipments to Israel's Arab neighbors. While Israel hailed the agreement as "a positive step towards the maintenance of stability in the Near East," the Arab states, joined by the Soviet press, attacked it as an American attempt to drive a wedge between the Arab states. Military observers called the transaction a significant departure from past American practice of providing Israel only with strictly defensive missiles, and indicated Washington's acceptance of the view that Israel needed bombers capable of striking at Arab bases and other distant targets to deter the Arabs from launching a sneak air attack. Other sources emphasized that the agreement was proof of America's firm intention to take concrete measures to assure Israel's security.

United States Reaffirms Commitment to Israel

The American concern for Israel's welfare was further demonstrated by the cordial reception President Zalman Shazar received in Washington in August on what the State Department termed a "private and informal visit" at the conclusion of his Latin American tour. President Johnson, however, received him with virtually all the pomp and circumstance of a formal state visit. At a White House state dinner on August 2, Mr. Johnson, in a toast, recalled the American commitment to Middle East peace made by the late President John F. Kennedy on May 8, 1963 "as a declaration of the leader of this country and as a spokesman for this land." Quoting Kennedy's words, "We strongly support the security of both Israel and her neighbors. . . We strongly oppose the use of force or the threat of force in the Near East," President Johnson added: "We subscribe to that policy."

An Israeli retaliatory raid into Jordan in November provoked American condemnation, but only briefly clouded the amicable relations. In December Vice President Humphrey noted "the great potential for conflict in the Middle East," and again emphasized United States commitment to oppose aggression which could threaten Middle East peace and to secure "the integrity of Israel as an independent state."
In the nonpolitical field, the close ties between Israel and the United States were strengthened by the announcement, in January 1966 at Independence, Mo., of a $4.1 million Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, to be built in Jerusalem with American private contributions; the dedication on July 4 of a striking monument to President Kennedy atop a hill in the outskirts of Jerusalem in the center of the Kennedy Peace Forest, and the announcement, in November, by Jacob Blaustein that he was donating $500,000 for the construction of a Center for American Studies at the University in Jerusalem, which will accommodate 1,500 students and house a specialized library, document archives, and audio-visual facilities (p. 427).

United States Aid to Israel

However, Israel officials found it increasingly difficult to convince the United States government that Israel still required economic aid. During their visits to the United States, Foreign Minister Abba Eban and Finance Minister Phineas Sappir pointed out that Israel's extraordinarily heavy defense burdens and unabsorbed immigrant population made such aid necessary. In December 1965 Sappir had presented to Washington requests for a $39 million loan for development of industry, communications, and electrical power, and for $70 million in surplus foods to be delivered over the next two years. The previous food-aid agreement had expired on June 30, 1965, as had a similar but larger-scale United States agreement with the UAR (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 262).

After lengthy negotiations, two new Food for Peace agreements were concluded in Washington in June to provide Israel with $32 million worth of agricultural commodities during the year. Under one agreement Israel was to pay $23.5 million in her own currency for feedgrains, wheat, cottonseed, and soybean oil. Seventy per cent of the Israel currency generated from the sale was to be used for approved social and economic development projects in Israel; 25 per cent by the United States government for its expenses, and the remaining 5 per cent for loans to private American and Israeli firms. The other agreement provided for the purchase on long-term credit of $8.5 million worth of feedgrains to be paid for in dollars. In addition, Israel has been buying annually an average of $50 million worth of food from private sources in the United States. As Israel's government-directed "moderation" of the inflationary economic boom began to boomerang into a recession, Sappir said, in September, that he would try to convince the United States to sell more food to Israel for local currency because the dollar cost "has now become a heavy burden on Israel's foreign currency balance." On September 29, at a Washington dinner, Sappir received pledges of $336,000 for Capital for Israel, Inc., a new holding corporation seeking to attract $20 million in private United States investments. In May Israel completed repayment of its first independence bond issue.

A request for allocation of £1.3 million ($1 million) from United States counterpart funds in Israel for the Hadassah Hospital in Jerusalem was at
first denied by the United States government. The appropriation was later included, with bi-partisan congressional support, in the foreign aid act after testimony in the House Foreign Affairs Committee by Mrs. Mortimer Jacobson, Hadassah’s national president.

Israel was granted a $10 million United States development loan in May, and in November President Johnson announced that $6 million of a previous AID development loan had been earmarked for expansion of electric power facilities in Tel Aviv. Discussions continued during the year on the proposed $200 million nuclear-fueled desalination and electric power plant in Israel. However, in view of unresolved economic and political questions, no firm agreement was reached.

**Aid to the United Arab Republic**

President Johnson opened the way for resumption of United States aid to Egypt when he informed Secretary of State Rusk, on December 29, 1965, that “I hereby determine that it is essential to the national interest of the United States to finance export sales of surplus agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic.” An irate Congress had earlier barred all aid to Egypt unless the President specifically made such a determination.

In January 1966 an agreement was signed in Cairo under which the United States was to provide Egypt with $55 million of surplus wheat, cooking oil, tobacco, and frozen chickens. The terms were somewhat stiffer than earlier agreements. One-fourth of this amount, $13.75 million for wheat, was to be repaid in dollars over a period of 20 years at a low 21/2 per cent interest. The remainder was to be paid in Egyptian currency, with 75 per cent of United States counterpart funds to be used for mutually acceptable development projects in Egypt. These terms were similar to those in the subsequent agreement with Israel, but the agreement with Israel was for a whole year while that with the UAR was limited to six months.

In addition to the usual provisions of aid agreements, requiring that the commodities be used for domestic consumption and forbidding the export of these or like commodities to “nations unfriendly to the United States,” the United States also set the special condition that the total cotton acreage planted in the UAR in the coming year would not be higher than “the present acreage.” This was interpreted as an indirect effort by the United States government to help curb the arms race, since President Nasser in recent years had been increasing his cotton acreage to pay for the more than $1 billion in Soviet arms shipments. One of the major Congressional arguments against aid for Egypt was that American wheat enabled Egypt to use its land to grow cotton for Russian arms instead of food for its own people. An editorial in Al Ahram acknowledged that six of every ten loaves of bread eaten in Egypt were made of American wheat.

In response to Representative Leonard Farbstein’s (Dem., N.Y.) protest against the resumption of aid to Egypt, Assistant Secretary of State Douglas MacArthur II wrote on February 1 that the administration had acted be-
cause of the improvement in relations with the UAR; Egypt's "increasing attention to internal problems of economic and social development," and the "constructive and helpful role the UAR has played in several current international issues"—apparently a reference to Cairo's unsuccessful efforts to intercede with North Vietnam for the release of American prisoners.

In February the United States turned over to Egypt the second half of its $12 million contribution to the fund for saving the Temple of Abu Simbel. In September a $40 million electric power plant, which doubled the energy available to Cairo, was inaugurated. The plant, the largest American industrial aid project in Egypt, had been authorized by President Kennedy under a 40-year loan with interest at only 3/4 of 1 per cent. Another symbol of improving relations was the official visit to Washington in February of Anwar Sadat, speaker of the Egyptian national assembly and one of the group of army officers who overthrew King Farouk in 1952. Sadat was the first member of President Nasser's inner circle to visit Washington.

However, the era of good relations did not last. The very day Sadat arrived in Washington, Nasser lashed out at the United States for its support of Israel and his "reactionary" Arab enemies, condemned American policy in Vietnam, and announced his determination to stay in Yemen. The domestic economic reform measures, cited by Secretary MacArthur, soon proved disappointing. Premier Zakariya Mohieddine was hampered in his efforts to reform the Egyptian economy through austerity measures, cutting of the bureaucracy, and shifting the emphasis from prestigious but unproductive industrial projects to expansion of agriculture on a scientific basis. Mohieddine was also opposed by the doctrinaire Socialists in the Nasser regime for trying to encourage Western private investment in the newly discovered oil deposits and in a free trade zone at Port Said. In part to offset concessions granted to two American firms—Pan-American Oil (a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana) and Phillips Petroleum Company—the UAR in February concluded a technical agreement with the Soviet Union to help the Egyptian government-owned General Petroleum Corporation search for oil. This agreement was used to block the bids for oil rights submitted by other Western firms.

An urgent request by the Egyptian government in the spring for a $70 million loan from the International Monetary Fund was rejected in August because of Cairo's failure to undertake recommended economic measures, including the devaluation of the Egyptian pound and a sharp cut in inflationary government deficit spending. A team of Russian economists gave Nasser much the same advice in October. The Fund was also concerned over the continuing economic drain of the Yemen war, conservatively estimated to cost more than $40 million annually, as well as the expenditure of roughly $650 million a year for military and security services.

For these and other reasons, Washington also refused to act on Nasser's request for $150 million in additional surplus food after the January agreement ran out. The ouster in September of Premier Mohieddine and his team
of experienced economic advisors; the appointment of the more leftist Mohammed Sidky Solaiman as premier, and the inclusion of additional army officers in the cabinet, were interpreted in the West as signs that Nasser was again turning to more centralized control of the economy and the adoption of other policies unfavorable to foreign investment.

Another complicating factor was the change in the United States foreign-aid legislation introduced in 1966, barring United States wheat to countries trading with North Vietnam. Egypt had exported a small quantity of cotton to North Vietnam during 1966.

In addition to the wheat it received from the United States under the January aid agreement, the UAR during 1966 imported $58 million from American commercial sources, for which it has to pay dollars within three years, and from Western European suppliers. But by the end of the year, Egypt's foreign exchange shortage had become so acute that it had to sell one-third of its dwindling gold reserves and defaulted on payments due on its loans to foreign creditors, including the United States and the International Monetary Fund.

United States Revises its Aid Policy

In December it was reported from Cairo that the Soviet Union, which had had a bumper crop of grain, had promised to provide wheat to Egypt which had almost depleted its stock. The United States did not move to match the Russian offer, as it would have done previously, because of a basic reappraisal of its approach to foreign food aid. The reasons were that doubts had been raised as to the value of aid as a means of political influence, and that a growing population and past aid shipments had virtually eaten up the American food stockpile. Accordingly, under the revised Food for Peace program, the United States placed major emphasis on encouraging underdeveloped countries to develop their own agriculture. At the same time, the United States prodded the other developed countries to join in providing technical assistance and supplying food aid. Moreover, Washington viewed the serious famine in India as a more urgent problem.

The new thinking was reflected in the overall drop in American aid to Israel and to 12 Arab states from $402 million (of which $267 million was surplus food) in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, to $262 million ($154 million in food) in the 1966 fiscal year. The only country continuing to receive large-scale grants in 1966 was Jordan, which got $35.6 million in grants plus $7.9 million in loans. Algeria received $25.4 million and Morocco $40.3 million, mostly in surplus commodities; Sudan received $17.4 million and Tunisia $18.9 million, mostly in development loans. Other Arab states received less than $5 million each.

Jordan Water Dispute

One of the heralded creations of the Arab summit conferences of 1964
and 1965 was the Arab Authority for the Exploitation of the Jordan River and Its Tributaries, for the proclaimed purpose of diverting the sources of the Jordan before they could flow into Israel (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 254). With the widening split in the Arab world in 1966, the diversion authority lost much of its impetus, and probably much of its financial backing as well. General Ali Ali Amer, the Egyptian commander-in-chief of the Unified Arab Command (UAC), disclosed in Cairo that Arab League members had paid only 26 per cent of the 1966 budget for the UAC, which was created primarily for the military defense of the Arab diversion works against possible Israeli attack.

The individual riparian states continued their various diversion schemes. In May King Hussein laid the foundation stone for the Mukheiba Dam on the Yarmuk River, the principal tributary of the lower Jordan (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 256). In his dedication speech, Hussein appealed to the Arab states to bury their differences and cooperate “to eliminate the Zionist threat.” The official reaction in Israel was that the dam’s projected capacity (200 million cubic meters) was consistent with Jordan’s allocation of Yarmuk water under the 1955 Johnston Plan (AJYB, 1955 [Vol. 56], p. 288; 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 256), and thus not in conflict with Israel’s own national water carrier.

Israel was far less sanguine, however, regarding the diversion activities in Syria. Prime Minister Eshkol, on several occasions, reaffirmed Israel’s willingness to adhere to its obligations under the Johnston Plan if the Arab states did likewise. In a radio broadcast on April 23, in an obvious reference to Israel’s shelling of Syrian diversion works in 1965 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 255), he noted that “with firmness and commendable efficacy, the Israel Defense Forces frustrated the beginning of a diversion plan” by neighboring states “aimed at robbing us of water due to us by virtue of elementary justice and international law.”

On July 14, Israel air force jets, in an unusual daylight raid, penetrated 10 miles into Syria and attacked engineering installations, earth-moving equipment, and tractors near the north-eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, which Israel said were being used “to divert the Jordan tributaries.” In the air action Israel planes shot down their first Syrian Mig-21. An Israel army spokesman explained that the attack was also in retaliation for 103 Syrian incidents of mining, sabotage, shootings, setting fire to fields, and damage to agricultural equipment, that had caused 16 casualties since February.

The Syrian daily Al Thawra, which reflects official thinking, charged that the attack was “part of an over-all imperialist conspiracy against the Syrian revolution.” The government-controlled Egyptian press blamed the United States, arguing that U.S. bombing of North Vietnam had encouraged Israel’s “provocative aggression” against Syria. The Syrian government vowed to continue its efforts for the “liberation” of Palestine.

In September it was reported that Syria had resumed work on the diversion project, this time with tractors of the Syrian Army’s engineering corps.
In December the manager of kibbutz Shamir in northern Israel reported steady progress by the Syrians on a project to divert the waters of the Dufela springs. (The kibbutz’s entire water supply comes from the springs located 300 yards within Syria, which the kibbutz has been sharing with Syria under a 1951 agreement.) At the end of the year Israel Minister of Labor Yigal Allon reiterated Israel’s warning that she would not allow Syria to deprive her of water.

**The United Nations and the Arab-Israel Dispute**

In a rare display of agreement, both Israel and the Arab states publicly urged U Thant to accept an additional term as secretary-general of the United Nations, and subsequently expressed their satisfaction at his reelection. In his annual report to the General Assembly in September, Thant warned that “dangerous tensions persist” in the Middle East and pleaded for peace in the region.

*United Nations Emergency Force*

In a separate report on the UN Emergency Force (UNEF) stationed along Egypt’s Sinai and Gaza Strip border with Israel, Thant noted that the Palestine Liberation Army (PLA) had increased its activities and that there had been “differences” between PLA and UNEF personnel. Although serious incidents were avoided with “the help of local authorities,” the report emphasized that “the operational deployment of detachments of the Palestine Liberation Army just outside the 500-metre zone of the Armistice demarcation line and increased patrolling and training activity of their units in this area are unavoidably of concern to UNEF and its functioning.” It said that, while UNEF had no means of establishing the size of PLA, “public indications by local sources in Gaza have put its strength at 12,000.”

UNEF’s own strength at the end of June was down to 3,959 and a further reduction to 3,400 was planned for economy reasons on the assumption that “relative quiet” would continue. While there had been no major incidents, the report noted “some disturbing signs recently” that the situation could change, and warned that, in the event of the removal of the UN buffer, “serious fighting would, quite likely, soon be resumed.”

After terrorist incursions into Israel and increasingly severe military clashes along the Jordan-Israel and Syrian-Israel borders had escalated in November, Senator Jacob K. Javits (Rep., N.Y.) urged Secretary of State Dean Rusk to ask that UNEF buffer forces be stationed along these Arab-Israel borders as well, a proposal that was rejected by Assistant Secretary MacArthur because of “major difficulties both of a political and financial nature.” He noted that neither Israel nor Jordan would accept UN forces on their common borders. In view of this opposition, Washington offered both Israel and Jordan the latest technical devices for detecting infiltrators as a more...
effective means of guarding the borders. Reports from Israel indicated that it had, on its own, begun to erect physical barriers along the more troublesome border stretches near urban centers.

A vigorous Israeli dissent to the whole concept of UNEF was presented by Major General Moshe Dayan, commander-in-chief of the Israel Defense Forces in the 1956 Sinai Campaign and more recently a leader of the Rafi party, in an address before the Zionist Organization of America in New York on November 27. Dayan said he would have “preferred to see the Egyptian troops returning to their positions in Sinai,” together with a guarantee of Israel shipping through the Strait of Tiran to Elath. He explained:

I prefer the normalization of even hostile relations over artificial arrangements. Arab and Israel farmers should plough their lands right up to the frontier, and get used to living in neighborly proximity. The troops and government of Egypt must reconcile themselves to the fact that Israel is their neighbor. The buffer of foreign troops merely creates a fiction in neighbor-relations, and thereby defers peace.

In response to this criticism, State Department officials made a point of emphasizing that American efforts to improve Arab-Israel border security were not intended to seal Israel off from its neighbors permanently and hermetically.

After a visit to the area, Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Dem., Mass.) proposed in December that, instead of creating a new UNEF, the personnel of the observer teams of the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) be increased five-fold and an attempt be made to organize mixed Arab-Israeli patrols along the Syrian and Jordanian borders. This followed a report to the Security Council by Secretary-General Thant, calling for more cooperation by Israel and the Arab states in providing around-the-clock liaison with UNTSO, more flexibility for its operations, and greater use of experts. He recommended the use of helicopters and speedboats for greater mobility of the observer teams, but noted that this would “substantially increase the cost of operation.” MacArthur, in his reply to Javits, stated that “the United States intends fully to support the Secretary-General’s proposals.”

During the year the deficit-ridden UN again sought, without success, to find an agreed formula for financing its various peace-keeping operations. The cost of UNEF was $14 million in 1966.

Security Council Debates Border Incidents

As Arab terrorist raids within Israel and armed clashes across the Syrian-Israel and Jordanian-Israel frontiers increased (p. 424), scarcely a week passed without a letter of complaint from one of the parties to the UN Security Council. On three occasions during the year the Security Council engaged in extensive debates after it was formally asked to intervene and adopt resolutions of condemnation.

The first debate grew out of a Syrian complaint in July over Israel’s “act
of aggression” against Syrian diversion works on July 14. The following day Israel filed a countercharge, asking the Council to consider “the repeated acts of aggression committed by Syrian armed forces and by armed saboteur groups, and Syrian Government statements openly inciting to war against Israel.” After more than a week of deliberations, the Council rejected a draft resolution submitted by Jordan and Mali asking for a condemnation of Israel’s air attack. The vote was six in favor (Bulgaria, Jordan, Mali, Nigeria, Uganda, and the USSR), with nine abstentions (Argentina, China, France, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, United Kingdom, United States, and Uruguay.) The resolution was not adopted since it failed to receive the requisite nine affirmative votes.

United States delegate Joseph J. Sisco explained that the United States could not support the draft because it pointed blame only in one direction and failed to take into account Syria’s responsibility for the mining incidents, which had killed one Israeli and wounded three others in four incidents near the Syrian border during the 48 hours preceding Israel’s retaliatory raid. Earlier, during the debate, Sisco rejected the Syrian claim that it had no responsibility to prevent the terrorist raids. He also “deplored” Israel’s decision to reply with armed force instead of relying on the UN. Similar views were stated by the other abstainers. Soviet Delegate Nikolai T. Fedorenko charged that Israel’s action reflected the “strengthening of the imperialistic policies of the Western powers and their agents in the Near East.” The Syrian and Iraqi delegates echoed the charges of American-Israeli collusion. In reply, Sisco insisted that the United States had not been consulted and had no prior knowledge of the air strike.

The second major debate, in October and November, dealt with Israel’s complaint against the “renewal of organized and armed infiltration by Syria into Israeli territory,” with the dynamiting of two apartment houses in Jerusalem—the 61st major incident since January 1965—and Syria’s open incitement of al-Fatah and other terrorist groups to destroy Israel.

United States Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, in his opening statement on October 14, pointed out that there was abundant evidence that al-Fatah had committed a series of acts of violence against Israel, causing loss of life and posing “a constant threat to the citizens of a Member State.” The root of the problem, he said, was “the attitude and policy” of the Syrian government, as expressed on October 12 in a statement of the Syrian army’s chief of staff, that al-Fatah’s operations were “legitimate actions which we should not restrict but should support and abet,” and in a Syrian government broadcast a day earlier that “under no circumstances” would it be willing “to hold back the revolution of the expelled and oppressed Palestinian people.” Goldberg emphasized that Syria was “bound by solemn commitments” not to support such actions, not only under the UN Charter, but also by its vote in favor of the December 21, 1965 General Assembly resolution providing that “. . . no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent over-
throw of the regime of another State. " Most specifically, Syria was bound
to refrain from such hostile actions by the terms of the Israeli-Syrian General
Armistice Agreement. Goldberg called the activities "Syria has been con-
donning in violation of these commitments," very dangerous to peace in the
area and urged Syria to ensure that its territory was not used as "a base for
terrorism or destruction, with or without the consent of the Syrian Govern-
ment."

In the midst of the Security Council debate, 19 members of Brith Trum-
peldor (Betar), the Zionist Revisionist youth group, forced their way into
the ambassador's office at the Syrian Mission in New York, where they
staged a half-hour sit-in, chanting "End Syrian aggression!" and singing
Hebrew songs as well as "We Shall Overcome." After the police led the
demonstrators away, Ambassador Goldberg personally signed a complaint
against them on behalf of the United States government. They appeared in
criminal court on charges of disorderly conduct, unlawful assembly, failure
to disperse, and trespassing. They pleaded guilty to disorderly conduct and
the other charges were dropped; they were let off with a judicial reprimand.
Planned to lend moral support to the presentation of Israel's case in the
Council, the demonstration quickly backfired, enabling the Arab states and
their supporters to divert public attention from the issue debated and to
focus instead on the Zionist "invasion" and "aggression" perpetrated against
the Syrian mission. The demonstration was universally condemned in the
Jewish community, and by the Israel mission to the UN.

Although Ambassador Goldberg publicly apologized to Syria for "this
highly regrettable incident," a formal protest on behalf of the UN African-
Asian group was delivered to Secretary-General Thant by the representatives
of Jordan, Mali, and Turkey. After presenting the protest to Goldberg on
November 17, Thant announced that he had received assurances that the
United States would fulfill its obligations as host government.

During the Council's debate later on the same day, George J. Tomeh, the
Syrian delegate, charged that Goldberg's support of the Israel complaint was
proof of his "complete identification" with Zionism, not only as a spiritual
and cultural heritage (referring to the Goldberg speech of May 1965; AJYB,
1966 [Vol. 67], p. 273) but also as a "rigid political organization." Goldberg
denied this accusation and noted that he had been quoted out of context,
for he had also called for good relations with the Arab states. Goldberg
emphasized that more important than his personal statement—but by no
means inconsistent with it—were his enunciations of the policies of his gov-
ernment, whose basic position was that "the United States, in keeping with
the action taken by the United Nations, supports the independence of all
states in the area—Israel, Syria and other countries, all other Arabic coun-
tries in the area."

On October 28, after Arab terrorists had derailed an Israeli freight train
near Jerusalem, Goldberg emphasized the need for quick Council action to
ease tension and prevent a "showdown." Had it been a passenger train, he
said, "there would have been a shock wave all through the Middle East with incalculable consequences." Goldberg also expressed his government's approval of Israel's desire to seek assistance through "peaceful political means" by bringing its complaint to the Security Council "where matters such as this should be settled."

A joint American-British resolution moderately critical of Syria, that appeared to have no chance of adoption, was replaced by a milder resolution sponsored by Argentina, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, and Uganda. This six-power draft deplored the incidents and the loss of life caused by them; invited the government of Syria "to strengthen its measures for preventing incidents that constitute a violation of the General Armistice Agreement" (the Anglo-American draft would have "reminded" Syria "to fulfill its obligations" to prevent the use of its territory as a base for anti-Israeli acts); invited Israel "to cooperate fully with the Israel-Syria Mixed Armistice Commission" (Israel had not attended regular meetings since 1951 because of a dispute as to the competence of the MAC to deal with the demilitarized zones), and called on both sides to facilitate the work of the UN Truce Supervision Organization and to refrain from any action that might increase tension.

When put to a vote on November 4, the resolution was supported by 10 members, with China abstaining, and although only 4 voted against (Bulgaria, Jordan, Mali and the USSR) the Soviet Union's veto defeated it. Soviet delegate Fedorenko said that Syrian responsibility had not been proved and repeated the charge that the real threats to peace were "the aggressive policies of Tel Aviv" and "the imperialist circles" which were trying to thwart progressive Arab development.

Despite the veto, Israel officials expressed satisfaction over the moral vindication of their position. Similarly, Ambassador Goldberg noted that widespread support of the resolution on a broadly geographical basis was "a matter of high import not to be ignored," and reemphasized the fundamental United States policy in the Middle East "to support the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries and the maintenance of unbroken peace."

However, on the night of November 12 another sabotage incident occurred on the Jordanian border (p. 426). Israel responded with a large-scale daylight retaliation action, which rapidly escalated as Jordan Arab Legion reinforcements rushed to the scene. In the resulting clash, according to UN observers, 18 Jordanians were killed and 54 injured, with three of the fatalities and 17 of the wounded being civilians. (One Israeli officer was killed and 10 soldiers were wounded.) The UN report stated that more than 150 houses had been destroyed in Es Samu—Israel said that the actual number of buildings demolished was 40. Three days later Jordan called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council to consider Israel's "act of aggression against the citizens and territory of Jordan."

At the Council session on November 16, the three major Western powers joined the Soviet Union in vigorously condemning Israel. Ambassador Gold-
berg declared that the nature of the Israeli raid and its "consequences in human lives and in destruction far surpass the cumulative total" of the Arab terrorist acts. He summed up the general sentiment in the Council when he pointed out that "this deliberate governmental decision must be judged as the conscious act of responsible leaders of a Member State and, therefore, on an entirely different level" than the earlier Arab terrorist incidents, "which we continue to deplore." Moreover, the government of Jordan had not been implicated in the terrorists acts—a point that was stressed by the British and French delegates as well.

At the end of the debate, on November 25, the Security Council censured Israel in its most strongly worded resolution against Israel in more than a decade, which diplomats considered just a step short of a specific threat of economic and other sanctions. It was adopted by a vote of 14 in favor, with New Zealand abstaining. New Zealand refused to support the resolution because it failed to include a fair appraisal of the total situation that moved Israel to retaliate as well as constructive proposals for checking a recurrence of violence. An implied reference to Arab terrorism was made in a preamble clause referring to earlier resolutions "for the cessation of violent incidents across the demarcation line, and not overlooking past incidents of this nature. The resolution warned Israel that "actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts."

United States support of this resolution was partly based on a concern that Israel's action had embarrassed King Hussein, the moderate, pro-Western ruler of Jordan, and jeopardized the stability of his kingdom by providing a rallying point for anti-Hussein Palestinian militants. It took several weeks for Hussein to quell the widespread demonstrations and disturbances that erupted after the Israeli attack and which, Hussein said, had been instigated by the PLO and "Communists and Marxists," with the backing of Syria and Egypt.

**ARAB REFUGEES**

**UNRWA's Financial Difficulties**

In his report to the General Assembly for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, Lawrence Michelmore, commissioner-general of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA), concluded that "as year succeeds year, there is no sign that the refugees are becoming any less embittered," and that, therefore, the refugee problem's implication for peace and stability in the Middle East "remain as grave as ever."

The number of refugees registered with UNRWA at the end of the period totalled 1,317,749, an increase of nearly 37,000 from the previous year. The decline in the number of ration recipients from 874,594 to 861,122 was al-
most entirely caused by the fact that UNRWA's 12,000 local workers and their families received a cash allowance in place of rations. The number of ration recipients did not rise because UNRWA continued to impose ceilings on the total in each of the four host countries—Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and the Egyptian-administered Gaza Strip.

UNRWA also failed to make any substantial progress in resolving its chronic financial problems. An emergency fund-raising trip by Michelmore early in the year brought several additional contributions, including $2 million from Sweden, which, he said, succeeded "in averting a collapse of the Agency's services" by reducing the 1966 deficit to about $1 million from the $4.2 million projected at the start of the year.

Michelmore expected 1967 contributions to fall "more than $4 million short of the target" for several reasons. To begin with, the 1967 budget was projected at $39.3 million as against $37.8 million in 1966, of which $17.3 million went for relief, $15.5 million for education, and $5.0 million for health services. The $1.5 million increase in 1967 was to meet rising costs and an increase of student enrolment in elementary and preparatory schools. A second factor was a cut in the United States contribution to UNRWA from $22.9 million to $22.2 million for the 1966–67 fiscal year, in keeping with the policy of gradual retrenchment instituted by Congress (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 267). At the UNRWA Pledging Conference in December, United States delegate Harding F. Bancroft noted that the United States had contributed more than $400 million over the years and that Washington believed that its current contribution was still "disproportionately high." The United States further asked that as much of its contribution as possible be used for education and vocational training. Other states, such as Britain, France, Switzerland, Australia, and the Scandinavian countries, specifically earmarked increasing portions of their contributions for education.

The cut in the United States contribution also indicated congressional impatience over UNRWA's failure to rectify its ration rolls and prevent fraud in the relief program. Michelmore conceded in his report that "only limited progress" had been made in this direction in response to the General Assembly's directive of December 1965 calling for equitable distribution of rations on the basis of need. UNRWA considered the state of the ration rolls in Lebanon "reasonably satisfactory." In Gaza the local authorities had helped remove 4,265 ineligible persons from the rolls. Their places were given to children from the waiting list, which had grown to over 27,000. In Syria, UNRWA had been unable to check who was receiving rations or to insure that they were distributed according to proven need.

The greatest problem continued to be Jordan, with more than half of the registered refugees, and with a waiting list of over 205,000 children. Michelmore noted that past attempts to rectify relief abuses in the country, "such as the activities of the so-called merchants, who traffic in ration cards and ration commodities and who have a vested interest in the existing inaccuracies in the rolls, have also often failed, owing to adverse reactions among
the refugees." A potentially significant step forward was an agreement concluded in June between Jordan and UNRWA, providing for the exchange of all existing ration cards for new ones, the personal appearance of heads of families showing proof of their identity, and the investigation of suspected false or duplicate registrations by a joint Jordanian-UNRWA committee. Jordan, the only Arab host country to grant the Palestinian refugees full citizenship and equal rights, has quietly taken measures to facilitate their economic rehabilitation. A further sign of realistic approach to the refugees' integration within Jordanian society was a statement by King Hussein on June 14, condemning the maintenance of the refugees in a state of poverty "in their camps surrounded by barbed wire" so that Arab delegates could justify their "continued begging" for funds at the UN. He declared:

People living on charity lose their dignity and their cause. To say that this misery produces hatred and that hatred, ignorance and starvation lead to victory is nonsense and absolutely illogical. The victors will be those who live proudly on their land and the land of their family and brothers where they are given a chance to become physically and mentally fit.

Shukairy's answer was a denunciation of the King over Cairo radio, with shouts from the audience calling on the Jordanians to revolt and kill Hussein. The strength of the refugee opposition may have prompted Jordan to ask UNRWA, later in the summer, to defer "temporarily" implementation of the rectification agreement.

UNRWA and the Palestine Liberation Army

Senator Edward M. Kennedy (Dem., Mass.), Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee's subcommittee on refugees and escapees, reported in June that members of his staff, who had just completed an on-the-spot investigation, found that PLA recruits were still receiving UNRWA rations in Gaza and Syria, and that such aid was "incompatible with United States policy and with the fundamental concept of the United Nations." At the same time, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs approved an amendment by Rep. Leonard Farbstein (Dem., N.Y.) to the Foreign Assistance Act, banning further United States contributions to UNRWA unless it takes "all possible measures to assure that no part of the United States contribution shall be used to furnish assistance to any refugee who is receiving training as a member of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army."

In testimony before the Kennedy subcommittee on July 20, Raymond A. Hare, then Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, and Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs—though critical of relief abuses and the continued presence on UNRWA lists of refugees in Gaza and Syria serving in the PLA—asked the Senate to restore the $700,000 cut by the House on the ground that this might force UNRWA to make reductions in its vital health and education services. Kennedy proposed that the $700,000 in question be earmarked to
build a vocational training school to be operated by one of the Arab host
governments for the benefit of both refugee and nonrefugee students. How-
ever, the committee failed to adopt the Kennedy proposal and the Senate
approved the cut made by the House. The Senate also endorsed the House
ban on the use of United States aid to feed PLA recruits.

UNRWA officials claimed that it was impossible for them to screen out
PLA recruits in the absence of both accurate relief rolls and active coopera-
tion by the local Arab authorities. Officials in Gaza and Syria continued to
refuse access to PLA trainees lists on the ground that this was classified
military information. To meet the objections by the United States and other
governments, Michelmore announced, he had arranged for "special added
donations"—subsequently revealed to have come from Arab sources—in the
amount of $150,000, "which meets the total cost of any rations consumed"
by refugees in the PLA. He said, in conclusion, that these arrangements
"provide a practical means of disposing of the problem insofar as the Agency
is concerned."

However, during the annual debate in the UN Special Political Committee
in the fall, several states took issue with Michelmore's approach. Frank
Corner of New Zealand remarked pointedly that, while the commissioner-
general's arrangement might provide a practical solution for the agency,
"it does not dispose of the issue of principle so far as Governments are con-
cerned." He stressed that no UN agency could give "any support, direct or
indirect," to a group like the PLO, since "the extremist demands of the re-
fugees" to annihilate Israel, "whether by direct attack by regular forces, or
by a so-called war of national liberation by irregular forces, would represent
a threat to international peace and security and, by implication, a threat to
all United Nations members." Ambassador Michael Comay of Israel stated
that PLA recruits in the Gaza Strip were "openly and officially recruited
and trained, and even march in public parades." And since a certain age
group had been conscripted (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 266), Comay sug-
gested that the ration cards of all men in that group be suspended, and the
burden of proving which of them had been exempted from recruitment be
placed on the authorities, or the refugees concerned.

In the debate, U.S. Ambassador Bancroft reiterated American opposi-
tion to UNRWA aid to the PLA, even through Michelmore's financial ar-
rangements. As a matter "of principle," he said, the UN "should not give the
impression that it condones or regards with indifference the involvement of
any United Nations agency with an organization" dedicated to the use of
armed force. He also emphasized that "much more" needs to be done to
rectify relief rolls and also called on UNRWA to act "promptly and vigor-
ously" to "stop the trafficking in ration cards and ration commodities." He
called it "outrageous to allow a few profiteers to cheat needy refugees
out of benefits provided by the international community." The announce-
ment at the December pledging conference of the American contribution
to UNRWA for fiscal 1967 indicated, however, the United States govern-
merit's apparent tacit acceptance of the view that the commissioner-general's arrangement did not violate the letter of the congressional injunction against United States aid to the PLA.

UNRWA Debate at the UN

The UNRWA debate in the General Assembly's Special Political Committee generally took the lines of earlier years. All Arab League UN members, except Tunisia, joined in a request to give a hearing to a spokesman of the PLO, which was followed by a similar request from Pakistan and Saudi Arabia on behalf of the Palestine Arab Delegation, a rival refugee group backed by the Arab Higher Committee of Haj Amin el-Husseini, former Mufti of Jerusalem. As in the previous year, the committee agreed to hear individual speakers from both groups with the understanding that such authorization did not imply UN recognition. On November 14 the committee adopted a United States draft resolution, similar to that adopted in 1965. The resolution contained three amendments proposed by Somalia, which 1. eliminated the implied criticism of the Arab states for impeding progress in rectifying relief rolls; 2. specifically appealed to "non-contributing Governments to contribute and contributing Governments to consider increasing their contributions" (although the number of UNRWA contributors had increased considerably in the past two years, and some states had increased their aid, two-thirds of all UN members, including the Soviet Union, refused support), and 3. substituted for the draft's expression of regret that the UN Conciliation Commission for Palestine (CCP) had been unable to achieve any "progress on implementation of paragraph 11" of a 1948 resolution on the repatriation or resettlement of the refugees, "because of the unchanged situation in the area," a request that the CCP "intensify its efforts" for implementation. (This ran counter to the CCP's own admission, in its report of September 30, 1966, that it saw no way out of the present impasse without "substantial changes" in the underlying political climate—and that "there was no evidence that such changes were taking place.")

A fourth Somali amendment, which would have singled out Israel instead of calling on all the parties to cooperate with the CCP, was defeated by a vote of 39 to 33, with 38 abstentions. The committee also rejected (by a vote of 38 to 36, with 36 abstentions) a separate resolution by Afghanistan, Malaysia, Pakistan, and Somalia, calling for the appointment of a UN custodian "to protect and administer" and to collect income from Arab refugee property in Israel. (While the sponsors had picked up two more votes than in 1965, the number of abstentions had increased by 13, reflecting the reluctance of the newly independent states to support a precedent undermining a state's exclusive jurisdiction within its own territory.)

The United States resolution, as amended, was adopted by a vote of 65 to 0, with 45 abstentions. Israel, which had cast the sole negative vote in 1965, decided to abstain, as did all the Arab states. Comay explained that
Israel would have voted for a separate resolution continuing UNRWA's relief and welfare services—especially in view of the resolution's call for rectification and the stated opposition of the United States and other delegations to UNRWA aid to the PLA—but did not do so because it considered the reference to the controversial paragraph 11 superfluous, ill-advised, and an obstacle to progress. Comay asked the UN to concentrate, "without prejudice to political attitudes," on the economic and social rehabilitation and integration of the refugees, for which massive funds should be placed at its disposal. At the same time, he reiterated Israel's willingness to pay compensation within the framework of a settlement of the refugee problem.

**ARAB ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES**

**The Arab Boycott**

In his January 1966 report to Congress on United States foreign aid during fiscal 1965, President Johnson stated that "there has been some success in mitigating the effects of the Arab boycott on certain American firms and individuals." As for travel restrictions imposed against United States citizens on religious grounds, which had been gradually reduced in recent years, he noted that "there was little progress in fiscal 1965." During 1966 the same inconclusive pattern emerged as the continued Arab efforts to intimidate American businessmen from dealing with Israel met with varying degrees of resistance.

Under an amendment to the Export Control Act, adopted by Congress in 1965 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], pp. 270-72), American exporters for the first time were required to report to the Commerce Department's office of export control whenever they received a request for information or action relating to the boycott. But the law did not prohibit American firms from replying to the boycott questionnaires or complying with boycott demands if they wished to do so.

The department reported that it had received 5,235 reports reflecting restrictive trade practices between October 7, 1965, when the regulations first went into effect, until June 30, 1966. Of these, 4,095 were Arab demands directed against Israel, with about a third of these involving certification of goods as not of Israeli origin. The rest were Arab restrictions on the use of ships of Israeli registry, or other ships stopping in Israeli ports or appearing on the boycott blacklist. In October the department stated that shipping restrictions aimed only at insuring the safe delivery of goods were not restrictive trade practices within the intent of the law, and henceforth need not be reported.

Earlier in March, after the publication of the first quarterly report by the Commerce Department, Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (Dem., N.J.) and Senator Jacob K. Javits (Rep., N.Y.), the sponsors of the antiboycott amendment, wrote to Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, objecting
that the regulations "weaken the intent of the law" because they gratuitously pointed out that businessmen "are not legally prohibited" from complying with boycott requests, and that the report gave only a bare statistical tally of boycott requests received without indicating what response was made either by United States government agencies or the businessmen concerned. The regulations were not modified, and the department reports grew less specific; the one for the last quarter of 1966 stated, without explanation or breakdown, that 1,146 reports has been received. No reference was made to the reaction in the business community subsequent to the report for the first quarter of 1966, which said that a preliminary analysis indicated "a general pattern of refusal" by American firms to comply with boycott requests.

In a letter to Secretary Connor, in April, Representative Seymour Halpern (Rep., N.Y.) called for congressional hearings on the implementation of the law. He asked that American firms be formally prohibited from replying to boycott demands. Assistant Secretary of Commerce Mark C. Feer replied that the department was "opposed to any amendment which would require a fixed course of action to be taken by the Executive Branch" irrespective of other foreign policy considerations.

The boycott continued to be much in the news during 1966. In December 1965 it had been revealed that the American President Lines had cancelled the scheduled Haifa stop of the S.S. President Roosevelt, on its round-the-world cruise from San Francisco, out of fear that the ship would not be allowed through the Suez Canal. After congressional protests, a demand by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL) that the United States government's $30 million annual subsidy to the line be cut off if it yielded to Arab pressure, and private discussions with the State Department and United Arab Republic officials, the company restored the Israel stop in January 1966, with the explanation that it had "misinterpreted" instructions from its Alexandria agent.

In April an ADL report accused the Coca-Cola Company of bowing to the Arab boycott by refusing to grant a franchise to an Israeli bottler, the Tempo Soft Drinks Company Ltd. In response to Coca-Cola's assertion that its decision was based on "economic and market conditions rather than political considerations," ADL pointed to special financial and operating requirements established for the Israeli bottler, in an "assiduous attempt to camouflage its submission" to the boycott. Coca-Cola, in turn, said that it did not operate in other Middle Eastern states, such as Jordan, Syria, and Afghanistan because it was not profitable to do so. In April a counterboycott of Coca-Cola by various enterprises and consumers in the United States brought a lengthy statement from James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corporation, calling the charges "completely unfair and unfounded" and assuring the public that the company "has not and will not conduct its affairs in response to any boycott, and that includes the so-called Arab boycott." After negotiations, in which Morris B. Abram, the president of the American Jewish Committee, participated, Coca-Cola an-
nounced that it had made an agreement with Abraham Feinberg, an Ameri-
can industrialist, to “sign a letter of intent as a first step in the establishment
of a bottling plant for Coca-Cola in Israel.” Feinberg had originally ob-
tained the Israel franchise from Coca-Cola in 1949, but the Israel govern-
ment had denied a permit “because of the difficult hard currency situation
at that time.”

Mahmoud Mahgoub, commissioner general of the central Arab boycott
office in Damascus, announced in May that Coca-Cola was being given three
months to cancel its arrangements with Israel or face expulsion from the
Arab world. Coca-Cola went ahead with its plans for Israel although the
November conference in Kuwait of boycott directors from 12 Arab League
members and five Persian gulf sheikhdoms unanimously voted for the boy-
cott. A month later Mahgoub announced that the Arab Coca-Cola plants
would be given a nine-months grace period to “re-adjust their position” be-
fore the ban would take effect.

The Kuwait conference also decided to ban the Ford Motor Company
and its subsidiaries, and the Radio Corporation of America from the Arab
world. Ford was blacklisted because it had licensed its Israeli dealer, Palestine
Automobile Corporation, Ltd., to assemble British and American Ford
trucks and tractors. Henry Ford II reaffirmed that “we are definitely going
ahead with our plans for Israel. We feel we have the unchallenged right to
compete in any market of the world willing to accept us as an industrial
citizen.” Although the reason for the ban on RCA was not officially stated,
it was generally reported to be the company’s licensing of an Israeli firm to
press phonograph records under the RCA label. In December the company
denied a Beirut press report that it was suspending its business with Israel.
The Zenith Radio Corporation was blacklisted earlier in the year after it
had contracted to establish a television assembly plant in Israel. Another ma-
jor American firm that continued to resist the boycott was the Sheraton
Hotels Corporation, which signed an agreement with the Israel Ministry of
Tourism in June for construction of a new luxury hotel in Jerusalem. In
September the Israel cabinet approved an agreement with the Columbia
Broadcasting System, under which CBS was to serve as technical consultant
in setting up general television in Israel for a fee of $150,000 in the first
year. There was no report of Arab reaction.

Arab Restrictions on American Jews

An intimation that American personnel of Jewish faith were not assigned
to posts in Arab countries was contained in a letter of January 14 from
Assistant Secretary of State MacArthur to Representative Richard S. Schwei-
ker (Rep., Pa.). He wrote that, while the United States did not normally
“take into account the religion of its employees in assigning them for duty
abroad, this is regrettably a factor which cannot be ignored in the case of
certain countries whose policies in this respect we cannot control, however
much we disagree with them.” After the American Jewish Committee and
the American Jewish Congress wrote Secretary Rusk and met with State Department officials to protest this acquiescence in Arab discriminatory policies, the department gradually clarified its position. It first stated that it did not inquire into religion, but carefully assessed all factors affecting an employee's effectiveness. As Assistant Secretary of State Raymond A. Hare explained in his March 7 letter to Morris B. Abram, "while religion is not a criterion in personnel assignments, the Department would not deliberately place any employee in a position in which he could not fully and effectively discharge the duties of his job or practice his personal beliefs without hindrance or embarrassment."

Finally, Deputy Undersecretary of State for Administration William J. Crockett declared that MacArthur's original letter was "in error with respect to policy and practice," and reaffirmed in a letter of May 19 to Joachim Prinz, past president of the American Jewish Congress, that "assignments are made on the basis of need or merit, without in any way taking into account race or religion." Crockett stressed, as had Hare, that our embassies had been active in making "clear our opposition to any policies of foreign countries that discriminate against Americans because of their religion."

Among such acts of discrimination cited by the Jewish organizations in their discussions with the State Department were the travel restrictions still imposed by some Arab states on American Jews.

The continuing tendency of some Arab leaders to equate American Jews, Zionists, and Israelis as objects of their hostility was dramatized by a widely publicized incident that occurred on June 22 during the visit of King Faisal of Saudi Arabia to Washington. Asked at a Women's National Press Club luncheon about the Arab boycott of American firms dealing with Israel, King Faisal replied: "Unfortunately, Jews support Israel and we consider those who provide assistance to our enemies as our own enemies." In response to an earlier question as to whether he considered Israel or the United Arab Republic the greater enemy, the king insisted that despite some differences with Cairo, he viewed the UAR as a "sister republic" and the Egyptians as "our brethren." The "enemy" were the Zionists, whose "aggression" had disposessed the Palestinian Arabs. Some diplomatic observers thought that the king's response to this embarrassing question was dictated by considerations of public opinion in the Arab world. They found it significant that he backed away from a statement widely attributed to his predecessor by stressing that "it was never our aim to exterminate the Jews and drive them into the sea." However, Faisal's statement that he considered American Jews who supported Israel his enemies outraged the Jewish community, and the public outcry was echoed in Congress and in New York, where Mayor John V. Lindsay cancelled an official dinner in the king's honor because he viewed the remark as "extremely offensive, not just to Jews, but to all citizens of New York." Governor Nelson Rockefeller also officially snubbed Faisal, although his brother David, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, played host to the king at his Tarrytown estate.
While public condemnation was almost universal, some in the Jewish community shared the view of Secretary Rusk and Senator J. William Fulbright (Dem., Ark.) that King Faisal was a guest in this country and, as such, should be treated with courtesy even though his remarks offended his hosts.

In retaliation for the snub to the king, the representatives of 12 Arab League states, including the UAR, declared in September that they would boycott a dinner-dance sponsored by Mayor Lindsay in honor of diplomats attending the UN General Assembly session. A month later, the local diplomatic crisis had apparently eased, for Cairo's UN ambassador, Mohamed el-Kony, was found seated next to Lindsay in the mayor's box at a concert in Carnegie Hall.

George E. Gruen
Jewish Communal Services:
Programs and Finances

Many types of Jewish communal services are provided under organized Jewish sponsorship. Some needs of Jews (and non-Jews) are exclusively individual or governmental responsibilities, but a wide variety of services are considered to be the responsibility of the total Jewish community. While the aim is to serve Jewish community needs, some services may also be made available to the general community.

Most services are provided at the geographic point of need, but their financing may be secured from a wider area, nationally or internationally. This report deals with the financial contribution of American Jewry to domestic and global services and, to a lesser extent, with assistance given by Jews in other parts of the free world. Geographic classification of services (i.e. local, national, overseas) is based on areas of program 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:

Economic aid, mainly overseas—largely a function of government in the United States.

Migration aid—a global function, involving movement between countries, mainly to Israel, but also to the United States and other areas in substantial numbers at particular periods.

Absorption and resettlement of migrants—also a 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, the economic and social viability or absorptive potential of the communities in which resettlement takes place, and the availability of resources and structures for absorption in the host communities.

Health—mainly general hospitals, some specialized hospitals, and outpatient 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, Europe.

Welfare services—primarily 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.

Youth and recreational services—mainly Jewish centers, summer camps, Hillel units on campuses, and other youth services provided by B'ni B'rith.
Community relations—provided 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.

Religious agencies—local congregations, national groups of congregations, and associated rabbinical bodies.

Jewish education—provided through congregational, communal, and independent schools, coordinating bureaus of Jewish education, specialized national agencies, *yeshivot*, teacher-training schools and theological seminaries.

Cultural agencies—are under Jewish sponsorship and include higher education (other than theological seminaries); research in the social sciences, history, linguistics; publications; library, archive and museum facilities and lecture bookings.

Vocational services—provided in larger communities in the United States through specialized agencies (Jewish Vocational Services and Vocational Service of B’nai B’rith) for individual and group guidance, in the form of sheltered workshops and sometimes as part of family agencies; overseas, in the form of vocational education programs conducted by ORT, Histadrut, Hadassah, and other agencies.

Service agencies—mainly specialized national agencies designed to make for more effective clearance of activities in each field of service among national and local agencies.

Many agencies provide services in more than one of these areas. For purposes of classification, agencies have been grouped in this report in terms of the major focus of their activities.

The cohesive elements in planning and financing these services are mainly federations and welfare funds, for local services; federations together with national and overseas agencies, for non-local services.

Federations identify needs, plan for their provision through budgeting, and conduct annual fund-raising campaigns to provide the resources requisite to planning. 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**

Estimates of income and costs of Jewish communal services can be made for most, but not all, activities. Exceptions where data are not available are noted below. Income and costs approximate each other roughly, particularly for operating programs, as distinct from capital projects.

The aggregate value, or cost, of Jewish communal services may be loosely described as the “gross national product” of such services.

On this basis, the minimal estimate for the “gross national product” for
Jewish communal services was over $725 million in 1965. Excluded from this total are: almost all endowment income of federations and local agencies, all local capital fund campaigns, and all internal congregational operating expense. Costs of Jewish education may also be understated in this total.

This sum is related to the major sources of income: annual campaigns for contributions, service payments, and public tax funds.

There have been major increases in service payments in tax funds, with moderate changes in contributed income in the last decade. If data for 1965 were compared with data for 1955, the following major changes are indicated:

Federations provided $22 million more in annual campaigns.¹

Nonlocal agencies raised $51 million more, including $4.3 million for the new Israel Education Fund campaign; $12 million more for Brandeis University; $6.3 million more for Yeshiva University (including the medical school); $5.3 million more for the Conservative and Reform theological drives; $4.6 million more for City of Hope and National Jewish Hospitals; $6.2 million more for three institutions of higher education in Israel; $1.7 million more each for B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal and America-Israel Cultural Foundation (AICF); and $1 million more each for American Jewish Committee, Anti-Defamation League, ORT, and Hadassah.

Other non-contributed income (earnings, investments, service payments, government grants, etc.) rose by $50 million, of which $34 million was accounted for by Brandeis and Yeshiva Universities.

Grants by community chests for local Jewish services rose by almost $9 million.

Hospital income rose by at least $170 million, care for the aged income by about $25 million, and center income by about $16 million.

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 by over $340 million from 1955 to 1965.

**Results of Jewish Federated Fund Raising**

Over $3 billion was raised by the central Jewish community organizations of the United States in their annual campaigns in the 28-year period 1939 through 1966.² This period coincides with the organization of the United Jewish Appeal (UJA), which received almost $1.7 billion, mainly from welfare funds.

¹ From 1953 to 1963 book values of endowment funds increased by $37 million for large cities, with market values $13 million higher. In 1965 alone, large city endowment funds increased by at least $6 million (CJFWF "Council Reports," November 1966).

² UJA partners raised funds jointly in 1934 and in 1935 but raised funds independently prior to 1934 and in 1936 through 1938; JDC raised funds since 1914, Keren Hayesod since 1920, and JNF since 1910.
The annual totals for campaign proceeds for this period show the following major changes:

• From 1939 through 1942 annual levels ranged from about $27 to $29 million.
• From 1943 through 1945 there were annual rises of about $10 million, so that a level of $57 million was reached by the end of World War II.
• From 1946 through 1948 peak fund raising was reached during the period of the massive post-war DP problem and the effort related to the creation of the State of Israel; 1946 results more than doubled and moved forward to the 1948 peak of over $200 million.

From 1949 through 1955 the impact of these historic events diminished. As a result, there were successive declines, until the level of about $110 million was reached in 1954 and 1955.

From 1956 through 1964 campaign results ranged from a high of $139 million in 1957 to a low of $124 million in 1958, with results in 1959–64 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.

1965 results of $132 million and 1966 results of $137 million were the highest since 1957. If 1966 pledges to the UJA Israel Education Fund of $6.4 million were included, the total for 1966 would be the highest since 1949.

These campaigns include only maintenance and operating needs, with minor exceptions. They exclude totals for 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 contrast, the data for independent efforts of national and overseas agencies include major capital and endowment fund drives, mainly for educational and religious institutions and hospitals. Comparisons between totals for annual federation campaigns and for independent appeals would be grossly inaccurate.³

The Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York and its beneficiaries obtained from 1961 through 1966 about $138.5 million in pledges including about $19 million in government grants, endowments and investment and other income, toward a building fund goal, originally set at $104.4 million, but later successively revised to over $250 million.⁴ The plan encompasses numerous 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 $16.5 million in 1949, $13.5 million in 1945, and $3 million in 1943.

³ For example, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies' experience of securing $16 million in capital fund pledges in 1966 alone was unique in size, but not in occurrence; many other cities raised substantial capital sums beyond their annual maintenance campaigns.

⁴ Pledges and collections at June 30, 1965 were about $98.5 million but rose to $115.7 million a year later. In addition, federation beneficiaries reported $19.2 million in "available and potential resources."
Systematic data on local capital fund raising are not available on an annual basis because of the long-term nature of these efforts, but partial figures indicate their magnitude. They are largely conducted by federations outside their annual campaigns.

The National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB) reported that in 1966 alone eight community centers were newly completed at an estimated construction cost of $9.1 million. This would bring the total of new centers built in the last two decades to 107, at a cost of $102 million.\(^5\)

Progress on plans for hospitals and medical centers were reported in 1966 in seven cities, involving an aggregate estimated cost of over $20 million.\(^6\) New or expanded homes for the aged (some including apartment housing for the elderly, and some medical facilities) in five cities were planned at a cost of $11 million. Five new facilities for Jewish education had goals of about $4 million, but this excluded school facilities in temple buildings. Some 16 temples had goals of about $13 million. Three Hillel buildings were projected at an estimated cost of $1 million. Many of these efforts were begun prior to 1966 and will continue for at least several years after 1966, with non-contributed income representing substantial portions of the cost (matching federal funds, proceeds of sale of old structures, mortgage loans, etc.). This was exclusive of the combined drives of New York Federation for over $250 million, that of Philadelphia for $15 million, of Chicago for $9 million, and of Washington, D.C. for over $5 million.\(^7\)

Reports from cities with a total Jewish population of 2,625,000 listed 555,000 individual gifts but excluded tens of thousands of individuals covered by organization gifts, Yiddish newspaper gifts, and the like, especially in the largest cities. These cities represent about 45 per cent of the Jewish population in the United States.

The amounts raised by federations are augmented by funds provided by nonsectarian united funds and community chests for local Jewish services. These grants totalled $19.5 million in 1965, mainly to federated agencies, and were expected to exceed $20 million as a result of the planned inclusion of local Jewish services by the community chest in Boston. Outside New York City, chests provided well over $16 million to federations. Among the largest cities, only Baltimore did not receive chest funds. Most larger cities and intermediate-sized cities received such support.

Cities with the same Jewish population frequently raised varying amounts in their federated campaigns and received widely different levels 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

\(^5\) JWB Yearbook, Volume 15, November 1966.

\(^6\) This is exclusive of the Toronto plan for hospital expansion, estimated at $18.5 million.

\(^7\) Mainly from 1966 issues of JTA Community News Reporter. Since coverage is not complete, figures cited are understatements. Some projects were announced in 1965 and earlier years. The degree of progress in 1966 had not been noted publicly at year's end.
agencies, and to the prevailing relationships among Jewish federations, Jewish local agencies, and chests.

**Independent Campaigns**

Each federation determines for itself the beneficiary agencies which it supports through allocations. There are about 25 nonlocal appeals which are included by most federated campaigns, with other agencies receiving less extensive inclusion.

A beneficiary agency is expected to forego 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, frequently with federation clearance on timing and other aspects of the campaign. Welfare funds do not normally allocate funds for capital needs of nonlocal agencies. In some cases, maintenance needs of agencies are included by federations while independent solicitations are conducted by the same agencies for capital needs not eligible for federation support.

A number of federations had developed policy statements regarding supplementary appeals, which stressed the primacy of the federation campaign, commitment of community leaders to such primacy, clearance procedures on approved appeals, and public reporting by these appeals.

In 1965, some 70 agencies raised $88.6 million independently. In most cases these were not additions to the allocations received from welfare funds, but represented the sole funds these agencies raised in communities for particular purposes.

The New York UJA's inclusion is limited to the national UJA, JWB, and United Hias Service (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 half of $88.6 million raised independently may have been secured in New York City. These funds are not supplementary to allocations by welfare funds.

Of $31.1 million raised independently by overseas agencies in 1965, Hadassah raised $7.9 million through membership efforts, while the other three women's organizations—ORT, National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW), and Pioneer Women raised $1.6 million, $0.6 million, and $1.1 million, respectively. Most welfare fund allocations to Hadassah were earmarked for the Youth Aliyah program operated by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), with other programs financed mainly by membership. ORT does not appeal to welfare funds because of the support it receives from the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee (JDC), while NCJW and Pioneer Women receive welfare fund support in a small number of cities.

---

8 Partial data for $55 million raised by 11 agencies independently in 1965 indicate that 55 per cent of this sum was raised in New York City but many other agencies were securing support in New York City below this level (Council Reports: Fund Raising, October 1966).
The three institutions of higher learning in Israel received contributions of over $7.5 million, mainly in New York City, with a substantial portion earmarked for building and special funds. Welfare funds provided maintenance funds to Hebrew University and Technion. The Jewish National Fund (JNF) continued its traditional appeal and raised $2.8 million, with no support sought from welfare funds. The other major effort was that of Histadrut which raised $1.8 million, mainly from Labor Zionist sources in those cities where it received no welfare fund allocations.

The UJA Israel Education Fund in 1965 had cash receipts of $4.3 million which were secured independently, but in close cooperation with welfare funds.

Most of the total of $5.6 million raised independently in the community-relations field was accounted for by the efforts of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League 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 respective welfare funds affected.

A total of $16.7 million was raised by hospitals, mainly City of Hope (Duarte, California) and National Jewish Hospital (Denver), and by the Einstein College of Medicine. Most of the national hospitals no longer have wide acceptance as welfare fund beneficiaries, and they are not thereby precluded from independent efforts. Welfare fund grants which continue are small and token in character.

In the cultural field the major amounts raised independently are by Brandeis University ($14.4 million), which does not seek welfare fund support, and by B’nai B’rith National Youth Service Appeal, which raises about $3.2 million, mainly from members of B’nai B’rith.

While $15.9 million was raised independently by agencies under religious auspices, the major components were for Yeshiva University (almost $3.3 million, the greatest portion of which was raised in New York City); $3.3 million raised by the Reform Jewish Appeal, mainly within its membership, and $5.2 million raised by the Jewish Theological Seminary, mainly from supporters of Conservative Judaism.

The magnitude of funds raised independently by specific agencies is based on effectiveness of campaign techniques, attractiveness of the nature of the appeal, effective organization of supporting groups, and, particularly, the response evoked in New York City.

The major independent efforts are those which do not appeal to welfare funds or which do not receive significant welfare fund support (e.g. Brandeis University, national health appeals, membership drives of ORT and B’nai B’rith, JNF, and Weizmann Institute); 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, with supplementation by welfare funds (Reform Appeal, Jewish Theological Seminary, Hadassah, NCJW, Pioneer Women).
Restricted independent fund raising for local agencies (generally arranged by agreement with federations) provides smaller sums for operating purposes. Local hospitals, centers, family agencies, child care agencies, and homes for the aged raised over $7 million independently for operating purposes in 1965. These were supplementary contributions, with the major share of income derived from Jewish federations and community chests. These amounts do not include capital fund campaigns and endowment income (bequests, etc.) received by local agencies.

**Distribution of Funds**

Jewish 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. Possibly one-third of cash collections on pledges for a given campaign year are paid in succeeding years. As a result, an allowance for "shrinkage" averaging 4.2 per cent was made in 1965 for the difference between cash and pledges.

Cost of administering federations, including costs of fund raising, budgeting, planning, and other central functions averaged 14.5 per cent.

These major elements explain the difference in the figures shown for amounts raised (Table 1) and the figures shown for amounts distributed (Table 3). Amounts distributed also include over $1.7 million in 13 cities, outside New York City, from sources other than current campaigns: investment earnings, bequests, unexpended income of prior years, and the like.

About 57.2 per cent of amounts budgeted for 1965 by welfare funds were applied to overseas needs, 4.1 per cent to national agencies, and 38.7 per cent to local services. The shifts from 1964 were less than one-half of one per cent.

The UJA share (included in "Overseas") rose from 58 per cent in 1955 to 65 per cent in 1957 and levelled off at 56 to 60 per cent in 1958 to 1961. From 1963 through 1965, the UJA share was 54 to 55 per cent.

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 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 about 58 per cent of funds budgeted in 1965 in cities with Jewish population of 40,000 and over. The very smallest communities (under 5,000 Jewish popu-

---

9 One hundred federations which raised $78.7 million in 1965 (outside New York City) provided for shrinkage allowances of $3.3 million and set aside $10.5 million for central administration, planning, budgeting, and fund raising.

10 Note that amounts raised are larger than amounts budgeted generally to the extent of shrinkage allowances and costs of operating federations; therefore, percentages of amounts raised will be lower than percentages of amounts budgeted.
lation) with the least developed networks of local Jewish services, continued
to give nonlocal agencies 82 per cent of their budgeted funds. Intermediate-
size cities provided nonlocal agencies with about 72 per cent of budgeted
funds.

Local services received for operating purposes about $40 million in 1965. While the total dollar amount remained stable, increases were shared by
most local fields of service where aid was secured from community chests. Income for Jewish local services from community chests rose by almost
three per cent in 1965. This was equivalent to about half of the rise of total
costs of services eligible for chest support (health, family and child care,
recreation and care for the aged). Jewish federation allocations rose by over
four per cent; but this was effected mainly by increased allocations for Jew-
ish education and for local community relations, by the need to provide total
financing in cities where local Jewish services received no chest support, and
by the need to supplement chest grants (based on reports from 127 cities
in 1965).

There was a decrease in allocations for local capital purposes in 1965. Such allocations did not exceed 1.4 per cent of the total nationally or 2.0 per
cent outside New York City. Local capital funds are frequently excluded
from the annual maintenance campaigns. The figure of allocations for capi-
tal-fund purposes from federations relates only to minor funds provided for
these purposes in the annual campaigns.

Local services receiving most widespread federation support in all sizes
of communities were community centers and Jewish education programs.
They received a greater proportion of the funds in smaller cities, than in
larger communities.

There are important variations in local services included by federations
even among cities of the same relative size in terms of Jewish population or
campaign results. Federations do not receive community-chest support for
Jewish education, local community relations, and local refugee aid programs.

In order to determine the relative support provided by federations to va-
rious local fields of service, it is necessary to take into account the contribu-
tion made by community chests.

Thus, from the total of $31 million provided to fields eligible for chest
support in 1965, in 127 cities outside New York City (hospitals, family and
child care centers, care of the aged, and administration) total chest support
of $16.1 million should be deducted. The difference ($14.9 million, or
about 48 per cent) represents federation support for these fields on a com-
combined basis.

In making intercity comparisons of allocations for specific fields of ser-
vice, it is important to note whether the federations being compared have
the same inclusion pattern, and if they do not, the approximate values of serv-
ces excluded by one community but included by another. This is particu-
larly significant for service areas which are not universally included by
federations.
The pattern of fund distribution in communities results from systematic 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 the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (CJFWF), and consideration of recommendations by the Large City Budgeting Conference (LCBC) consisting of 25 of the largest communities. LCBC recommendations deal with 16 nonlocal agencies which receive three-quarters of all nonlocal federation allocations, exclusive of UJA.

OVERSEAS SERVICES

Aid to Israel and Other Overseas Areas

Aid to Israel by Jews in the United States is channelled through the UJA and other overseas agencies, and through the Israel Bond drive. From 1948 through 1966 the UJA provided over $810 million for the Jewish Agency for Israel (via the United Israel Appeal, which included transmissions of $115 million to the JNF, mainly between 1948 and 1952). The JDC used UJA funds for its program in Israel (as part of its ramified overseas services) to the extent of almost $160 million.\textsuperscript{11} Hadassah raised over $160 million in this period. Sales of Israel Bonds were over $780 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 1965 was about $1,065 million including $466 million in loans, of which $273 million was repaid; grants and technical aid of $278 million; surplus food, of which $93 million were grants and the remainder loans in local currency, which were partially repaid. (In addition, total aid for 1966 was about $39 million.\textsuperscript{12}) German reparations payments totalling about $830 million were completed in 1966; over $50 million was transferred to Jewish organizations outside Israel under the terms of the reparations agreement.

There was a rise in foreign currency balances of $106 million in 1965, which resulted in a record balance of $749 million (or $611 million after deduction of foreign deposits in Israeli banks). This was more than offset by foreign currency liabilities of $1,206 million,\textsuperscript{13} mainly loans (including Israel bonds, $532 million; and other loans, $674 million).

In 1966, however, there was a reduction of $20 million in these reserves, and the governor of the Bank of Israel warned that these reserves would be exhausted if the trade deficit rose to $750 million by 1970.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11} This was included in total receipts of JDC of over $560 million received from 1948 through 1966. Total JDC receipts in the 53-year period 1914 through 1966, from all sources, was over $850 million.

\textsuperscript{12} Near East Report, May 1966 and September 1966.

\textsuperscript{13} Review of Economic Conditions, July 1966 (Bank Leumi Le-Israel).

\textsuperscript{14} Jerusalem Post, January 20, 1967.
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 $406 million in 1965, or about 50 per cent of imports of $816 million. Preliminary data for 1966 indicate exports of about $476 million in 1966, or about 58 per cent of imports of about $818 million. The annual trade deficits had ranged from $223 million to a peak of $465 million in 1964. The 1966 deficit reached $342 million.

These figures deal with trade in commodities only. If services are included (tourism, transport, debt service, unspecified government costs), the deficit was $465 million in 1966, $521 million in 1965, and about $569 million in 1964. These deficits were partially offset in 1965 by 341 million and in 1964 by $351 million in "unilateral transfers" consisting mainly of restitution and reparations, campaign proceeds in United States and other countries, personal transfers, and United States government aid. This offset was reduced to $310 million in 1966, mainly as a result of the end of reparations income. Capital imports vital to Israel's economy were reduced from $453 million in 1964 to $390 million in 1966, mainly as a result of a drop in foreign investments.

Philanthropic Programs for Israel

Philanthropic funds continue to be an important source of income for Israel's economy. These funds are specifically earmarked for welfare, health, and educational programs. At the same time, the exchange of dollars for pounds is also helpful to the country.

American Jewish philanthropic agencies reporting to the CJFWF had available for overseas purposes about $102.6 million in 1965, compared with about $92.1 million in 1964. Over 80 per cent of these funds are earmarked for Israel. Campaigns in other overseas countries also provide funds for programs in Israel. The Bank of Israel reported global transmissions of about $107 million to Israel in 1965, compared with $96 million in 1964.

Total immigration since the creation of the State of Israel, 1948 through 1966, was about 1,260,000, while about 150,000 Jews migrated from Israel to other countries. Major migration took place from 1948 through 1951, when almost 700,000 Jews entered Israel. Fewer than 90,000 Jews migrated in the following four years (1952–55), but there was an upsurge in 1956–57, when over 125,000 Jews migrated to Israel.

The immigration pace slackened in the three years from 1958 through 1960, when fewer than 75,000 Jews went to Israel; the tempo was increased again in the ensuing four years (1961–64), when 230,000 Jews migrated to Israel. In 1965 and 1966, migration was again at a lesser level.

---

The waves of immigration were related to opportunities existing at particular times: the postwar migration of displaced persons; movements from Eastern Europe, when conditions in Poland, Hungary, and Rumania permitted emigration; movements from North Africa resulting mainly from political changes in Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco, Yemen, and Egypt, and the like.

**Bond Sales for Israel**

A series of State of Israel 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, and of the Development Investment Issue on March 31, 1966.

Flotation of the Independence Issue for a three-year period, from May 1, 1951 to May 1, 1954, resulted in sales of $145.5 million. The second issue, the Development Issue, which was floated for a five-year period from 1954 to 1959, resulted in sales of $234.1 million, and sales of the third issue, known as the Second Development Issue, were $293.7 million in 1964, the end of the five-year period of flotation. Sales of the fourth issue, known as the Third Development Issue, began on March 1, 1964. By November 1966, $200.2 million had been sold and were still outstanding.

Total bonds sold for all issues were $928 million at the end of 1966.

At the end of November 1966 there were outstanding in the hands of the public $501.9 million, consisting of $85.2 million Development Issue; $182.3 million Second Development Issue; $200.2 million Third Development Issue, and $34.1 Development Investment Issue.

From the inception of sale of Israel bonds in May 1951 through November 1966, $66.8 million worth of State of Israel bonds were surrendered in Israel for pounds by the Jewish Agency for Israel. In 1966, $5.7 million worth of bonds were reported to have been received by the UJA in payment of individual pledges to local welfare funds.

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 was completed. Redemption of the Development Issue began on April 1, 1964, and $26.6 million is to mature during 1967.

From 1963 through 1966 over $170 million in bonds matured. Almost $38 million was converted for investment purposes in 1963–66, out of a total of $94.7 million converted for such purposes since inception.

A substantial portion of the monies received by bondholders on redemption of their matured bonds was reinvested in the State of Israel bonds being sold in 1963 and later years.

---

19 This includes $5.6 million in conversion from earlier issues.
20 This includes $22.4 million in conversions from earlier issues.
21 The bond sales organization reports total “turn-ins” from 1961–66 of over $30 million.
Bond sales in the United States totalled $76.2 million in 1966, at about the same level as in 1965. In Canada, 1966 sales amounted to $5.7 million, compared with $5.5 million the preceding year. Elsewhere, $9 million in bonds were sold, so that worldwide sales amounted to $90.9 million, close to the level of 1965 Israel Bond sales, the largest for any one year.

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 during 1965 and 1966. This totalled $112.7 million in 1965 and $115 million in 1966, compared with $134.2 million in 1964.

Payments from Germany under the reparations agreement were $17 million during 1965, with no further payments due.

In March 1964 the Conference of Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (CJMCA) 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 Israel government.

There was a loss in income of about $6.5 million for the JDC for programs in Europe and Australia. The JDC continued to receive $1 million annually from residual reparations funds.

There had also been grants for cultural and educational reconstruction in Europe and the United States. About $10 to $11 million annually had gone for relief programs in Israel in recent years, with the Jewish Agency as the major beneficiary. These ended early in 1966.

No further annual allocations were available after 1964, but a Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture was established in 1964, with $10 million from Claims Conference funds for the support of "Jewish history, religion, education, traditions." Operations began in 1965.

**Overseas Agencies**

American Jewish financial support for needs in Israel and in other overseas areas is provided mainly through federation allocations to UJA and to about a dozen other overseas agencies. UJA continued to receive the major share of overseas allocations by welfare funds. Other overseas agencies raised the major portion of their funds independently.

Total income in 1965 of all overseas agencies was $92.1 million, with $31.1 million raised outside the federations. The largest of these independent fund-raising activities were the Israel Education Fund of UJA, which was now conducted independently under agreement with welfare funds; Hadas-

---

22 The UJA share of all funds budgeted was 54.5 per cent in 1965. Its share of gross pledges was 46 per cent.
sah, which raised $7.9 million through membership activities; the building
and special fund drives of Hebrew University and Technion, which raised
$6 million; the drives of National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer
Women, for welfare activities conducted by Histadrut in Israel, which raised
$2.9 million; the JNF campaign for "traditional income," which raised $2.8
million, and Weizmann Institute, which raised $1.5 million.

**United Jewish Appeal**

UJA is a partnership of the United Israel Appeal (UIA) and JDC for
joint fund raising. Over 90 per cent of UJA income is received from federa-
tions. The remainder is secured in hundreds of small nonfederated commu-
nities where UJA enlists the cooperation of community leaders to take re-
sponsibility for conducting local campaigns for UJA or joint appeals, with
UIA as the major beneficiary.

From its inception in 1939 through 1966, UJA received about $1,686
million and distributed about $925 million to UIA (formerly United Palestine
Appeal), $580 million to JDC and $87 million to United Service for New
Americans (USNA), New York Association for New Americans (NYANA),
and UHS.

UJA provides general campaign services to communities (publicity, speak-
ers, 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 through the agencies which share in the UJA proceeds: UIA
(actually by the Jewish Agency in Israel), JDC, and NYANA and UHS
which received most of its income from sources other than UJA.

The distribution of UJA funds in 1965 was in accordance with a formula
which has remained unchanged since 1951 and is effective through 1968. It
provides that, after deduction of campaign expenses and allocations to
NYANA, UIA is to receive 67 per cent and JDC 33 per cent of the first
$55 million raised each year. Beyond $55 million, UIA is to receive 87.5
per cent and JDC 12.5 per cent. This formula was not applied to the pro-
ceeds of "special" campaigns.

UJA initiated its Israel Education Fund in September 1964. The objec-
tive is to conduct a five-year capital-fund campaign to provide high school
buildings, teacher-training programs, student scholarships and related cen-
ters, equipment and facilities. This effort is separate from the annual UJA
campaign.

A total of $9.6 million in pledges were received in 1965, which increased
to $16 million by the end of 1966.

Large gifts are sought: $100,000 and over, payable in up to 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 does not share in this fund. The funds are turned over to the UIA
which is to "own, manage and operate the schools and related institutions" to be built with the donated funds, with the Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem) as operating agent in Israel.

The government of Israel cooperates by providing land for construction, exempting the institution from governmental tax, providing funds toward the cost of maintenance, and agreeing not to make similar arrangements with other efforts of the same kind without prior consultation with UJA and UIA.

**UJA Special Funds**

Beginning in 1956, UJA received "special" funds designed to augment the proceeds of its "regular" funds each year (except for 1961).

On a pledge basis, UJA income was $64.4 million in 1966, exclusive of the Israel Education Fund. This was about three per cent higher than the 1965 pledge total of $62.4 million.

On a cash basis, the UJA had receipts of $61.6 million in 1966, compared with $61.4 million in 1965. These were the cash amounts received each year regardless of years in which the pledges were made. In addition $4.3 million was received in 1965 and $2.7 million for the Israel Education Fund on total pledges of $16 million.

UJA seeks agreements with federations in advance of campaigns to maximize its percentage share of campaign proceeds. UJA proceeds for 1966 of about $64.4 million compared with gross campaign proceeds of about $137 million.

**UJA Special Loans**

**CURRENT LOAN**

Borrowing from banks has been a major factor affecting the financing of UJA, UIA and JAFI, Inc. in the last decade.

The current loan was negotiated in April 1965 for $50 million for a 15-year period with a group of 11 insurance companies.

These funds were borrowed by UIA and guaranteed by UJA.

This represented a refinancing of prior bank loans of about $45.2 million which had been borrowed earlier for a 10 (and then a 12) year term by federations from local banks and underwritten nationally by UJA.

The consolidation of the loan in 1965 resulted in repayment of the outstanding balances of the earlier loan. The difference in the terms of loans was expected to make about $4 million per year additional in cash available for the work of UIA. The amount owed on the loan at the end of 1966 was $46.6 million.

The terms of the loan also limit short-term debt (for 12 months) at any time to $10 million. The loan for $50 million is exclusive of financing provided by some of the insurance companies for capital requirements for housing in Israel.
JEWISH COMMUNAL SERVICES / 139

PRIOR LOANS

UJA borrowed $64,751,500 though welfare funds in 1954. These funds were transmitted to UIA 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 welfare funds repaid loan installments and interest, UJA credited such amounts against community allocations to UJA. Such repayments were considered as UIA income on account of its share of UJA proceeds in lieu of cash.

UJA undertook in 1961 a ten-year debt liquidation program which consolidated prior debts of UJA and UIA, totalling $65 million. The debts were to be repaid at the rate of ten per cent each year. The loans were arranged by federations and local banks, and underwritten nationally by UJA. There were 39 cities involved in the loans, with $40 million borrowed outside New York City and $25 million in New York City. The balance of about $45 million in these loans was repaid out of the proceeds of the current loan in April 1965.

Liabilities of the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) exceeded assets by about $206 million on March 31, 1965. Assets were about $50 million, but liabilities were about $256 million (borrowing in the succeeding two years was expected to result in raising this total above the $300 million mark). Long-term debt was reported at $119 million with short-term debt and debt currently maturing totalling $127 million. UIA has no legal responsibility for loans made outside the U.S.

UJA funds destined for the Jewish Agency, Jerusalem, are disbursed through UIA which is one of the two official partners in UJA.

Receipts of UIA, in 1966, from UJA were about $38 million and, in 1965, about $37 million. In addition, cash receipts for the Israel Education Fund were $2.7 million in 1966 and $4.3 million in 1965. 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, UIA received a lower share from UJA in that year ($37 million) than in more recent years when the JDC share of UJA funds had declined.

Jewish National Fund

JNF, under the UJA agreement, is permitted to raise $1,800,000 annually from “traditional collections” in the United States, after deduction of expenses not exceeding $300,000. Its total United States income, including traditional income, bequests, and other income was about $2.8 million in 1964–65. JNF received in Israel annual allocations of about $1.2 million directly from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), which were terminated at April 1, 1965.

In the four fiscal years ending March 31, 1964, JNF had a global income of almost IL 102 million, or an annual average of $8.5 million at cur-
rent rates of exchange. The global JNF budget for 1966–67 is set at almost $19 million, with about 40 per cent to be derived from contributions. Most of the funds are used for land reclamation, afforestation, road-laying, and drainage. It reports the planting of 80 million trees. In late 1966 it was providing 3,500 jobs in afforestation.

United Israel Appeal, Inc.

The Jewish Agency for Israel, Inc. and the United Israel Appeal were merged in June 1966. The merged organization is known as the United Israel Appeal, Inc. One hundred of 210 members of the board of trustees of the combined agency were drawn from names suggested for consideration by various communities, and 100 were designated by the American Zionist organizations, which had previously been represented in the former UIA. Ten were elected at large.

The new board of trustees elected two-thirds of the board of directors of 27, with the remaining one-third designated by the Jewish Agency-American Section, Inc.23

The operating agency for services to immigrants and for other programs in Israel continues to be the Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem). These services are to be provided in line with the specific allocations and instructions of the new UIA, Inc., in the same way as they were previously provided in accordance with allocations by JAFI, Inc.

This change eliminated one channel for transmission of funds, reduced confusion with multiple agencies bearing the name “Jewish Agency,” and broadened representation on the new governing board.

Funds from UJA flow directly to the new UIA, Inc., and are appropriated for specific programs.

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 unimpaired, since the American control of funds is in line with policies developed by the Internal Revenue Service for all agencies providing funds for use overseas.

UIA utilizes American staff appointed by and responsible to itself (stationed in Israel) in order to assure American control of the specific programs and costs in resettlement, absorption of immigrants, and related services for which it assumes responsibility for financing. The operating agency continues to be the Jerusalem Jewish Agency, with which UIA contracts for the financing and operating of specific agreed-upon projects in Israel.

Jewish Agency for Israel (Jerusalem)

Sources of Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) income have been primarily UIA,

23 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.
Inc. earmarked grants from the United States; a share of Keren Hayesod campaigns in Jewish communities outside the U.S.; counterpart income flowing from the German reparations agreements up to 1966; grants and loans by the Israel government for costs of agricultural settlement; and earmarked contributions for Youth Aliyah.

In 1948 through 1966, the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) received UJA funds of about $700 million. (In earlier years during this period JNF had received an additional $115 million. In addition, since 1952, JNF received funds indirectly from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), with such support ending in March 1965.

About 80 per cent of contribution income generally comes from the United States. Contributions in 1964–65 accounted for about $44 million transmitted to Israel from the United States and other countries. This was over two-thirds of total income (exclusive of loans), but less than half of total income if loans are included. Over $28 million was derived from new long- and medium-term loans, and about $27 million was repaid. Israel government grants for agriculture and remaining receipts, mainly from reparations (up to 1966) and sales of housing to earlier immigrants, and earmarked funds, covered the balance of income.

The Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) spent about $108 million in the year ended March 31, 1965, including loan repayment principal and interest of about $27 million.

While similar detailed data were not yet available for 1965–66, indications were that total income and borrowing was at about the preceding year’s level, except for the start of receipts from the Israel Education Fund of UJA.

The largest single area of functional expenditures in 1965–66 was for agricultural settlement, amounting to over $23 million. The objective is eventual self-support for the newcomer. Aid is provided in the form of founding of new settlements, irrigation projects, citiculture, equipment, instruction, supplementary employment, and long-term loans. Part of these costs has been covered by advances and grants from the Israel government. The Jewish Agency has been transferring settlers’ agreements to repay Jewish Agency loans to the government in consideration of government grants for agricultural settlement.

After financial independence was attained late in 1966 by 116 settlements, aid continued to be received by 364 settlements inhabited by 110,000 persons. It was planned to transfer 63 additional settlements to government care by April 1967, and to bring 150 settlements to independence by 1968–69. This resulted from decisions following findings released by the Ben Aharon Commission which had recommended advances in this direction.

---

24 Includes some advance payments for 1965–66 for “other countries.”
25 In 1964–65 the combined budgets of the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) and of the World Zionist Organization were about $113 million, of which $96 million was for the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). The combined budgets for 1965–66 were again at the same level (see report submitted to Zionist General Council, Jerusalem, January 1967).
Costs of permanent immigrant housing were almost $15 million in 1965–66.

Initial absorption of immigrants cost over $11 million in 1965–66, exceeding, for the first time, the $10 million mark for immigration and transportation costs. This change was further accentuated in 1966–67.

Youth Aliyah programs for maintenance and education of immigrant and other youth cost about $6.8 million in 1965–66. Hadassah in the United States and other women's organizations in the United States and abroad provided a major share of these costs, with the remaining share of costs borne by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) and UIA.

Other Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) expenditures included grants totalling about $2.5 million for institutions of higher learning in Israel (Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, Technion, Bar-Ilan University and Tel Aviv University), a terminal allocation of $1.2 million to JNF (in 1964 and 1965), organization and information activities, and general administrative expenses within and outside Israel.

UIA provided financing toward specific agreed-upon projects conducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) but not those of its American Section, or the American Zionist Council, or the World Zionist Organization.

Programs Financed by United Israel Appeal, Inc.

In 1965–66, UIA, Inc. provided $34.0 million toward costs of programs operated by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem). These expenditures were based upon an agreement that the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) would make specific expenditures on behalf of, and in accordance with, the instructions of UIA. In addition, UIA had repaid $3.1 million in loans and in interest in the United States.

The programs which received the largest shares of UIA financing were those for initial immigrant care, including immigration, transportation, and absorption. In 1965–66 the amount provided for absorption exceeded amounts for other programs.

Other non-UJA sources of income were available to the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem) for particular programs. These were funds provided by the government toward the agricultural settlement program, and by Hadassah and other groups for Youth Aliyah. In each case, UIA earmarked its funds for specific programs.

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee

JDC is an American agency conducting a global program of direct aid to Jews through its own staff overseas and through cooperation with indigenous Jewish organizations. In 1966 it undertook to align its administrative structure so as to make for maximum effectiveness.

It assisted about 212,000 persons in 1966. Of these, 86,000 were in Israel (including about 37,000 receiving aid from Malben, over 26,000 in ORT
schools, and about 16,000 in yeshivoth), 70,000 in Europe, 51,000 in Moslem areas, and about 5,000 in other areas. This is exclusive of others aided by "relief-in-transit" programs which are less formally organized.

When the German reparations income ended in 1965 (except for $1 million annually in terminal grants), cash receipts fell to $20.4 million and disbursements to $24.0 million, with about $3.3 million additional secured from borrowing. UJA provided $17.9 million, reparations income less than $1.2 million, and campaigns abroad (mainly Canada, Great Britain, and Latin America) less than $0.6 million.

Preliminary estimates for 1966 indicate that income in 1966 was expected to remain at the 1965 level of about $20.5 million, while appropriations were to be at a level of about $22.6 million.

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: $6.1 million, or 27 per cent of the 1966 total. An additional $0.8 million was provided for aid to yeshivoth and other traditional institutions in Israel. Malben aided about 37,000 persons during 1966, including care of the aged in institutions (3,800), in their own homes (21,700), and medical and psychiatric services. Malben accounts for the greatest portion of the total of over $160 million spent by JDC in Israel from 1950 through 1966.

The largest number of North African Jews receiving JDC aid was in Morocco, where over 23,000 Jews (about one in three Jews remaining in Morocco) were being assisted in 1966. About 26,000 Jews in Tunisia and Iran were also receiving JDC aid. JDC appropriated almost $4.8 million in 1966 for work in Moslem areas. JDC assistance is channeled through such agencies as OSE in the health field; the Alliance Israélite Universelle, Ozar Hatorah and Lubavitcher schools in the educational fields, and ORT for vocational training.

JDC programs operated in about a dozen European countries, but two-thirds of the total aided were assisted in France: 45,500 aided included a large proportion of Tunisian, Algerian, and Moroccan refugees. Two-thirds of the Jews aided in France were assisted by federated agencies of the Fonds Social Juif Unifié which secure JDC aid. The JDC assistance program was aiding 11,000 Jews in Poland and 5,000 in Italy, Belgium, Austria, and other countries.

ORT and Vocational Education

Vocational training overseas is provided through facilities of ORT which operates in Western Europe, Moslem countries, and Israel. Vocational education in Israel is also conducted as part of the programs of Histadrut.

26 Progress of the FSJU is indicated in its fund-raising totals, which have risen from $450,000 in 1957 to $1.6 million in 1966. JDC aid to programs in France was about $2 million in 1966.
Hadassah, Youth Aliyah, and Technion, and by the Israel government and municipalities.

The global expenditures of the World ORT Union were at an annual level of about $12.9 million in 1966. Total ORT trainees in 1966 were 47,623, of whom 26,723 were in Israel, 5,389 in France, 6,185 in Moslem countries, and the balance mainly in Europe.

American Jewish support of the ORT program is channeled in two ways: through the JDC grant to ORT ($1,950,000 in 1966 and $2,100,000 for 1967) derived from the JDC participation in UJA and through membership contributions of ORT in the United States. Women's American ORT raised $1.6 million in 1965 and $1.8 million in 1966. In addition, the American ORT Federation provided in 1966 almost $0.4 million from dues and bequests and about $0.2 million from similar sources. The agreement between ORT and JDC permits ORT to recruit members at annual dues not to exceed $25, unless otherwise provided by mutual local agreement.

World ORT raised about $0.9 in other countries in 1966, and secured over $8 million from local sources in the countries of operation, mainly from government sources.

Global income of ORT was estimated at close to $12.8 million in 1966, and was expected to exceed $13 million in 1967. Over half of the outlay in 1966 was in Israel ($6.8 million) and about one-fifth in France ($2.7 million), but local sources (mainly governmental tax revenues and school fees) provided the major share of financing.

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 8,806 Jewish immigrants to migrate in 1966 (including 5,901 to France and 2,089 to the United States), compared with 12,142 in 1965. A migration level of at least 8,200 is expected in 1967.

A large proportion of the Jewish immigrants arriving in the United States remain in New York City. Hence, the financing of the program of NYANA is considered to be a national responsibility, reflected in the inclusion of NYANA as a direct beneficiary of national UJA.

Jewish immigration to the United States in 1966 was estimated by UHS and NYANA at about 7,000 including those aided by agencies and those arriving independently. Of those who settled in New York City about 3,100 received aid from NYANA in 1966. UJA grants to NYANA in 1965 and 1966 were over $600,000 annually.

Hadassah

The largest income of an overseas service agency other than UJA was that

27 This excludes transactions involving ORT contracts with the U.S. Agency for International Development for nonsectarian services in underdeveloped nations in Africa and elsewhere.
of Hadassah which received $10.9 million in 1965 and $11.8 million in 1966. Hadassah's major projects are for medical services and Youth Aliyah. The new 545-bed Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center on the outskirts of Jerusalem was opened in 1961 at a cost of over $25 million. Medical services in Israel are also provided by the Kupat Holim of the Histadrut, by governmental departments, and by the Malben program of JDC.28 Hadassah has transferred 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 conducted by the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), at a cost of about $6.8 million in 1965–66. Hadassah's transmission to Youth Aliyah was about $1.8 million in 1965–66. Other women's groups in the United States and overseas provide smaller supplementary funds for Youth Aliyah. The number of children cared for at the end of June 1966 was 12,333, including 2,474 in day centers.

Higher Education in Israel

A report, issued in Israel late in 1965 by a Special Committee on Higher Education (Sharef Committee), recommended the establishment by law of a Higher Education Authority to develop a master plan of educational needs; recommend the level of government financial aid; decide on the division of the governmental appropriation for higher education, and possibly have veto powers over proposals to create new institutions or add new facilities. It estimated that the 1964 enrolment of 18,000 might rise to about 50,000 by 1974. (In 1965–66 total enrolment was 21,756.)29 The composition of the 25-man Authority, to be appointed by the president of Israel, would include seven scholars, five representatives of the given institutions, nine public figures, and key ministry officials.

The institutions of higher education in Israel (Weizmann Institute, Hebrew University, and Technion) had receipts in America of over $11 million in 1965, mainly in contributions. In addition, all three institutions received grants from UIA, a beneficiary of UJA funds, from the Jewish Agency (Jerusalem), and from the government of Israel.30 Weizmann Institute income in the United States is derived from an annual fund-raising dinner and from an investment program.31

Hebrew University and Technion received over $624,000 from federations

28 All hospital beds in Israel (public, voluntary, and private) totaled about 18,400 and provided about 6.7 million days' care in 1965.

29 Newspaper reports cite increased enrolment in 1966: 12,000 for Hebrew University, 5,700 for Technion, 6,700 for Tel Aviv University, 1,500 for Haifa University, 2,600 for Bar-Ilan University.

30 Government support to higher education in Israel has been over one-half total costs. It was almost $27 million in the draft budget for 1967–68.

31 Of $1,315,000 earmarked for higher education by UIA in 1965–66, Weizmann Institute received $859,000, Hebrew University $293,000, Technion $67,000, Bar-Ilan University $43,000, and Tel Aviv University $53,000. These funds were augmented by grants by the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem.
in 1965. Their building-fund and special-fund cash campaign proceeds were at the $6 million level in 1965. Pledges for Hebrew University had risen sharply in 1965 because of the inclusion of about $3.6 million for the Truman Peace Center, and exceeded $10 million. The Truman Peace Center appeal was largely non-recurring in 1966. The maintenance appeals of the two institutions were combined; their capital-fund drives were conducted separately.

Both institutions had marked enrolment increases in recent years, with 10,813 students registered at Hebrew University (including a Tel Aviv branch) and 4,422 at Technion in 1965–66. 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, 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 Mizrachi Organization of America, had a student enrolment of 1,838 in four faculties in 1965–66: Jewish studies, natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, and languages and literature. Fund raising in the United States has been largely directed to Mizrachi membership groups.

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 3,547 students enrolled in 1965–66 in humanities, in natural sciences, and in postgraduate medical courses. About $1.3 million was secured in pledges in the United States in 1965–66, of which about $0.8 million was received in cash.

Haifa University began its program in 1964–65 and had an enrolment of 878 students in 1965–66. Beersheba University opened in 1965 and had an enrolment of 440 students in 1966.

Religious and Cultural Programs in Israel

There were 15,871 students in attendance in 1965–66 in 127 yeshivoth receiving JDC support and about 1,400 students in 48 other yeshivoth. Many of these yeshivoth have no age limits, although most students are aged 14 to 17. They are termed "traditional institutions" because of their roots in the traditional religious life in Eastern Europe.

Many of the yeshivoth receive support from JDC (about $800,000 annually). Some of these, and others, receive support from the Federated Council of Israel Institutions ($176,000 raised in 1965), but a great number also seek funds separately in the United States through collectors (meshulochim).
and through 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 million, with about one-third from contributions in Israel and about one-third from other contributions.

Cultural programs in Israel were supported in the United States through the America-Israel Cultural Foundation ($2 million in 1965), which included in its appeal some 50 agencies in Israel. These were mainly agencies in the fields of music, theater, dance, art, and literature. AICF seeks building funds, in addition to funds for maintenance. The major recent capital project was for a new structure to house the National Museum of Israel.

**Other Overseas Agencies**

While UJA received almost all its income through welfare funds and joint community appeals, other overseas agencies received a similar share of their total contributions through welfare funds.

Hadassah, Pioneer Women, and NCJW 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 medium-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 regarding timing, goals, scope of campaigns, and clearance with welfare funds, 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.

Fifteen overseas agencies, other than UJA agencies, had income of $26.3 million in 1964, compared with $31.3 million in 1965. The rise was centered in receipts for higher education and for AICF.

UHS and AICF participated in the cooperative budget review process of the LCBC, a grouping of welfare funds in 25 of the largest cities (Providence and Columbus joined in 1966).

The Labor Zionist effort in the United States is channeled through the National Committee for Labor Israel and Pioneer Women, which raise funds

---

34 Authorized agencies in recent years were: American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science, Inc. (annual fund raising dinner only); American Friends of Hebrew University; America-Israel Cultural Foundation; American Red Mogen Dovid for Israel, Inc. (membership campaign only, no application to welfare funds); American Technion Society; Federated Council of Israel Institutions; Hadassah, the Women’s Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Jewish National Fund (traditional collections only; no application to welfare funds); Pioneer Women, the Women’s Labor Zionist Organization of America, Inc.; Women’s League for Israel, Inc. (New York area).
for activities of the Histadrut 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 $152,000 in 1965, including New York UJA.)

There are agencies which center their activities in other areas but include limited overseas programs: NCJW for social work and education scholarships, and for activities related to the Department of Secondary and Higher Education at the Hebrew University, and the Jewish Labor Committee for aid to political and labor refugees in Europe and in Israel.

Overseas concerns are also shared by some domestic agencies in the form of intervention with governmental bodies on behalf of the rights of Jews overseas: the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the American Section of World Jewish Congress, B'nai B'rith, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Jewish Labor Committee.

National Agencies and Services

Jewish national agencies deal with the continuing needs of American Jews in the areas of protection of civil rights, health, education (both religious and secular), youth services, culture, and the like. In some of these program areas, local service agencies exist in specific communities, 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.

Some agencies operate in more than one field of service. As a result 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, through federation review of agency programs in the process of budgeting funds, and in 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, inter-city and national-local relations, overseas services, specialized consultation in such services as family service, child care, care for 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 American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, and Jewish War Veterans, indirectly in the case of the Anti-Defamation League (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 American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League conduct activities which utilize mass media (radio, TV, movies, press, magazines, etc.), as well as specialized programs (interfaith and intercultural education, business and industry, labor, veterans, youth, minority groups, etc.). Both maintain networks of regional offices as two-way channels for the integration of their national and local programs.

The other three agencies concentrate on more specialized approaches: American Jewish Congress on legal and legislative activities; Jewish Labor Committee on work with labor unions, and Jewish War Veterans on work with veterans' groups. Interfaith and other community-relations activities are conducted also by congregational associations, although the major portions of their programs are centered on aid to the religious programs of affiliated congregations.

After the Joint Defense Appeal (JDA) arrangement was terminated at the end of 1962, both the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League conducted separate campaigns for funds. Both increased their gross receipts from their independent New York City and Chicago campaigns, and welfare fund support, while rising, was closer in the aggregate to the previous JDA level.

The National Community Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC) serves as the coordinating and clearance agency for the American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans, National Council of Jewish Women, and the three congregational associations, and for 79 local and regional community relations councils. The B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League re-joined the NCRAC in 1965; the American Jewish Committee rejoined in 1966.

NCRAC, American Jewish Congress, Jewish Labor Committee and Jewish War Veterans have participated in the cooperative budget review process of LCBC. The B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League began to participate in 1963, and the American Jewish Committee in 1965.

The five national operating agencies and NCRAC received $10.8 million in 1965, compared with $10 million in 1964. 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 status of Jews and medical advances in recent years in TB therapy led to a shift of emphasis by the TB hospitals to include 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.

Almost all fund raising by these agencies is conducted independently. Income from federations amounts to about one-fifth of one per cent of the institutions' total income.

The Albert Einstein Medical School, under the sponsorship of Yeshiva University in New York City, began functioning in 1955. Its receipts in 1965 were $26.5 million, compared with $21.8 million in 1964. Its student enrollment in 1965–66 was 408. It awarded 92 M.D. degrees in 1965–66. A new hospital was opened in 1965 by the medical school. Construction cost was $20 million.

Income of the other five agencies in 1965 was $15.2 million, compared with $14.8 million in 1964. Two of the agencies (City of Hope near Los Angeles, and National Jewish Hospital in Denver) accounted for almost $12.4 million of the total for 1965.

Service Agencies

Basic services in many program areas are provided by local service agencies, financed in large measure by federations and (in some fields) by 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 furnish service to local Jewish community centers, programs for the Armed Forces, Jewish education, religion, and vocational guidance. These agencies serve as coordinating and consultative bodies for their respective fields.

JWB is the largest of these agencies. It received $1,518,000 in 1965, out of a total of $2,058,000 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. The JWB undertook a financial plan in 1961 which was related to the magnitude of 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 (USO) 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 $355,000 in 1963 to about $145,000 for 1966.

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 Jewish school administrators (National Council of Jewish Education).

Other national service agencies are the Jewish Occupational Council, which serves local Jewish Vocational Services 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 seeking to foster intergroup cooperation and relations with corresponding Christian bodies and in relation to governmental agencies.

NCRAC also provides service to 79 affiliated local community-relations agencies.

**Jewish Culture**

Following a CJFWF survey, the National Foundation for Jewish Culture was established in 1960 as an autonomous operation, with an associated Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies consisting of sixteen participating agencies.

Specific activities undertaken initially included a program of awards to scholars for research, earmarked grants to existing cultural agencies for high priority projects, provision of information on the Jewish cultural field, aid to the Council of Jewish Cultural Agencies process for joint cultural agency consultation, and information on Jewish cultural agencies.

In addition to a number of small agencies dealing with specific aspects of Jewish cultural endeavors exclusively,35 major programs in the Jewish cultural area are conducted by agencies which concentrate their efforts in other fields (e.g., American Jewish Committee, JWB).

Although sixteen agencies had income of $33.2 million in 1965, Brandeis University accounted for $24.9 million; B’nai B’rith National Youth Service Appeal for $4.2 million; Delaware Valley College for $1.3 million, and the Zionist Organization of America for $0.8 million. The remaining 12 agencies received $1.9 million in 1965.

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.

35 The field also includes agencies operated under Jewish auspices with general cultural programs as well as programs with more specific Jewish content.
Research and scholarly publication programs are conducted by YIVO, and by the Conference on Jewish Social Studies in the fields of sociology, economics, and linguistics; American Academy for Jewish Research; American Jewish Historical Society, American Jewish Archives, American Jewish History Center, and the Jewish Museum of the Jewish Theological Seminary in the fields of history and archives, and by Histadruth Ivrit and Bitzaron for Hebraism. Population studies are conducted mainly by CJFWF and JWB. Both of these agencies expanded 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 a 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: the *American Jewish Year Book* (published jointly by the American Jewish Committee and Jewish Publication Society) contains specialized articles on major developments in the United States and other countries, statistics, and directories; 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 of rabbis, cantors, Jewish educators, *shohatim*, and other religious functionaries, assist programs of religious congregations, including elementary Jewish education, and encourage the enlistment of the religiously unaffiliated members of the Jewish population.

Each of the three religious wings has its own rabbinical association and congregational associations, 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. The Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox congregations had enrolled well over 200,000 families each, exclusive of ancillary sisterhoods, brotherhoods, men's clubs, youth groups, and non-member users of synagogues.

---

The major seminaries rely extensively on associated congregations for their financial support, sometimes through per capita arrangements, but they 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.

Most Orthodox yeshivoth are located in New York City. Major yeshivoth in other cities are: the Jewish University of America-Hebrew Theological College in Chicago; the Rabbinical College of Telshe in Cleveland; the Ner Israel Rabbinical College in Baltimore; and the Chachmey Lublin Theological Seminary in Detroit.

Aid to religious day schools is a major function of the Mizrachi National Council for Torah Education, the United Lubavitcher Yeshivoth, the National Council of Beth Jacob Schools and Torah Umesorah.

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.

Nineteen national religious agencies received $29.3 million in 1965 compared with $26.6 million in 1964. This excludes the Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University which received a total of $26.5 million in 1965, compared with a 1964 total of $21.8 million.

**LOCAL SERVICES**

Central communal sources (Jewish federations and chest-united funds) provided about $61 million for local Jewish services in 1965.

Jewish federations supplied about $41.5 million in 1965, compared with $39.8 million in 1964, to local Jewish services in the fields of 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 $19.5 million in 1965, in most cases through Jewish federations, but in some cases directly to Jewish service agencies. Of this sum, $12.4 million was received in the 14 largest cities in which over 75 per cent of the Jewish population resides.

Community chests generally restrict their support to agencies operating in the fields of health, family and child care, care of the aged, and Jewish cen-

---

37 Includes Greater New York Fund and New York City United Hospital Fund.
A substantial share of contributed communal income even in these fields comes from Jewish federations, particularly for health services and care of the aged. Federations have, in addition, the exclusive responsibility for sectarian activities in the fields of refugee care, Jewish education, and community relations.

Available data for 127 communities for 1964 and 1965 show how central communal funds (federation and chest income) were distributed among various fields of local service (see 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 1965 was 3.7 per cent. Total allocations by Jewish federations for local services have continued to rise dollar-wise since 1955.

The largest rises in 1965 occurred for Jewish education (6.9 per cent) and for vocational services (6.7 per cent), almost exclusively from Jewish federation sources, since community chests infrequently provide aid to such services. Rises from 4 to 5 per cent in 1965 in central community grants were experienced in the fields of recreation, family and child care, and local community relations. Hospital grants and grants for refugee care rose by less than two per cent. There was a drop in grants for care for the aged, but this was accounted for mainly by an increase in service payments in one of the largest cities.

The major sources of funds for local service agencies other than central funds are payments for service by users and public tax funds. These sources of funds have risen to a greater extent than community funds. Such communal grants accounted for 4.4 per cent of receipts of hospitals in 1965. Homes for the aged, family service and child care agencies also increased their income from service payments.

An analysis of allocations for local services by 94 communities over a five-year span (1961–1965) indicates significant changes:

Both chest grants and federation grants rose at about the same rate: 14 to 15 per cent. The federation share of allocations was stabilized at about 60 per cent during this period.

There were sharp rises in allocations for Jewish education, family and child care, and community relations services, which rose by 20 to 21 per cent since 1961. Allocations for centers, camps, and youth services rose by 18 per cent, while refugee care rose by 15 per cent, and vocational services and care for the aged by about 10 to 11 per cent. Hospital allocations rose least of all (two per cent).

A similar analysis for a full decade indicates that chest grants rose by 40 per cent since 1956, while federation grants rose by 42 per cent. The sharpest rises in the decade 1956–65 were for care of the aged, 65 per cent; employment services, 62 per cent; centers, 62 per cent; Jewish education, 58 per cent; family and child care services, 51 per cent, and local community relations, 39 per cent. Allocations for refugee care fell by 45 per cent.
**Health**

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;\(^38\) in the 15,000 to 40,000 population group, eight out 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 over 25 per cent of total local allocations in this group of cities.

There were reports in 1965 on 18,770 beds and 1,692 bassinets in 54 general and special hospitals under local Jewish sponsorship. Further reports for 1964 on ten other hospitals indicated an additional total of 950 beds and 100 bassinets. Federations and chests provided $12.8 million for 49 of these hospitals in 1965, and an additional $1.3 million in 1964.

A total of 6.3 million days' care was provided in 1965 by 54 local (general and special) Jewish hospitals.

“Third Party” payments for service (Blue Cross, tax-support) have borne 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, they accounted for less than five per cent of operating receipts. Payments for hospital services (individual patient fees and Blue Cross insurance) and tax support had risen to $249 million in 1965 in 49 hospitals, or about 86 per cent of operating receipts. This total excluded payments of about $26 million for 14 additional hospitals in 1964.

**Family and Child Care**

Family service agencies provide personal and family counseling, family life education, psychiatric services, and a limited amount of economic aid. An increasing number of agencies provide homemaker services for the care of sick parents or of the aged in their own homes (26 in 1965, 19 in 1964), and group treatment where this is indicated as potentially helpful (21 in 1965; 16 in 1964). Activities of family service agencies are frequently conducted jointly with child care programs and with refugee services. Specialized Jewish casework agencies exist in most of the cities with a Jewish population of more than 5,000. As in the case of health programs, most services are provided on a local level, although there are several regional programs and one national home for asthmatic children.

During 1965, 75 family agencies reported direct service to a total of 70,544 open cases on their rolls with about 52,000 cases opened and closed during the year, and a monthly average active caseload of over 18,000 families.

A total of 8,155 children were under care during 1965 in 47 child care

---

\(^{38}\) The exception is Washington, D.C.
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 in institutions, with most of the remainder living at home or with relatives.

Central communal allocations by federations and community chests for family and child care services rose by 5.4 per cent in 1965. Such central allocations continued to account for about 76 per cent of total receipts for family agencies (including refugee service). Central allocations were 25 per cent of the receipts of child care agencies. An additional 48 per cent was provided by public tax funds.

Refugees

These services in communities are financed locally, though they may be considered as extensions of an overseas problem. Post-war 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. There was a parallel decline in local refugee costs for most of these years. While refugee costs accounted for 4.1 per cent in local allocations in 1956, they accounted for only 1.6 per cent in 1965.

Because over half of the immigrants tend to settle in New York City, the largest share of refugee costs is that of 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 counseling are provided through local refugee programs, generally administered by the Jewish family agencies. In such arrangements, there is a sharing of overhead costs by these local agencies.

Average monthly aid was provided in 1965 to over 800 refugee families by 72 family agencies (including NYANA). While these were about five per cent of the active cases of these agencies, financial aid to refugees was 34 per cent of aid given by these agencies to all families outside New York (44 per cent, if NYANA were included).

Centers, Camps, Youth Services

According to JWB, there were over 300 Jewish community centers with a membership of about 710,000 in 1964. About 32 per cent of members are under 14 years of age, 18 per cent are aged 14 through 24, and half are 25 years or older.

Estimated total community center expenditures in 1964 were about $32.7 million, exclusive of separate camping agencies, compared with $30.6 million in 1963. A decade earlier, in 1954, these expenditures had been $15.5 million, while the 1945 level had been $7.2 million for a smaller network of centers. Federation and chest allocations to centers and other recreational facilities rose by 4 per cent in 1965, and by 18 per cent in the five-year period 1961–1965 (a rise of 62 per cent since 1956).
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. It rose from 50 per cent of center receipts in 1954 to 62 per cent in 1964, reflecting higher dues in new centers. Central community support from federations and community chests provided the balance of finances. Except for New York City (where minor chest support is secured); Baltimore, Boston, and six other important cities (where none was secured), and five other major cities (where lump-sum grants from chests do not involve earmarked center funds), chests generally provide greater support than federations.

Both sources of financing accounted for $10.4 million in 127 communities for centers, camps, and youth services outside New York City in 1965, a four per cent rise. From 1961 the rise was 18 per cent, while from 1956 it was 62 per cent.

**Homes for the Aged**

There were 68 homes for the aged which reported 13,181 beds in 1965. They cared for 15,892 residents who received 4.5 million days' care. This was a gain of about 700 residents over 1964. Federations and chests provided 10 per cent of receipts, with 82 per cent secured from payments for service, including public funds. Over 42 per cent came from governmental sources, exclusive of OASDI funds paid by clients.

Federation allocations to homes for the aged had risen by about 11 per cent between 1961 and 1965 (a rise of 65 per cent since 1956), increasing as the proportion of aged in the population continued to grow.

Over half of the residents in homes for the aged were over 80 years of age; four-fifths were over 75. Family agencies served at least 17,000 persons aged 60 and over in their own homes, including some requiring institutional placement. About 1,000 older Jewish persons were living in housing designed for the elderly in six cities operated under Jewish communal auspices, with the aid of long-term federal mortgage loans. The impact of Medicare and Medicaid programs on services to the aged will be evident after the effective dates of these programs in mid-1966 and 1967.

Receipts of $37 million were reported for 1965 by 60 of the homes. Payments for service accounted for $30.3 million, including public funds. Federations and chests reported $3.7 million to 49 homes (including over $2.9 million outside New York City). There were 11 homes which received support from neither source.

**Jewish Education**

There was an estimated enrollment of less than 590,000 students in 1963.40

---

40 In Boston, agreement for securing chest support for local Jewish services was attained in 1966.

Of these, half were attending Sunday schools, two-fifths were attending afternoon schools, and less than 9 per cent were in all-day schools. About 90 per cent of them were in schools with congregational orientation. In 1966 AAJE undertook to conduct a school enrolment census designed to secure more precise data than currently available.

The AAJE *National Study of Jewish Education*, issued in 1959, arrived at an estimate of a cost of “over $60 million” for 553,600 pupils in 1958. This estimate, in turn, was based on average costs in a number of cities totaling $46.5 million in 1956, which was increased to an estimated $60 million in 1958 on the basis of “general cost increases” and allowances for building-maintenance costs for congregational schools, which had not been included for estimates in cities outside New York City.

The consumer price index rose by over 12 per cent from 1958 to the end of 1966. Therefore, the cost of Jewish education since 1958, when it was estimated at $60 million, may have risen in excess of $10 million. An estimate of “over $70 million” is of the grossest type and is advanced only in the absence of more reliable data at this time.

The major sources of support of pre-bar mitzvah education are congregational and parental. Variations in scales of tuition fees are frequently dependent on variations in the provision for Jewish education in congregational membership dues. “Scholarship” arrangements are made by both congregational and communal schools to avoid barring students from low income homes. Financing of Jewish education is 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 $6.1 million annually for Jewish education. The total budgets of the agencies supported are not reported.\(^{41}\) 1965 allocations to local Jewish schools and to bureaus of Jewish education, reported by Jewish federations, were about $5.3 million outside New York City. They rose by almost seven per cent in 1965. A gradual, steady increase in allocations to Jewish education has occurred each year; they were 21 per cent higher in 1965 than they had been in 1961, and 58 per cent higher than they had been in 1956. Payments by parents, either directly or through membership fees to congregations, provided the major source of income for primary education.

However, federations provided substantial shares of income for post-bar mitzvah education, for teacher training, and for the coordination and common service functions performed by bureaus of Jewish education.

Partial data for 19 cities indicate that federation grants for Jewish education in these cities were $3.2 million, or 23 per cent of total local allocations from federation sources (community chests do not provide funds for

\(^{41}\) Note that it would be inaccurate to compare the federation total of $6.1 million in allocations to the total of “over $70 million” for all costs of Jewish education, since most congregational schools do not seek federation support.
Jewish education). Included in these totals was $2.4 million given to elementary schools, or 39 per cent of their income of $6.2 million. Ten of the federations provided 59 per cent of the income of the secondary and teacher training schools which they supported.

In 1965 CJFWF established a Committee on Federation Planning for Jewish Education which developed in 1966 a "guidelines statement" with particular emphasis on the need to upgrade teaching manpower and post-elementary school education.

**Community Relations**

Organized programs designed to improve intergroup relations and to deal with specific instances of antisemitism exist primarily in the large and intermediate communities. The local activities financed by federations received about $1,025,000 in 1965 (outside New York City, which is served mainly by national agencies)—a rise of 20 per cent since the beginning of 1961 (39 per cent since 1956). Allocations in 1965 rose by 2.6 per cent.

In some areas, local and regional community-relations programs are financed by national agencies (mainly the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League) as part of a national network of regional offices.

**Employment and Vocational Services**

These programs are designed to assist Jews in finding employment and in guiding Jewish youth and others in the selection of trades and professions. Jewish vocational agencies or departments of Jewish family services operate mainly in the larger cities. Federations provided about $2.1 million in 1965 (including New York City). Substantial and growing supplementary income was received in recent years from government sources and service payments. Over $3.1 million in annual noncontributed income was identified by the Jewish Occupational Council. A complementary program is provided by a network of vocational service bureaus, financed by the B'nai B'rith National Youth Service Appeal at a cost of over $0.4 million in 1965.

Local allocations for vocational programs increased by 3.5 per cent in 1965 outside New York City. The gain since the beginning of 1961 was 10 per cent.

**Changes in Financing Since 1956**

The major changes in federation and chest support of local Jewish services in the ten-year period 1956–1965 are briefly noted; only refugee costs fell by $0.5 million. The major rises were for:

- Recreational services, almost $3.9 million.
- Family and child care services, over $3.0 million.
- Jewish education, almost $1.9 million.
- Care for the aged, almost $1.2 million.
- Hospitals, about $0.4 million.
  Employment and vocational service, over $0.5 million.
  Local community relations, almost $0.3 million.

Of total rises of about $11 million since 1956, chests provided about $4 million, while the balance of $7 million was provided by federations.

S. P. Goldberg
### TABLE 1. AMOUNTS RAISED IN CENTRAL JEWISH COMMUNITY CAMPAIGNS 1939–1966

*Estimates in Millions of Dollars*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Totala</th>
<th>NYUJA</th>
<th>FJPNY</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$28.4</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$12.6</td>
<td>$15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>106.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>157.8</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>106.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>204.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>135.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>107.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>121.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>117.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>110.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>130.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>127.5</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>126.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>129.4</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>124.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>126.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>137.0b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1939–1966 $3,072.7 |

NYUJA $1,978.3 |

a Total pledges excludes amounts raised annually in smaller cities having no welfare funds, but includes substantial multiple-city gifts which are duplications as between New York City and the remainder of the country. Estimates for some prior years were adjusted by NYUJA in 1967 to secure greater year-to-year comparability. Excludes capital fund campaigns of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York: $3 million in 1943, $13.5 million in 1945, and $16.5 million in 1949, and about $138.5 million in 1961–66 including government grants, other noncampaign income and endowment funds of beneficiary agencies. Also excludes most endowment funds and major capital fund raising by federations for local agencies outside New York City.

b Provisional estimate based on incomplete results and on assumption that results for New York City will approximately follow national trend in 1966. Excludes Israel Education Fund of UJA, with pledges of about $17 million in 1965 and 1966, of which $11 million was raised by NYUJA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated Annual Level of Income in 1965 of Jewish Communal Services in U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(In millions of dollars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Welfare Fund Contributions (excluding capital funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Grants by United Funds and Community Chests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Other Contributions to National and Overseas Agencies (including capital funds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Other Income of National and Overseas Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Hospital Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Family Service Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Child Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Jewish Vocational Service (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Aged Care Income (excluding 1 and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Center Income (excluding 1 and 2)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Jewish Education Income (excluding 1) b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[This excludes mainly endowment income in most communities; local capital fund campaigns, and internal congregational operating expense.]

---

a JWB Yearbook, Table 13, November 1966.
b Approximate; 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.
d Major inclusions were Brandeis University $14.4 million; Hadassah $7.9 million; Einstein Medical Center $6.5 million; City of Hope $5.4 million; JTS $5.2 million; AFHU $3.5 million; BBNYSA $3.2 million; NJH $3.2 million; JNF $2.8 million; ADL $2.5 million and AJCommittee $2.2 million.
# TABLE 2. STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS, 1951–1966

(*Estimates in thousands of dollars*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Cash Sales Incl. Conversions</th>
<th>Total Sales in United States</th>
<th>Total Sales Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951(^a) (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>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>91,564</td>
<td>76,656</td>
<td>14,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>90,894</td>
<td>76,176</td>
<td>14,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$927,761</td>
<td>$780,162</td>
<td>$148,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Redemption of 12-year bonds issued in 1951 to 1955 began on May 1, 1963.
TABLE 3-A. DISTRIBUTION TO FIELDS OF SERVICE OF

(Excludes Total Under 5,000\textsuperscript{c})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUDGETED\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>$73,636,422</td>
<td>$70,741,401</td>
<td>$8,160,874</td>
<td>$7,807,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td>43,451,912</td>
<td>41,525,496</td>
<td>6,149,125</td>
<td>5,819,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td>40,992,227</td>
<td>39,141,877</td>
<td>5,845,534</td>
<td>5,543,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td>2,459,685</td>
<td>2,383,619</td>
<td>303,591</td>
<td>276,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td>4,142,552</td>
<td>4,025,914</td>
<td>563,008</td>
<td>516,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2,453,396</td>
<td>2,371,802</td>
<td>238,770</td>
<td>208,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td>44,071</td>
<td>44,763</td>
<td>27,375</td>
<td>26,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>478,236</td>
<td>457,892</td>
<td>65,198</td>
<td>60,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>291,858</td>
<td>295,672</td>
<td>146,230</td>
<td>135,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td>874,991</td>
<td>858,785</td>
<td>85,435</td>
<td>84,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td>23,982,596</td>
<td>22,902,609</td>
<td>1,314,090</td>
<td>1,356,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care</td>
<td>589,454</td>
<td>668,331</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td>1,463,586</td>
<td>1,614,714</td>
<td>130,382</td>
<td>110,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{*} 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 due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5,000–15,000&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>15,000–40,000&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>40,000 and Over&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUNDS RAISED BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,411,357</td>
<td>$10,867,315</td>
<td>$10,501,145</td>
<td>$10,029,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,488,312</td>
<td>7,153,470</td>
<td>6,791,783</td>
<td>6,482,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,105,932</td>
<td>6,769,899</td>
<td>6,276,869</td>
<td>5,968,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382,380</td>
<td>383,571</td>
<td>514,914</td>
<td>514,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722,480</td>
<td>720,574</td>
<td>645,674</td>
<td>625,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387,526</td>
<td>378,780</td>
<td>403,280</td>
<td>390,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,516</td>
<td>9,197</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>5,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63,788</td>
<td>59,425</td>
<td>75,325</td>
<td>71,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115,253</td>
<td>129,639</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147,397</td>
<td>143,533</td>
<td>137,889</td>
<td>133,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,714,311</td>
<td>2,449,071</td>
<td>2,506,673</td>
<td>2,436,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58,962</td>
<td>54,713</td>
<td>113,015</td>
<td>119,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424,964</td>
<td>489,219</td>
<td>444,000</td>
<td>365,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Includes small undistributed amounts.
<sup>c</sup>Jewish population.
<sup>d</sup>Less than .05 of one per cent.
### TABLE 3. DISTRIBUTION TO BENEFICIARIES OF FUNDS RAISED BY JEWISH FEDERATIONS

*(Estimates in thousands of dollars)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Amount Budgeted To</th>
<th>Beneficiaries&lt;sup&gt;c,d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>New York City&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>107,361</td>
<td>102,695</td>
<td>33,725</td>
<td>31,954</td>
<td>73,636</td>
<td>70,741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>61,452</td>
<td>58,465</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>16,940</td>
<td>43,452</td>
<td>41,525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,592</td>
<td>55,742</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>40,992</td>
<td>39,142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,443</td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>4,143</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>2,372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td>478</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Operating Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,408</td>
<td>37,557</td>
<td>15,425</td>
<td>14,654</td>
<td>23,983</td>
<td>22,903</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Refugee Care&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>589</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Based upon communities which are currently CJFWF members and some smaller cities which are not CJFWF members but 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. Community chest support excluded from this table, but included in Tables 5, 6.<br><br><sup>b</sup> Figures for New York include UJA of Greater New York 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 1964 and 1965 campaign proceeds, regardless of year in which cash is received.<br><br><sup>c</sup> The difference between this amount and "total raised" in Table 1 represents mainly "shrinkage" allowance for nonpayment of pledges, campaign and administrative expenses, elimination of duplicating multiple-city gifts, and contingency or other reserves.<br><br><sup>d</sup> Includes small undistributed amounts in "total" and "other cities" columns.<br><br><sup>e</sup> NYANA is included in UJA totals.<br><br><sup>f</sup> Less than .05 of one per cent.
### TABLE 4. ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION AND CHEST ALLOCATIONS TO LOCAL SERVICES IN 1965

(In millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields Receiving Chest Support</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals and Health</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
<td>$ 5.8</td>
<td>$ 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Care</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Provided by Chests (Exclusive of Administrative)</td>
<td>$17.6</td>
<td>$ 2.0</td>
<td>$15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by Federations</td>
<td>$28.5</td>
<td>$13.6</td>
<td><strong>$14.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>$ 0.8</td>
<td>$ 0.3</td>
<td>$ 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields Receiving Only Federation Support</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>New York City</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Services (incl. Free Loan)</td>
<td>$ 2.1</td>
<td>$ 0.7</td>
<td>$ 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.3</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>1.0</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Capital</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Provided by Federations                 | $41.0   | $15.7         | $25.3        |
| Provided by Chests^e                    | 18.4    | 2.3           | 16.1         |
| **TOTAL**                               | **$59.4** | **$18.0**     | **$41.4**    |

*Preliminary data for 1966 indicate a decrease of about $0.5 million for hospitals; a rise of $0.2 million for centers and camps; a rise of $0.3 million for family and child care, and a rise of $0.3 million for aged care.

^Provided by NYANA, financed by UJA.

^Provided mainly by national agencies.

^Most capital campaigns excluded because conducted apart from annual campaign; also excludes chest funds in nonfederated cities.

^Includes in N.Y.C. Greater New York Fund and United Hospital Fund.
### TABLE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS* INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 127 COMMUNITIES, 1964, 1965

*Excludes New York City*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,563,128</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>$7,672,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service</td>
<td>8,711,834</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>9,182,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>10,042,120</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>10,443,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>3,219,635</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3,168,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1,308,597</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1,395,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,913,845</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5,251,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>657,355</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>668,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>984,455</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,025,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>506,028</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>527,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Federation for Local Administration</td>
<td>475,276</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>465,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$38,382,273</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$39,802,854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$22,750,651</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>$23,720,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>15,631,622</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>16,082,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of total administrative and fund-raising costs ($10,720,058 in 1964 and $11,184,818 in 1965) reported for these 127 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 nonlocal programs.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (127)</th>
<th>(58)</th>
<th>(41)</th>
<th>(15)</th>
<th>(13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td>5,000-15,000</td>
<td>15,000-40,000</td>
<td>40,000 and Over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,563,128</td>
<td>$7,672,905</td>
<td>$1,076</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$82,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$503,750</td>
<td>$513,834</td>
<td>$6,976,167</td>
<td>$7,062,775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service</td>
<td>8,711,834</td>
<td>9,182,941</td>
<td>158,945</td>
<td>148,396</td>
<td>1,173,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,266,429</td>
<td>1,325,145</td>
<td>6,113,243</td>
<td>6,445,390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td>10,042,120</td>
<td>10,443,233</td>
<td>825,245</td>
<td>825,288</td>
<td>2,191,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1,308,597</td>
<td>1,395,889</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>44,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>4,913,845</td>
<td>5,251,918</td>
<td>121,033</td>
<td>128,450</td>
<td>579,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>657,355</td>
<td>668,732</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>984,455</td>
<td>1,025,224</td>
<td>14,567</td>
<td>16,992</td>
<td>83,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>506,028</td>
<td>527,651</td>
<td>29,625</td>
<td>31,972</td>
<td>73,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,660</td>
<td>17,014</td>
<td>388,691</td>
<td>405,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,275,051</td>
<td>$3,275,051</td>
<td>$3,275,051</td>
<td>$3,275,051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,042,120</td>
<td>10,443,233</td>
<td>825,245</td>
<td>825,288</td>
<td>2,191,432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table includes chest allocations for administration of local services which are part of administrative and fund-raising costs ($10,720,058 in 1964 and $11,184,818 in 1965) reported for these 127 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 nonlocal programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Admin. &amp; Fund Raising Costs</td>
<td>$10,720,058</td>
<td>$11,184,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5,000</td>
<td>638,382</td>
<td>683,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-15,000</td>
<td>1,750,125</td>
<td>1,754,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-40,000</td>
<td>1,694,806</td>
<td>1,879,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 &amp; Over</td>
<td>6,996,945</td>
<td>7,067,285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b Jewish population.
### TABLE 5-B. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS, INCLUDING CHEST FUNDS FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 127 COMMUNITIES, 1964, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (127)</th>
<th>(58) Under 5000b</th>
<th>(41) 5,000–15,000b</th>
<th>(15) 15,000–40,000b</th>
<th>(13) 40,000 and Overb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, Child Service</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. for Local Administration</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totalb</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: 59.3% (1964), 59.6% (1965)
- Chests: 40.7% (1964), 40.4% (1965)

### Notes:
- See Table 5-A, note a.
- Jewish population.
- Less than 0.5 of one per cent.
- Slight difference due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>Index of Change&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,492</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>$7,812</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>$7,430</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Service</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>7,726</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>8,006</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth   Services</td>
<td>8,511</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8,734</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>9,118</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>2,739</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and           Guidance</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education         Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>4,529</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>4,645</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local Administration</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,981</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,524</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income:
- Federations: $20,341, 59.9%
- Chests: $13,640, 40.1%

<sup>a</sup> Includes both federation and community chest funds; excludes New York City.

<sup>b</sup> Administrative costs of federations are not segregated between local and nonlocal programs. The total chest participation in these costs represents about four per cent of total administrative costs for these cities.

<sup>c</sup> Slight differences due to rounding.

<sup>d</sup> During this period the United States consumer price index rose by 5.5 per cent.
### TABLE 6-A. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES IN 94 COMMUNITIES, 1961, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (94)</th>
<th>(36)</th>
<th>(31)</th>
<th>(15)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,491,842</td>
<td>$7,655,839</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$68,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family &amp; Child Service</td>
<td>7,399,759</td>
<td>8,885,207</td>
<td>127,688</td>
<td>115,085</td>
<td>878,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>8,511,302</td>
<td>10,076,501</td>
<td>672,315</td>
<td>727,299</td>
<td>1,739,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>2,769,679</td>
<td>3,083,725</td>
<td>71,577</td>
<td>83,947</td>
<td>305,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>1,270,017</td>
<td>1,395,889</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>44,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>4,306,992</td>
<td>5,211,609</td>
<td>142,563</td>
<td>141,001</td>
<td>527,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>564,197</td>
<td>648,682</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>796,432</td>
<td>957,673</td>
<td>12,286</td>
<td>12,211</td>
<td>45,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>430,783</td>
<td>488,049</td>
<td>20,423</td>
<td>21,625</td>
<td>59,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>439,804</td>
<td>465,500</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>81,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$33,980,807</td>
<td>$38,868,674</td>
<td>$1,050,752</td>
<td>$1,101,968</td>
<td>$3,809,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources of Income**

- **Federations**  $20,340,954  $23,190,739  $665,208  $723,055  $1,853,987  $2,309,817  $2,327,593  $2,619,688  $15,494,166  $17,538,179
- **Chests**  $13,639,853  $15,677,935  $385,544  $378,913  $1,955,181  $2,532,592  $2,601,688  $2,949,247  $8,697,440  $9,817,183

\(a\) Includes both federation and community chest funds; excludes New York City.

\(b\) Jewish population.

\(c\) See Table 6, note \(b\).
<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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Service</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth Services</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed Local Admin</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Table 6-A, note a.
* Less than .05 of one percent.
* See Table 6, note b.
* Slight difference due to rounding.
TABLE 6-C. DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERATION ALLOCATIONS\(^a\) FOR LOCAL SERVICES
IN 82 COMMUNITIES, 1956, 1965

(Amounts in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$7,275</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Service</td>
<td>6,025</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers, Camps, Youth</td>
<td>6,223</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and Guidance</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Education</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Care</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest to Fed. Local</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$28,157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per</td>
<td>Per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federations</td>
<td>$16,458</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chests</td>
<td>11,699</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Includes both federation and community chest funds; excludes New York City.
\(^b\) Administrative costs of federations are not segregated between local and nonlocal programs.
\(^c\) Slight difference due to rounding.
TABLE 7. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR OVERSEAS PROGRAMS  
FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1965 AND 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds*</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Jewish Appeal &amp; Beneficiary Agencies</td>
<td>$61,457,359</td>
<td>$60,635,483</td>
<td>$4,277,080</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel Education Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Israel Appeal®</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Fund®</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Association for New Americans®</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORT—Women’s Division®</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American ORT Federation®</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total UJA and Beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>$61,457,359</td>
<td>$60,635,483</td>
<td>$8,273,635</td>
<td>$4,089,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Overseas Agencies</th>
<th>Federation and Welfare Funds*</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Committee for Weizmann Institute of Science®</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Red Menor David®</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>193,361</td>
<td>162,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-Technion Joint Maintenance Appeal®</td>
<td>624,373</td>
<td>615,948</td>
<td>3,496,351</td>
<td>2,518,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Friends of the Hebrew University</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Technion Society®</td>
<td>197,853</td>
<td>189,336</td>
<td>2,555,936</td>
<td>1,813,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America-Israel Cultural Foundation</td>
<td>6,611</td>
<td>8,536</td>
<td>241,352</td>
<td>219,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra Torah Fund®</td>
<td>98,799</td>
<td>94,963</td>
<td>76,931</td>
<td>50,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadassah®</td>
<td>540,000</td>
<td>544,855</td>
<td>7,856,248</td>
<td>7,611,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Telegraphic Agency</td>
<td>152,217</td>
<td>145,315</td>
<td>23,514</td>
<td>12,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee for Labor Israel®</td>
<td>241,701</td>
<td>258,954</td>
<td>1,807,272</td>
<td>1,547,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of Jewish Women®</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>1,072,806</td>
<td>954,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Hias Service®</td>
<td>1,090,269</td>
<td>993,640</td>
<td>156,939</td>
<td>153,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Jewish Congress®</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>159,261</td>
<td>102,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,998,798</td>
<td>$2,898,530</td>
<td>$22,358,742</td>
<td>$17,829,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Overseas</strong></td>
<td>$64,456,157</td>
<td>$63,534,013</td>
<td>$31,082,377</td>
<td>$21,919,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including joint community appeals.
*® Cash received in each calendar year.
*® Excludes income from UJA; also income from campaigns abroad, intergovernmental agencies, and reparations income.
*® Traditional collections in the U.S., exclusive of Jewish Agency grants to JNF in Israel.
*® Excludes contributions and earnings of investment fund.
*® Income from welfare funds estimated.

Includes Swope endowment fund.
*® Excludes grants from other organizations.
*® Amounts raised for JNF are excluded. Hadassah “other income” includes membership dues, shekel and Zionist youth funds.
*® Includes overseas income and income from CJMCCRA, but includes UHS income from NYUJA.
*® Excludes overseas and Canadian income.
*® CJFWF estimate.
TABLE 8. RECEIPTS OF NATIONAL JEWISH AGENCIES FOR DOMESTIC PROGRAMS
FROM FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS AND FROM OTHER DOMESTIC SOURCES, 1965 AND 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Relations Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Joint Defense Appeal         | $20,583
| American Jewish Committee    | $1,350,226,1,163,756 | $2,205,288,2,194,177 | $708,394,588,554 | $4,269,902,3,946,487 |
| Anti-Defamation Leagueb      | 1,182,263,1,119,600 | 2,536,569,2,342,520 | 415,829,417,538 | 4,134,751,3,897,658 |
| American Jewish Congressa    | 393,929,401,553 | 620,738,471,080 | 241,394,246,133 | 1,256,061,1,118,766 |
| Jewish Labor Committeed      | 201,895,198,222 | 173,302,168,667 | 43,588,56,132 | 418,785,432,021 |
| Jewish War Veterans          | 127,903,124,310 | 11,393,5,082 | 310,066,248,603 | 455,382,378,423 |
| National Community Relations Advisory Council | 185,516,177,449 | 8,875,9,600 | 56,372,38,178 | 250,763,218,927 |
| **Sub-Total** | **$3,468,315,3,215,890** | **$5,595,389,5,239,020** | **$1,781,663,1,588,840** | **$10,845,367,10,043,750** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and Welfare Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Medical Center at Denver</td>
<td>$5,997,6,883</td>
<td>$690,483,1,037,319</td>
<td>$374,437,526,426</td>
<td>$1,070,917,1,070,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hope</td>
<td>5,500,6,354</td>
<td>5,364,234,4,934,650</td>
<td>2,031,356,2,320,019</td>
<td>7,401,090,7,261,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>43,225,42,502</td>
<td>202,445,249,600</td>
<td>260,543,292,620</td>
<td>506,213,584,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish National Home for Asthmatic Children (Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital)</td>
<td>6,616,6,695</td>
<td>742,690,739,117</td>
<td>508,870,394,208</td>
<td>1,258,176,1,140,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Hospitalt</td>
<td>25,040,24,544</td>
<td>3,200,538,2,866,638</td>
<td>1,733,733,1,376,913</td>
<td>4,959,311,4,268,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva University—Albert Einstein College of Medicine</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,501,098,4,424,720</td>
<td>19,989,775,17,422,700</td>
<td>26,490,873,21,847,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$86,378,87,158</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,701,488,14,252,044</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,898,714,22,332,886</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,686,580,36,672,088</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Service Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association for Jewish Education</td>
<td>$107,804,98,241</td>
<td>$99,660,72,031</td>
<td>$63,930,58,826</td>
<td>$271,394,228,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Occupational Council</td>
<td>21,499,20,610</td>
<td>1,500,1,773</td>
<td>120,664,121,157</td>
<td>143,663,34,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference of Jewish Communal Service</td>
<td>9,860,8,455</td>
<td>9,244,9,308</td>
<td>26,609,25,278</td>
<td>45,713,43,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board</td>
<td>1,284,568,1,275,834</td>
<td>70,058,61,336</td>
<td>163,669,154,682</td>
<td>1,158,295,1,491,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
<td>19,170,17,857</td>
<td>49,227,49,393</td>
<td>10,331,6,834</td>
<td>73,782,74,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,442,901,1,420,967</strong></td>
<td><strong>$229,668,193,841</strong></td>
<td><strong>$385,203,257,597</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,057,793,1,872,405</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Agencies</th>
<th>Federations and Welfare Funds</th>
<th>Other Contributions</th>
<th>Other Income</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Academy for Jewish Research</td>
<td>$3,625,4,620</td>
<td>$25,033,20,500</td>
<td>$5,253,4,450</td>
<td>$33,911,29,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Jewish Historical Society</td>
<td>7,283,7,290</td>
<td>1,048,1,021</td>
<td>105,718,91,290</td>
<td>114,049,99,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'nah B'rith National Youth Service Appeal</td>
<td>2,032,2,057</td>
<td>11,268,10,772</td>
<td>15,766,15,303</td>
<td>29,066,28,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>564,258,502,278</td>
<td>3,247,217,2,922,891</td>
<td>431,124,296,436</td>
<td>4,244,599,3,721,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>503,1,300</td>
<td>14,425,516,15,087,907</td>
<td>10,488,912,8,797,652</td>
<td>24,914,928,23,886,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture</td>
<td>1,880,2,335</td>
<td>11,774,13,700</td>
<td>6,651,5,363</td>
<td>20,305,21,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropsee College</td>
<td>43,397,43,103</td>
<td>26,904,30,836</td>
<td>107,702,92,948</td>
<td>179,003,166,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildasruby Ivrit College</td>
<td>13,341,13,206</td>
<td>101,583,108,662</td>
<td>102,877,91,810</td>
<td>222,939,211,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Breilale Institute</td>
<td>14,546,14,522</td>
<td>68,240,71,885</td>
<td>32,823,30,651</td>
<td>115,609,136,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Chautauqua Society</td>
<td>8,230,8,715</td>
<td>287,861,252,615</td>
<td>19,374,46,185</td>
<td>315,465,307,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers in parentheses represent dollars in thousands. ** Numbers do not add up due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Publication Society</th>
<th>12,132</th>
<th>12,699</th>
<th>30,662</th>
<th>29,852</th>
<th>477,913</th>
<th>466,808</th>
<th>520,707</th>
<th>509,359</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Teachers' Seminary and People's University</td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td>3,530</td>
<td>79,961</td>
<td>45,263</td>
<td>38,721</td>
<td>30,923</td>
<td>122,167</td>
<td>79,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Jewish Culture</td>
<td>80,708</td>
<td>81,049</td>
<td>17,130</td>
<td>22,589</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>98,967</td>
<td>103,810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIVO</td>
<td>27,696</td>
<td>27,696</td>
<td>29,061</td>
<td>651,072</td>
<td>664,864</td>
<td>168,717</td>
<td>120,200</td>
<td>847,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-Total** | $826,129 | $777,445 | $19,074,980 | $19,384,892 | $13,309,961 | $11,282,675 | $33,211,070 | $31,445,012 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Religious Agencies</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beth Jacob Schools and Hebrew Teachers College</td>
<td>32,538</td>
<td>23,608</td>
<td>301,482</td>
<td>284,767</td>
<td>165,058</td>
<td>137,355</td>
<td>499,078</td>
<td>445,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Yehuda Govohet</td>
<td>5,522</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>474,163</td>
<td>533,333</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>484,030</td>
<td>540,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion</td>
<td>104,618</td>
<td>82,441</td>
<td>689,613</td>
<td>2,083,795</td>
<td>1,912,533</td>
<td>3,094,494</td>
<td>2,689,588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
<td>84,115</td>
<td>88,978</td>
<td>1,65,094</td>
<td>173,374</td>
<td>1,000,009</td>
<td>871,503</td>
<td>1,856,252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary</td>
<td>1,760,833</td>
<td>1,042,196</td>
<td>1,042,846</td>
<td>814,056</td>
<td>2,665,769</td>
<td>1,856,252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Theological College</td>
<td>23,700</td>
<td>24,778</td>
<td>289,444</td>
<td>289,444</td>
<td>161,683</td>
<td>161,683</td>
<td>287,327</td>
<td>329,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirvis Yeshiva Central Institute</td>
<td>4,018</td>
<td>4,060</td>
<td>252,588</td>
<td>248,338</td>
<td>105,787</td>
<td>105,787</td>
<td>368,115</td>
<td>368,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mizrachi Hapoel Hamizrachi (National Council for Torah Education)</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>26,316</td>
<td>28,929</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>29,751</td>
<td>32,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi Chaim Berlin, Yeshiva and Mesivta</td>
<td>9,415</td>
<td>9,361</td>
<td>131,579</td>
<td>151,739</td>
<td>114,606</td>
<td>131,730</td>
<td>255,998</td>
<td>229,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical College of Telz</td>
<td>7,087</td>
<td>8,605</td>
<td>448,985</td>
<td>448,985</td>
<td>211,703</td>
<td>211,703</td>
<td>643,985</td>
<td>643,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbinical Seminary of America</td>
<td>12,260</td>
<td>13,739</td>
<td>140,756</td>
<td>165,627</td>
<td>254,176</td>
<td>231,931</td>
<td>407,392</td>
<td>402,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torah Umesorah</td>
<td>5,952</td>
<td>6,177</td>
<td>142,957</td>
<td>140,921</td>
<td>31,286</td>
<td>28,521</td>
<td>180,195</td>
<td>175,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Farm Settlement</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>241,397</td>
<td>265,315</td>
<td>75,975</td>
<td>40,199</td>
<td>282,222</td>
<td>251,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeshiva Torah Vodaath</td>
<td>35,053</td>
<td>32,297</td>
<td>878,531</td>
<td>1,245,537</td>
<td>490,571</td>
<td>415,982</td>
<td>1,405,571</td>
<td>1,405,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations</td>
<td>3,413</td>
<td>2,234</td>
<td>185,506</td>
<td>145,076</td>
<td>675,547</td>
<td>609,448</td>
<td>863,469</td>
<td>756,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Lubavitcher Yeshivot</td>
<td>20,576</td>
<td>19,243</td>
<td>552,133</td>
<td>540,203</td>
<td>57,796</td>
<td>72,971</td>
<td>630,550</td>
<td>632,417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yeshiva University—Other than Medical School** | 67,877 | 65,563 | 3,255,635 | 2,410,144 | 5,225,226 | 5,234,769 | 8,575,738 | 7,713,476 |

**Sub-Total** | $418,547 | $393,835 | $15,933,474 | $13,736,330 | $12,970,663 | $12,484,729 | $29,322,684 | $26,614,894 |

**Total Domestic** | $6,242,270 | $5,895,295 | $57,535,020 | $52,806,127 | $33,464,204 | $47,946,727 | $117,123,494 | $106,648,149 |

**Total Overseas and Domestic** | $70,698,427 | $69,429,308 | $88,617,397 | $74,725,513 | $60,390,596 | $54,614,046 | $219,706,420 | $198,768,867 |

**Notes:**
- Payments on pre-1963 pledges.
- Includes independent appeals in welfare fund cities: about $430,000 for AJCommittee, $257,000 for ADL in 1964; $595,000 for AJCommittee, $297,000 for ADL in 1965. On allocations basis, AJCommittee received $787,000 in 1964 and $810,000 in 1965; ADL received $914,600 in 1964 and $935,000 in 1965.
- Excludes overseas income.
- Represents dues from national agencies.
- On an allocations basis, former JDA agencies together received about $43,400 more in 1964 than in 1963.
- The former Ex-Patients Sanitarium was consolidated with the American Medical Center at Denver in 1964-65. Financial reports reflecting this consolidation were not available at press time.
- Includes building fund.
- Yeshiva University is reported in part under health and welfare agencies and in part under religious agencies. In the medical school, "other income" includes $16.3 million in government funds and hospital service grants in 1964 and $18.7 million in 1965, in other than medical schools, "other income" includes approximately $1 million additional in government grants for each year.
- Excludes grants from CJMCA, National Foundation for Jewish Culture, and Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.
- Income from centers included in federation agencies.
- Includes grants by other national agencies to avoid double counting.
- Excludes gross sales of religious education publications.
- One-half to one-third of federation allocations consist of local "lunch fund" allocations reflecting public funds received through FJPNY.
- Including University of Judaism, California; duplicating Seminary income excluded. Transfer of approximately $1.5 million of other subsidiary asset to JTS excluded.
- Includes fire insurance proceeds.
The Modern Jewish quest for community, produced by the breakdown of the pre-modern Jewish order, demands a renewed concern with Jewish public affairs, a field of theoretical and practical interest that can best be defined in political terms. Long hidden within the confines of history and sociology, this field is now ready to force itself upon the consciousness of all those concerned with the quest for Jewish community at the highest level and, more immediately, with the life of specific Jewish communities. If, in most cases, today's quest for community is masked by the quest for identity—a concern that superficially appears to be more individualistic and private—the astute observer soon discovers that the two are not only intertwined but also interdependent. This is borne out by an already extant literature which, though presented in other guises, does speak to the central and specific problems of Jewish public affairs.

What do we mean when we define “Jewish public affairs” as a field, and what are its concerns? Public concerns are those involving the community as a whole, the collective interests of people living in the community, activities in society that have a communal bent or character, and the concerns of individuals insofar as they relate to community life and interests. While acknowledgment of some distinction between public and private concerns is crucial, it is equally clear that no sharp division between the two spheres can ever be drawn, even for reasons of convention. Rather, Jewish life can be conceived as revolving around a core of clearly public concerns, e.g., the life of the congregation or the provision of certain public services, surrounded by concentric circles of concern that move out toward the private realm and into a grey area of matters that can be considered “public” for some purposes, and “private” for others.

The delineation of Jewish public affairs raises certain additional problems by virtue of its Jewish aspect. In the western world, where the separation between public and private starts from firmly established premises and the political and the religious aspects of life are separated with equal clarity, public affairs soon resolves itself into questions of the immediately or essentially political. Within the framework of Jewish civilization, however, the distinctions between public and private, political and religious, are substantially blurred. Moreover, the lack of clearly political institutions to help set the formal boundaries of public affairs requires examination of Jewish social and communal life with a more careful and penetrating eye. Here, the present state of our knowledge of things political gives us an advantage over preced-
ing generations. Social scientists have discovered in Afro-Asian cultures blurrings of public and private, political and religious, similar to those found in Jewish life, that give us some new points of comparison.

The Biblical Paradigm

Identification of the specific concerns of Jewish public affairs must begin with the delineation of the appropriate theoretical principles. The principles that establish the continuing foundations of Jewish political thought properly originate in the Bible. A substantial, if hidden, literature discussing biblical political thought has been in existence for many years. Biblical political ideas have been elucidated by political philosophers (e.g. Locke and Spinoza) in the past and, more recently, by students of the Bible using modern critical methods (e.g. Noth and Kaufman). Even theologians have found it necessary to explore the political dimension of Scripture, a certain indicator of its importance in the scheme of biblical thought. One such work published in the period under review here, Leo Baeck's posthumous This People Israel,* fortuitously offers us a way to view some first principles. By discussing the meaning of Jewish peoplehood and existence through a special kind of biblical exegesis, Rabbi Baeck implicitly outlines the fundamental concerns of Jewish public affairs and analyzes their differential development over the four millennia of Jewish history. In doing so, he unfolds what is, in effect, a political theory of Jewish existence, but a political theory in the uniquely Jewish religious context.

Baeck begins with the covenant idea, the central idea in Jewish social thought, and the great contribution of Jewish thought to political theory. The brit, or covenant, embodies both the source of all law and the commandments which comprise Jewish law. Following Jewish tradition, Baeck sees God covenanting with the universe, humanity, history, and the fathers. It is the covenant that links all things within the universe and within history. More than a theological concept, the covenant defines a political relationship at the highest level. In part, this is because God is the central source of right and justice, two of the highest concerns of politics, while the covenant is the means by which human beings are granted freedom, a third.

As a polity, Israel functions as the embodiment of the covenant idea, celebrating the freedom which it effectively brought into the world through the covenant and the idea of the covenant. Israel is not a power structure like Rome, whose institutions and ideas celebrate power and its uses, nor a talent contest like Greece, whose institutions, symbolized by the Olympic games, were designed to test the talents of the various Hellenic communities and their citizens.

From the covenant idea, Baeck sees the derivation of the Jewish conception of community. Man is not simply born into community, but is called to

---

* Complete citations of all books and articles mentioned in this essay will be found on pp. 222–229.
the task of molding it. When he forms his life in recognition of morality, he begins to create community. The covenant enables man to rise above the limitations inherent in his creation, to establish the free, just community.

Baeck sees the congregation as the uniquely Jewish embodiment of the community. In his thought, the congregational polity constitutes a small republic combining the religious and the political in the ideal form of "religious democracy." It provides the practical framework for the expression of the highest Israelite political ideal, the idea of theocracy. Baeck's conception of theocracy, the direct sovereignty of God over men, differs from the conventional modern conception because it correctly reflects the idea of *malchut shamayim* enunciated in the Bible. In the biblical spirit, he sees the acceptance of the sovereignty of God as the means of freeing individuals from pseudo sovereigns on earth. Herein Baeck sees a major difference between a congregation and the church. The congregation must be a republic. It can only exist through individuals who come together within it, partly because of their prior commitment to the great covenant and partly by means of an immediate contract. The Church, on the other hand, exists *per se* regardless of the individuals who may or may not be in it, arrogating, as it were, sovereign power to itself.

Historically, the spread of congregations throughout the world is the Jewish equivalent of the colonization process which led the Greeks to plant cities in the Mediterranean basin and the Americans to extend towns across a continent. Through the congregation, the Jews have been able to create communities wherever they have settled.

Baeck traces the history of Israel as one of the rise, decline, and renewal of congregational republics in their various forms, beginning with the biblical congregation of Israel. It is seen as a series of encounters, within which the fundamental principles of Jewish religio-political life have been expressed in different ways. The resultant differing syntheses of religious expression, communal organization, and economic activity have encouraged a variety of forms of public organization within the Jewish community as a whole.

Within the foregoing framework, Baeck considers the relationship of Israel as a community to the land of Israel, examining the ways in which the forces of geography work to mold the people. So, for example, he sees in the Jubilee legislation biblical affirmation of the relationship between labor, that binds man to the forces of creation, and freedom in the land, that is absolutely essential as a precondition of political freedom. In this light, Baeck views Zionism as a natural outgrowth of Jewish political ideas, an important factor in the renewal of the vital colonization process in the land of Israel. He then poses the great political question of Israel restored: whether it will develop a society in the spirit of traditional covenant of the Jews, or encourage an ersatz life of hedonism so widespread in the modern world.

Baeck also considers the crucial political problem of leadership. He sees the ideal leader of Israel as a combination of teacher and prophet, and, like many before him, finds this ideal expressed in the view of *Moshe rabbenu*
(Moses our teacher) presented in the Bible and the midrash. The leader, as teacher and prophet, has limited power and is chosen for higher reasons than mere personal talent. He is eminently suited to head the congregational republic because his role effectively supports man's freedom of choice to receive instruction and listen to prophecy, or to persist in his willfulness.

More generally, Baeck advocates the prophetic concept of the state from which can develop the promised kingdom of God on earth, a kingdom which embodies, in traditional Jewish terminology, the linkage of truth, justice, and peace. In this, it differs significantly from the two other Western concepts: the Greco-Roman that views the state as "the organic form and limits of the communal life of men" or the modern totalitarian that advocates the existence of the state for its own sake. Baeck regards the striving for the kingdom of God as man's great political task.

The unique role of the Jewish people as an entity on the world scene, Baeck says, evolved from its belief in the one God, at a time when other peoples worshipped idols. God's covenant which granted freedom to Israel marked the beginning of history. The Jewish people continues to exist and to play a special role in civilization because it understood the oneness of history and universe within which man lives, a oneness revealing totality and order. Illustrating his thesis, Baeck gives examples of the impact of Jews and Hebraic thought on public affairs, ranging from the role of the Jews as the maintainers of the channels of communication in the medieval era to the influence of the congregational idea on the revolution in church polity during the reformation. He could have added—as others have—the contribution of Hebraic ideas to the development of modern popular government.

Finally, implicit in Baeck's book is a methodology for studying Jewish public affairs. Using the midrashic method, Baeck sets forth a generational theory of history. Within the framework of space and time, which together comprise the universe (Baeck uses the appropriate Hebrew world olam to define the universe as space-plus-time), the basic unit of analysis is the generation, just as within the social order the basic unit is the congregation. History is given structure through generations and the meeting of generations. From the movement and meeting of generations emerges progress—defined not in the usual terms, but as a new understanding on the part of each generation of "that which is demanded" of humanity in general, and of it in particular. The generations themselves are tied together by a common share in their task and its fulfillment. An examination of the movement, meaning, and linkage of generations pursuing the great common task, makes possible the understanding and interpretation of the course of Jewish public affairs.

The Recent Literature

What Baeck expresses in occasionally esoteric theological terms, others have discussed in the more familiar language of history and the social sciences. Perry Miller, Hans Kohn, William Albright, and Louis Finkelstein,
to name but a very few, have explored various aspects of Jewish political life and thought, from the covenant idea to the use of contractual arrangements to organize societies and preserve individual rights. Examples of other historical and social science studies that willy-nilly elucidate the points made by Baeck will be found in the following pages. In fact, most of what Baeck and the others have said explicitly is implicit in all serious discussions of Jewish public affairs. That is why simple inventories of materials dealing with Jewish social and communal life miss the essential point. The implicit unity in such works, which remains immanent but unrevealed in unstructured catalogs, can only be brought to the surface through an understanding of the principles that underlie that unity and the proper application of these principles in organizing the literature in question.

With Baeck’s theoretical formulation as a starting point, we can look at the other materials published in the last two years and see the practical manifestations of the Jewish concern for “the moral, the social, the community, and the congregation”; examine the practical considerations affecting these four elements, and get some sense of the theoretical concerns which animate those who study or comment upon Jewish public affairs. In one sense, this literature is vast; in another, the paucity of works is astounding. The periodical literature of the contemporary Jewish world is filled with materials that fall in the category of Jewish public affairs. Articles ranging from discussions of Jewish life in Afghanistan to the problem of Israel’s relationship with the diaspora can be found aplenty. More serious works are less readily available, and when they are, they are more frequently commentaries on contemporary or perennial Jewish problems than probes into the nature of those problems. Indeed, scholarly works in the field remain at a minimum, rarely encompassing more than conventional historical and demographic research. Even though many of the questions should be obvious, the lack of theory in the field keeps them hidden in a maze of ephemeral materials.

Given the fundamental perspective set forth here—to consider it a theory would be much too premature—a review of the publications of the last two years reveals a number of subcategories of concern which more or less call attention to themselves. Only the most significant publications in each, with emphasis on books rather than periodicals, are cited here.

**Jewish Political Thought**

A number of books deal with the basic principles of Jewish political thought, albeit without quite acknowledging that they do so. In *The Higher Freedom*, David Polish attempts to reinterpret the characteristic “messianic obsession” of the Jewish people for our generation. Rabbi Polish’s analysis starts from two traditional premises that also animate Baeck’s ideas: that God, Israel, and Torah are tied together in an enduring covenant relationship, and that the rebirth of the State of Israel is “a new turning point in Jewish history” (his subtitle) because it restores the fullness of the union of
the three. The triad is bound together in a kind of "metabolic balance" which must be maintained without unduly emphasizing or minimizing any one of the elements, and which is to be brought about by the Jewish people today through proper deeds. Such deeds range from the revitalization of halakhah to continuing the struggle for universal social justice.

Robert Gordis, in his book *Judaism in a Christian World* and in a lecture at Syracuse University on "Jewish Tradition in the Modern World: Conservation and Renewal," deals with the changing nature of the Jewish community over the past several millennia and, particularly, with the problems of reconstructing that community in our own time. He identifies three major types of Jewish community: the natural community of ancient Israel and the compulsory community of the middle ages, both organic in character, and the voluntary community of today, seeking an organic structure. The first of these communities was self-determining; exclusive in that its membership was easily defined to include those born into it or resident within its territory, and inclusive in the sense that it embraced all aspects of life. The second, while not self-determining, remained exclusive and inclusive in these two ways. Both focused on the linkage between God, Israel, and Torah, and both were Torah-centered. Gordis makes the oft-repeated point that post-emancipation Jewish community life must be voluntary, can barely be exclusive, and cannot be inclusive at all, except in the land of Israel. An analysis of the various attempts at communal reconstruction leads him to a vision of the Jewish community of the future as one resting on voluntary principles that restore some degree of inclusiveness, but, in a way also tending to encourage a partnership with the larger world community.

In *The Case for the Chosen People: The Role of the Jewish People Yesterday and Today*, W. Gunther Plaut clearly reaffirms the thesis that the Jewish people exists for the special task of raising the world's moral level and that they are, indeed, chosen because of God's covenant with Israel at Sinai.

In a sense, *The Legacy of Maurice Pekarsky*, the collected writings of the late Hillel Foundation leader edited by Alfred Jospe, is a continuation of foregoing expositions in a different vein. For Pekarsky was also led to an overweening concern for Jewish community out of his sense of Jewish vocation. His fragmentary writings tie these two themes together within a framework of ostensibly historical and sociological analysis, but which, the careful reader will discover, is really much more than that.

Arthur A. Cohen's "Between Two Traditions" continues this theme in yet other ways. Discussing the Jewish people as a promethean force, he examines the Jewish sages as exemplary heroes for the Jewish world and the larger world of humanity. Jacob Neusner developing similar themes in "City, Society, Self," an essay in his *History and Torah*, describes the ideal Jew as one who participates in society and knows community, and discusses the kind of Jewish education necessary to fit him for both.

The publication of the second edition of Max Kadushin's *The Rabbinic Mind* once again makes available that milestone in the elucidation of the
mode of thought dominating the shapers of normative Judaism. Since so much of the organic thinking of the sages is devoted to problems of public affairs, Kadushin's exposition of the relation between the great Jewish value concepts and the social order provides an important starting point in the study of Jewish political thought. He concerns himself with the balance between society and the individual as part of the essential value structure of Judaism, and, particularly, with the manner in which value concepts endow historic groups with special character and direction.

The Worlds of Norman Salit, a posthumous collection of the sermons and addresses of one of the nation's leading rabbis, edited by Abraham Burstein, reflects a Jewish perception of public affairs at a different level. Salit, the late president of the Synagogue Council of America, described his work in the light of three precepts: Jewish law as the central concern of Jewish public affairs; an abiding concern with political morality, and the combined impact of law and political morality on the life of the community.

There were also several studies on specific aspects of Jewish political thought. David Daube discusses Collaboration with Tyranny in Rabbinic Law and rejects the notion of the legitimacy of tyranny in any form. Gerald J. Blidstein, in "Capital Punishment—The Classic Jewish Discussion" analyzes the meaning of the three Hebrew words for killing and murder according to halakhah and tradition. He concludes that the issue is too complex for simple formulary resolution because, despite the reluctance of later Jewish authorities to inflict the death penalty, there was an equal reluctance to abandon it entirely as a principle. "Crisis Halachah and Heterodoxy Today" publishes with a minimum of comment, responsa of the Hazon Ish and Chief Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook on heresy and the limits of dissent. While generally flexible in response to the needs of the times, both men recognize the legitimacy of setting limits within the framework of Jewish tradition. André Neher's "The Humanism of the Maharal of Prague" opens up the political aspects of that great medieval Jewish leader's universalistic humanism for consideration and further exploration.

A more contemporary note on the state of Jewish political thought was struck in the Commentary symposium "The State of Jewish Belief." Among the questions asked of the representative group of Jewish theologians selected to participate in the symposium was whether, in their view, Judaism advocated or was in tune with any particular political or economic philosophy or system. The answers were instructive. Most of the participants were quick to disclaim direct Jewish endorsement of any particular form of political or economic organization, even those who indicated that they believed that there was some anti-totalitarianism inherent in the Jewish system of thought. A generation ago, such a question would no doubt have elicited support for the idea that Judaism is the equivalent of liberal democracy or socialism. The trend away from the uncritical identification of Judaism with some modern ideology represents a step in the right direction. However, the politically attuned student having some knowledge of Jewish tradition must
necessarily be saddened by the complete failure of American Jewish theolo-
gians to recognize significant Jewish political ideas because of a lack of
serious exploration of the dimensions of Jewish political thought.

The recent literature of Jewish nationalism seems to reflect the dominant
trend of the new generation to seek out the ways in which the Jewish people
and Judaism differ from other peoples and religions. This is in sharp contrast
to the previous generation which, following the lead of the Zionists and their
Reconstructionist associates, sought to minimize such differences. The change
in terminology alone is significant. Whereas discussions of Jewish peoplehood
and the survival of the Jewish national spirit were couched in sociological
terms in the earlier period, a tendency to use theological terms has reemerged
in the 1950's and, most particularly, in the 1960's among the new generation
of Jews writing here and in Israel. The distinguished Israeli historian J. L.
Talmon sums up the new attitude at the very close of his essay "Uniqueness
and Universality" in his recent work The Unique and the Universal:

The Jewish historian becomes a kind of martyr in his permanent and anguished
intimacy with the mystery of Jewish martyrdom and survival. Whether he be
orthodox in belief or has discarded all religious practice, he cannot help but
be sustained by a faith which can neither be proved nor disproved. I believe
that notwithstanding all the vexations and entanglements caused by emergency
and inescapable necessity—also reminiscent, by the way, of the times of Ezra
and Nehemiah—Israel will one day be spiritually significant and in conjunction
with the Jewish diaspora, spiritually effective in the world. History would some-
how make no sense otherwise.

Perhaps the most significant scholarly discussion of the positive aspects of
Jewish nationalism and its corollaries of chosenness and uniqueness to appear
recently is Frederick M. Barnard's "Herder and Israel." Barnard points out
that Johann Gottfried Herder, the 18th century German philosopher, viewed
Israel as a model of the proper synthesis of nationalism and peoplehood.
Herder emerges as a major delineator of the political in Jewish civilization
who understood the intimate linkages between the political and the religious
in Judaism. His political interest in the organic or community form of po-
litical organization found expression in a study of Hebrew poetry, Vom
Geist der ebraischen Poesie ("The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry"). Herder views
Moses as the creator of a nation who, by federating 12 republics into a polity
based on the rule of law (Herder calls it a nomocracy), created the model
social order. He compares Israel to the Swiss confederation of his age and
discovers five essential determinates for proper development of national spirit:
1) a land that is the people's common heritage; 2) a constitutional covenant,
freely entered into by the population, that leads to a commonly accepted
law; 3) a common language and folk tradition; 4) an emphasis on family
cohesion fostered and perpetuated by 5) deep reverence for the common
forefathers of the nation. All these factors he finds to be preeminently pres-
et in the political history of Israel. Of these, he says, language is of first
importance as the underlying tie that binds the polity. Herder found particu-
larly attractive the combination in Israel of an organic social order which enhanced the opportunities for community, with a political order that provided for the distribution of power among many centers.

If Jewish political thought has been on the ascendancy in the last few years, the number of Jewish thinkers specifically oriented towards politics has declined. Most of the men cited in these pages do not consider themselves political philosophers, but deal with the political either explicitly or implicitly because it is so much a part of life. Only during the heyday of the Zionist revolution did there arise from the ranks of the Jewish people political thinkers who concentrated on Jewish political problems as such. As the Zionist revolution fades into history, such men become more difficult to find.

Charles H. Freundlich's *Peretz Smolenskin, His Life and Thought* treats one of the famous figures of turn-of-the-century Zionism. Jonathan Frankel writes penetratingly of "The Communist Rabbi: Moses Hess," the first real political theorist of modern Zionism, who viewed the Jews' return to their land as a "messianic act," a major step toward creation of a new world order founded on proper national, social, and moral principles.

There is a certain kind of intellectualizing that frequently passes as Jewish political thought by which Jews seek to confirm as "Jewish," beliefs derived first from outside Jewish tradition. In the last few years most of this kind of political thinking has been directed towards the great issues of world peace, particularly as they center on the struggle in Vietnam. The very range of such statements reflects the variety of views seeking support within Jewish tradition. On one extreme, there has emerged a group of Jewish pacifists who justify their pacifism as being in the mainstream of Judaism. While Erich Fromm is perhaps the best known of these, Rabbi Everett E. Gendler has recently come to the fore as a more authentic Jewish voice. Perhaps his best recent statement is the one published in "therefore chose life," which was prepared for the convocation on ways to peace held by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions of Santa Barbara in New York in 1965. Nearly as polemical is Steven S. Schwarzchild's "The Religious Demand for Peace." In a frankly pacifist argument he concludes that, since God is radically for peace, religion must also be. A more balanced statement on the Vietnam situation is *Judaism and World Peace*, the record of the study conference sponsored by the Synagogue Council of America in February 1966.

Abraham Joshua Heschel summarizes his recent thoughts in the realm of social action in a new book, *The Insecurity of Freedom: Essays on Human Existence* which presents his general approach to understanding mankind and man's relations with God in a social context. In a very different way, Ellis Rifkin turns his attention to contemporary problems in an article "The Internal City: Judaism and Urbanization."

At least one recent work raises the very serious question of how Jewish tradition can be related to the political problems of the day. Richard J. Israel in "Jewish Tradition and Political Action" rightly points out that "Biblical
and Halachic traditions are no longer generating the kind of continuing guidance that we need for the world in which we live." But because tradition "gives us a chance to stand back from our totally contemporary perspective and view our problems with other eyes," it may still have the potentiality for developing in this direction. In effect, Rabbi Israel joins a small but growing chorus calling for the revival of serious Jewish political thought.

Religious Movements and Public Persuasions

Regardless of the significance of political thought in the larger framework of Jewish public affairs, the public life of the American Jewish community is increasingly oriented toward the religious movements as the institutional embodiments of the public persuasions of American Jews. The term "public persuasions" is used advisedly. While religion in America is commonly conceived to be primarily concerned with the private sphere, institutionalized Jewish religion is, in fact, overwhelmingly a reflection of public persuasions rather than private behavior or belief. Only a small percentage of Jews who are formally affiliated with any of the Jewish religious movements conduct their private lives according to the patterns prescribed by those movements. Hence, institutional affiliation reflects the kinds of public commitments which Jews wish to make and tells us little about the state of their personal lives as Jews.

These institutionalized public persuasions regularly receive a great deal of attention which is reflected in a wide range of publications. In the period under consideration here, three books appeared which examine in the conventional manner the panorama of public persuasions on the American scene: Joseph L. Blau's Modern Varieties of Judaism, Benjamin Efron, ed., Currents and Trends in Contemporary Jewish Thought, and Ira Eisenstein, ed., Varieties of Jewish Beliefs. The periodical literature is no more rewarding. A number of articles sought ways and means to transcend the spreading denominationalism in Jewish life and to find a higher ground of common Jewish endeavor. Even they do not represent any new thinking but, rather, continue a line of thought and concern that has persisted in the United States for several generations.

Orthodoxy

The record of the emergence of a vital Orthodox movement since the end of World War II, with many and variegated strands representing a wide spectrum of views, finally broke into print in 1965. Charles S. Liebman's article "Orthodoxy in American Jewish Life" is not only symptomatic of the new wave of Orthodox writing, but provides by far the best picture of the movement in its diversity. A second article by Liebman, "Left and Right in American Orthodoxy," distinguishes between what are, in effect, three Orthodox approaches: the Modern Orthodox emphasizing the maintenance of Orthodox ritual practices side by side with a full commitment to modern society and its general values; the right-wing seeking the perpetuation of
traditional Judaism by developing isolated and tightly knit communities that hold themselves aloof from all non-Orthodox Jews; and the new Orthodox left wing, modern in its involvements but particularistic in its values, that wants Jewish law extended into contemporary social, political, and economic realms, not necessarily by modifying it or making it lenient, but by making it relevant to the concerns of our day.

In “Orthodox Judaism in a World of Revolutionary Transformations” Eliezer Berkovits speaks for the Orthodox left when he criticizes Orthodox obscurantism and provincialism and calls for the increased involvement of Orthodox Jews and Orthodox Judaism in the problems of the day through Jewish law and tradition.

Most of the material on the new Orthodoxy can be found in Jewish Life and Tradition, the two major periodicals of the modern Orthodox; but increasingly the non-Orthodox Jewish press has come to recognize the phenomenon as significant to their readership as well. Jacob Neusner discusses “The New Orthodox Left” in Conservative Judaism, essentially an analysis of, and reply to, Liebman’s study and his earlier review of Moshe Davis’ book, The Emergence of Conservative Judaism. The discussion was continued by Liebman.

CONSERVATISM

If the thrust of Orthodox thought in the past two years has been to raise questions of greater involvement in the world and the larger Jewish community, the Conservative movement has turned further inward. Continuing a trend begun some years ago, Conservative Jewish writers have been trying to emphasize the special historical roots of their movement that have helped make it a unique entity. Led primarily by rabbis and scholars, the major voices articulating this position have found their organ in Conservative Judaism which has been growing in importance. Neusner’s article has already been cited. In a similar piece by Abraham J. Karp, “The Origins of Conservative Judaism,” the accepted view is clearly enunciated:

The roots of Conservative Judaism are in the tradition. Its beginnings are in the rediscovery of authentic Judaism by 19th century Jewish scholarship, which disclosed the evolving, dynamic nature of Judaism. Those who exposed themselves to this scholarship soon found that the new knowledge influenced their understanding of the nature and demands of Judaism.

The new knowledge of the history of Judaism, Karp continues, revealed that “Judaism was influenced by the environment in which the Jewish people lived, and by their historical experience.” At times “the environment influenced the mode of living and the religious ritual expression,” and at other times, “the challenge was to ideology.” From this, the founders of the Conservative movement drew a dynamic picture of Jewish tradition and embarked on their course of adjusting the inheritance of tradition to the needs of new times.

On another plane, the conception of Conservative uniqueness has encour-
aged a drive for a greater separatism within the community. Whereas in the past, the Conservative synagogues frequently were the most identified with communal institutions of an educational and Zionist nature, today a strong drive exists for the reconcentration of all Jewish activities within the synagogues themselves. Perhaps the most extreme published expression of that view is Rabbi Jack Schechter's "Primer for a Revolution" outlining ways and means for Conservative institutions to take over functions previously shared as communal ones, even in the welfare field.

REFORM

The 75th anniversary of the establishment of the Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) led to a spate of evaluative and historical discussions of the development of Reform Judaism in the United States and the world. CCAR, itself, sponsored a volume Retrospect and Prospect, edited by Bertram W. Korn, which includes ten articles discussing various phases of the Reform movement and CCAR since 1889. Sidney L. Regner, in an historical article, notes the failure to unite Orthodox and Reform rabbis at the very inception of CCAR, the sectional basis of the organization in its early days, and its increasing self-definition as an advisory rather than a decision-making body within the context of the Reform movement. Bernard J. Bamberger, in an outline of the theological developments of the past 75 years, traces the problem of authority from the early attempts to call a synod for theological definition, to the present situation where CCAR serves primarily as a forum for theological debate. His discussion of trends and problems with which the Reform rabbis have dealt is almost a catalog of the modern concerns of organized religion.

Two articles in the volume, discussing social action, are Roland B. Gittelson, "The Conference Stand on Social Justice and Civil Rights" and Eugene Lipman, "The Conference Considers Relations between Religion and the State." In light of the recent discussions of the need to reevaluate the Jewish position on church and state (p. 91ff.), Lipman provides some valuable information on the development of radical separatism as a virtual dogma within the Reform movement. Arthur J. Lelyveld's "The Conference View of the Position of the Jew in the Modern World" and David Max Eichhorn's "The Conference and the Organized American Jewish Community" delineate Reform Judaism's growing concern with Jewish community in a more traditional sense. The thrust of the volume in its entirety, which is at least a quasi-official statement of the dominant views among the articulate leadership of the Reform movement, is that the traditional concerns of Jewish community in the sense of peoplehood, problems of authority, and the role of Jewish law, have increasingly come to the fore, in particular since the end of World War II.

This view is substantially confirmed in W. Gunther Plaut's The Growth of Reform Judaism, a companion volume to his book The Rise of Reform Judaism. It chronicles the development of the Reform movement until 1948
through a judiciously edited selection of sources, interwoven with sensitive and useful commentary by the compiler. Plaut, who stands in the right wing of Reform Judaism and is known to be an advocate of the restoration of Jewish law and observance within Reform ranks, has also become the best historian of Reform of our time.

Other histories of the Reform movement and its impact appeared recently. Stephen Steinberg’s “Reform Judaism: The Origin and Evolution of a Church Movement” traces the history of the Reform movement with the tools of modern sociology. Lucy S. Dawidowicz in “When Reform Was Young” sees the rise of Reform as a revolt against European Orthodoxy, parallel to a similar revolt among American Protestants at the time. Within a small Jewish community, numbering somewhere between 40,000 and 50,000 Jews in 1846, with only 40 congregations staffed by four rabbis having very little Jewish learning, the Reform movement demonstrated its revolutionary character in its efforts to decommunalize Judaism and make Jewish religion a private matter. The low level of education of its leaders, even those coming from Europe, corresponded to the increasing prevalence of uneducated ministers in the Protestant churches. Reform’s emphasis on the Decalogue as embodying all that was necessary in Jewish law, its emphasis on subordinating Judaism to Americanism, its social optimism and emphasis on America as the chosen land, all ran parallel to similar views in mid-19th century frontier Protestantism. The author observes that pioneer Reform rabbis zealously goaded partly-observant Jews into nonobservance and elevated nonobservance into doctrinal antinomianism. Highly critical of Isaac Mayer Wise, the author develops the thesis that Wise looked to a nondoctrinal universal religion based on Jewish principles, and that his efforts to mold Reform Judaism ultimately pointed to that end. This, in the author’s view, also accounts for Wise’s militantly separationist stand on church-state relations. Wise was, perhaps, the first Jewish leader to attack the notion of the United State as a Christian nation. In doing so, he started the development of the present radical position on church-state separation, which is dominant in the contemporary Jewish community and still finds many of its most articulate spokesmen in Reform circles.

The author’s thesis draws support from two other articles that appeared at approximately the same time. John J. Appel writing about “The Trefa Banquet” held in 1883 that completed the split between Reform and non-Reform elements in American Judaism, concludes that Wise was not the moderate reformer he is conventionally made out to be, but “a doctrinaire Reformer zealous to bring Judaism into one with American customs and apparently blind to the fact that attacks on others’ habits and preferences are bound to create controversies which appeals to reason cannot resolve.” This analysis is further confirmed in a review of Wise’s editorial writings. Walter Jacob concludes in “Isaac Mayer Wise’s Views on Christianity” that “Wise was not satisfied with reforming Judaism, but sought also to reshape Christianity and
to demonstrate that the new Christianity led directly to the Judaism of the future.'

A more sympathetic view of Wise and the Reform movement is presented in James G. Heller's biography, *Isaac M. Wise*. Arthur Gilbert's "Reform Judaism in America" emphasizes the role of the Reform movement and CCAR in the social sphere, and the fight against antisemitism. He traces the history of the movement from its 19th century central European origins. In doing so, he also tends to confirm the Dawidowicz hypothesis that the Reform concern with "individualism in theology, experimentalism in liturgy, anticlericalism, and denominationalism" fits in well with the American scene and reinforces the links between Reform Judaism and "the voluntaristic, nonge-
clesiastical character of American religiosity."

Two important spokesmen for Reform Judaism, one of the preceding and the other of the present generation, also published significant statements. Julian Morgenstern, president emeritus of the Hebrew Union College and a leading advocate of Reform in the 1920's and 1930's, presents a major re-
view of his philosophy of Jewish life, with special emphasis on the relation-
ship of Reform Judaism to the Zionist idea, in "What Are We Jews?" Though more moderate than the views he espoused when he was at the height of his influence, Morgenstern is still close to classical Reform's position on the Jewish community. Jakob J. Petuchowski, on the other hand, in "The Limits of Liberal Judaism" reflects the more popular contemporary view of the im-
portance of Jewish community by asking, "How much Liberal deviation is still compatible with the basic Jewish commitment to revelation and law?" He concludes that the basic Jewish commitments still stand as the measure of things Jewish, and that liberalism must be considered, to a certain extent at least, a deviation and must be limited accordingly.

In the area of more purely sociological considerations, Norman L. Fried-
man's study of social prestige and Reform Judaism, "German Lineage and Reform Affiliation: American Jewish Prestige Criteria in Transition" is an attempt to document the changes in patterns of Reform membership since the end of World War II.

**RECONSTRUCTIONISM**

Since the early 1960's, Reconstructionism has been making strides toward becoming a full-fledged fourth movement on the American Jewish scene. It has been limited in doing so only by the lack of congregations interested in formally affiliating with it. This transformation from intellectual movement to institutionalized organization has been reflected in the pages of *The Recon-
structionist*. For thirty years a major intellectual voice in the Jewish com-

munity because of its concern for all things Jewish from the broadest per-
Perspective, *The Reconstructionist* has, in recent years, become increasingly a "highbrow" house organ, devoted more and more to expounding Reconstruc-
tionist doctrine rather than inviting the expression of a wide range of views. Thus, while the volume of material on Reconstructionism as an ideology and
a movement remains great, perhaps even greater than that produced by the other movements, little, if any, new thought has emerged in the last two years. Rather, there has been a succession of reworkings of Mordecai M. Kaplan's ideas, both by Kaplan and by his disciples and heirs.

**ZIONIST AND SECULAR VIEWS**

While the public persuasions dominant in American Jewish life today are increasingly those espoused by and reflected through the religious movements, there remain some bastions of secularism and autonomous Zionism in the United States, offering optional persuasions with organizational components for those who do not find themselves even nominally at home within the religious structure. A review of the literature tends to reaffirm the essential dormancy of independent secularist and Zionist persuasions. A few secularist and even more Zionist magazines and journals continue to publish, but generally confine themselves to reprinting speeches restating established points of view, or articles applying unmodified canons of analysis to the crises of the moment.

Standing outside of the mainstream of the movements are men whose task it is constantly to redefine the perennial questions of Jewish life. While frequently philosophers in a technical sense, they are equally concerned with shaping public attitudes at the persuasional level. In the past few years, the significant writers in this field have tended to take their direction from the works of Franz Rosenzweig (or other colleagues from the famous Lehrhaus, particularly Martin Buber). Rosenzweig's influence was clearly manifest in the *Commentary* symposium (pp. 184–85), as Milton Himmelfarb pointed out in his introduction to it. Maurice Friedman describes this group in his article, "The New Jew," who is defined "not by what he is but by what he must respond to." Therefore, what holds modern Jews together is their confrontation with a common situation, no matter how varied their responses to it. The direction of the new Jews is away from destroying old meanings and towards discovering new ones on every ground from social justice to the inner-light, meanings which flow from "an existential confrontation with the Hebrew Bible—not as an object of antiquarian interest but as the real ground and source of Judaism."

The emergence of this group, whose adherents cut across the established "denominational" lines, as an embryonic community as well as an intellectual force has given rise to widespread feeling in certain quarters that Jewish life in the United States is becoming polarized into two groups—the highly observant and the essentially nonobservant. The inference here is that the older public persuasions, which held Jews of different levels of observance within some kind of common framework, are being eroded by the public consequences of private indifference. Among Jews who observe, a common public persuasion is emerging, regardless of their formal ties with Orthodoxy, Conservatism, Reform, or anything else, while among Jews who do not observe, a similarly shared pattern is developing, regardless of their affiliation.
The two-sided notion of covenant and tradition, and its implications that Jews cannot simply accept the course of events in the modern world without raising critical voices as to the ultimate value of certain of the thrusts of modernism, is increasingly the common property of the first group. However, for the great majority of American Jews, including the great majority of synagogue members, the subordination of everything Jewish to the demands of modernism is becoming the characteristic pattern. The potential meaning of this polarization has been best evinced in the pages of *Judaism*. That journal has become the most outspoken voice of the younger generation of committed Jews, regardless of the nuances of their own belief patterns, and also the outlet for much of the most promising writing in the field of Jewish public affairs.

**Defining the Boundaries of Jewish Society**

The problem of defining the boundaries of Jewish society is a particularly modern one in Jewish history. While the question of who is a Jew is raised in every corner of the Jewish world, it is especially alive in the United States where freedom of choice is not only a theoretical phenomenon, but an immediately practical reality faced almost on a day-to-day basis by millions of Jews. The collection of *responsa* published in *Jewish Identity*, edited by Sidney Hoenig, treats the problem at its most universal level. Developed in answer to David Ben-Gurion’s query of the leaders of world Jewry about “Who is a Jew” in light of the problem of registering as Jews children of mixed marriages in Israel, the responsa cover the entire range of contemporary Jewish thought, with all its problems and contradictions. As was to be expected, the opinions were only advisory in character, with no definitive statement emerging even from the *halakhists*. The underlying positions taken in those responsa are effectively summarized by Stephen Steinberg in his article, “The Anatomy of Jewish Identification: A Historical and Theoretical View.” After discussing the problem of obtaining agreement on what precisely it means to be a Jew, Steinberg outlines five dimensions that can be tested empirically: the racial, religious, communalistic, secularistic, and intellectual.

The problem of defining the boundaries of the Jewish people has been complicated by the addition of a new wrinkle in the post World War II era: the problem of conversion to Judaism. If the new freedom of the 20th century in matters religious and ethnic serves to weaken the attachments of many Jews to their faith and people, by the same token it also opens up, for the first time in a millenium or more, possibilities for non-Jews to be added to the fold in significant numbers. Indeed, whereas in the past marriages between Jew and non-Jew almost invariably meant the loss of the Jew to Jewish life, today it is equally possible to bring the non-Jewish partner into the Jewish fold, if the Jewish partner so desires. The most reliable figures in recent studies of intermarriage show that at least one-third of all intermar-
riages result in the conversion of the non-Jewish partner to Judaism. Moreover, an increasing number of non-Jews seek to become Jews for reasons of belief. In recent years some Jewish groups have taken cognizance of this, and have even initiated efforts to bring information to potential converts in the non-Jewish world. The recent major work on this subject is *Conversion to Judaism*, edited by David Max Eichhorn, a comprehensive review of the theoretical and practical implications of conversion as discussed in classical Jewish sources. Included are not only biblical and talmudic references, but historical accounts of both individual and group conversions to Judaism in the past, as well as analyses of the phenomenon of conversion in the contemporary period by a psychologist, a sociologist, and a theologian.

In a more philosophical vein, Monford Harris discusses "On Marrying Outside One's Existence." He seeks to explain why otherwise nonobservant and apparently uninterested Jews react so violently to their children's marriage outside of the covenant. Harris concludes that most Jews remain committed to covenantal Jewish existence, even if subconsciously, despite their lapses from actively living up to the terms of the covenant. But the child who intermarries "cuts the link that binds the generations" in their covenant relationship.

Sidney Goldstein and Calvin Goldschneider report on a study of intermarriage in the Greater Providence area in "Social and Demographic Aspects of Jewish Intermarriages." It indicates a much lower incidence of intermarriage than either the Iowa or the Washington, D.C. studies, which received much attention.

Turning to the more technical literature of Jewish group identification, two items in particular deserve mention. Jack Rothman's monograph *Minority Group Identification and Intergroup Relations: An Examination of Kurt Lewin's Theory of Jewish Group Identity*, published by Research Institute for Group Work in Jewish Agencies in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee, is one of the volumes of the Jewish Group Life Research Publications program. It attempts to concretize and analyze some of the propositions on the subject which have been dominant in sociological thinking since the publication of Lewin's works.

In an historical note, "Heroes, Heretics and Hidalgoes," Allen D. Corré discusses the reasons for Baruch Spinoza's excommunication by the Amsterdam Jewish community, making a serious point about the character of Jewish group consciousness. He rejects the conventional explanation—that the community wished to disassociate itself from Spinoza because his "seemingly atheistic tendencies" might have offended the Christian community, with which the Jews were anxious to preserve good relations—and offers a more profound one. Had the Amsterdam Jews, almost all of whom were Marranos or the children of the Marranos, ignored Spinoza's attack on Judaism, Corré contends, they would have undermined the whole meaning of the Marranos' martyrdom in Spain and Portugal and demeaned the reasons for their flight to strange lands where they could live freely as Jews. This positive interpre-
tation is perhaps more in keeping with the concern of the Jews for a meaningful definition of their existence as Jews than is the "anti-defamational or intergroup relational" approach found in conventional histories.

Political Culture

One of the most significant factors shaping the responses of Jews to the needs, demands, and problems of Jewish public life is their dominant political culture—the underlying pattern of their orientations towards politics, the community, and public issues. Elsewhere, this writer has posited that the Jews have a moralistic political culture. That is to say, they look to public affairs as a means for achieving a better way of life and have correspondingly high expectations, both of their leaders who must be responsible to the community and its largest goals, and of the members of the community who are expected to maintain a high level of involvement in public life.

In this vein, Milton Himmelfarb’s discussion of “The Jew: Subject or Object” is an attempt to understand the essentially moralistic response of the Jews (he uses the term “public regardingness”) in light of their overall relationship to the larger political process as a result of their exclusion from certain kinds of political participation during the years of exile. The Zionist view, presented with great force in the last two generations, is that the Jews existed for seventeen centuries as political objects because they were stateless, political slaves of majorities in the various countries in the diaspora. Among the elements of the dominant political culture among Jews, as identified by Himmelfarb, are “an actively positive attitude toward society and community, growing out of their life in their own society and community; and a potentially positive attitude toward government, growing out of a Jewish tradition that affirms the worth of government and out of their strong feelings for the social and communal. . . .” Himmelfarb concludes that even during their exclusion from the political life of their host countries, the Jews were “already civic,” and simply “wanted to be citizens.” Pursuing the idea of political culture in a different direction, Herman Israel argues in “Some Influences of Hebraic Culture on Modern Social Organization” that Jewish tradition, by its very nature, promotes the limitation and diffusion of authority and that the social organization of modern western society is a direct result of the influence of biblical concepts on the Puritans, first in England and then in the United States and elsewhere. The study of the political culture of the Jews is barely recognized as a field for inquiry. The points raised by Himmelfarb and Israel are suggestive but hardly exhaustive, and the problems they implicitly pose will require much careful consideration.

Political Behavior

The political culture of the Jews leads directly to certain kinds of political behavior, both within the Jewish community and in relationship to the larger
society. The few articles exploring Jewish political behavior which were published in the past two years, all tend to confine themselves to particular causes and deal with the larger question only indirectly. Thus, Nathan Glazer writing on “Jews and Poverty” is primarily concerned that Jewish organizations have not taken a more active role in the war on poverty. In discussing their proper role, he elucidates the great Jewish achievements in the field of voluntary organization, which he pinpoints as reflections of the very fabric of Jewish life. He advocates a specifically Jewish contribution to the war on poverty in the form of an “aid program which teaches how to build institutions—nurseries, schools, counseling agencies, child care agencies, businesses, trade organizations.” Perhaps more typical is Charles F. Wittenstein’s “Jews, Justice and Liberalism” discussing the record of Jews as liberals and of their overall participation in the civil-rights movement. J. L. Talmon considers “The Jewish Intellectual in Politics” from a somewhat more detached and scholarly point of view, analyzing the intellectuals’ political behavior in the past century in light of tendencies in Jewish political culture.

**Political Organization**

In recent years there has been an increase in scholarly efforts to understand the nature of Jewish political organization, both past and contemporary. In a sense, this concern, much of which emanates from Israel, reflects a transcending of the Zionist view that the Jews had no political life except when they lived in an independent state of their own. Contemporary studies seek to explore the varieties of Jewish political organization during periods of independence, autonomy, and even nominal dependence. A number of good political histories emphasizing this point were published in 1965–1966, including the second volume of Yitzhak Baer’s monumental *The History of the Jews in Christian Spain*. While not exclusively political in orientation, Baer’s study deals extensively with the political concerns of the Jews of the Spanish kingdoms, focusing sharply on the role of Jewish political institutions in shaping Jewish life. In *Urban Civilization in Pre-Crusade Europe: A Study of Organized Town Life in Northeastern Europe During the 10th and 11th Centuries Based on the Responsa Literature*, Irving A. Agus does much the same thing for the French and German Jewish communities. While more broadly oriented than the Baer study, Agus’s work demonstrates how the use of responsa has opened up new vistas in research into the character of Jewish public affairs and the functioning of the Jewish community.

Mark Wischnitzer’s posthumous work, *A History of Jewish Crafts and Guilds*, is another book which, though not political in approach, adds to knowledge of Jewish public affairs, primarily in the Middle Ages. In documenting the socio-corporative nature of Jewish guilds and their relationship to Jewish congregational organization, Wischnitzer highlights the penchant for a particular kind of corporate polity, akin to Baeck’s “congregational republic,” which has characterized the Jewish approach to public affairs for
millennia. The continued existence throughout history of a Jewish artisan class with its own internal corporate and congregational structure, side by side with other elements in the Jewish community, not only dispels the myth that Jews did not work with their hands until the restoration of Israel, but also throws much light on how Jews combined work and community in order to preserve both the free status of individuals and the organic character of the social order.

All three works reflect the uniquely Jewish synthetic approach to polity formation and maintenance, one which combines the various elements of living into an organic political whole. As Baeck points out, this pattern stemming from the inseparability of religious and political concerns that was established in ancient Israel, fully prevails today in Israel’s rural settlements. As Martin Buber noted in his study of the kibbutz, Paths to Utopia, both the kibbutz and the moshav embody this combination of political and socio-economic organization for essentially utopian ends. It is discussed also in Melford E. Spiro’s Children of the Kibbutz, reissued in 1965 by Schocken as a paperback, and in Boris Stern’s The Kibbutz That Was which evaluates kibbutz achievements and the social and political impact of the kibbutz on Israeli society. Indeed, the kibbutz remains the most popular Jewish political creation from a publishing standpoint. Among other important discussions in the last two years are Growing up in the Kibbutz by A. Rabin; The Economy of the Israeli Kibbutz by Eliyahu Kanovsky; “Utopia and Politics: The Case of the Israel Kibbutz” by the political scientist Allen Arian; “The Changing World of the Kibbutz” by Allen D. Crown, and “The Changing Kibbutz” by Ronald Sanders.

Reading through the material on political organization, the astute observer immediately senses connections between covenant theory and communal government in Jewish life, even after the biblical period. This connection is made more explicit by Martin P. Golding in “The Juridical Basis of Communal Associations in Medieval Rabbinic Legal Thought.” He discusses institutionalization, by membership consent, of the medieval communities which thereby acquired the powers of the ancient courts under Jewish law.

The writings on the political organization of the American Jewish community pose difficulties unprecedented in the literature of earlier Jewish communal experience. There is an almost total absence of significant research into the operation of the organized Jewish community in the United States. Most published materials are collections of simple demographic data, catalogues of the numerous organizations and their interconnections, or polemical works discussing immediate problems of organized Jewish life. The occasional pieces going beyond these categories are almost invariably historical accounts. An important piece of historical research is Zosa Szajkowski’s “Jewish Relief in Eastern Europe, 1914–1917” which discusses the ideological conflicts that developed out of the attempt to organize American Jewish relief to European Jews in World War I.
Public Law

A subfield of direct concern in the study of Jewish public affairs is Jewish public law. This branch of Jewish law, long the major consideration of Talmudical students, has fallen into a state of some disrepair in the last two generations, with the completion of Jewish emancipation and the destruction of the last remaining corporate Jewish communities in the diaspora. Today, outside of Israel, students and scholars at best devote themselves to the laws regarding the status of Jews within the Jewish community but even this is confined to a relatively small group. In Israel, on the other hand, there is something of a revival of concern with Jewish public law as many Israelis, both in the religious camp and outside, seek to find ways to build the law of the new state upon Jewish jurisprudential precedents. Consequently, most of the published material dealing with Jewish public law appears in Hebrew and is outside the scope of this article. In general, it reflects the search for ways and means to adapt Talmudic precedents to contemporary situations and the ambivalence of those engaged in the enterprise.

The scholarly study of Jewish law as a system of jurisprudence has also been growing. Perhaps the most notable work in this field is Boaz Cohen's *Jewish and Roman Law: A Comparative Study*, a major step forward in the comparative study of the very fundamentals of Jewish law. In a more popular vein, Samuel K. Mirsky's article, "Jewish Codes" presents a history of Jewish codes, together with an analysis of their purposes and a veiled appeal for the development of a new code within the framework of halakhah.

Communal Institutions

If little is available in the way of a general discussion of American Jewish communal organization, there is considerably more material on its various basic institutions. Here too, the material tends to be polemical rather than analytical, journalistic rather than scholarly. The exceptions are worth noting.

The closest thing to an umbrella institution on the American Jewish scene is the Jewish welfare federation, or its equivalent. The role of the federation as more than a fund-raising agency is just now being recognized. In this context, Ben Halpern, an excellent scholar in the field, discusses "Federations and the Community" in an article based on a working paper he prepared for the 1964 general assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the national "federation of federations." His approach is, in many respects, typical of the new-found concern for expanding the role of the federation as the heart of the local Jewish community, with responsibility for the range of vital communal services.

Mannheim S. Shapiro has written extensively on this and related questions in the last few years. In "Dilemmas of Jewish Agencies—Real and Unreal," he speaks with the authoritative voice of an insider about the problems facing Jewish agencies in light of the changing general society. He makes the useful
distinction between agencies which are concerned with the Jews as a group and those dealing primarily with individual Jews. He leads us to the question every agency must face, namely, what is distinctively Jewish and how agencies are responsible for dealing with it. In an earlier article, "The Role of Jewish Communal Agencies in Maintaining Jewish Identity," Shapiro speaks of the communal agency's new role which is no longer simply to bring relief to people made conscious of their Jewishness by external forces, but to stimulate Jewish consciousness in order to create the clientele they are to serve. Jacob Neusner takes a somewhat similar approach from the perspective of a "religionist" in his pamphlet, *Jewish Education and Culture and the Jewish Welfare Fund*.

Looking at another institution, Arthur Hertzberg sparked a great controversy with his article, "The Changing American Rabbinate." Himself a rabbi, Hertzberg argues that the rabbinate today is at an historic turning point because the American rabbi has ceased to be judge and leader, and has become a religious functionary in the more narrow Protestant sense. Viewing the traditional concerns of the rabbinate as increasingly peripheral to American Jewish life, Hertzberg concludes: "There are no great individual rabbinic careers, because there are no shared Jewish purposes on the American scene grand enough to evoke them."

The role of the Jewish community center has also come in for reevaluation in recent years. Herbert Millman's thesis in "The Jewish Community Center as an Arm of the Organized Jewish Community" is that in the highly diverse American society, "the sense of Jewish community is given significant expression, principally through the federation and the functional agencies established to serve the total Jewish community," and that the Jewish community center has been "particularly identified" as working closely with the federation "in nurturing the concept of community." Millman notes, however, that the Jewish communal purpose of the center needs greater clarity of emphasis and definition. Morris Levin also examines "Social Change and the Jewish Center," and in a similar, but longer, work Graenum Berger takes the center position a step further to argue that it is, or should be, a fourth force in American Jewish life, as indicated by the title of his book, *The Jewish Community Center: A Fourth Force in American Jewish Life*. Berger suggests, in effect, that the community center become the congregation of the new secularists.

The problem of Jewish communal organization and services in the open American society with its increasingly activist government has come in for considerable attention at this time of the "Great Society." The publication of the National Conference of Jewish Communal Service, *The Jewish Community Faces the Great Society: Implications for Jewish Communal Service; A Symposium* brings together some views of this problem. Ben Halpern discusses one aspect in "Sectarianism and the Jewish Community" and Arnold Aronson writes about another in "Sectarianism in the American Society Today: Impact on Jewish Communal Services."
In a very different vein are the historical studies of Jewish communal and political institutions. Perhaps the major one to appear in the past two years is Hugo Mantel's *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin*. Though primarily concerned with the development and workings of Jewish legal institutions, this volume sheds considerable light on the political role of the Sanhedrin at various stages of its existence.

**Jewish Public Welfare Institutions**

A major share of the attention given to Jewish public affairs throughout Jewish history has focused on institutions serving the public welfare in various assistance, relief, and rehabilitation capacities. In our own time, the work of these institutions has often constituted the virtual totality of Jewish public affairs in the diaspora, and their problems are therefore of special import in the study of Jewish public affairs. *Trends and Issues in Jewish Social Welfare in the United States, 1899–1958*, edited by Robert Morris and Michael Freund, can be considered the first comprehensive review of Jewish public welfare in this country as an independent communal activity. In commemoration of its 50th anniversary in 1966, JWB sponsored the publication of a volume by Oscar Janowsky and others, *Change and Challenge; the History of Fifty Years of JWB*. Similarly, Oscar Handlin authored *A Continuing Task: The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, 1914–1964*, a short history to commemorate the agency’s 50 years of overseas relief, rehabilitation, and education work.

One of the more scholarly studies of local welfare institutions is Arnold Gurin’s *The Functions of a Sectarian Welfare Program in a Multi-Group Society: A Case Study of the Jewish Welfare Federation of Detroit*. "Organized Jewish Welfare Activity in New York City (1848–1860)" by Nathan M. Kaganoff examines the incorporation papers filed by social welfare organizations with the City of New York during that period, a potential source of important material on Jewish institutional development in the United States.

**Organizations and Interest Groups**

The structure of Jewish community life in America would not be complete without considering the role of Jewish organizations, both national and local. A few exceptionally significant items published in 1965–1966 place Jewish organizational life in a larger perspective. Edward Grusd, editor of B’nai B’rith’s *National Jewish Monthly*, wrote a comprehensive history of *B’nai B’rith; Story of a Covenant*, the chronicle of the first great nonpolitical international organization for Jews from its beginnings in 1844. Gus Tyler’s "The Legacy of the Jewish Labor Movement" examines another facet of Jewish organizational life, albeit one which is dying. Although, as he says, "Yiddish—the mark of the old Jewish labor movement—is almost a dead language" in the American labor movement of today, "the ideals of social
unionism, with which that same movement was identified are today as lively a language as ever." Raw material for Jewish organizational history is provided in two jubilee volumes: *Arbeiter Ring: The Strivings and Achievements* and *The Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations of Maryland, 1916–1966*, the latter being one of the few state-level organizational histories available to students of American Jewry.

**Civic Education**

It is generally agreed that one of the major functions of Jewish educational institutions is to foster what might properly be called civic education. Indeed, it can be shown that, in the United States, the increased interest of Jewish welfare federations in Jewish education is in direct proportion to federation leaders' concern with the problems of civic education. A particular problem is the lack of commitment by the younger generations of Jews, a commitment necessary for the continuation of the federations' operations, and of their related agencies and programs. Therefore civic education, whether defined as the kind of "Torah education" designed to produce an Orthodox "citizen," or the kind of "peoplehood"-oriented education of other groups, ranks very high on the agenda of Jewish public affairs today. The literature of civic education is becoming a vast one, ranging in content from discussions of proper curricula, to questions of first premises, to studies of the receptivity of the population that is to be educated.

One of the best starting points for reading in the field is *Judaism and the Jewish School*, edited by Judah Pilch and Meir Ben-Horin, an anthology of the works of 45 authors published over the past 50 years, which covers the several schools of thought underlying Jewish education in the United States.

Parallel to these ideological considerations is the double debate over the form and control of Jewish education, centering on two questions: the degree of communal responsibility, and the day school versus the afternoon Hebrew school. The most important recent statement on the first is the *Jewish Education* symposium on "The Jewish Community School." Its contributors include supporters and opponents of community schools which they visualize in different ways. Also of interest is the article "Jewish Education and the Community" by Louis Kaplan, one of the deans of Jewish education in the United States.

Alvin Irwin Schiff's volume, *The Jewish Day School in America*, provides us with an optimistic history and survey of the day school movement. Unfortunately, it does not go beyond a compilation of statistics.

The concern for civic education extends deeply into matters of curriculum. Zalmen Slesinger writes on "The Need for Jewish Social Studies Programs," and sets up eight major fields of social studies concern: structure and dynamics of the American Jewish community, unity in diversity (intracommunal pluralism), preserving tradition, relations with Israel, maintaining Jewish society in the United States, community leadership, community fi-
nance, and the Jews' role in general public affairs. These are to be supplemented by second-level studies touching on similar problems in other Jewish communities, current Jewish affairs and problems, and intergroup relations. Meanwhile, the National Curriculum Research Institute of the American Association for Jewish Education has begun publishing experimental editions of specialized curricula in several of these fields. The Concept of Eretz Israel in Jewish Literature and The Concept of Jewish Peoplehood in Jewish Literature appeared in 1965.

With the proliferation of Jewish college students and the attendant discovery of the problems that come from exposure of ill-prepared young Jews to the college environment, a growing literature has developed about the role of Jewish education on the campus. Again, the emphasis is implicitly on civic education in the sense that communal identification and responsibility are considered to be the most important ends of the educational process. By and large, this literature focuses on the role of the Hillel Foundations on campus, either alone or in conjunction with other Jewish movements that have been entering the campus scene in recent years. As a result of numerous studies, the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations themselves have come up with at least a preliminary picture of the Jewish college student today; and some of their findings, very sad, indeed, are reported in Campus, 1966: Change and Challenge. Jewish college students, while much less self-consciously alienated from Judaism, are increasingly more ignorant and indifferent to Jewish life.

At the same time, there is a strong attempt by national Jewish organizations, particularly the synagogue movements, to enter the campus scene, displacing the traditionally communal approach of Hillel. The implications of this development were discussed in a pamphlet published by the 1965 annual conference of Hillel directors, Jewish Pluralism on the Campus and Its Implications for the Hillel Program, Three Case Studies. One remedy suggested for the problem of Jewish ignorance on the campus is the expansion of formal Jewish studies at the university. Efforts in this direction are described in Robert Michaelsen's, The Study of Religion in American Universities and Arnold J. Band's article "Jewish Studies in American Liberal-Arts Colleges and Universities."

Public Personalities

The study of Jewish public affairs would be incomplete without reference to the powerful and not so powerful personalities who are the leaders of the Jewish community; hence biographies of such leaders must necessarily occupy a significant place in the field. But here, too, the kinds of materials that tend to be published often minimize the analytical approach in favor of a more adulatory one.

Two works were published in 1965 on David Ben-Gurion who remains the most frequently portrayed modern Jewish figure. Maurice Edelman, a member of the British parliament, has written David, The Story of Ben-
Gurion, the most frank biography of Ben-Gurion yet to appear. Himself a political figure, Edelman is able to penetrate into the political life of Ben-Gurion, but, in a brief 214-page book, is hardly able to do justice to his long career. Moshe Perlman's book, Ben-Gurion Looks Back, is based on interviews with the ex-prime minister and, thoroughly uncritically, reflects the world through the principal's eyes. Simcha Kling's The Mighty Warrior: The Life Story of Menachem Ushishkin is a brief and generally oversimple biography of one of the great pre-state Zionist leaders.

Considerably more valuable are the recently published biographies of American Jewish leaders. Morton Rosenstock's Louis Marshall, Defender of Jewish Rights focuses on Marshall's role as a Jewish communal leader. Done by a professional scholar, it makes every effort to maintain the standards of scholarship appropriate to the subject. Of a different order, but equally important, is Eli Ginzberg's memoir of his father, Keeper of the Law: Louis Ginzberg, a very personal yet penetrating biography. From it, the personality of one of the great American Jewish scholars of the 20th century emerges quite clearly.

Harold U. Ribalow edited Autobiographies of American Jews, a collection of excerpts from the autobiographies of 25 significant Jewish figures who came to maturity during the period between 1880 and 1920. While not all were leaders in the Jewish community, a significant number of them were, and the others provide us with insights into the development of American Jewish life in the critical period of its formation. Melech Epstein's Profiles of Eleven delineates the lives of leading personalities in the American Yiddish milieu at the turn of the century and immediately thereafter. Concentrating heavily on labor leaders, secularists, and pioneers of Yiddish literature and culture in the United States, Epstein provides us with important insights into the same era from a different perspective.

Several serious biographical essays on rabbinical leaders also appeared during the two years. Bertram W. Korn discusses the life of "The Hacham De Cordova of Jamaica," one of the first rabbis to come to the New World and the author of Emeth V'Emunah ("Reason and Faith"), a defense of revealed religion against the assaults of the Enlightenment. M. David Hoffman's "Charles Isaiah Hoffman: One Hundredth Anniversary (1864–1964)" is a useful contribution to the history of the early years of the Conservative movement, just as Eugene Markovitz's study of "Henry Pereira Mendes: Architect of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America" throws considerable light on the formative years of mainstream American Orthodoxy.

The 25th anniversary of the death of Louis D. Brandeis in 1966 produced a number of articles about his life and role in the Jewish community. Yonathan Shapiro's "American Jews in Politics: The Case of Louis D. Brandeis" is a valiant attempt to develop a larger thesis based on Brandeis's career; it has been subjected to heavy criticism on factual grounds. Rabbi Edgar E. Siskin provides a personal memoir in "Mr. Justice Brandeis: A Rabbi's Recol-
lection" which describes his 1934 visit with Brandeis and gives us insight into Brandeis's hopes for Israel and Zionism and his concern over Soviet persecution of Zionists.

Israel and Zionism

While all topics of concern in the study of Jewish public affairs also include the Israeli dimension, the special place occupied by Israel in the structure of Jewish civilization puts the State of Israel and the Zionist movement in a special category. The sheer volume of material about Israel reveals the special place it occupies in the hearts and minds of Jews. Consideration here must be restricted to recent books, with only passing reference to the most significant items in the periodical literature.

Barnett Litvinoff's *To the House of Their Fathers: A History of Zionism*, like many other comprehensive popular histories of the Zionist movement and the creation of the State of Israel that appeared in recent years, concentrates on the more romantic aspects of its effort and leaves the more serious aspects of Zionist public affairs relatively untouched. Somewhat more probing, though still tailored to the popular market, is *The Jews in Their Land*, conceived and edited by David Ben-Gurion. It is primarily an account of Jewish settlement in the land of Israel from the days of Moses onward, with individual chapters written by political figures, historians, and archeologists, and Ben-Gurion contributing the one on modern Israel. As a history, it is written within the framework of Zionist thought; but because of its unique thrust, it adds to the general knowledge about Jewish settlement in those periods when the Jews were considered by most to have been absent from the land. Marmin Feinstein's *American Zionism, 1884—1904* is a serious study of the formative years of American Zionism.

Of more theoretical interest is Yonathan Shapiro's essay "The Zionist State" which contributes significantly to an understanding of the complexities of Zionism. Shapiro's thesis is that "the essence of the Zionist faith is the need to preserve the distinctiveness of the Jewish people," a theme common to Eastern European and American, as well as Israeli Zionism. Immediate differences in the social conditions and cultural traditions of each, he maintains, led to differences in their responses to that theme.

Norman and Helen Bentwich published another volume on their experiences in Palestine, *Mandate Memories, 1918–1948*, which not only gives us insights into the overall history of the development of Jewish Palestine, but also provides valuable information about the development of the governmental institutions of the Jewish state. In a different vein, Joseph B. Schechtman writes of the *Mufti and Fuehrer*, a study of the relationships between the ex-Grand Mufti of Jerusalem and the Nazis during World War II in their common effort to destroy the Jewish people and prevent the establishment of a Jewish national home. A second book by Schechtman, *The United States and the Jewish State Movement: The Crucial Decade—1939–1949*, chroni-
icles and documents shifts in American policy on Zionism and Palestine in the period between the issuance of the British White Paper and Israel's establishment. It is effectively supplemented by Murray Frank's article "Duplicit
city on Palestine in 1944. Reviewing the State Department papers in
Foreign Relations of the United States, 1944, vol. 5, Frank points to the
"duplicity of the State Department and the White House during that crucial
period" in matters regarding Jewish aspirations in Palestine. Regarding the
struggle for statehood itself, Geula Cohen's Woman of Violence: Memoirs
of a Young Terrorist, 1943–1948 and Colonel Benjamin Kagan's The Secret
Battle for Israel each add some details to our knowledge of that period.

The two years under consideration here saw the inevitable publication of
a number of books on the State of Israel. Among the best of these are Robert
Gamzey's Miracle of Israel, a sensitive and perceptive account by the editor
of the Intermountain Jewish News of Denver, Colorado. Meyer Levin's The
Story of Israel has the dual advantage of having been written by a first-rate
author who has lived much of his life in Israel. A short, politically sophisti-
cated picture of the state is Nadav Safran's Israel Today: A Profile.

More personal, and somewhat more critical, is Israel: The View from
Masada by Ronald Sanders, an editor of Midstream, which is a collection of
his own articles on the contemporary scene. While clearly sympathetic, he
does not pull his punches. Much less revealing is Abba Eban's Israel in the
World, a published version of two television interviews with the Israeli for-
eign minister, in which he very carefully echoes the official policies of his
government on a wide range of issues.

There were several good studies of social change and intercommunity re-
lations in Israel, written by Americans long resident in that country. The
political realm gets some attention in all of them. Judah Matras has a limited
discussion of changing political outlooks in the Jewish population of Pales-
tine and Israel in Social Change in Israel, though his book is primarily about
social change within families. It is particularly useful for the historical stat-
istics he has compiled. Moshe Lissak attempts to relate some of the same
variables to political ideology in "Patterns of Change in Ideology and Class
Structure in Israel." In the very delicate field of intercommunal relations
which has become one of the chief concerns of Israeli public affairs, Alex
Weingrod, an anthropologist who spent many years in Israel studying the
problem in the field, published Israel: Group Relations in a New Society.

The question of the communities relates to the entire problem of post-state
settlement, which, in turn, is tied significantly to the development of the
basic social and political institutions which will be serving Israel for the fore-
sееable future. This relationship has been well illustrated in Professor Wein-
grod's Reluctant Pioneers: Village Development in Israel, a study of post-
1948 immigrants in rural Israel, whose settlement was predetermined by the
Jewish Agency of Israel and who have had to adjust simultaneously to rural
living and to the problems of centralized bureaucratic direction. Viscount
Samuel's article, "Where Did Israel Put Its Million Jewish Immigrants?"
offers a less intimate and more institutionally oriented look at the overall settlement patterns of this immigration. He deals particularly with the expansion of the old agricultural settlements into local councils (the equivalent of townships) and their transformation from the kind of integrated socio-political communities represented by the kibbutz or the moshav, into more politically discrete formal structure. Samuel also discusses the development of new towns, which, as urban centers, never had the kind of socio-political unity characteristic of the rural settlements, and such political problems as over-centralized planning, ministerial rivalries in Jerusalem, and the growing demand for local government on the part of the local residents, which their development brought. An important fact emerging from Samuel's discussion is that the first significant power acquired by the new towns is the power of taxation which, despite the control imposed by the ministry of the interior, gives the local community some concrete means to express its own value preferences.

Two other articles expand on this theme. Dorothy Wilner's "Politics and Change in Israel: The Case of Land Settlement" speaks of "a decline in the intensity of ideology and party loyalty . in recent years," and suggests that their replacement with more concern for practical politics is likely to further the nation's integration. Ernest Stock's "Grass Roots Politics—Israel Style," a study of local politics in Kiryat Gat, the painstakingly planned town in the most comprehensively planned new settlement area in Israel, the Lachish region, traces the emergence of local civic consciousness in a culturally mixed community, and its first strivings for local self government in the face of heavy centralizing pressure from Jerusalem. He shows how the complex of emerging local institutions make Kiryat Gat not merely a simple municipality but a "civil community" with various paths of access to the national government that, in turn, increase local decision-making powers.

Israel remains a fascinating field for inquiry by political scientists, and the years 1965 and 1966 saw their share of books about its government and politics. E. A. Bayne contrasts Israel with three other Mediterranean and Near Eastern nations in Four Ways of Politics: State and Nation in Italy, Somalia, Israel, Iran. Benjamin Akzin and Yehezkel Dror, both researchers in the political science department, Hebrew University, wrote a short monograph Israel: High Pressure Planning. Leonard J. Fein, a political scientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, published "Ideology and Politics in Israel," which is based on sections of his book Politics in Israel. Moshe Czudnowski and Jacob Landau wrote on The Israel Communist Party and the Elections for the Fifth Knesset, 1961.

Shlomo Avineri's study of the party struggle preceding the elections for the sixth Knesset, "Israel in the Post Ben-Gurion Era," places that struggle in a larger context by reviewing Israel's political history before statehood. His analysis of Israeli political processes in light of the voluntaristic origin of the country's settlement leads him to make the extremely important point that its political background is not merely a product of Eastern Euro-
pean culture, but also a direct outgrowth of the autonomous Jewish kehillah with its congregational, republican, and confederal principles which, for many generations, provided the training ground for Jewish political leaders and ultimately influenced those who became Israel's leaders. Avineri sees the dilemmas of contemporary Israeli politics as rooted in the contradictions between the foreign ideological institutions brought from Eastern Europe and the political culture of the Jewish people, and views the present conflict as reflecting a new state of affairs in which the amalgam of Jewish and Eastern European political patterns is no longer effective.

The other major consideration in Israeli public affairs in recent years is the question of the relationship between religions and the state. Here, too, the periodical literature has been voluminous and the amount of seriously reflective material small. A serious discussion of the question was featured in Judaism. Nathan Rotenstreich, professor of philosophy at the Hebrew University, states the case for church-state separation in the liberal pattern in "Secularism and Religion in Israel." Aharon Lichtenstein of Yeshiva University replies in "Religion and State: The Case for Interaction," a cogent discussion of traditional Jewish political theory, providing a halakhic approach to the problem that offers substantial grounding for an interrelationship that does not rest on the political premises of the ultra-Orthodox. Indeed, Lichtenstein provides a useful point of departure for studying the entire question as one of Jewish political theory. Meanwhile, the controversy goes on and continues to evoke comment from the non-Orthodox religious movements in the United States. Two of the more authoritative recent statements are "Judaism in Israel" by Wolfe Kelman and "The Problem of Recognizing the Reform Rabbi in the State of Israel" by Jakob J. Petuchowski.

Joseph L. Bentwich, in a compact book on Education in Israel, devotes considerable space to the function of the school system in developing an idealistic attitude towards public needs and public service, characteristic of Zionist days, within the context of an emerging affluent society. Interestingly enough, he concludes that the best integrated curriculum in the country is to be found in the yeshivahs which, he says, are "far from being a dying relic of the past," but are becoming "a growing force."

Growing concern in Israel over this very problem, over retaining or transmitting the idealism of the pre-state and early state periods into a permanent feature of Israeli life, is discussed by Dwight J. Simpson in "Israel: The State of Siege." Simpson concludes that "The siege mentality, induced by 17 years of isolated existence in a hostile Arab world, has developed to such a point that all Israelis seem increasingly present-minded, with little or no thought of the future."

National, Community, and Area Studies

The study of specific Jewish communities on the national, local, and regional levels is closely related to the field of Jewish public affairs. The char-
acter of the material is varied, ranging from casual travelers' reports to serious social science studies of the organized Jewish communities in most parts of the world. Expectedly, the data on the United States is best, while material on the smaller countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America is sparse indeed. Our focus here will be limited to national, state, and community studies within the United States, of which at least a hundred must have been published in 1965 and 1966.

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL STUDIES


Oscar Janowsky presented a summary reappraisal of the American Jewish community in "A New Look at American Jewry," a digest of relevant statistical information that adds up to a portrait of certain of its quantitative aspects. He goes over familiar ground concerning the acculturation of the Jews and their integration in American society, and then raises the questions, "Do we have cause for complacency? What have we done with our wealth, security, education and leisure?" In his view, there is hope in a saving remnant of committed Jews. However the future holds many problems ranging from the content of Jewish education to those of the growing nonsectarian approach of Jewish service agencies in a community "that regards itself as primarily a religious community." Eli Ginzberg updated his earlier work, *An Agenda for American Jews* in an article "The Agenda Reconsidered." While acknowledging the changes that have taken place in the American Jewish community, he expresses discontent over the limited progress made toward the goals which he had set for it.

In the same spirit of self-examination was the republication of a study of American Jewry in 1872, taken from *A History of all Religions: etc.*, edited by William Burder and apparently written by Sabato Morais, then rabbi of Congregation Mikveh Israel in Philadelphia. Morais's article, titled "Jews of the United States of America," presents a fairly comprehensive picture of the half-million Jews in the United States nearly a century ago: the history of local settlement as it emerged from the variety of their congregations; the differences in rituals, primarily between German and Spanish-Portuguese; the struggle between Reform and Orthodox; the organization of
their charities; their schools and Sunday schools; their attempts and failures to create colleges; their secret societies; their journals and literary associations, and their position in American society as a whole.

Another early analysis and program for the American Jewish community by Isadore Bush appeared under the title, "The Task of the Jews in the United States—1857." Bush, a Prague-born Jew who became a St. Louis banker, politician and communal leader, based his program on two assumptions: that the American political system corresponds "more closely than any other of our days to the spirit of our own Holy Scriptures," and that the Jews must be "champions of light" and a "blessing for all the people on earth." He therefore urged the Jews to venerate the Bible, maintain the unity of the Jewish people, and build their lives and social order on the social principles set forth in the Bible, particularly those regarding limitations on interest, promotion of land distribution and agriculture, and the prevention of usury in land sales.

The growing literature of acculturation of American Jews is beginning to show signs of more sophisticated division into its proper subcategories. Robert D. Cross, a noted non-Jewish scholar, discusses in "Some Reflections on Jewish Immigration" (originally an address to the American Jewish Historical Society) the present state of scholarly thinking about the impact of Jews on the United States. A contemporary account of the coming of the Eastern European Jews by David Philipson, a German-born Reform rabbi, was published as "Strangers to a Strange Land."

Specific studies of particular Jewish groups in recent years have tended to be the province of the German-Jewish organizations in the United States. The Leo Baeck Institute's Yearbook, vol. 10, 1965, contains a detailed article by H. G. Reissner on "The German-American Jew (1800-1850)." The more recent immigrants, refugees from Hitlerism, published the proceedings of their Conference on Acculturation, 1965: Papers Delivered at the First Lerntag of the American Federation of Jews from Central Europe. This small, high-quality publication discusses problems in the United States of Central European Jews in particular, and of Jews in general.

Comparative Americanization has also come in for serious treatment. Rudolf Glanz's Jew and Irish: Historic Group Relations in Immigration is a study of the two groups perhaps most frequently compared. "Acculturation and Identity in American Society: Irish and Jewish Separateness 'Beyond the Melting Pot'" was also the subject of a joint meeting, in 1964, of the American Historical Association, the American Committee for Irish Studies, and the American Jewish Historical Society. The published proceedings contain papers delivered by Irving Greenberg and William V. Shannon, and a discussion by Marshall Sklare. Richard Robbins compares in "American Jews and American Catholics: Two Types of Social Change" their "immigration and ethnicity, social class or mobility, institutional separatism, and problems of minority group status and ethnic prejudice." Robbins's article evoked an
extensive observation by Jacob Neusner in “Jews and Catholics: A Comment.”

In a somewhat similar vein, Bernard J. Coughlin’s book *Church and State in Social Welfare* discusses, among other things, the differences in Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish self-perceptions of their responsibilities in society. He describes the Protestant perception as one of responsibility for the character of society only through changing individuals. By contrast, Catholics feel that their church must become one of the institutions of society, while for Jews, social responsibility is an integral part of their religious system and social philosophy. Tracing the implications of these differences for responses to social welfare issues, Coughlin concludes that all groups generally accept some form of state support of sectarian welfare institutions.

Among recent historical articles one of the most important “The Charleston Organ Case” by Allen Tarshish is a detailed examination of the rise of the Reform movement in Charleston, South Carolina, within a framework of the larger history of Charleston Jewry and, indeed, of Jewish and non-Jewish religious movements in the 19th century. In discussing a major controversy in what was, in 1820, probably the largest Jewish community in the United States, he conveys a sense of the transitions in Jewish and American life as the 19th century moved into full gear. The author’s hints of possible ties between Marrano ideas and Reform tendencies are especially worthy of consideration.

Of the same period is “Mordecai Emanuel Noah’s Ararat Project and the Missionaries” by S. Joshua Kohn who, like Tarshish, discusses a particular aspect of an outstanding event in American Jewish history by placing it in the context of the time and the non-Jewish community. His focus is on the manner in which Christian missionaries picked up the Noah plan for their own purposes.

American Jewish history in the Civil War period is elucidated in Stanley K. Brav’s “The Jewish Woman, 1861–1865” and Joakim Isaacs’ “Candidate Grant and the Jews.” Brav discusses the role of organized Jewish womanhood in maintaining Jewish communal life during the Civil War, even in the smallest communities. Isaacs attempts to show that the concept of the “Jewish vote” emerged for the first time in the presidential campaign of 1868, when the Democrats used it against Grant’s reputed antisemitism.

Evelyn Levow Greenberg’s “An 1869 Petition on Behalf of Russian Jews” sheds more light on the Jewish community’s involvement in American politics in its efforts to protect the rights of fellow Jews. Her emphasis on the connections between the American Jewish protest and protests of Jewish groups in other parts of the world is particularly interesting. Jewish political activities to aid immigrants are chronicled by Esther Panitz in “In Defense of the Jewish Immigrant (1891–1924),” a study of the shift in the attitude of the established American Jewish community from opposition to Jewish immigration in the 1890’s to efforts to prevent closing the doors to immigration in the 1920’s.
Abraham J. Karp, writing on the "Reaction to Zionism and to the State of Israel in the American Jewish Religious Community," traces changes in the reaction of American Jewry to Zionism as reported in the Jewish press from the days of Herzl to the establishment of the State, from one of anti-Zionism to solidarity with Israel. He emphasizes how these changes paralleled other changes in the organization and outlook of the American Jewish community.

Herbert Parzen's "New Data on the Formation of Dropsie College" quotes extensively from letters providing information on the internal maneuverings of the founders of the college. Much of the political struggle was immediately connected with the relationship between the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and the proposed new institution, which indirectly reflected the shifting of the center of American Jewish life to New York.

Increasing consideration is being given to methodological refinements in the study of aspects of American Jewry, particularly in the field of demography. Fred Massarik's "New Approaches to the Study of the American Jew" is a discussion of the research method used in his study of the demography of Los Angeles Jewry. Among the obstacles encountered by the students of American Jewry, Massarik feels, are problems in arriving at an operational definition of Jewishness; little likelihood of obtaining foundation support for research because of the high socio-economic level of the American Jewish community; the American Jewish communal structure which makes the acquisition of funds for, and the conduct of, comprehensive studies difficult; the "personal identity conflicts" of Jewish scholars in the United States which have led them away from research in contemporary Jewish affairs, and the separation of church and state which denies researchers adequate census data. In another article, "Methodological Problems in Jewish Population Studies in the U.S.A.," Gad Nathan examines the needs for demographic research, selected methods that have been used for such studies, and the role the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds should play in promoting such research.

American Jewry is generally studied as if it were one entity. It is beginning to become apparent, however, that there are significant regional differences in American Jewish life. To date, almost the only regional aggregation of Jews to be studied is that of the South which, as in general studies of the country, stands out most obviously. Alfred O. Hero, Jr., writing on "Southern Jews, Race Relations, and Foreign Policy," presents the results of personal interviews with 194 Southern Jews between 1959 and late 1962, as part of a larger study of Southern attitudes on foreign affairs. Louis Berg's "Peddlers in Eldorado" is typical of the other kind of prevailing regional history, the chronicling of the adventures of Jews in the trans-Mississippi West, in this case mainly in California.

STATE AND LOCAL STUDIES

Turning to the field of community studies, we find a wide variety of ma-
terials ranging from filiopietistic chronicles to sophisticated demographic analyses. What is lacking are studies of the way in which the public business of Jews is conducted at the local level in this country. New York City is a case in point: Although it has the largest concentration of Jews in the world and much has been written about its Jewish life, we know almost nothing about the community's public affairs, except perhaps for the period of the ill-fated New York kehillah. Some of the typical 1965–1966 publications about New York City include a guide book, several articles on the lower East Side, published in honor of the Jewish museum exhibit, and a reissue of Hutchins Hapgood's *The Spirit of the Ghetto; Studies of the Jewish Quarter of New York*.

The sampling of Jewish community studies outside New York City reveals the variety of available material and the paucity of serious analytical work being done. The following list is presented on a state-by-state basis. It is, no doubt, far from exhaustive.

**Georgia:** Malcolm H. Stern published "The Sheftall Diaries: Vital Records of Savannah Jewry (1733–1808)" containing family and personal data about the Jews in Savannah and in Georgia as a whole, from the founding of the colony until the 19th century. The *Southern Israelite* of Atlanta published a 40th anniversary issue in 1965 which reviews the development of Atlanta Jewry since 1925.

**Indiana:** An interesting study is Whitney H. Gordon's "Jew and Gentiles in Middletown—1961," a resurvey of the 174 Jews in Muncie, Indiana, the fabled "Middletown" of the Lynds. Predominantly small businessmen, the Jews are particularly active in interfaith work and other civic projects primarily designed to earn them "good will." They face little overt antisemitism but almost all have a strong belief that it exists. On the whole, Muncie's Jews are Reform, heavily assimilationist, and have a great deal of self-hate.

**Kansas:** The *American Jewish Archives* published documents relating to "A Colony in Kansas—1882" that chronicle a chapter of the history of the Beersheba colony, one of the settlements supported by the Hebrew Union Agricultural Society to encourage Jewish immigrants on the land. The documents are Isaac Mayer Wise's "A Humble Plea for a Russian Colony," the diary of a colonist, Charles K. Davis, and M. H. Marks' report to the Hebrew Union Agricultural Society, "Beersheba Colony—an Insured Success." Of course, what the optimistic reports chronicle is the beginning of a complete failure.

**Louisiana:** Louise Matthews Hewitt's *Days of Building, History of the Jewish Community of Shreveport, Louisiana* is a more complete history of a continuing community. While still in the filiopietistic mold, it offers a reasonably comprehensive portrait of a Southern Jewish community of rather long lineage. Also adding to our knowledge about Louisiana Jewry is Bernard Lemann's *The Lemann Family of Louisiana*, a personal memoir of a distinguished Southern Jewish family.

**Michigan** is one of the states furthest advanced in chronicling its Jewish
history. There, a group of Detroit Jews interested in local history have created the Michigan Jewish Historical Society and publish *Michigan Jewish History* biannually. While few of the contributing authors are professional historians, they are all concerned with important historical questions. The June 1966 issue, for example, includes articles on "Forty Years of the Detroit Jewish Welfare Federation" and "The Story of the Adas Shalom Religious School." The United Jewish Charities, a constituent agency of the local federation, sponsored Albert J. Mayer's painstakingly thorough study, *The Detroit Jewish Community, Geographic Mobility, 1963–1965 and Fertility* portraying a highly mobile Jewish community in its most mobile period.

**Minnesota:** Minneapolis is one of the best studied Jewish communities in the United States, both qualitatively and quantitatively. Most recently, Nancy J. Schmidt published a paper on "An Orthodox Jewish Community in the United States: A Minority within a Minority," which focuses on the local Orthodox day school and the parents of its pupils. The Minneapolis community is exceptional in that it has a substantial Orthodox group, despite its relatively small Jewish population, and Miss Schmidt's study tells us much about it.

**Missouri:** Howard F. Sach's article, "Development of the Jewish Community of Kansas City, 1864–1908," reflects an upgrading in the standard of local Jewish historiography.

**New Jersey:** More typical of the kinds of Jewish community studies being published is Charles F. Westoff's *Population and Social Characteristics of the Jewish Community of the Camden Area, 1964* which was sponsored by the Jewish Federation of Camden County.

**New York:** Very different in purpose and style is Joan Gould's "A Village of Slaves of the Torah." Her discussion of New Square, New York, a hasidic colony near Spring Valley, is that of a slightly amazed, reasonably sympathetic outsider viewing a form of American exotica. Still another kind of source material for Jewish community studies is B. G. Rudolph's autobiography, *Tell Me More*, an account of a veteran Jewish leader's experiences in Jewish organizational life, offering some insights into the Syracuse Jewish community and considerable raw data for the future historian.

**North Dakota:** The fascination with putative Jewish agricultural colonies is such that their histories are among the best chronicled in the American Jewish world. Among them is Lois Field Schwartz's "Early Jewish Agricultural Colonies in North Dakota."

**Ohio:** Leo Wiesenfeld's reminiscences, *Jewish Life in Cleveland in the 1920's and 1930's*, provides rarely recorded information about local Jewish public affairs. As former editor of the *Cleveland Jewish World*, he was in the midst of the city's Jewish public life. A different aspect of communal affairs is the subject of Oscar Janowsky's "The Cleveland Bureau of Jewish Education: A Case Study (1924–1953)." Using minutes, reports, and files of the bureau, he constructs the history of educational activities in one community which accepted responsibility for certain aspects of Jewish education.
Of course, limitations of source material prevent him from going beyond a surface picture of the dynamics of bureau operations; but it is a first step. From the perspective of Jewish public affairs, the study enriches our knowledge of the evolution of community involvement in Jewish life through common community institutions.

Rhode Island: Sidney Goldstein's "The Changing Socio-Demographic Structure of an American Jewish Community," a study of Providence, R.I., and its suburbs, is in many respects a model of its kind and an excellent addition to the body of data about Jewish life in the United States, particularly in the light of the excessive claims made for the universality of the findings in the Washington, D.C., and Iowa studies conducted a few years ago. Goldstein's findings indicate a much more traditional pattern of identification among Providence Jewry than among the Jews of Washington or Iowa, showing a higher level of synagogue membership and a greater degree of religious observance with little intergenerational shift in either. They reveal a very low intermarriage rate—less than 5 per cent of the total married Jewish population and only half of that not converted—that is less frequent in the 20-39 than in the 40-59 age group.

Vermont: "Religion in a Northern Vermont Town: A Cross Century Comparative Study" by Louis S. Feuer and Mervyn W. Perrine contains statistics on religious observance of Burlington Jews which, of course, show them to be less devoted synagogue attendees than their Protestant and Catholic fellow citizens are church-goers.

In a more general vein, Lloyd P. Gartner, a most active historian of local Jewish communities, encourages further activity in that field in "The History of North American Jewish Communities, a Field for the Jewish Historian." He suggests possibilities in the field of local history, based in part on his own experiences as collaborator in the series of histories of local Jewish communities now appearing under the auspices of the American Jewish History Center of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Charles Miller's "Research in the Intermediate Community: Its Role and Uses" discusses the kinds of sociological and demographic research that are useful to Jewish welfare agencies and their constituent agencies.

Intercommunity Relations

An aspect of Jewish public affairs, commanding growing attention, is the relationship between the various Jewish communities in the world, particularly between Israel and the diaspora, between the United States and smaller diaspora communities, and the agonizing problem of the relationship between Soviet and world Jewry. To date, most attention has been paid to the first and the last of these. The Soviet-Jewish problem has been widely discussed and its literature well-recognized. We will therefore confine ourselves here to looking at some of the more significant publications dealing with the first. One caveat: the tone of discussion in this field remains overwhelmingly
polemical, and serious study of these problems has yet to be undertaken.

Yitzhak Harkavi's "Israel and the Diaspora: Problems and Cultural Interdependence" examines the problem and the possibilities from the point of view that such a relationship is essential for the preservation of Jewish life, whatever its points of emphasis. On the more negative side, S. Z. Abramov's article, "The Danger of a Religious Split in Jewry" voices concern about the clash between the Orthodox supporters of established religion in Israel and the non-Orthodox and secularists in Israel and abroad and projects some of its possible consequences. On the other hand, Louis Shub discusses "The Diaspora Factor in Israel's Foreign Policy," an exposition of the Israeli government's way of taking cognizance of the need Israel has for close relations with diaspora Jewry.

External Relations

Traditionally, one of the most important concerns of Jewish public affairs has been the relations between the Jewish people and the rest of the world. Indeed, this aspect has been so significant that it has become commonplace to think that all political concerns of Jews, as Jews, are wrapped up in the problems inherent in these external relations. This, we have seen, is emphatically not the case. Nevertheless, the importance attached to this problem is reflected in the sheer volume of written and published material about it. Here we can only identify the major recurrent themes in 1965-1966. The discussion of the place of the Jewish people in modern society has been recurring for uncounted years variously estimated to range from two generations to two centuries. Typical of the kinds of serious material recently published are "Judaism in the Secular Age" by Jacob Neusner and "The Cost of Jewish Survival" by Immanuel Jakobovits. Neusner, a Conservative Jew, explains why he feels that "Judaism is both admirably equipped and completely unprepared" for life in a secular world, while Immanuel Jakobovits, a leader of Orthodoxy, is concerned with the immediately practical question of what Jews must do to survive in the modern world.

Jewish-Christian relations represent another major area of concern, particularly as evolving from Vatican Council II and the ecumenical movement. Responding to certain pressures from Christian groups for dialogue, much of the published material focuses on the possibilities for such confrontations. While, on the surface, they appear to be more theological than political, there are behind the theological statement also clearly political concern about the possibility that true dialogue may touch upon matters offensive to the non-Jewish majority or that ostensible "dialogue" could open the gates to Christian missionary activity.*

* This feeling is supported by the publication of such books as Edward H. Flannery's The Anguish of the Jews: 23 Centuries of Anti-Semitism, a well-meaning study by a Catholic priest who concludes by putting on Jews and Christians "coresponsibility" for antisemitism and virtually whitewashing the New Testament.
Among the most scholarly discussions of this problem is Solomon Zeitlin's "The Ecumenical Council, Vatican II and the Jews." Leon Poliakov, a French Jewish historian, surveys the development of the anti-Jewish mentality in "Anti-Semitism and Christian Teaching." His conclusion, less than startling, is that the original source for persecution "continues to be an interpretation of the New Testament." He discusses the role of Lutheran theology and 19th century German scientism in reinforcing this interpretation, and analyzes long-term trends in light of the Ecumenical Council's action.

Significant for the study of Jewish-Christian relations is the publication of the first two volumes in the ADL-sponsored University of California study of antisemitism in the United States by Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark. Volume one, Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism, is a thorough and scientifically exacting survey on the extent to which different kinds of Christian beliefs influence antisemitic attitudes. The second, The Apathetic Majority: A Study Based on Public Responses to the Eichmann Trial, reveals the large-scale indifference on the part of Christians to the trial, and its implications.

Jews in the Mind of America (New York: Basic Books, 1966) by Charles Herbert Stember and others, perhaps the most thorough scholarly analysis of the evolving Jewish position in the United States, was published under the auspices of the American Jewish Committee. Its emphasis on the role of the political system in determining the place of the Jews as individuals and as a group in American society is pronounced and most appropriate. So, too, is the stress it places on the Jews' needs to establish and respect their own boundaries for self-definition within an open society.

B. Z. Sobel writes on "Protestant Evangelists and the Formulation of a Jewish Racial Mystique: the Missionary Discovery of Sociology." Stepping away from the immediate issue of Catholic-Jewish relations, he looks at the attempts to evangelize and convert the Jews on the part of fundamentalist Protestants and the manner in which they have updated their approach in the light of their understanding of contemporary social science.

One final note. There has been a marked tendency among certain Jewish elements to take the offensive in matters of Christian-Jewish relations as a result of the recent Christian acknowledgment of culpability in regard to antisemitism. Orthodox and neo-Orthodox Jews in particular have begun to raise fundamental questions in print as to how Judaism really threatens Christianity and how it will necessarily and inevitably continue to do so. See, for example, Eliezer Berkovits, "Judaism in the Post-Christian Era."

Much of the American-Jewish literature deals with Negro-Jewish relations. Several symposia on the subject have been published, including "Negro-Jewish Relations in America: a Symposium"; Negro-Jewish Relations in the United States, the product of a conference called by the Conference on Jewish Social Studies, and "Changing Race Relations and Jewish Communal Service: A Symposium." While the first two tend to dwell on highly personal reactions to contact between individuals and masses, the last is concerned
with the response of the organized Jewish community and, most particularly, of its institutions.

In addition, there have been numerous specialized studies of aspects of Negro-Jewish relations. In fact, some of the best social science work on American Jews has been done in this field in recent years. Elijah E. Palnick discussing “Southern Jewry and Civil Rights” makes the point that the Southern Jews have been active in civil rights; but this has become “the best kept secret in Judaism” because they dare not boast of it openly. One recurring theme in this discussion is the idea that Jews and Negroes have much in common as ex-slave and marginal peoples. See, for example, James A. Moss, “The American Jew and the Negro Civil Rights Struggle” and Charles Silberman, “A Jewish View of the Racial Crisis.” Marion Wright, Henry Aaronson, and John Mudd, writing in *New South* (Atlanta, Ga.), one of the umbrella journals of the civil rights movement, offer a proposal with Jewish roots in “Proposed: A Kibbutz in Mississippi,” an idea which has been bandied about in the civil-rights movement for several years and has apparently influenced some experimental efforts at community reorganization among Southern Negroes.


In the second of a two-part article, Hazel Gaudet Erskine analyzes “The Polls: Religious Prejudice, Part II; Antisemitism” reviewing questions on antisemitic issues that were asked in national surveys from 1937 through 1965. She found a decline in incidence of overt antisemitic responses in that period. In a Jewish response to Christian efforts to improve relations, the American Jewish Committee sponsored the Dropsie College study of textbooks, and published *Jewish School Textbooks and Intergroup Relations: Summary of Findings* by Bernard Weinryb and Daniel Garnick.

In the historical realm, Bernard Klein examines “Hungarian Politics and the Jewish Question in the Inter-War Period.” His study takes a good look at the kind of minority group problems that dominated Central Europe, and the failure of “diaspora nationalism” as a viable solution to them. Hans Rogger’s “The Beilis Case: Anti-Semitism and Politics in the Reign of Nicholas II” examines that incident as part of the decay of the Czarist regime. Alex Bein discusses “The Jewish Question and Modern Anti-Semitic Literature; Prelude to ‘The Final Solution’.” Edward A. Synan, in *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages*, develops the thesis that, in many cases, the Popes protected the Jews from external antisemitic pressures.

**The Course of Jewish Public Affairs**

In *The Jewish People in Metamorphosis*, a historical analysis presented as
a B. G. Rudolph lecture at Syracuse University, Moshe Davis discusses the continuing subject matter of Jewish public affairs. In reviewing the changes of the past century, he poses many significant questions that must be considered by students in the field. With the publication of *The Dynamics of Emancipation: The Jew in the Modern Age*, Nahum Glatzer completes his trilogy of readers in the Judaic tradition. While his concern is primarily intellectual and theological, he does make available important sources on matters relating to Jewish public affairs—particularly in the final volume which deals with the emancipation in Europe, the rise of Zionism, and the development of the Jewish community in America.

*The Five Stages of Jewish Emancipation* by Josue Jehouda is a major, though brief, work on the social theory of modern Jewish life and Jewish relations with the larger world. Jehouda, a social theorist in the grand European manner whose works are just now being published in the United States, has rooted his social theory in highly traditional Jewish categories, even though his conclusions are not necessarily those of the traditionalists. In his examination of the course of Jewish emancipation since the 18th century, Jehouda discovers a generational pattern based on four forty-year intervals from Mendelssohn through Herzl, each representing a different stage and, in turn, giving rise to the next stage. Jehouda, writing in the late 1930's, speaks of the needs of the then just emerging fifth stage, that of spiritual revival, in which the Jews rediscover that their lives are healthy only insofar as they recognize monotheism as Judaism's central principle and the unity of their spiritual and temporal goals in a sanctified secularism that is anticlerical but not atheistic. Looking back with the advantage of hindsight some 30 years after his book was first written in its original French, he concludes, not without reason, that something akin to this spiritual revival has become the major concern of this fifth generation since emancipation. Concerned Jews have, indeed, been attempting to infuse spiritual meaning into both the triumphs and disasters of our generation.

The second volume of *The World History of the Jewish People*, edited by Cecil Roth, appeared in 1965 simultaneously in the United States, Great Britain, and Israel. This volume, titled *The Dark Ages 711–1096* and actually numbered as volume 10, offers a major summary of the latest knowledge of the Jews of that period.

Salo W. Baron completed volumes 9 and 10 of his monumental *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. They deal with the late middle ages and the era of European expansion (1200–1650), and together initiate the third great segment of his work. Emphasizing the historical data of Jewish socio-political experience, both within the Jewish community and in that community's relations with the world around it, Baron provides valuable source material for the study of Jewish public affairs, particularly in the realm of external relations.

The large literature of anguish on the Nazi holocaust that continues to appear ranges from highly personal memoirs dealing with the innermost...
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reactions of human beings to attempts to understand the role of Jews qua Jews in the extreme circumstances in which they found themselves. Our concern necessarily lies at the latter end of the spectrum. In 1965 and 1966 the focus was on the Eichmann trial and its meaning. To a great extent, it centered around Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, which was reissued in 1965 in a revised and enlarged edition. Miss Arendt's discussion of "The banality of evil" in which she appeared to be more critical of the Jews for not resisting than of Eichmann and his cohorts, provoked wide controversy in the Jewish world and in the literary world at large. Her criticisms struck to the heart of the entire Jewish ethos. The replies they provoked then were equally sharp. Perhaps the most important is Jacob Robinson's *And The Crooked Shall Be Made Straight; the Eichmann Trial, the Jewish Catastrophe, and Hannah Arendt's Narrative* refuting Miss Arendt's "case," point by point, in a masterful and thorough document that is more in the nature of a legal brief than a book. Gideon Hausner, the prosecutor for the State of Israel at the Eichmann trial, published his version of Israel's actions and Eichmann's guilt in *Justice in Jerusalem*, another work with highly legal overtones. Both volumes were widely recognized as authoritative in the Jewish community, at least partly because of their heavy emphasis on the legalistic approach which has been the traditional manner of Jewish response to questions of public affairs, even among those Jews who do not consider themselves bound by Jewish law.

Turning to accounts of the holocaust itself, only a few of the most relevant materials can be cited here. *To Die with Honor: The Uprising of the Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto* by Leonard Tushnet is one of the best because it not only chronicles the story of the resistance, but provides a detailed, if not an analytic, account of the setting in which the uprising took place: the Warsaw Jewish community in the pre-revolt and pre-war period, with its party system and internal political cleavages which were so important in mounting the operation.

A number of individual community histories of the period also appeared. *Bergen-Belsen, Holocaust and Rebirth: 1945–1965* edited by Sam E. Bloch and published by the World Federation of Bergen-Belsen Survivors as a commemorative work, introduces a haunting chapter in the aftermath of the holocaust. It describes the way in which the Jewish survivors, battered though they were, created a self-governing community on the very site of one of the worst concentration camps. Lucy S. Dawidowicz elaborates on this phenomenon in "Belsen Remembered." The 10,000 Jews who lived in the DP camp at Belsen from 1945 to 1950 created a Jewish police force, Jewish courts, the full range of Jewish religious institutions, Talmud Torahs and secular schools, an adult vocational-educational program, a library, a newspaper, and even a drama studio. A full range of Zionist and non-Zionist parties competed for representation on a democratically elected central committee providing full internal self-government. The Belsen experience, which
was not unique, should lead social scientists to give the study of the reorganization of Jewish communities on the very sites of the concentration camps more attention, not only for its historical significance but as an important potential lesson in the "genius of Jewish politics."

**Contemporary Issues**

Not the least important of the concerns of Jewish public affairs are the contemporary issues facing the Jewish community as a community. A review of the topics considered above makes most of these issues obvious. A few recently published sources may be mentioned here.

One of the acknowledged issues of major importance, Jewish religious unity, is discussed in "Towards Jewish Religious Unity: A Symposium." The participants representing the four main sectors of Judaism in America—Irving Greenberg of Yeshiva University, Seymour Segal of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Jakob J. Petuchowski of the Hebrew Union College, and Mordecai M. Kaplan, the founder of Reconstructionism—agree that unity is not in the offing, but that greater cooperation among the committed Jews could be expected in the future. A more practical view of the problem is provided by Baruch Levine in "Divisiveness in American Jewry: A Case in Point," the chronicle of a controversy over a bequest to Brandeis University for "studying the literature of traditional Judaism," which was challenged by three Orthodox groups on the ground that Brandeis is an heretical institution.

A specific public issue in American Jewry today is the community's attitude on government aid to church-related schools. The position that has become traditional was clearly stated by the American Jewish Congress in *Schools, Subsidy, and Separation: A Statement on Federal Aid to Education*. A newer view endorsing federal aid to church-related institutions is stated with equal succinctness in the *Jewish Observer*, "Brief: Amicus Curiae," the full text of a brief submitted by Agudath Israel of America appealing a New York State Supreme Court decision of August 19, 1966. That decision declared unconstitutional an act permitting the use of public funds to provide nonpublic schools with textbooks (p. 94). Two discussions of the respective positions, which in effect summarize current thought on the subject, are Milton Himmelfarb's "Church and State: How High a Wall?" and Carol Weisbrod's "Church, State and Schools." Miss Weisbrod defends the radical separationist position, while Himmelfarb calls it into question.

In an entirely different vein are discussions of what the Jewish community role should be in the anti-poverty program. Richard G. Hirsch, executive director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations' Commission on Social Action, authored *There Shall Be No Poor*, a thorough discussion of the Jewish attitudes towards poverty and the effective participation of Jewish institutions in fighting poverty in the United States.
Research Approaches and Methods

As the foregoing pages reveal, the great quantity of work touching upon problems of Jewish public affairs offers no substitute for the relative paucity of serious study in the field, despite great opportunities and the urgent need for such study.

Some of those who are involved in the scholarly study of Jewish public affairs have written on the problems of working in the field; several of their articles have already been cited here. Among the others, Howard Morley Sachar, a leading American Jewish historian, discusses in "Objectivity and Jewish Social Science" the new style Jewish history now coming into its own, its virtues, and its implications.

In a different vein, O. Schmelz's article "The Israel Population Census of 1961 as a Source of Demographic Data on the Jews in the Diaspora" reveals how the new statistical tools developed in Israel for reasons of state, combined with the methods of modern statistics, can be used to apply the usual demographic data in the study of a wide variety of Jewish social problems and situations. Professor R. Bachi of the Hebrew University, writing on "Recent Progress in Demographic Research on the Jews," outlines the problems facing demographers of the Jews.

This, then, is a sampling of the 1965-1966 literature bearing on Jewish public affairs. In many respects, it is a summary of questions rather than of answers, a delineation of areas of concern rather than an explication of the nature of those concerns. What should be evident, even from this far from exhaustive sampling, is the vital importance of Jewish public affairs in the spectrum of Jewish life. The literature itself should further indicate that the mere expression of the concerns of Jewish public affairs is one very important way in which the Jewish people enter into their encounter with western civilization and human civilization as a whole.

Daniel J. Elazar
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Jewish Population in the United States, 1966

The Jewish population of the United States is currently estimated at 5,720,000, a figure approximately identical with that reported for 1965. It reflects decreases in population estimates reported for individual communities on the basis of more current studies, as well as the elimination of duplication of community figures from several state totals.

In the past decade, 1956–1966, the totals reported in the successive volumes of the American Jewish Year Book showed an annual average growth rate of just under one per cent. This compares with the average annual growth of 1.5 per cent for the general population in the same period.

The lower growth rate for the Jewish population is compatible with conclusions drawn from individual community studies. However, the very approximate nature of these statistics must be emphasized because we lack both a firm “base” figure of Jewish population and usable statistics on Jewish births and deaths.

In the absence of such data, the estimates for the total United States Jewish population is based upon individual state estimates. These, in turn, are developed from individual community estimates, and adjusted for the unknown population living in communities with a Jewish population of less than 100.

The individual community estimates in Appendix Table 3 were obtained from member federations of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds and from the files of the national United Jewish Appeal. Communities with fewer than 100 Jews have been omitted from this listing. They are, however, included in the state totals and are the base for estimating the unknowns (generally twice the number of known Jews in communities with fewer than 100).

New York City Estimates

The estimates for New York City and Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester counties are kept at 1962 levels (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], pp. 57–59).
1962 estimates were a modification of data obtained from a study conducted for the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies in 1959 (AJYB, 1961 [Vol. 62], p. 53), based on the so-called Yom Kippur technique (school absences on the High Holy Days) and relying in part on the special 1957 U.S. Census of New York City and its suburbs. Estimates for the general population growth in this area, covering the period 1962 through 1966, show an overall 3.5 per cent gain—2.3 per cent in New York City proper and 8.0 per cent in the suburbs. A comparison with the annual rates of increase, based on the excess of reported births over deaths, shows that in- and out-migration continued to be an important factor in population changes.* Thus, New York City's gain in population was below the level of its natural rate of increase (implying a net migration out of the city area); Nassau and Westchester counties are roughly in balance; Suffolk county's rate of growth is far in excess of its natural rate of growth (implying a net migration into the county).

The Jewish population may be assumed to share in these shifts, but the lack of quantitative information makes it impossible to evaluate the numbers involved. This caution should be borne in mind when using the New York City figures cited in Table 1.

**URBAN AND RURAL DISTRIBUTION**

The March 1957 U.S. Census survey on "Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States" indicated that more than 95 per cent of the total Jewish population is distributed in urban areas (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 140).

Almost half (47 per cent) of the estimated total Jewish population in the United States resides in one area, the New York-Northeastern New Jersey standard consolidated area. This includes New York City, its immediate suburbs, and several counties in New York and New Jersey. The counties comprising this area, and their population estimates, are shown below:

**TABLE A. JEWISH POPULATION IN THE NEW YORK-NORTHEASTERN NEW JERSEY STANDARD CONSOLIDATED AREA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York (five boroughs)</td>
<td>1,836,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County</td>
<td>373,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County</td>
<td>131,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland County</td>
<td>8,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris County</td>
<td>2,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County</td>
<td>34,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hudson County ................. 29,375
Bergen County .................. 80,000
Passaic County .................. 25,450
Middlesex County .............. 23,025
Somerset County ............... 2,500

TOTAL .................... 2,687,680

Adding this total to the estimates for the nine next largest Jewish communities (Table 3), we find the combined total to be over 4,400,000, or slightly over three-quarters of the total estimated Jewish population in the United States.

CURRENT JEWISH POPULATION STUDIES

As a result of studies conducted in 1965, estimates for three major communities in the United States were adjusted.* Boston, carried for many years at 160,000, is now estimated—on a provisional basis—at 185,000. Los Angeles increased its estimate from 492,000 to 500,000. Milwaukee, which had maintained an estimate of 30,000 over many years, now estimates its Jewish population at 24,000. Since the full analyses of these studies have not yet been published, a description of their findings is deferred until next year. Preliminary data indicate certain salient similarities with the findings of earlier studies reported in the AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK (Vol. 66, pp. 142—46 and Vol. 64, pp. 59—69). These studies reported a smaller number of Jewish children in the 0-4 age group than in the 5-9 and 10-14 groups. Both Milwaukee and Los Angeles studies show that this trend is continuing.

The Los Angeles community, which owes much of its growth to in-migration, estimates a 53 per cent increase between 1959 and 1965 in the number of persons 60 years and older. The percentage of the total Jewish population in this age group has increased from 12 to 14 per cent.

A characteristic of Jewish communities, which appears to be independent of their size or location, is the high level of secular education. Since educational levels are very highly correlated with socio-economic status, it should be noted that preliminary results of the Boston and Milwaukee studies again demonstrate this finding. For the younger age group, which may be considered indicative of future trends in the Jewish community, Boston estimates that 78 per cent of those between the ages of 21 and 29 have attended college; in Milwaukee, the comparable figure for those aged 20 to 34 years is 83 per cent. The rate of college attendance for all adults is lower because it is affected by the older immigrant generation. But Boston, which distributed its adults by generation, found a college attendance rate of 70 per cent for the third and succeeding generations of all ages. Occupational patterns reported by Boston and Milwaukee are in consonance with these educational

* The author is grateful to the study directors, Dr. Fred Massarik (Los Angeles), Dr. Albert J. Mayer (Milwaukee), and Dr. Morris Axelrod (Boston), for making preliminary findings available to him. Responsibility for the data, as published, is the author's.
statistics, showing a much higher proportion of professional occupations among Jews than among the general population.

In Boston, the number of foreign-born adults was 20 per cent of the total; in Milwaukee it was 33 per cent. These proportions, of course, would be lower for the total population including children. Los Angeles reports that 41 per cent of its heads of household were born outside the United States. The larger proportion of foreign born in Los Angeles is probably due to the in-migration of older persons retiring to Los Angeles.

Alvin Chenkin

APPENDIX

TABLE 1. JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1966

<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>Alabama</td>
<td>9,465</td>
<td>3,517,000</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>272,000</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>20,485</td>
<td>1,618,000</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>3,065</td>
<td>1,955,000</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>650,085</td>
<td>18,918,000</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>23,140</td>
<td>1,977,000</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>103,835</td>
<td>2,875,000</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>512,000</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>808,000</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>143,770</td>
<td>5,941,000</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>25,060</td>
<td>4,459,000</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>718,000</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>694,000</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>283,625</td>
<td>10,722,000</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>23,610</td>
<td>4,918,000</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>7,765</td>
<td>2,747,000</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>3,515</td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>3,183,000</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>16,130</td>
<td>3,603,000</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>8,285</td>
<td>983,000</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>153,415</td>
<td>3,613,000</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>258,485</td>
<td>5,383,000</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>97,995</td>
<td>8,374,000</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>33,225</td>
<td>3,576,000</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>2,327,000</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>80,710</td>
<td>4,508,000</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>702,000</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>1,456,000</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>454,000</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>681,000</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>363,265</td>
<td>6,898,000</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1. JEWISH POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1966 (Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Estimated Jewish Populationa</th>
<th>Total Populationb</th>
<th>Estimated Jewish Per Cent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>1,022,000</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2,518,680</td>
<td>18,258,000</td>
<td>13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>9,155</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>160,720</td>
<td>10,305,000</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>2,458,000</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>9,045</td>
<td>1,955,000</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>444,465</td>
<td>11,582,000</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>21,840</td>
<td>898,000</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>7,085</td>
<td>2,586,000</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>682,000</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>16,680</td>
<td>3,883,000</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>63,925</td>
<td>10,752,000</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,008,000</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2,330</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>35,850</td>
<td>4,507,000</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>13,740</td>
<td>2,980,000</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>1,794,000</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>32,375</td>
<td>4,161,000</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>329,000</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total United States</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,720,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>195,857,000c</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a See p. 231.

b These data are for July 1, 1966 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.

c Total U.S. population, including Armed Forces abroad, was 196,842,000.

### TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF UNITED STATES JEWISH POPULATION BY REGIONS, 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</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>47,962,000</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>3,725,445</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>11,224,000</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>399,035</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Atlantic</td>
<td>36,738,000</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3,326,410</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>54,349,000</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>733,900</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East North Central</td>
<td>38,480,000</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>598,325</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West North Central</td>
<td>15,869,000</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>135,575</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>60,898,000</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>533,695</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>29,220,000</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>402,685</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East South Central</td>
<td>12,910,000</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>41,360</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West South Central</td>
<td>18,768,000</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>89,650</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>32,647,000</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>727,135</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain</td>
<td>7,804,000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>53,075</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>24,843,000</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>674,060</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>195,857,000b</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,720,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Details may not add to totals because of rounding.

b Represents estimates of the total resident population as of July 1, 1966. Total U.S. population, including Armed Forces abroad, was 196,842,000.
TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1966 (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><strong>ALABAMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anniston</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>Dothan</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Huntsville</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Selma</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Citiesa</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Tuscaloosa</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALASKA</strong></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><strong>ARIZONA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARKANSAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blytheville</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ft. Smith</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Hot Springs</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Southeast Arkansasb</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynne-Forest City</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda and Contra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Costa counties</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsinore</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLORADO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danbury</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielson</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middlesex countyc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun City</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare and Kings county</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vallejo</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura county</td>
<td>1,000</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. 502.)
### TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES¹ WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1966 (ESTIMATED) (Cont’d)

<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>FLORIDA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brevard county</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Clearwater</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>2,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Myers</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Fort Pierce</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Hollywood</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>Key West</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lakeland</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Palm Beach county</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pensacola</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Pompano Beach</td>
<td>2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>St. Augustine</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fitzgerald-Cordele</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Valdosta</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td></td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Champaign-Urbana</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Chicago Metropolitan Area</td>
<td>269,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>(incl. in So. Ill.)</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Galesburg</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joliet</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kankakee</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mattoon</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quincy</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rock Island</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elkhart</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garyh</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indianaopolis</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan City</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shelbyville area</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cedar Rapids</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Council Bluffs</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dubuque</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Fort Dodge</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marshalltown</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Mason City</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muscatine</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Ottumwa</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sioux City</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Topeka</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Hopkinsville</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>10,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paducah</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Shreveport</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Lake Charles</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>10,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shreveport</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aroostock county</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bangor</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Biddeford-Saco</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biddeford-Auburn</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>Calais</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brickport</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Easton Area¹</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Hagerstown</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Montgomery county*</td>
<td>46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prince Georges</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Great Barrington</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Haverhill</td>
<td>2,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holyoke</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>Hyannis</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>Leominster</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medway</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>Millis</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newburyport</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>North Berkshire</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Peabody</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsfield</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>Southbridge</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ware</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>\</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1966 (ESTIMATED) (Cont'd)

<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>Battle Creek</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>Mt. Freedom</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay City</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Nashua</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Mt. Holly</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton Harbor</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Newark (incl. Essex county)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>84,500</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>North Hudson county</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>10,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Paulsboro</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron county</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>Penss Grove</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Perrineville</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Mountain</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Perth Amboy</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>Pine Brook</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Plainfield</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Rahway</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>Red Bank</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>Somerville</td>
<td>1,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette county</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>South River</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Clemens</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>1,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskegon</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>Toms River</td>
<td>1,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>White Meadow</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Haven</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>Vineland</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duluth</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibbing</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksdale</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicksburg</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>210</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>650</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>7,000</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>380</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>Dover</td>
<td>315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene</td>
<td>105</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>3,000</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>NEW YORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amenia</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. all Broome county)</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BREMERTON</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>25,000</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>Cortland</td>
<td>195</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>1,450</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>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES\(^1\) WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1966 (ESTIMATED) (Cont’d)

<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>Glens Falls</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>Gastonia</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Altoona</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloversville</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>Goldsboro</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Ambridge</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>Beaver</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Falls</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Hendersonville</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Beaver Falls</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornell</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>High Point</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Berwick</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Kinston</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Bloomsburg</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Highland Falls</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Braddock</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>High Point</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loch Sheldrake-Hurleyville</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Central Bucks</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massena</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Jamestown</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>Chambersburg</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>Coatesville</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Newburgh</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Connellsville</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Donora</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2,381,000</td>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>1,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ellwood City</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greensburg</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogdensburg</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olean</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harrisburg</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneonta</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hazleton</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswego</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Homestead</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parksville</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawling</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnstown</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plattsmouth</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kittanning</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Chester</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Jervis</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Latrobe</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potsdam</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poughkeepsie</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lewistown</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lock Haven</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland County</td>
<td>8,625</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bucks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>county(^2)</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>McKeesport</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monessen</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Springs</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Carmel</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fallsburg</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt. Pleasant</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Castle</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Kensington</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norristown</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walden</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Penn</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oil City</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Philadelphia Metropolitan Area(^3)</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>Oxford-Kennett</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Lake</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Philadelphia Metropolitan Area(^3)</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>Square</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodborne</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Phoenixville</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodridge</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pottstown</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pottsville</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Punxsutawney</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sayre</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>5,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shamokin</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)\(^a\) \(\text{cont’d}\)
### TABLE 3. COMMUNITIES WITH JEWISH POPULATIONS OF 100 OR MORE, 1966 (ESTIMATED) (Cont'd)

<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>Sharon</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>Martinsville</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>Corsicana</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>8,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroudsburg</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>De Witt county &lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunbury</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>1,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniontown</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>Ft. Worth</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Roanoke</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne county</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Harlingen</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chester</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>Kilgore</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsport</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>Laredo</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Lubbock</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawtucket</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>McAllen</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>North Texas Zone &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woonsocket</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Port Arthur</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiken-Barnwell</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>San Angelo</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>Texarcana</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Waco</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangeburg county</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Wharton</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartanburg</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>Wichita Falls</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunter</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Falls</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson City &lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennington</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johnsbury</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH VIRGINIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckley</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluefield</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLESTON</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarksburg</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmont</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington</td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinsburg</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgantown</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkersburg</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weirton</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeling</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloit</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eau Claire</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fond du Lac</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Bay</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitowoc</td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinette</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>23,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshkosh</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheboygan</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wausau</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Florence, Sheffield, Tusculumbia.
<sup>b</sup> Towns in Chicot, Desha, Drew counties.
<sup>c</sup> 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, Whiting.

‖ Towns in Caroline, Kent, Queen Anne’s, Talbot counties.

1 This is 12,000 higher than the total reported for 1964. However, no information is available on the distribution of this increase among the listed towns comprising Bergen County. Earlier population estimates for these towns (including surrounding localities), based on 1964 data, are carried in Table 3, AJYB (1966, vol. 67), p. 88.

The is 12,000 higher than the total reported for 1964. However, no information is available on the distribution of this increase among the listed towns comprising Bergen County. Earlier population estimates for these towns (including surrounding localities), based on 1964 data, are carried in Table 3, AJYB (1966, vol. 67), p. 88.

2 For lack of new data, 1962 estimates are maintained. See text.

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

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

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

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

q Includes communities also in Colorado, Fayette, Gonzales and La Vaca counties.

r Denison, Gainesville, Greenville, Paris, Sherman.
Jewish Intermarriage in Indiana

The present study of Jewish inmarriage and intermarriage patterns in Indiana is a continuation of the author's earlier studies of assimilatory tendencies in the American Jewish community.\(^1\) It should however be emphasized at the outset that Indiana as well as Iowa (in the 1963 study) were selected for analysis because pertinent data are available only for them. In no way are they to be considered as samples, representative or otherwise, of Jewish assimilationist tendencies in the United States.

The study analyzes the data in the Indiana marriage record forms\(^2\) for the years 1960\(^3\) through 1963. The availability of detailed information about the groom's and bride's usual place of residence, the locality where application for the marriage license was made, and the place where the marriage was solemnized, made possible an ecological analysis,\(^4\) that contributes significantly to our understanding of the formation of Jewish inmarriages and intermarriages. The analysis further reveals the need to reevaluate the relationship between intermarriage and divorce. It has been generally observed that intermarriages were more likely to lead to divorce than inmarriages, and the more frequent failure of intermarriages has been attributed to the religio-cultural differences of the spouses. The Indiana data indicate that many intermarriages occurred after one or both spouses had terminated a previous marriage by divorce and that, therefore, this factor will have to be considered in determining the cause of frequent failures of intermarriages.


\(^2\) The writer would like to acknowledge the cooperation of K. G. Ely, director of Vital Records, Indiana State Board of Health, who kindly made available copies of all records involving a Jewish marriage, and of Thelma E. Thompson, supervisor of its tabulating section, who graciously arranged for the sorting and duplicating of these records. Louis Lieberman, lecturer in the department of anthropology-sociology at Queens College, undertook a preliminary exploration of the data. In close cooperation with the author, Mrs. Marion Gold, teaching assistant in the department, conscientiously and cheerfully performed the many tedious sorting and counting operations. Mr. Eric Lehrman, Graduate Fellow in the Department, also aided in this task. It is with special pleasure that the author records the assistance rendered by his daughter Barbara in the preparation of the tables.

The writer would like to dedicate this paper to the memory of two of his graduate-school instructors, William F. Ogburn and Samuel A. Stouffer, who pioneered in the quantitative study of marriage and family life.

\(^3\) This was the first full year in which information on religion was recorded on a state-wide basis. See D. Jean Pavela, “An Analysis of Mixed and Non-Mixed Marriages in Indiana During 1959” (Purdue University, unpublished master's thesis, 1962), p. 3.

\(^4\) To the best of the author's knowledge, this type of analysis had, heretofore, been limited to the other two branches of vital statistics—fertility and mortality.
NATURE OF THE STUDY

The Data

The data to be analyzed here are taken from 785 marriage records, the total number of all marriages involving Jews in Indiana in a four-year period. The Indiana Marriage Record Form which is virtually identical with the standard report form developed by the National Vital Statistics Division of the U.S. Public Health Service, contains the standard questions on usual residence, age, birthplace, race, previous marital history, and usual occupation. In addition, however, it also secures information on religion, in compliance with an act of the 1958–1959 Indiana state legislature. This item is pre-coded in a manner that gives each groom and bride one of three choices: “Catholic,” “Jewish,” or “Protestant.” Persons who do not fall within these categories can specify “other.” Eleven grooms and 10 brides did not specify their religion, and were classified as “unknown”; six grooms and five brides checked the “other” category. Both categories were included in this study as “non-Jews.”

Intermarriage: Definition and Measurement

A couple is considered to be intermarried if one spouse professes a religion different from that of the other. Persons who changed their religion before marriage in order to conform to the religion of their future spouse are considered to be inmarried. The intermarriage rate for Jews is computed by determining the ratio of intermarried couples to the total number of marriages, Jewish marriages, i.e., in which one or both partners are Jewish.

The analysis of the Indiana marriage records measures the formation of intermarriages. An average intermarriage rate of \( x \) per cent, means that of all Jewish marriages that were solemnized during the period studied, \( x \) per cent were intermarriages. It does not mean that \( x \) per cent of all Jewish families in Indiana are intermarried.

EXTENT OF JEWISH INTERMARRIAGE

In the past we had to be satisfied with few measures of intermarriage. Predominant among them was the overall, or crude, rate showing “the frequency
of events throughout the entire population, without regard to any of the various smaller groupings that are sometimes used for better observation." 10 The availability of information on the usual residence of groom and bride made it possible to supplement the crude rate with a large number of area-specific rates.11

**Crude Rate**

The listing of all Jewish inmarriages and intermarriages recorded by the Indiana State Board of Health (Table 1) shows that the total number of intermarriages ranged from 175 in 1960 to 232 in 1963, from a low rate of 46.3 per cent in 1960 to a high of 51.7 per cent in 1962, indicating a crude average intermarriage rate of 48.8 per cent. Since the intermarriage rate appeared to fluctuate at random during this period, the further analysis of the data will proceed without regard for the year in which the marriage occurred.

### TABLE 1. TOTAL AND JEWISH MARRIAGES, INDIANA, 1960–63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Indiana marriages</th>
<th>Jewish marriages</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In-marriages</td>
<td>Inter-marriages</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In-marriages</td>
<td>Inter-marriages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>42,050</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>42,302</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>43,464</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>45,992</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>173,808</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indiana State Board of Health.

### State Specific Rates

Information on the usual residence of groom and bride revealed that within the overall levels of 51.2 per cent of inmarriages and 48.8 per cent of intermarriages three ecological groupings are hidden, each with its own distinct level of inmarriage and intermarriage: 1) extrastate marriages, with both groom and bride usually residing outside Indiana; 2) interstate mar-

---


11 The author is aware that the validity of information on usual residence has been examined. (See, for example, Alfred C. Clarke, "An Examination of the Operation of Residential Proximity as a Factor in Mate Selection," *American Sociological Review*, February 1952, pp. 17–22.) Since none of the earlier studies explored the location and residential movement of couples with one partner usually residing across state or county lines, the residence data will have to be accepted at face value. Once the residential distribution is presented, it will become apparent that these data do have a high degree of validity.
riages, with one partner from outside the state, and 3) intrastate marriages, with both partners usually residing within the state. Table 2 shows that extrastate and interstate marriages, each, constitute fully one-fifth of all Indiana marriages; intrastate marriages, slightly less than three-fifths.

Table 3 reveals that, among these three groups, the extrastate couples have the highest level of intermarriage (67.4 per cent); the interstate couples the lowest (29.8 per cent), and intrastate couples an intermediate level (49.0 per cent).

### TABLE 3. JEWISH MARRIAGES BY USUAL RESIDENCE, INDIANA, 1960–63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of marriage</th>
<th>All Indiana marriage records</th>
<th>INDIANA RESIDENTS</th>
<th>Both spouses out of state residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarriage</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriage</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>785</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indiana State Board of Health.

### INTERMARRIAGE AND EXTRASTATE MARRIAGES

It is obvious that one can no more burden the Jewish population of Indiana with the intermarriage rate of couples usually residing outside the state than one can include out-of-state T.B. patients in computing the morbidity rate of the permanent population of Denver, Colorado. But since these couples
constitute one-fifth of all Jewish couples who get married in Indiana, a discussion of why they come into the state for this purpose is to the point.

Licensing Restrictions

Traditionally, couples have crossed state lines to take advantage of more lenient regulations. The absence of a waiting period between the application for a license and its issuance or of a premarital physical examination requirement entices couples to "Gretta Greens" across state lines. At times, also, they get married in the contiguous state because its marriage license bureau is more accessible than that in their home state.

A comparison of the requirements for the issuance of a marriage license in Indiana with those in the contiguous states shows that Indiana offers no advantages to residents of Illinois and Michigan. On the contrary, Indiana has a three-day waiting period, while Illinois has none; Indiana men can marry without parental consent only at the age of 21, as compared with 18 in Michigan. On the other hand, women from Ohio and Kentucky can marry in Indiana without parental consent at the age of 18, while they can do so only at 21 in their home states. In addition, Ohio imposes a five-day waiting period, as compared with three days in Indiana (see Table 4).

| TABLE 4. REQUIREMENTS GOVERNING THE ISSUANCE OF MARRIAGE LICENSES IN INDIANA AND NEIGHBORING STATES |
| State   | Legal minimum marriage age | Waiting period |
|         | With parental consent | Without parental consent | Blood test required | Between application for, and issuance of, license | Between issuance of license and performance of marriage |
|         | M | F | M | F | | |
| Indiana | 18 | 16 | 21 | 18 | Yes | 3 days | none |
| Illinois | 18 | 16 | 21 | 18 | Yes | none | none |
| Michigan | 18 | 16 | 18 | 18 | Yes | 3 days | none |
| Ohio    | 18 | 16 | 21 | 21 | Yes | 5 days | none |
| Kentucky | 18 | 16 | 21 | 21 | Yes | 3 days | none |


An examination of the data reveals that there is no correlation between the strictness of licensing procedures and the crossing of state lines. Although Illinois and Michigan put fewer obstacles in the path of couples who want to get married than does Indiana, Lake county (contiguous to Chicago, at the northwesternmost border of the state) has the largest number (50) of nonresident marriages; Steuben county (contiguous to Detroit, at the north-

easternmost corner of the state) ranks second, with 27. Both are "Gretna Greens" of long standing. At the same time, only 20 nonresident couples were married in Wayne county (contiguous to Dayton, Ohio) and 14 in Dearborn county (near Cincinnati, Ohio), despite the more stringent regulations in Ohio.

**Family and Community Pressures**

However young couples may elope and marry in another state for reasons other than licensing restrictions. The considerably higher intermarriage rate for nonresident marriage partners than for inter- or intrastate marriage partners leads to the assumption that the desire to overcome familial and communal pressures against intermarriage may be causally related to elopement. Since we are not in a position to ask the nonresident marriage partners why they crossed state lines to get married in Indiana, we must resort to an operational definition of elopement. For our purposes, a couple has eloped if the following conditions are present: 1) the usual residence of both groom and bride is outside Indiana; 2) the birthplace of both groom and bride is outside Indiana; 3) the marriage license is issued in a border county of Indiana; 4) groom and bride are married in a civil ceremony. (The

| TABLE 5. MARRIAGES OF EXTRASTATE RESIDENTS BY USUAL RESIDENCE PLACE OF BIRTH, COUNTY OF ISSUANCE OF MARRIAGE LICENSE, AND TYPE OF CEREMONY, INDIANA, 1960-63 |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Type of marriage                          | Both groom's and bride's | Birth place outside Indiana | Marriage license issued in border county | Civil ceremony |
|                                            | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent |
| Inmarriage                                 | 55     | 32.5     | 37     | 27.6     | 31     | 26.5     | 23     | 23.0     |
| Intermarriage                              | 114    | 67.4     | 97     | 72.4     | 86     | 73.5     | 77     | 77.0     |
| Jewish groom                               | 66     | 39.0     | 58     | 43.3     | 50     | 42.7     | 44     | 44.0     |
| Jewish bride                               | 48     | 28.4     | 39     | 29.1     | 36     | 30.8     | 33     | 33.0     |
| Total                                      | 169    | 100.0    | 134    | 100.0    | 117    | 100.0    | 100    | 100.0    |

Source: Indiana State Board of Health.

13 Ibid., Table 17, p. 51.

14 Among others, Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines "elope" as "to run away with the unannounced intention of getting married," and gives as an example the phrase, "she eloped with her second cousin and they were married in the next state" (1961, p. 737).

15 The complementary assumption must be that couples who are fully emancipated or whose parents are not opposed to intermarriage marry in their places of residence.

16 A further restriction, "divorce or separation within five years of marriage, especially if no children had been born," which has been suggested by Samuel A. Stouffer ("Effects of the Depression on the Family," in Social Research to Test Ideas [New York, 1962], p. 140), could not be applied because of lack of divorce data.
second and third restrictions are aimed at minimizing any ties to localities in Indiana.) When these restrictions were applied to the data (Table 5), it became apparent that the intermarriage rate rises as one gets closer to the full definition of an eloped couple, pointing to a causal relationship between extrastate marriages and intermarriage.

The exclusion from the total nonresident marriages of partners whose place of birth was Indiana, and therefore may still have had some ties in the state, significantly raised the intermarriage level by 5 points, from 67.4 to 72.4 per cent. By contrast, limitations governing the issuance of marriage licenses raises the percentage by only 1 more point, to 73.5. However, the additional restriction of marriage in a civil ceremony increases the intermarriage rate by another 3 per cent, to 77 per cent. It still remains to be explained why about one-fourth of those who elope marry within their religious faith. Parents may, of course, object to the prospective son- or daughter-in-law on grounds other than religion. Some elopements may also be spurious: the couple “elopes” with the parents’ knowledge and consent in order to escape a formal wedding.

For the same or similar reasons, Jewish couples usually residing in Indiana doubtless elope to neighboring states, and their intermarriage rate is part of the Indiana picture. Although there is no way to arrive at an estimate of their number, it must be infinitesimally small compared to the 169 extrastate couples from Chicago, Detroit, Cincinnati, Louisville, Dayton, and Toledo, with a combined estimated Jewish population of 415,000 (Indiana’s Jewish population is about 23,000).

INTER- AND INTRASTATE MARRIAGES

Allocation of Interstate Marriages

It is clear that marriages of eloped couples from contiguous states cannot be allocated to the resident population of Indiana. It is equally clear that marriages in which both partners are usual residents of the state are generated by its Jewish population. The question then is to which state should one allocate marriages between instate and out-of-state residents. The fact that, of the total of 616 intra- and interstate marriages, 171 (or 27.7 per cent) are interstate would indicate that interstate marriages constitute a significant practice among the Indiana Jewish population.17

A closer analysis of interstate marriages reveals that the recorded number of interstate marriages understates very considerably the significance of this practice. Table 6 reveals that in 143 of the 171 marriages the groom did not usually reside in Indiana, and that in only 28 cases did an Indiana boy bring home a bride from out of state. The recorded preponderance of pairs with the

17 For these reasons the detailed analysis of intra- and interstate marriages will be made jointly.
TABLE 6. MARRIAGE RATES FOR COUPLES WITH ONE SPOUSE INSTATE RESIDENT, INDIANA, 1960-63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of marriage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Bride instate, groom out</th>
<th>Groom instate, bride out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarriage</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriage</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indiana State Board of Health.

The groom from out-of-state is due to a technicality related to the place where the wedding is held. Since it is customary for the bride's parents to make the wedding and since a wedding requires a license of the state where it is held, most of the marriages between Indiana grooms and out-of-state girls are recorded by the Indiana State Board of Health. (The marriage of a girl from Fort Wayne to a young man from Elgin, Ill., is recorded in Indiana, although this couple will most likely live in Illinois. But the marriage of the girl's brother, who owns a business in Fort Wayne and imports his bride from Peoria, Ill., will most likely not be recorded in Indiana.) The state licensing procedure, therefore, does not provide for recording the "true" number of interstate marriages by Indiana residents.18

**Interstate Marriages Are Arranged Marriages**

The analysis of extrastate marriages (p. 246) led to the conclusion that most of them were elopements. It was also found that these impulsive marriages produced a very high level of intermarriage. By contrast, it must be assumed that interstate marriages, which have the lowest level of intermarriage, are what might be called "arranged" marriages—the result of the conscious effort to find a Jewish marriage partner. In some instances the marriage may have been arranged in the literal sense of the word. In others, husband and wife may have met in residential colleges or in summer resorts which are often selected with that end in mind.

Table 6 reveals that there is a considerable difference (11.3 per cent) in the levels of intermarriage between couples where the bride is from Indiana (28.0 per cent) and where the bride is from out-of-state (39.3 per cent). To

---

18 If one assumes that the number of grooms who marry out-of-state brides equals the number of brides who marry out-of-state grooms, 143 such marriages are not recorded. If the "true" number of interstate marriages is 286 (twice the number recorded for interstate brides) then the "true" proportion of interstate marriages in relation to the total number of inter- and intrastate marriages is 39.1 per cent, rather than the observed 27.7 per cent.
this writer this differential comes as no surprise. It indicates that couples who tend to adhere to tradition in the selection of a marital partner also tend to adhere to convention in the selection of the place of marriage, namely the bride's home.

**Jewish Population of Indiana**

A deeper understanding of the factors contributing to the formation of inmarriages and intermarriages in Indiana will be gained from a knowledge of the size and distribution of the Jewish population of the state. Since the decennial population census does not list the religion of the American people, no official population statistics are available for the Indiana Jewish community. Current estimates vary from a high of 24,700 for 1960 to a low of 23,305 for 1962, representing about .5 per cent of the state's total population.¹⁹

The general settlement pattern of Indiana Jews, like that of the Jews throughout the United States, is concentration in the large urban centers. Over 80 per cent (Table 7) live in the five largest of the state's eight urbanized areas: ²⁰ Indianapolis, Gary-Hammond, South Bend-Mishawaka, Fort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urbanized area</th>
<th>Total population, 1960</th>
<th>Estimated Jewish population, 1962</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>639,340</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary-Hammond</td>
<td>478,946</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>218,953</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>179,571</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>18,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>143,660</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>19,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>23,305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


²⁰ “To improve its measure of the urban population, the Bureau of the Census adopted, in 1950, the concept of the urbanized area . . . to provide a better separation of urban and rural population in the vicinity of the larger cities . . . An urbanized area contains at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more in 1960, as well as the surrounding closely settled incorporated places and unincorporated areas . . . which together constitute its urban fringe.” U.S. Census of Population, 1960: Number of Inhabitants, Indiana. (Final Report PC (1)-16A 1961), pp. VI and VII. For maps of the urbanized areas in Indiana, *ibid.*, pp. 28–31; also Figure 1.
Figure 1. COUNTIES, PLACES WITH POPULATION OF 25,000 OR MORE.

Source: UNITED STATES CENSUS OF POPULATION, 1960.
Wayne, and Evansville. It will be noted that, as these areas decrease in size, so does the Jewish population. The largest aggregation is in Indianapolis (approximately 8,500), the smallest number in Evansville (1,225).

**County Specific Rates**

The intra- and interstate marriage record data for the state are presented here to reflect their relationship to the size of the Jewish communities. They are divided into one set for the five counties where the Jewish population is concentrated—Marion (Indianapolis), Lake (Hammond-Gary), Saint Joseph (South Bend-Mishawaka), Allen (Fort Wayne), and La Porte (Michigan City)—and a second set for the remaining 87 counties. Part A of Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of marriage</th>
<th>Total State</th>
<th>Five Counties²</th>
<th>Remainder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. All intra- and interstate marriages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarriages</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriages</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Intra-state marriages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarriages</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriages</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Interstate marriages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarriages</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriages</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indiana State Board of Health.

² Marion, Lake, St. Joseph, Allen and La Porte counties.

²¹ Since La Porte county (with a Jewish population of 500 in Michigan City) recorded more Jewish marriages than Vanderburgh county (Evansville, Jewish population 1,150) La Porte is grouped with the four major Jewish settlements.
shows that 490 (79.5 per cent) of the 616 intra- and interstate marriages in
the state were solemnized in the five counties listed above. The remaining 87
counties generated only 126 such marriages during the same period. A com-
parison of the county distribution of intrastate marriages and interstate mar-
riages (parts B and C of Table 8) show them to be virtually identical (and
confirms the soundness of the decision to treat both types together). Of 445
intra-marry marriages, 355, or 79.8 per cent, were solemnized in the five coun-
ties; the corresponding percentage for interstate marriages was 78.9 (135 out
of 171).

By separating the five major Jewish communities from the minor settle-
ments and the scattered Jewish population we can ascertain their respective
marriage levels. According to Part A of Table 8, their intermarriage levels
are diametrically opposed: an intermarriage rate of only 38.6 per cent in the
five counties, as compared with an in-marriage rate of only 36.5 in the re-
mainder of the state. To express it in different terms: In the five major Jewish
communities of Indiana about two-thirds of Jewish marriages recorded were
inmarriages, while in the remaining counties two-thirds of Jewish marriages
were intermarriages.

What is the significance of these rates for the survival of the small com-
munities? It has been calculated that a random choice of marriage partners
by Jews would yield an intermarriage rate of 98 per cent.22 Therefore it
would appear that even among the so-called small-town Jews of Indiana full
random selection of marriage partners is not practiced. Still, an intermarriage
formation rate of 63.5 per cent supports earlier observations about the disap-
pearing small-town Jew.23 In contrast, an intermarriage level of 38.6 per
cent in the five major Jewish settlements suggests a concerted effort toward
group survival. One of the devices employed to keep the younger generation
within the Jewish group is examined below.

Mobility and Intermarriage

The overall intermarriage rate of 38.6 per cent in the five counties is a
combination of two distinctive sets of rates: an interstate intermarriage rate
of 22.2 per cent and an intrastate marriage rate of 44.8 per cent (Table 8,
Parts C and B).24 The finding that interstate marriages produce only half
as many intermarriages as do intrastate marriages leads to the inference that
it is the objective of interstate marriages to produce inmarriages. The selec-
tion of a partner from across state lines is a conscious effort to find a Jewish
spouse.

22 Paul C. Glick, "Intermarriage and Fertility Patterns Among Persons in Major Religious
24 The lower intermarriage rate for interstate marriages lowers the total level of intermar-
riages by only 6 per cent (from 44.8 per cent for intrastate marriages to the overall intermar-
riage rate of 38.6 per cent) because interstate marriages constitute only 27.7 per cent of the
combined groups.
An examination of the relationship between inter-county and intra-county marriages (Table 9, Part A) showed a tendency similar to that on the state level. In the five-counties area, the inter-county intermarriage rate was 35.2 per cent, as compared with 46.5 per cent for intra-county marriages, with a combined level of 44.8 per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Marriage</th>
<th>Both in same county</th>
<th>Both not in same county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 counties</td>
<td>Remainder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarriage</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriage</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>301</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Both born in Indiana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Marriage</th>
<th>Both in same county</th>
<th>Both not in same county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 counties</td>
<td>Remainder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarriage</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriage</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. One born in Indiana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Marriage</th>
<th>Both in same county</th>
<th>Both not in same county</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 counties</td>
<td>Remainder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarriage</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriage</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indiana State Board of Health.

An examination of the effect of the state of the marriage partners' birth on intermarriage yielded interesting data. Since interstate and inter-county marriages have lower intermarriage rates than intrastate and intra-county marriages (all based by definition on usual residence) one should expect a lower intermarriage rate for marriages with one partner born outside the state than for marriages with both partners born in the state. A comparison of Parts B and C of Table 9 reveals that this was true of only one of the four
groups: of marriages in the remaining counties where both partners' usual residence was in the same county. In all other groups, marriages with one partner born outside the state showed a higher intermarriage rate than those with both partners born in Indiana (56.8 as against 36.5 per cent; 28.6 as against 16.7 per cent; 85.7 as against 50.0 per cent).

Why should individuals who migrate to the five counties and establish usual residence have a higher intermarriage rate than the native-born residing there? There are several explanations for this. Some in-migrants may not want to have ties with the Jewish community, and may even go to some length to avoid them. Others, who would like to establish contacts with the Jewish community may not succeed in doing so. Their age, occupation, or social status may keep them from becoming part of a social set or clique. As the mobility of the American people increases, there will undoubtedly be a greater need for "social engineering," i.e., community organization which would help in-migrants become part of their cultural group.25

**Jewish Community Characteristics and Intermarriage**

An inverse relationship is presumed to exist between intermarriage and the size of the Jewish community (the number of Jews in a given locality); its density (the ratio of the Jewish population to the total—Jewish as well as non-Jewish—population of the area), and the degree of its voluntary segregation (the concentration of Jews in residential neighborhoods). The greater the size, density, and voluntary segregation, the lower will be the level of intermarriage.

The data at our disposal makes it possible, for the first time, to demonstrate the overall effect of size upon the extent of intermarriage.26 Table 10 reveals that the intermarriage rate increases as the size of the Jewish community decreases. In Marion county the intermarriage rate was only 34.5 per cent, while in Allen and La Porte counties the rate rose to 54.3 and 54.5 respectively. At the same time, the tabulated information demonstrates graphically the abrupt and almost identical decline of vitality in Jewish communities of less than 3,000, in spite of deviations within this range.

The information also reveals in considerable detail the components of the marriage market. It shows that marriages of Indiana brides to out-of-state grooms greatly bolster the inmarriage rate. The fact that this is not the case in La Porte county, the smallest community with a Jewish population of 500, highlights a general condition: with the decreasing size of Jewish com-

25 At a meeting devoted to a discussion of the author's study of "Jewish Intermarriage in Greater Washington" (AJYB, Vol. 64 [1963], pp. 15-33), a Washington resident complained bitterly that the Jewish community had failed to spread the welcome mat for newcomers.

26 For the state of Iowa, where this relationship could be measured only indirectly by dividing cities and towns according to size, it was found that in cities with a population of 10,000 and over, where the larger Jewish communities are located, the intermarriage rate was only 34.2 per cent; in towns under 10,000 it was 64.1 per cent (Rosenthal, "Jewish Intermarriage . . .," loc. cit., p. 40).
TABLE 10. INMARRIAGES AND INTERRMARRIAGES IN SELECTED JEWISH COMMUNITIES, INDIANA, 1960-63
(INTRA- AND INTERSTATE MARRIAGES)

Usual residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of marriage</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Groom and bride same county</td>
<td></td>
<td>Groom specified county, bride different county</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bride specified county, groom different county</td>
<td></td>
<td>Groom specified county, bride out of state</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bride specified county, groom out of state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marion County (Indianapolis); estimated Jewish population: 8,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmarriage</th>
<th>169</th>
<th>65.5</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>58.1</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>75.0</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>73.3</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>100.0</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>78.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriage</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lake County (Hammond and Gary); estimated Jewish population: 5,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmarriage</th>
<th>72</th>
<th>62.1</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>56.1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>75.0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>44.4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>77.8</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>75.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriage</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont'd)
Saint Joseph County (South Bend and Mishawaka); estimated Jewish population: 3,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inmarriage</th>
<th>Intermarriage</th>
<th>Jewish groom</th>
<th>Jewish bride</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allen County (Fort Wayne); estimated Jewish population: 1,225

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inmarriage</th>
<th>Intermarriage</th>
<th>Jewish groom</th>
<th>Jewish bride</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

La Porte County (Michigan City); estimated Jewish population: 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inmarriage</th>
<th>Intermarriage</th>
<th>Jewish groom</th>
<th>Jewish bride</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indiana State Board of Health.
munity, the components of the marriage market either fade away or become negative. Here then is the statistical documentation for the depiction of Jewish communal life and of the marriage market in small Jewish communities, as presented by the author in an earlier study.27

Religion of Non-Jewish Grooms and Brides

The question arises whether Jewish men and women who intermarry have a preference for spouses of a particular religion. Table 11, which presents data for intrastate marriages, indicates that for every geographic area Protestants constitute at least 70 per cent of all non-Jewish partners in Jewish marriages. It would appear that this ratio reflects the religious affiliation of the state's population, which is estimated at 71.5 per cent Protestant and 28.5 per cent Roman Catholic.28 Since, however, in three of the five counties where Jews are concentrated (Lake, La Porte, and Saint Joseph) Catholic church members outnumber Protestant,29 it is most likely that Jews who intermarry show a decided preference for Protestant marriage partners.

REMARRIAGE AND INTERMARRIAGE

Analysis of the Iowa marriage data revealed a considerably higher intermarriage rate for remarriages (54.1 per cent) than for first marriages (36.3

27 Ibid., pp. 11-14, 40-41.
29 Denominational Statistics by Metropolitan Areas (New York: National Council of the Churches of Christ, 1956), Series D.
per cent). The higher intermarriage rate for the widowed or divorced was attributed to the limited supply of eligible mates. It was argued that "since the Jewish marriage market in general was found to be disorganized in small Jewish communities, with a resultant high intermarriage rate, it can be expected that the rate of intermarriage will be even higher for other marriages [i.e., remarriages]." 30

The Indiana findings suggest the need for modifying this interpretation. While the Iowa tabulations had lumped the previously widowed and divorced into one category, the availability of the original Indiana data made it possible to tabulate the precise previous marital status of grooms and brides. Table 12 is arranged to show the intermarriage rates for marriages with neither partner previously married, with one or both previously widowed, and with one or both previously divorced.

**Previous Widowhood**

The data reveal a marked difference between the intermarriage rates for marriages with one or both spouses previously widowed and for marriages with one or both spouses previously divorced. The intermarriage rate for previously-widowed marriage partners is much closer to the rate for the never-married-before than for the previously divorced. As a matter of fact, the previously-widowed marriage partners have a lower intermarriage rate than the never-married-before, indicating that the widowed make a determined effort to remarry within their faith.

**Previous Divorce**

While previous widowhood generates a high level of inmarriage, previous divorce status produced a high intermarriage rate in all groups analyzed. It will be recalled, for example, that interstate marriages have the lowest intermarriage rate since they were presumably arranged for Jewish group survival. But even among these (Table 12), the previously divorced have a five per cent higher intermarriage rate (27.3 per cent) than the previously never married. In the remaining counties where, because of the relative scarcity of eligible Jews, the intermarriage rate is high for the both-never-married-before marriage partners (59.7 per cent for intrastate and 50.0 per cent for interstate), the comparable rates for the previously divorced are 69.2 and 83.3, respectively.

The divorced can be divided into those who obtain a divorce after having met another man or woman whom they would prefer as husband or wife, and those who have been divorced because their marriage failed and have no immediate prospects of remarriage. For the first, divorce is the device through

---

## TABLE 12. PREVIOUS MARITAL STATUS AND INTERMARRIAGE, INDIANA, 1960-63

| Type of marriage | Both Never Married | | One or both Widowed | | One or both Divorced | |
|------------------|--------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|                  | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent | Number | Per cent |
| A1. Intrastate: 5 Counties | | | | | | |
| Inmarriage       | 139 | 67.8 | 12 | 80.0 | 46 | 35.1 |
| Intermarriage    | 66 | 32.2 | 3 | 20.0 | 85 | 64.9 |
| Jewish groom     | 43 | 21.0 | 1 | 6.7 | 57 | 43.5 |
| Jewish bride     | 23 | 11.2 | 2 | 13.3 | 28 | 21.4 |
| Total            | 205 | 100.0 | 15 | 100.0 | 131 | 100.0 |
| A2. Intrastate: Remaining Counties | | | | | | |
| Inmarriage       | 25 | 40.3 | 3 | 50.0 | 8 | 30.8 |
| Intermarriage    | 37 | 59.7 | 3 | 50.0 | 18 | 69.2 |
| Jewish groom     | 26 | 41.9 | 2 | 33.3 | 12 | 46.1 |
| Jewish bride     | 11 | 17.7 | 1 | 16.7 | 6 | 23.1 |
| Total            | 62 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 | 26 | 100.0 |
| B1. Interstate: 5 Counties | | | | | | |
| Inmarriage       | 81 | 77.9 | 5 | 100.0 | 16 | 72.7 |
| Intermarriage    | 23 | 22.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 27.3 |
| Jewish groom     | 20 | 19.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 13.6 |
| Jewish bride     | 3 | 2.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 13.6 |
| Total            | 104 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 |
| B2. Interstate: Remaining Counties | | | | | | |
| Inmarriage       | 14 | 50.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 1 | 16.7 |
| Intermarriage    | 14 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 83.3 |
| Jewish groom     | 11 | 39.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | 83.3 |
| Jewish bride     | 3 | 10.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total            | 28 | 100.0 | 0 | 100.0 | 6 | 100.0 |
| C1. Extrastate: Elopees | | | | | | |
| Inmarriage       | 16 | 30.8 | 1 | 100.0 | 6 | 13.6 |
| Intermarriage    | 36 | 69.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 38 | 86.4 |
| Jewish groom     | 15 | 28.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 27 | 61.4 |
| Jewish bride     | 21 | 40.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 11 | 25.0 |
| Total            | 52 | 100.0 | 1 | 100.0 | 44 | 100.0 |
TABLE 12. PREVIOUS MARITAL STATUS AND INTERMARRIAGE, INDIANA, 1960–63
(Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of marriage</th>
<th>Both Never Married</th>
<th>One or both Widowed</th>
<th>One or both Divorced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmarriage</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermarriage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish groom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish bride</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Indiana State Board of Health.

which the exchange of successive marriage partners is accomplished; the second group experience nothing but the pain of the divorce proceedings and its aftermath. For “even in societies with a relatively high divorce rate there is no substantial approval of divorce,” 31 and, having been forced into a major act of nonconformity, the divorced person may regain his self-respect and respectability within his social circle by remarriage, even to a person of a different faith.

It is widely held that intermarriage leads to desertion and divorce (though this finds scant support in the few scientific studies that have been conducted) 32 because of irreconcilable religio-cultural differences of the spouses. Let us assume, for the moment, that religious intermarriages generate a higher divorce rate than do inmarriages. However, we now know (Table 12) that a considerable number of intermarriages are remarriages. We also know from an early study of marriage and divorce records in Iowa and Missouri “that remarriages are not as enduring as first marriages and that the probability of divorce rises with each successive marriage.” These findings clearly suggest “divorce-proneness among divorced persons who remarry.” 33

32 An early analysis of the Iowa data revealed that “mixed-Catholic marriages are more often divorced than both-Catholic marriages,” and that “mixed-Protestant denominations do not seem to be at any particular disadvantage” (Loren E. Chancellor and Thomas P. Monahan, “Religious Preference and Interreligious Mixtures in Marriages and Divorces in Iowa,” American Journal of Sociology, November 1965, p. 239). An analysis of Philadelphia divorce and desertion records was summarized as follows: “Mixed marriages may (or may not) [sic] be more prone to end in divorce” (Thomas P. Monahan and William M. Kephart, “Divorce and Desertion by Religious and Mixed-Religious Groups,” American Journal of Sociology, March 1954, p. 454).

For a proper assessment of the effect, if any, of religio-cultural differences on the success of intermarriages, these would have to be sorted according to the previous marital status of one or both spouses. Such a tabulation would show whether the remarriage factor, rather than religio-cultural differences, accounts for the failures of marriages in which one or both partners had previously been divorced.
SUMMARY

The ecological analysis of the Indiana marriage records revealed the usual residence of groom and bride as a significant factor in the formation of Jewish intermarriages:

1. Couples who had eloped from contiguous states to Indiana had the highest level of intermarriage (67.4 per cent). A detailed analysis of these extrastate marriages pointed to a causal relationship between elopement and intermarriage.

2. Couples with one partner usually residing in Indiana and the other outside the state had the lowest intermarriage rate (29.9 per cent). It is assumed that these interstate marriages are arranged marriages or the result of a conscious effort to find a Jewish marriage partner.

3. Couples with both spouses residing within the state produce an intermediate level of intermarriage (49.0 per cent). This means that a Jewish young man or woman who relies on finding a spouse close to home has a fifty-fifty chance of inmarriage.

The Indiana data also made it possible to demonstrate empirically the inverse relationship between the size of the Jewish community and the rate of intermarriage. For the individual residing in a Jewish community in the five counties with the highest concentration of Jews, the chances for inmarriage are substantially improved (with an intermarriage rate of 38.6 per cent). In all other counties, where the Jewish population is small, the intermarriage rate is 63.5 per cent.

The marital behavior of individuals who had previously been widowed stands in sharp contrast to that of individuals who had previously been divorced. The former have a high inmarriage rate, higher than that of individuals who were never married before; the latter have a high level of intermarriage, higher than the one observed among the previously-never-married.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY FOR GROUP SURVIVAL

The finding that interstate marriages have the lowest level of intermarriage led to the inference that they are arranged marriages. The data therefore underlines the wisdom of or necessity for the old Jewish tradition of arranged marriages to secure Jewish group survival. Our inference is further strengthened by the findings that elopements, or so-called impulsive marriages, have an intermarriage level of from 67 to 77 per cent, and that dependency on the local marriage market creates a fifty-fifty chance for intermarriage.

Students of Jewish life in America have repeatedly observed that the size of the local Jewish community is a significant factor in the survival of the Jewish group. The larger the Jewish community, the easier it is to organize communal activities, to effect the voluntary concentration of Jewish families in specific residential neighborhoods, and to maintain an organized marriage
market. Conversely, the smaller the local community, the more difficult it becomes to maintain an organized community and marriage market. The intermarriage statistics of the 87 Indiana counties with their isolated Jewish families support the oft-told tale of the "disappearing small-town Jew." An earlier study\(^3\) revealed that, in 1957, the fertility of American Jews had been only two-thirds that of American Protestants and Catholics, and more recent local community studies have shown no upswing in the birthrate. On the contrary, there is some evidence that, like the total birthrate, the Jewish birthrate too has declined since then. Studies of intermarriage in the large Jewish communities would make possible a much more exact evaluation of its significance for the American Jew. Such data, however, do not detract from the value of the Indiana study, which adds weight to the author's earlier contention that, in the absence of large-scale immigration and of a substantial rise in the birthrate, the current level of intermarriage formation is going to be of ever increasing significance in the future demographic balance of the Jewish population in the United States.

\[\text{Erich Rosenthal}\]

Canada

There was no change of national government in Canada in 1966. In Manitoba, the Roblin (Progressive Conservative) government was returned. Biggest upset was in Quebec where the Lesage Liberal government, which had been in power since 1960, was defeated by the National Union of Daniel Johnson, the Irish-French former leader of the Opposition. Johnson in getting the returns, expressed regret that the English and the Jews of Montreal had not voted for his party.

Four Jews were elected to Manitoba’s legislative assembly: New Democrats Saul Cherniak, Q.C. (reelected), Sidney Green, and Saul Miller, and Progressive-Conservative Sidney T. Spivak, Q.C., who was also appointed industry and commerce minister in the Manitoba cabinet. Victor Goldbloom was elected to the Quebec legislature, and Harry Blank was returned for a third term. Samuel Lieberman of Edmonton, Alberta, was appointed to the Northern Alberta district court. Philip G. Givens, Q.C., Mayor of Toronto since 1963, was defeated in the 1966 elections by William Dennison. Charles Drukarsh, Q.C., was appointed magistrate in Toronto, and 11 other Jews were either elected or reelected to the city’s municipal and borough councils, and to school boards. Max Silverman was elected mayor of Sudbury, Ontario. Sidney Buckwold was again elected mayor of Saskatoon, Sask., after an absence of several years, and Jack Freadman and Allan Barsky were reelected as mayors of Flin Flon, Manitoba and Prince Albert Saskatchewan respectively. The Winnipeg city council appointed A. Montague Israels to the city’s police commission.

CIVIC AND POLITICAL STATUS

The report of the special justice department committee to outlaw hate propaganda, set up in January 1965, was issued in April by its chairman Maxwell Cohen, Dean of the McGill Law School. The 327-page document summarized the committee’s investigation of hate propaganda in Canada, its social-psychological effects, the role of law and education as controls, and its examination of existing anti-discrimination legislation in Canada and elsewhere. The committee unanimously recommended an amendment to the criminal code which would make the advocacy or promotion of genocide, and public incitement to or the willful promotion of hatred or contempt of any identifiable group, punishable by imprisonment. (The maximum penalty of five years’ imprisonment was recommended for genocide and two years’ for the
other offenses.) The suggested draft placed hate propaganda or group defamation on the same legal ground as defamation of individuals.

In August Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson announced to the press that his government intended to introduce anti-hate legislation, but that the heavy schedule before parliament may prevent such action in 1966. Indeed, on November 7, a bill was introduced in the senate by government leader, Senator John Connolly, which was expected to go before a joint committee of both houses when parliament reconvened in 1967.

The bill differed from the draft recommended by the Cohen committee in that it did not include "religion" as a characteristic of an "identifiable group." The Jewish community felt that this would weaken their protection under the bill.

Alberta enacted its first anti-discrimination law barring denial of accommodation, public services, or employment to anyone because of race, color, or ethnic origin, and banning reference to racial or religious origin in advertisements for employment.

The legislatures of Ontario and Manitoba unanimously passed resolutions, on January 28 and March 22, respectively, urging the House of Commons to enact legislation to curb the dissemination of racial and religious hatred.

**Ontario**

A special six-member Committee on Religious Education set up in 1965 by Minister of Education William G. Davis, to review and recommend changes, if any, on the highly controversial religious instruction in Ontario's public schools, began work in April. By year's end it had received more than 40 briefs, including statements opposing religious teaching in the public schools from the Jewish communities of Windsor, Chatham, London, and Ottawa.

Earlier, in January, the Canadian Jewish Congress's (CJC) central region (Ontario) submitted a brief to the Ontario government's Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education. It expressed objection to the ethical aims of public education which were officially based on the "Christian ideal," dealt with education for citizenship and intergroup relations, and emphasized the necessity for improved teacher training. The brief also pointed to the inadequate treatment of the Nazi period in history instruction. It cited as a case in point the perfunctory line-and-a-half reference to Nazi racial persecution in one high school text that devoted three chapters to the Nazi period.

**Quebec**

Recommendations by the Quebec Royal Commission of Inquiry on Education for sweeping educational reforms were made public in its report of May 11. It stated that, while "the confessional nature of public education" was well enough suited to a population whose great majority was Roman Catholic or Protestant, the obvious growth of religious pluralism changed the
situation. "Even within the French and English populations," the report continued, "associations of citizens have demanded nonconfessional public education for their children." And since "the religious pluralism of society demands of everyone, believing or unbelieving, a respect for the opinions of others founded on recognition of the freedom and dignity of the human person," the commission recommended "the establishment of nonconfessional education whenever an adequate number of persons request it." In the report, the commission referred to the Jews who "accommodated themselves to the Protestant schools," except for "certain groups among them" who established in Montreal and its suburbs "a fairly important network of private Jewish schools."

In a brief analyzing the commission's report, CJC welcomed the recommendations that Quebec's educational system offer a choice of Roman Catholic, Protestant, and nonconfessional education, provided standards could be maintained in each instance. It subscribed to the proposed full choice between French and English as the language of instruction in all these schools. CJC further asked that biblical literature in confessional schools be taught not as religious dogma; that confessional elementary and secondary schools which accept pupils of other faiths offer them, if possible, appropriate moral or religious instruction; that interim measures be taken to do away with the legal disabilities of Jewish parents and taxpayers, and that the Jewish day schools in Quebec be recognized for grants on the pre-school and elementary level.

The superior court of Quebec invalidated a clause of a will intended to impose disinherition in the case of a marriage "out of the Jewish faith," on the ground that "the provision was illegal as contrary to the principle of freedom of religion as declared in the Quebec Freedom of Worship Act."

Antisemitism

In the spring the Toronto city council passed an amendment to its parks by-laws making the granting of a permit to speak in certain parks mandatory, but subject to the provision that no person use language or engage in any form of conduct likely to stir up hatred against any group identifiable by color, race, religion, and ethnic or national origin. The amendment was soon to be tested in court. John Beattie, leader of the so-called Canadian Nazi party (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 278) spoke in Allan Gardens on June 5, and again two weeks later. The mounted police escort was increased at his second rally to prevent a clash between Beattie and groups of concentration camp survivors who picketed the meeting.

Beattie was later served with a summons for violation of the parks by-law. In December the case came before Magistrate C. A. Opper who, while acknowledging the Crown's arguments that Beattie had made offensive remarks designed to stir up religious and racial hatred and had thereby violated the parks by-laws amendment, dismissed the case. The decision was based in part on the ground that the right to restrict or to regulate free speech be-
longed only to parliament. (This, incidentally, was the first time the Canadian Bill of Rights was upheld in a court since its adoption in 1960.) The City of Toronto indicated it would appeal the decision.

A feature article by John Garrity, "I Spied On the Nazis," in *Maclean's Magazine*, October 1, 1966, told how he was engaged by CJC to infiltrate the small Toronto neo-Nazi group of John Beattie and how he gained the latter's confidence. Garrity also described meetings of the group, named some of its leaders, and revealed Beattie's link with George Lincoln Rockwell, leader of the American Nazi party, and meetings between the two at Niagara on the United States-Canadian border. CJC, in a statement, disavowed any responsibility for or prior knowledge of the article. It did, however, confirm the story's general accuracy insofar as it related to CJC.

**Relations with Germany**

In January CJC issued a statement in connection with the training of West German NATO personnel at Camp Shiloh in West Canada. Although CJC acknowledged that Canadian commitments necessitated such facilities, it pointed to the "inescapable fact of social and political life that emotions are deeply stirred when such obligations confront a large number of people who underwent unparalleled pain and suffering at the hands of Nazi Germany, of which the Wehrmacht was the symbol." The Congress therefore asked that the country refuse hospitality to elements that had helped bring about the suffering, and that the reactions and emotions of newcomers and other Canadians "not be flouted."

In January the *Canadian Jewish News* of Toronto issued a special supplement on West Germany, containing advertisements from West German manufacturing firms. The issue raised considerable controversy in the Jewish community.

**Jewish Community**

In 1965 there were 270,000 Jews in Canada, who formed 1.4 per cent of the total population of 19 million. Of these, 76 per cent lived in Montreal (110,000) and Toronto (95,000), where they formed close to 5 per cent of the general population. Winnipeg had a Jewish population of 20,000; Vancouver, 8,000, and Ottawa, 6,000. The remaining 31,000 Jews were scattered in some 160 cities, towns, and villages throughout Canada with a heavier concentration in Ontario (13,000 outside Toronto and Ottawa).

**Interrmarriage**

Statistics on intermarriage among Jews in Canada, based on 1964 data released by the Vital Statistics Branch in Ottawa, were compiled by Louis Rosenberg. The study revealed that 286 intermarriages took place in 1964, involving 185 Jewish men and 101 Jewish women. Of these, 132 took place...
in Ontario, 64 in Quebec, 34 in British Columbia, 25 in the two prairie provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, 20 in Manitoba, and 11 in the Atlantic provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. British Columbia had the highest percentage (50.7 per cent) of intermarriages, followed by 44.6 per cent in Saskatchewan and Alberta, 44 per cent in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, 19 per cent in Ontario, 15 per cent in Manitoba, and the lowest (9.5 per cent) in Quebec which has no provision for civil marriage. The percentage of intermarriages among Jews in Canada increased from 3.7 per cent in 1928 to six per cent in 1939, to 11 per cent in 1944, fluctuated slightly from 1944 to 1952, when it continued to increase to 18.5 per cent in 1963, and dropped slightly to 17.4 per cent in 1964.

In 1964 the percentage of intermarriage among Jewish men was highest (41.7 per cent) in the Atlantic provinces, followed closely by 41.1 per cent in British Columbia, 36.7 per cent in Saskatchewan and Alberta, dropped to 12.2 per cent in Ontario and 9.6 per cent in Manitoba, and was lowest in Quebec (6.7 per cent).

The percentage of intermarriage among Jewish women in 1964 was highest (25 per cent) in British Columbia, followed by 18.4 per cent in Saskatchewan and Alberta, dropped to 8.8 per cent in Ontario, 6.7 per cent in the Atlantic provinces, and 6.6 per cent in Manitoba, and was lowest in Quebec (3.2 per cent).

**Jewish Education**

Quebec, which had no nondenominational school system, even in name, has become a fertile ground for the development of Jewish day schools. The Quebec provincial government, indirectly subsidized private high schools, including the Jewish day schools, with a $200 per capita grant to parents and $75 per capita to recognized schools. In other provinces, the question of government subsidies to Jewish day schools has become a controversial issue within the Jewish community. In Ontario parents’ group of the various Jewish day schools (in Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa) convened in December and planned to ask the provincial government for financial aid. A group of Orthodox students had picketed the Conference of CJC in November, criticizing its “neutrality” on this issue.

A study of Jewish education in Canada conducted in January by Joseph Klinghofer, director of Jewish education of CJC central region, yielded detailed data on the types of Jewish schools, their number, enrolment, and curricula. There were over 30 day schools, offering 12 to 25 hours a week of instruction in Jewish subjects; (13 in Montreal, 8 in Toronto, 5 in Winnipeg, 2 in Calgary, and one each in Edmonton, Ottawa, Vancouver, and Hamilton). In the smaller communities the percentage is much higher, ranging up to 90 per cent. In 1963, of some 23,000 Jewish children attending various types of Jewish schools, in communities with 25 or more Jewish families, 8,348 were attending Jewish day schools and some 14,500 supple-
mentary schools (Montreal: 4,358 of 7,300, or 59.7 per cent; Toronto: 2,500 of 9,565, or 26 per cent; Winnipeg: 56 per cent; Vancouver: 26 per cent; Ottawa: 58 per cent; Calgary: 76 per cent; Edmonton: 84 per cent).

The percentage of youths continuing Jewish studies on a high school level, usually from one to three years, was much lower, about 10 to 12 per cent of about 20,000 children in the 13–17 age group.

Programs and methods of instruction varied from school to school. In the yeshivot the emphasis was on Torah and Talmud; in the modern day school, on the Hebrew language and literature. Israel, Jewish history, and current events, taught either in Hebrew or English, received more attention in the modern schools. Methods ranged from old type mechanical reading and translation, to all kinds of oral and written exercises and projects using audio-visual aids.

The United Teachers' Seminary and other training institutions, maintained in Montreal by CJC, graduated some 200 teachers since 1946. The Midrasha L'Morim, established in Toronto in 1953 and supervised by the Bureau of Jewish Education, trained 102 teachers to date, and Maimonides College in Winnipeg had 67 alumni. There were also two rabbinical seminaries in Montreal and another Ner Yisrael, recently opened in Toronto. In Winnipeg, the University of Manitoba set up a department of Jewish studies. Altogether, approximately 680 professional teachers staff Canada's Jewish schools.

However, the Klinghofer study concluded that Jewish education suffered from a shortage of qualified teachers; limited financial resources for the growing day school movement; a lack of coordination of educational efforts in the larger communities; a drop in enrolment of children of post-bar mitzvah age, and little interest in Jewish studies among university students and adults. Yiddish schools functioned in Montreal (2), Toronto (3), Winnipeg, Calgary, Vancouver and Windsor (1 each). Hebrew afternoon schools, often called Talmud Torahs, offering up to 10 hours weekly instruction were largely under congregational auspices. The number of Sunday schools, usually sponsored by Reform temples, was diminishing. In general they had two to three hours of weekly instruction for younger children, and recently added several hours of Hebrew language classes for older children.

The total enrolment in all types of Jewish schools for elementary-school children was 40,000. In the larger cities, about half of the Jewish children received some kind of organized Jewish education: in Montreal, 7,900 of a total of 16,000; in Toronto, 8,208 of 14,000, and in Winnipeg, 1,950 of 3,000.

**Religious and Communal Activities**

Two rabbinical conferences were held in Toronto: the Rabbinical Assembly of America (May) at which numerous Canadian-born rabbis, now serving in the United States, played a major role, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis (June).

The French-speaking Jewish community of Montreal, engaged as its spir-
ritual leader the Swiss-born, French-trained Rabbi David Feuerwerker. The community's 15,000 to 20,000 members came from North Africa, the Middle East countries, Belgium, France, and Switzerland.

In the spring the Lincoln County Baron de Hirsch Jewish Congregation in Beamsville, Ontario, dedicated a new community center. The building was purchased with the aid of the Jewish Colonization Association and improvements and remodeling were financed with contributions from the Jewish farming community in the Niagara Peninsula, which the center served.

The synagogues and their central organs have had an increasing impact on every aspect of Jewish education; B'nai B'rith, the Y's, women's organizations and various ideological groups have assumed important roles in youth and adult education.

A national Leadership Conference on Jews in the Soviet Union, attended by 300 persons, was held in Montreal on May 29. Resolutions were passed on such matters as the equality of Jewish citizens in the USSR; the freedom to practice, enhance, and perpetuate their culture and religion; the reunion of Soviet Jewish families with relatives abroad; eradication of antisemitism, and freedom of contact and association with Jews abroad.

B'nai B'rith opened an ADL office in Toronto, the first in Canada.

Publications

*Through Narrow Gates* by Simon Belkin, a study of Jewish immigration to Canada from 1840 to 1940, was published jointly by the Jewish Colonization Association and CJC.

*Judaism* by Rabbi Stuart E. Rosenberg of Toronto, was published by the Paulist Press in Glen Rock, N.J., conducted by the Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle.

The Zionist Organization of Canada (ZOC) began publication of *Etgar*, a new quarterly, edited by Max Goody of Toronto.

The *Canadian Jewish Review*, which had been published weekly for more than 40 years, first in Toronto and later in Montreal, was purchased by the Canadian Jewish Chronicle in December 1966 and now appeared as the *Canadian Jewish Chronicle-Review*, with Stanley Shenkman, publisher, and David Novek, editor.

Samson Dunsky of Montreal received a $4,000 grant from the Canada Council for work on a Yiddish translation of the Midrashic commentary on Koheleth. He also shared with C. J. Newman, author of the novel *We Look After Our Own*, the H. M. Caiserman literary award of CJC.

Zionism

In December the various Zionist groups in Canada agreed on the establishment (in March 1967) of a Federated Zionist Organization of Canada to carry out an all-embracing Zionist program. It was hoped that this arrange-
ment would bring an end to controversy and conflict that had gone on for several years within Canadian Zionist organizational life.

ZOC and Keren Hatarbuth, the Canadian Association for Hebrew Education and Culture, were active in various projects, such as Ulpanim, a Bible contest, assistance to day schools, teacher exchange with Israel, teachers' summer courses, and youth camps.

**Personalia**

Professor S. Sinclair of Winnipeg was appointed to head an agricultural advisory team for the Kenya government, a project financed by the Ford Foundation.

Lazarus Phillips, Q.C., was elected vice-president of the Royal Bank of Canada.

Mrs. Newton Zemans of Calgary was named to the senate of the University of Alberta.

Maxwell Cohen, dean of McGill University law school, was appointed to the Board of Directors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. for a three-year term.

Lawrence Marks, Q.C., of Montreal was elected president of the Canadian Council of Reform Congregations to succeed Sydney M. Harris.

Arthur Siggner of Toronto was elected president of the Ontario region of the Canadian Conference of the Conservative Synagogue.

Morris A. Gray, veteran community worker, pioneer of Jewish life in Western Canada, and long-time member of the Manitoba legislature, died in Winnipeg on January 2 at the age of 76.

Samuel D. Cohen, national vice-chairman of the Joint Canadian Jewish Congress-B'nai B'rith Committee on community relations and chairman of the Cercle Juif de Langue Française, died in July.

J. Irving Oelbaum, Toronto businessman and leading member of the major Jewish agencies, who had acquired a reputation as the senior statesman of Canadian Jewry, died in Toronto in October, at the age of 66.

Max Silverman, mayor of Sudbury, Ontario, died on October 5 at the age of 60.

Kenneth Soble, chairman of the Ontario government Housing Corporation and national chairman of UIA, who, as owner of a television station, was known as the "dynamo of Canadian broadcasting," died in December at the age of 55.

---

Ben Kayfetz
On June 28, 1966 the heads of Argentina's armed forces overthrew the government of President Arturo Umberto Illia in a bloodless revolution—the fifth coup since 1930. The following day they swore in General Juan Carlos Onganía, chief of staff during the early months of Illia's government, as the new president. The government's first act was to do away with the constitutional representative system, which had been in force since 1853, and to give the president the power to issue decrees, adjourn Congress, dismiss from office all members of the Supreme Court, and ban all political parties. The Estatutos de la Revolución Argentina (Articles of the Argentine Revolution) became the law of the land. In his first press conference in August, Onganía said that one of the revolution's major aims was to promote public participation in the country's political life. He listed as some of Argentina's major problems Communism, underdevelopment, demographic distortion, statism, and excessive bureaucracy. The government, Onganía continued, would combat these problems by impeding the activities of Communists and all other extremists, streamlining state industries, and instituting a system of "selective immigration" of persons from countries of "similar races and beliefs." He reaffirmed his government's support of free enterprise and private property as the basis of Argentina's economic system.

An immediate problem for the new government was to make peace with the labor leaders, who were followers of former dictator Juan Perón and decidedly anti-military. In an attempt to prevent the recurrence of the often politically motivated crippling strikes that had plagued the ousted Illia regime, Onganía reportedly promised the unions that labor's rights would be respected as long as the workers did not meddle in politics. In September the government ordered the unions to submit to compulsory arbitration. The climax in government-labor disputes was reached with the international boycott of Argentine ships, precipitated by government intervention in a strike by local longshoremen. When the Confederación General del Trabajo (General Labor Confederation) called a general strike in December, it embarked on what seemed to be a collision course with the government.

One month after the revolution the government took over the national
universities in an effort to stop Communist agitation and all other political activities in these institutions. President Ongaña ordered all university presidents and deans of faculties to recognize the authority of the education ministry within 48 hours, or to resign their posts. This order destroyed the tripartite system of university government administered jointly by faculty, students, and alumni. Henceforth, relations between the universities and the government were to be maintained through the education ministry; political activity by student organizations was prohibited. Only three of the state universities accepted government control, and many of the deans and presidents resigned their posts in protest. One of the first to resign was Fernandez Long, president of the University of Buenos Aires which had an enrolment of 75,000 students. In the course of anti-government demonstrations, 140 professors and students of the faculty of exact sciences were beaten and detained by the police (among them a visiting professor from the United States). In all, over 1,000 professors, among them leading men in the faculties of sciences, architecture, economics, and humanities, resigned.

As a result, when the universities reopened, many students were unable to continue their studies; others had to be satisfied with a much inferior education. A study conducted by the Torcuato Di Tella Institute, a private foundation for social science studies, found that "three months after the event, the intervention in the national universities and the consequent loss of autonomy has already resulted in the emigration of 108 professors at the University of Buenos Aires alone, most of whom were full-time (professors) and of a standing that will make their replacement difficult in the near or more distant future. This figure will go even higher if there is no fundamental change in the university situation."

The continuing instability of Argentina's economy was another major problem. The devaluation of the peso and the government's announcements of large increases in various public services caused grave concern throughout the country. The average rise in the cost of living in 1966 was 32.4 per cent. The cost of sanitary services increased by 30 per cent, fuel by 30 per cent, and railway fares by 80 per cent. The price of all other public utilities as well as of food products was steadily rising.

Many of the government's actions and their underlying purposes remained unclear. In July Ongaña banned all political parties and expropriated their funds and property. Yet, the federal police did not interfere with several quasi-political meetings. Captain Enrique Green, former secretary of the Buenos Aires police and Ongaña's brother-in-law, who for many years had been suspected of antisemitic activity, began a morals clean-up campaign in the capitol. In a dispute with the mayor, Green was later fired without protest from the president. Unofficial surveys indicated that public opinion originally favoring the new regime seemed to be far less enthusiastic about it as 1966 came to a close. The absence of decisive planning in the economic, labor, and political spheres left it open to many attacks. Lieutenant General Pascual Pistarini, the nominal leader of the coup that placed Ongaña in power,
asked to be retired from his post as commander-in-chief of the army after a disagreement with the president. A wave of speculation about the underlying causes for Pistarini’s replacement followed his sudden departure in December. On December 29 all cabinet ministers and their staffs as well as the state governors resigned in order to give Onganía the opportunity to reorganize his government. He accepted the resignations of Interior Minister Enrique Martínez Paz, Finance Minister Jorge Néstor Salimei and of six state governors.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

The Jews of Argentina were extremely sensitive to the critical events in 1966. In July the government set up strict controls over the more than 1,000 credit cooperatives in Argentina which had always played an important role in the country’s economy. The move caused panic and a run on reserves by depositors and, since 30 per cent of the cooperatives were Jewish, it was mistakenly interpreted by the world press, and especially by the New York Times, as an anti-Jewish act. Shortly thereafter, at a joint meeting, AMIA (Asociación Mutual Israelita Argentina) and DAIA (Delegación de Asociaciones Israelitas Argentinas, the coordinating agency of all sectors of the Jewish community and its official representative in relations with the government) (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 287) issued a statement describing the problem of the cooperatives as national in scope, and not limited to Jews. They called upon the Jewish community to continue their full support of the cooperatives which had made an important effort in maintaining and furthering Jewish institutions, especially schools and welfare agencies.

Communal Activities

The estimated number of Jews remained unchanged in 1966. Of the total of 450,000, 75 per cent lived in Buenos Aires (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 285). During the first six months of the year, 1,015 deaths were registered with the Buenos Aires kehilla.

AMIA, the central organization of the capital’s Jewish community, had a membership of 36,000 families. It organized a membership campaign and raised dues to cover a larger part (heretofore only 10 per cent) of its expanded activities. Eighty-five schools and 21 different institutions received monthly financial aid from the AMIA. About $163,000 were allocated in 1966 for social welfare alone. AMIA also subsidized about 100 persons who emigrated to Israel.

The AMIA-sponsored Casa del Estudiante Judío Moshe Sharett (Jewish Student House) inaugurated in Buenos Aires in May, provided dormitory facilities for students coming from the interior to study at the University of Buenos Aires. By the end of the year, 51 of the 100 available places were filled. The Escuela de Instructores y Tecnicos en Trabajo Institucional (School for Institutional Leadership) organized by AMIA and the Sociedad
Hebráica Argentina (culture and sports center), had an enrolment of 65 students. It offered a two-year training course for leaders and administrators of all types of Jewish institutions—social, cultural, recreational, religious, and economic. The school also conducted seminars throughout the country in conjunction with various institutions. It sent ten of its first graduates to Israel for study at the Makhon Lemadrikhei Hutz La-aratz (Institute for Youth Leaders from Abroad).

There was a distinct decline in interest in communal affairs, as indicated by the May elections for officers of AMIA. Only 12,646 votes were cast, as compared with 16,284 in the 1960 elections. Votes were cast for eight different lists: Agudat Israel, Liberal Zionists, Herut, Mapam, Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi, Central Europeans, Bund, and Mapai-Ahdut Ha-'avadah. The largest number of votes went to Mapai-Ahdut Ha-'avadah after an electoral campaign including newspaper advertisements, billboards, TV and radio announcements, with a total expenditure of approximately 25 million pesos. The new officers were headed by Tobias Kamenszain.

In February the community celebrated the 50th anniversary of the first Jewish Congress in Argentina whose purpose it was to unite the different segments of Jewry and to form a structured community.

The Wa'ad Ha-kehillot, the national organization of Jewish communities, had 145 affiliates throughout the country. Eighty per cent, or 113, of the so-called communities outside Buenos Aires had less than 100 members; 15 had between 100 and 300; 10, between 300 and 800, and 7 (including Buenos Aires), more than 800. Only some 30 of these were organized on a community level; the rest were individual schools, burial societies, or Jewish centers. The unorganized communities presented a serious problem to Jewish leaders because the absence of Jewish educational facilities and of Jewish commitment among the youth led to a growing tendency toward assimilation and intermarriage.

Commitment of Youth

The findings of a study conducted by DAIA demonstrated a disquieting lack of Jewish identification on the part of the vast majority of Argentine youth. There were approximately 90,000 young people between the ages of 10 and 25 in Argentina. Sixty-two per cent (about 56,000) of these were not affiliated with any Jewish institutions. Of the remaining 34,000, some 26,000 belonged to groups with no specific Jewish content (such as Jewish sports clubs); 8,000 were members of organizations having specific Jewish content. The unaffiliated youths either identified with political movements, or believed in cultural assimilation which led to complete separation from Jewish life. Of the approximately 17,000 Jewish university students (3.4 per cent of the total Jewish population as compared with .36 per cent university attendance for the general population), only 1,400, or 8 per cent, were active in Jewish institutions.
Cultural Activities

The Sociedad Hebraica Argentina, which played a major role in furthering Jewish and Argentine culture, celebrated its 40th anniversary in April. The World Jewish Congress (WJC) sponsored a symposium on "Yiddish and Jewish Life" in June. It organized the first Colloquium of Jewish Intellectuals of South America in November, at which guests from several Latin American countries discussed "Jewish Consciousness." WJC also published The History of Yiddish and Sholem Aleichem, the first two in a pamphlet series on Jewish personalities and events. A Bibliography of Jewish Themes in Spanish, another WJC publication, made available the first such listing to institutions and the general public.

The Confederación pro Cultura Judía (Culture Congress) laid the cornerstone for its new building in May. It published a Yiddish translation of Simon Dubnow's History of the Jewish People, in an effort to promote the Yiddish language as part of Jewish culture.

The Latin American office of the American Jewish Committee held a conference on Jewish identity and identification in Cordoba in August. Many prominent speakers participated. It also sent two travel exhibits of Haggadah illuminations and ceremonial art to various institutions in Buenos Aires and in the interior, and provided educational film-strips and slides to different groups. The AJC's new pamphlet series on basic Jewish themes included A Compilation of the Bible, an abridged History of Jewish Literature, and The Talmud. It also published the first issue of Comunidades Judías de Latinoamérica (year book of Latin American Jewry) with historic, demographic, cultural, religious, and statistical data pertaining to 19 Latin American countries. Comentario, the 13-year-old bi-monthly issued by the Instituto Judio Argentina de Cultura e Información, published its 50th issue. It also presented in June its first annual award to Argentina journalists who excelled in the field of human rights, an honor shared by Luis Mario Lozzia and Tomas Eloy Martinez. In September the Instituto established, as a tribute to Jewish agricultural pioneering in Argentina, the Gregorio Werthein award for Argentine professionals who distinguished themselves in farm-production research. The Instituto also published a booklet, Neonazism in Europe and America, and the fourth edition of Morris Kertzer's What is a Jew?


At the 20th AMIA-sponsored annual book fair in September, over 16,000 books in Yiddish, Hebrew, and Spanish were sold. There were 6,280 buyers, some 900 less than the preceding year. AMIA also sponsored a weekly television program and extensive lectures on Jewish affairs.
Education

The Central Organization for Hebrew Education (Wa'ad Ha-hinnukh) reported 15,500 students in all Jewish schools in Buenos Aires. Of these, 5,300 were enrolled in kindergartens, 8,800 in primary grades, and 1,400 in secondary schools. Eighty per cent of the students in primary schools, had also attended Jewish kindergartens. There were eight Jewish day schools with an enrolment of 2,400 students. The Natan Gesang school, one of the largest day schools, opened its new building for 400 pupils attending grades from kindergarten through high school.

In the interior of the country, 4,600 students attended 48 schools; 70 per cent of the student body was concentrated in 11 schools. The first secondary day school in northeast Argentina opened in Tucuman. Eighteen communities in the interior offered no Jewish education whatsoever. In general, the number of day-school students throughout Argentina was increasing.

The Moises Ville Teacher’s Seminary, which trained many of the teachers for the interior of the country, had 120 resident and 85 local students. The Seminario Docente para Escuelas Israelitas (Midrashah) of the AMIA, whose graduates usually taught in Buenos Aires and neighboring schools, had 350 students (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 289).

The function of the Wa’ad was to supervise the curriculum and textbooks of all affiliated schools throughout the country, and to serve as employment center for all licensed teachers. It subsidized all affiliated schools with funds allocated by AMIA. However, the Wa’ad’s work was impaired by the lack of trained professionals on its own staff and by limited funds. While the general orientation of most schools was secularist and Zionist, they lacked unification because they were usually organized to correspond to local Israeli political parties. Another aggravating factor was the continued lack of cooperation between the Sephardi and Ashkenazi members of the community.

In the annual report to the Wa’ad, its president Hayyim Raichemberg stressed the need for restructuring the school system. He proposed that small Buenos Aires schools within a given district be combined, since only half of the city’s 24 primary schools had the required minimum number of students for the proper functioning of the schools’ morning sessions; the rest had far below the minimum. Other serious problems were the low teachers’ salaries and the lack of uniform textbooks.

Zionism and Relations with Israel

The main identification of the Jewish community, apart from the small but growing religious sector, was with Zionism and Zionist ideals. CUS (Centro Universitario Sionista) president Jorge Pustilnik stated in an article in the Buenos Aires Semana Israelita that 30 per cent of the Jewish students attending universities showed no interest in the Jewish community. The failure of the home to stress Judaism, the inability of the poorly organized Jewish institutions to keep pace with the times, and the incompetence of the
Jewish schools to impart ideals, all contributed to this general disinterest. Raichemberg maintained that Jewish identification could be developed among the university youth only through Zionism—"the most important contemporary means of expression and the nucleus of Judaism." Most sectors of the Jewish community held this view. As a result, there was great emphasis on strengthening communal ties with Israel, as well as relations between the governments of Argentina and Israel.

WIZO (Woman's International Zionist Organization), with 40,000 members in 370 centers throughout Argentina, completed 40 years of activities. Its work of cultural and social programs and social welfare work for Israel was hampered by a big financial scandal involving the leadership. The Makhon le-Tarbut Israel, sponsored by the Israeli embassy, remained the center for Hebrew language studies and Israeli culture. The Federación de Clubes de Padres de Escuelas Hebreas Horim sponsored a three-week study tour of Israel for parents of Jewish students. The Friends of the Hebrew University and the Friends of the Weizmann Institute organized cultural and educational programs.

The General Zionists in Argentina sent seven delegates to the party's national convention in Israel in January. Tobias Kamenszain, president of the AMIA, participated in the World Jewish Congress convention in Brussels (July-August). He also represented the Argentine Jewish community in the inauguration ceremony for the Keneset building in Jerusalem.

On the long list of Israeli dignitaries who visited Argentina in 1966 were Moshe Goldstein, the assistant mayor of Tel-Aviv; Minister of Agriculture Hayyim Gvati; Hayyim Yehiel, the official representative for diaspora relations, and Minister of Finance Phinehas Sappir, who came to bolster trade relations between Argentina and Israel.

Since the creation of the State of Israel, 15,000 Argentine Jews have gone on aliyah. Before 1961, 2 per cent of the emigrants had returned to Argentina; since then the percentage has risen to 20.

The Argentine government maintained cordial relations with Israel. In January the Keneset invited ten members of the Argentine senate and house of deputies to visit Israel. They met with government officials and made special tours to various cities, industrial plants, agricultural projects and universities. The official announcement of the establishment of the Casa Argentina en Israel (Argentine House in Israel) in May, created much general public interest. Plans for the Casa Argentina, a project sponsored by Argentine Jews and Christians, included a center to house Christian pilgrims in Nazareth, a study center in Jerusalem, and a central house, a library, and a museum in Tel-Aviv.

In general, the Onganía government made strong efforts to reassure Argentine Jewry and critics abroad that it would continue to further friendly relations with Israel. This was the keynote of an interview of the noted Israeli journalist Moshe Ron with President Onganía in September. Onganía told Ron that he favored technical interchange and good relations between
Argentina and Israel, and made it a point to stress that "there has never been anti-semitism in Argentina; there have only been isolated incidents." Onganía also said that he hoped President Zalman Shazar, who had canceled a scheduled visit in July because of political events, would visit Argentina shortly. Other government officials expressed similar feelings. Argentine Foreign Minister Nicanor Costa Méndez, who met with Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban in New York in October, expressed his country's support of Israel and again extended the invitation to Shazar. He also took the occasion to deny all rumors regarding anti-Jewish discrimination in Argentina. In October a committee on Argentine-Israeli government exchange programs was set up in Argentina. During the same month a public primary school in Buenos Aires was named Estado de Israel in a ceremony attended by government officials; messages were received from Onganía, Minister of the Interior Enrique Martínez Paz, and Monsignor Ernesto Segura, secretary to Cardinal Antonio Caggiano, Primate of Argentina.

**Religion**

The growth of diverse religious tendencies and movements was greeted by some Jews as a revitalization of religious life in Argentina. For others, it was a disturbing factor. Among the latter was David Kahane, former colonel in the Israeli air force and, since April, chief rabbi of AMIA, who gave his impressions after a visit to various communities in the interior. "In addition to the forces that disintegrated Jewish life," he said, "the harmful influence of the groups identified with Conservative trends was felt. This entailed a danger, especially for the youth, since the snide tactics and actions of the Conservatives contributed to the weakening of the foundations of Jewish existence."

Until the formation of liberal congregations in 1963, religious life was centered in the Orthodox rabbinate of the AMIA and the synagogues which were organized on a *landsmanshaft* basis. The German synagogues belonged to the CENTRA movement, and the other synagogues were separated according to their members' country of origin. With few exceptions, there was little attempt to adapt the ritual and customs to the Argentine environment. Thus, sermons were delivered in German, Hungarian, Arabic, Yiddish, etc., and no Spanish was used in the service. There was complete separation of the Sephardim and Ashkenazim.

Buenos Aires had over 50 synagogues and some 14 rabbis. Most of the Jews, however, were not affiliated with any synagogue and, in 1966, the estimated attendance of the city's 350,000 Jews at High Holy Day services dropped below the 10 per cent figure in 1965. The rabbis of AMIA attempted to register all marriages and to control divorces in the Ashkenazic community. They refused to perform conversions under any circumstances, and did not recognize conversions performed by other rabbis. With the appointment in February of Rabbi Kahane as chief rabbi, the religious parties...
of AMIA began an all-out effort to stop the growing influence of the liberal groups.

The first three graduates of AMIA's Orthodox Escuela Superior Teológica Seminario Rabinico received their ordination in Israel in August and subsequently began their rabbinate in Rosario and in the religious department of AMIA. (No university training was required for ordination.) Rabbi Itzhak Rojlin became director of the Seminario in August.

Rabbi Mordechai Edery, vice rector of Seminario Rabinico Latinoamericano, the first Conservative rabbinical school on the continent, was invited to address the Sephardi synagogue of Sharei Tefila in November. His lecture was cancelled after Sephardi Chief Rabbi Isaac Shehebar and Rabbi Kahane exerted pressure to prevent a "liberal" from having a public platform. During that month, however, Rabbi Edery became the spiritual leader of the Asociación Israelita Sefardi Templo Chalom in Buenos Aires, the first Sephardi community to affiliate with Conservative Judaism. In Cordoba, a new Conservative synagogue, Bet El, was founded with a mixed Sephardi and Ashkenazi membership.

One of the Conservative synagogues in Argentina, Bet El in Buenos Aires, celebrated its fourth anniversary; it had a membership of some 500 families. It appointed Rabbi Jeffrey A. Wohlberg, a recent graduate of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (JTS), as assistant to its spiritual leader, Rabbi Marshall T. Meyer. The Seminario Rabinico Latinoamericano (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 291) sent its second graduate to finish his studies at JTS. All students at the Seminario, among them young men from Peru, Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, and Argentina, conducted High Holy Day services in communities throughout Latin America. The school opened a high school department. The Latin American office of the World Council of Synagogues, under the direction of Rabbi Meyer, continued its work with affiliated synagogues and the general community; it continued to publish Maj'shavot (Mahashavot), a Spanish-language quarterly dedicated to Jewish thought.

The newest Reform synagogue in Argentina, Congregación Emanu-El, appointed Rabbi Rifat Sonsino, a recent graduate of Hebrew Union College, as its spiritual leader.

Campamento Ramah, a summer camp sponsored by the Bet El congregation, began its third season with an enrolment of 250 young people, some of whom came from Chile, Brazil, and Uruguay. Congregaciones Emanu-El (Reform), Lamroth Hakol (German), and Templo Libertad also sponsored summer camps. In Buenos Aires and surrounding areas, some 5,000 children attended Jewish institutional and privately-owned day camps.

**Antisemitism and Church Relations**

Reaction to the Ecumenical Council was strong among both Argentina's Catholic clergy and lay leadership. Twenty-seven priests, representing 80 per
percent of the parishes in the province of Mendoza, resigned in protest against Archbishop Alfonso M. Buteler's criticism of the progressive attitudes of the Council and against his efforts to block the influence of young liberal priests. Cardinal Caggiano supported Buteler and assured him of "complete solidarity." Another defeat of the liberal clergy was the closing of Rolf Hochhuth's The Deputy, after a few performances in Buenos Aires, in response to a protest by the cardinal. The internal struggle between the two church factions was also seen in their attitudes toward the Council's statement concerning the Jews.

The Onganía government was emphatic in its denial of the existence of official antisemitism. It issued a particularly strong denial of reports of alleged antisemitic attitudes of the new government by the Argentine New York Times correspondent. On July 12 President Onganía received a delegation of the Jewish community, headed by Isaac Goldenberg, the president of DAIA. In the course of the conference, which was given wide coverage in the national press, the delegation expressed concern over the activities of extremist groups which "openly created artificial divisions within the Argentine family, while distorting the image of the nation." As a result of this meeting, a presidential statement was issued to the press, calling for a continuation of the ethical and traditional religious values of Argentina that always fostered tolerance and respect for the individual. Onganía also said that, as a firmly committed Catholic and as president of the nation, he would spare no efforts to promote the general welfare of the people and to take energetic action against any extremism of the left or right, that could endanger the harmonious development of society. Argentine Jewry was pleased with the president's statement.

One day before the Jewish delegation met with Onganía, Minister of the Interior Enrique Martinez Paz received Patricio Errecalte Pueyrredon, secretary general of the ultranationalist Tacuara movement (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 292), despite the fact that the new government had dissolved all political parties. Pueyrredon stated after the interview that Tacuara "supported the spirit and program of the new government." The Buenos Aires daily Yidishe Tsaytung found it hard to understand Martinez Paz's hurry to speak with a leader of this notorious, terrorist political group even before receiving representatives of such bodies as the Academy of Law and the Lawyers' Representative Societies.

In the periodical Política Internacional, the journalist Jorge Julio Greco stated that President Onganía was not antisemitic, but that some officials in the new administration were: "Now, as before, there were some elements, mainly from the middle class, who were not sympathetic to the Jews. And it is from this class that the military men come. However, the active, aggressive antisemite could only be found in an infamous minority."

The College of Lawyers strongly protested against the appointment of Fernando Mántaras as a judge in the province of Sante Fé, in November.
Mántaras had burned a floral wreath placed by the Jewish community on the statue of San Martin when Argentina recognized the State of Israel.

Throughout Argentina there were several sporadic antisemitic manifestations, such as swastika daubing in public places and the appearance of a group of extreme rightist activists in La Rioja.

**Naomi F. Meyer**
Brazil

During 1966 President Humberto de Alencar Castelo Branco relentlessly pursued his aim to legalize, with the support of the military and a comfortable majority in congress, the far-reaching political, administrative, and economic changes which he had instituted by presidential decree.

There was, however, growing disagreement between Castelo Branco and the military leaders of the March 1964 revolt, who had overthrown the João Goulart regime as a threat to democratic institutions, to freedom of thought and expression. They disagreed with Castelo Branco's concept of "democracy in action," that was a mixture of formal respect for the constitution and law, and the authoritarian manner in which he applied them. The idea of national security, as elaborated by the Escola Superior da Guerra (Higher School for Warfare), called "Sorbonne," became dominant; all else was subordinated to it.

The first challenge to the president's authority came during the last days of 1965, when Minister of War Arturo da Costa e Silva announced that he was a "contender for the candidacy of president." (He had signed the first emergency decree in 1964, which had put Castelo Branco into office.) Under military and civil pressure, Castelo Branco, who was generally suspected of wanting to succeed himself, was now forced to take up the question of presidential succession. He declared in February that no civilian candidate would be acceptable, and thereby barred his strongest political opponent, Guanabara's former governor Carlos Lacerda (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 295), from running for the presidency.

At the same time, Castelo Branco established by presidential decree (Ato Institucional No. 3) what was later called the "timetable for elections" (Calendário eleitoral). The decree called for: 1) gubernatorial elections on September 3, by absolute majority vote of the legislative assemblies in 11 states, to be held in public session (gubernatorial elections in Guanabara and Minas Gerais in 1965 by popular vote had brought victory to candidates of the opposition); 2) presidential and vice-presidential elections, on October 3, by absolute majority vote of the national congress; 3) elections for congress (senate and chamber of deputies) and state legislative assemblies by secret ballot. This timetable was rigorously observed. Since Castelo Branco held the power to suspend political rights, control over the elections remained in his hands. He handpicked the candidates for governorship, overruling even wishes of the military and of his supporters in the Alliance for National Renovation (Aliança Renovadora Nacional—ARENA; AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 295).

The most impressive proof of presidential power was the sudden disappearance of São Paulo's Governor Adhemar de Barros from the political
scene. He had been a key figure in the 1964 uprising, but, in March 1966, he began voicing severe criticism of the regime's economic policy which caused wide discontent in São Paulo industrial and commercial circles. In June he was suddenly ousted from the governorship, his political rights were suspended and he left for Europe to avoid imprisonment. Two months later his strongest supporter and a possible military candidate for the presidency, General Amaury Kruel was relieved of his post as commander of the second army, with headquarters in São Paulo.

The uncontested election on October 3 of Costa e Silva as president, and ARENA leader Pedro Aleixo as vice-president, was followed by a crucial challenge to Castelo Branco's power. He suspended the political rights of six members of the chamber of deputies, which had just elected his successor, but ran into strong resistance from its president and ARENA leader Adauto Lucio Cardoso, who called the presidential act a violation of the prerogatives of the chamber of deputies. He was supported by congress president Senator Auro Moura de Andrade. Public opinion was widely roused. Castelo Branco then adjourned congress and stationed soldiers there to enforce his decree. When the congress reconvened after the general election of November 15, the presidency of the chamber of deputies declared the mandates of the six suspended members void, against the vote of Adauto Cardoso, who resigned in protest from the presidency of the chamber.

The elections brought the expected victory for the ARENA which gained the majority in Congress and in most of the state assemblies. At the end of the year President Castelo Branco by special decree forced upon the congress a new constitution which would strengthen the president's executive power and weaken congress. He set the end of January 1967 as time limit for its adoption.

The progressive Archbishop D. Helder Camara of Olinda and Recife asked the clergy in a pastoral letter to help support attempts to institute far-reaching social changes for the improvement of the situation of the workers, especially in rural areas. To this, the commanding officer of the fourth army at Recife gave a violent public reply in July. The personal intervention of Castelo Branco and of the Archbishop D. Agnello Rossi of São Paulo, as president of the Conference of Brazilian Bishops, quickly put an end to the incident.

The extension of the two-parties system (ARENA and MDB, created by presidential decree in November 1965 until 1968) deflated Carlos Lacerda's hopes of becoming the presidential candidate of a third party. He signed a "Manifesto to the Nation," asking for a return to civil government and democratic procedures, in September and, after the November elections, went to Lisbon to meet former President Juscelino Kubitschek, with whom he signed the "Pact of Lisbon" calling for reestablishment of a civilian government in Brazil.

The country's international monetary position improved. Heavy and strictly enforced taxation supplied the government with money for a num-
ber of public and other projects. Foreign credit was greatly improved, and there was a rise in exports and a growing demand for imports. At the end of the year the dollar reserve was about 600 million. The national budget still showed a deficit, but it was expected that, barring a change in fiscal policies, the budget would be balanced within a few years.

Loans were granted by international and private banking institutions, but the flow of money into the country was slow because of the time needed to get big industrial projects under way. The auto industry, for example, reached its November 1962 production figure only in November 1966.

Although the value of the cruzeiro had remained stable (at 2.210 cruzeiros to the dollar) for more than 14 months, the promise given by Minister of Planning Roberto Oliveira Campos and Minister of Finance Otavio Gouveia de Bulhões to make 1966 the year of stabilization was not kept, and the new “hard cruzeiro” (cruzeiro forte) was not introduced.

The cost of living index rose by more than 40 per cent (about the same rate as in 1965). Wages increased by only 30 per cent; the minimum wage was maintained at 84,000 cruzeiros (about $40 a month) since March 1966, and consumption was shrinking. At the end of 1966 salaries for civil servants were raised 25 per cent.

Money in circulation in December 1966 totaled 2,661 billion cruzeiros, as compared with 2,275 billion at the end of 1965. Low buying power and the government’s fiscal policy, which syphoned large amounts of money from private enterprise and kept credit under strict control, greatly slowed down industrial development. The increase in the gross national product (GNP) could hardly keep pace with the rate of population growth (3.1–3.5 per cent).

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

The estimated number of Jews in Brazil was 130,000–140,000, of whom some 60,000 lived in São Paulo, 50,000 in Rio de Janeiro and 12,000 in Porto Alegre (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 342). Belo Horizonte (Minas Gerais) had about 3,000 Jews, Recife (Pernambuco) 1,600, Belém (Pará) 1,200, Paraná 1,300, and Salvador (Bahia) 1,000.

Immigration of Jews had come to a virtual standstill, with United HIAS Service reporting a total of 43 cases for the year. No figures were available for the negligible unassisted immigration.

According to the Zionist organization in Brazil, 213 Jews emigrated to Israel in 1966.

**Communal Activities**

The Confederação Israelita do Brasil (CIB—Jewish Confederation of Brazil; AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 296) strengthened its position as coordinating agency and spokesman for Brazilian Jewry. The federal government indirectly recognized the Confederation by inviting its president, Moysés
Kauffmann, to all official events on the occasion of President Shazar's visit (p. 429). In 1966 the Confederation's executive held three meetings: in March in São Paulo, in June and November, in Rio, at which national and international problems affecting Jews were discussed. Among the activities of the Confederation were a protest against the court verdict handed down in the Novak war crimes trial at Vienna to which it received an official reply from the Austrian embassy in Rio (December); a protest to the Russian embassy in Rio against equating Zionism with Nazism; expressions of appreciation to the Brazilian government for its condemnation of antisemitism at the UN and to the embassy of Uruguay for rejecting an anti-Israel resolution at a three continents conference in Havana, Cuba. Its representatives also met with Deputy Rainer Barzel of the Bonn parliament, on his visit to Rio de Janeiro.

The Federação Israelita do Estado de São Paulo (Jewish Federation of São Paulo; AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 296) opened new offices in December on the occasion of its 20th anniversary. Other communal celebrations included the 25th anniversary of the Associação Religiosa Israelita (ARI—Jewish Religious Association) at Rio de Janeiro, headed by Rabbi Henrique Lemle (July); the 30th anniversary of the Congregação Israelita Paulista (CIP) in São Paulo, headed by Rabbi Fritz Pinkuss (September), and the golden jubilee of the São Paulo welfare organization EZRA, one of the oldest Jewish institutions in Brazil (May).

As a constituent member of the World Jewish Congress, the Confederation sent delegates to the WJC general assembly at Brussels in August; and to meetings of the South American Council of the WJC in Buenos Aires and Montevideo. In July, it sent representatives to Geneva to attend meetings of the World Council of Jewish Education and of the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture of which it became a member.

The second Pan American Maccabiah was organized at São Paulo in August with 600 participants from 15 countries. More than 20,000 spectators attended each of the two events at which the state government and the Church were officially represented.

A new burial place was consecrated in July at Rio in Vila Rosali. The São Paulo Cemetery Society bought a five million square foot plot as reserve, although 15,000 places are still available in the new cemetery in Butantan.

The Liga Feminina Israelita (Jewish Women’s League) held a seminar on the volunteer community worker (August); in collaboration with the Instituto Brasileiro Judáico de Cultura a Divulgação, WIZO organized a three-day seminar for young couples on the role of the Jewish mother in a changing society.

Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan, UN high commissioner for refugees, visited Brazil in September and met with leaders of Jewish welfare institutions. UN funds were to be made available for the care of former Jewish refugees.

American visitors to Brazil included Max Lerner to Rio and São Paulo (April); Republican Senator Jacob Javits (April) and Judel Mark of YIVO,
who spoke in Rio and São Paulo (July-August). Professor Konrad Bloch of Harvard, 1964 Nobel Prize-winner in medicine, who toured five South American countries, was the official guest of the Foreign Office in Brazil (July). He gave lectures at the universities of São Paulo and Rio, received an honorary doctorate of medicine from the Federal University of Brazil and was made an honorary citizen of Rio de Janeiro.

Communal Relations

The position of the Jews in Brazil, was not affected by political trends. In the November general elections six Jews, running on both ARENA and MDB tickets, were elected to the chamber of deputies: Julia Steinbruch (MDB), wife of Senator Aaron Steinbruch, and Ruben Medina (MDB) in Guanabara; Marcos Kertzmann (ARENA) and David Lerer (MDB) in São Paulo; Henrique Henkin (MDB) in Paraná, and Abraão Saba (ARENA) in Amazonas. This was the largest number of Jews elected in any single election. No reference to Jews was heard during the campaign or after the elections. Non-Jewish candidates sought Jewish votes; they visited synagogues in São Paulo and Rio on Rosh Ha-shanah and Yom Kippur.

The Brazilian press gave prominence to news of Jewish interest, both on the international scene (Middle East affairs, events in Germany, the situation of the Jews in Russia) and in local affairs. Comments on news such as the liberation of war criminals Baldur von Schirach and Albert Speer (p. 355) or the elections in Hesse and Bavaria (p. 351) referred to the horrible Nazi past. The writers were generally well informed, objective, and sympathetic to the Jews. Jewish religious and communal festivals were the topic of articles in many papers, which attempted to explain them to their readers by pointing out similarities between them and Christian holidays (Purim and Carnival, Hanukkah and Christmas, Rosh Ha-shanah and the New Year).

The activities of the Conselho de Fraternidade Cristão-Judaica (Council for Christian-Jewish Brotherhood) in São Paulo (and, to a lesser degree, in Rio de Janeiro) were reflected in a growing ecumenical spirit. In July a “Day of Prayer” at Rio was addressed by Christian and Jewish speakers and attended by Governor Negrão de Lima. The interfaith events culminated in São Paulo in October with a series of four evenings devoted to the following subjects: “The Bible and Human Society,” “The Bible as Inspiration in Art,” “The Bible as Fountain of Revelation and as Literature,” and “The Presence of the Bible in the Contemporary Life of Man.” The last event was a round-table discussion held at the CIP community center. Jewish speakers were Rabbis Fritz Pinkuss and Menachem Diesendruck, Carlos A. Levi, and Isaac Schifnagel; art critic Lisette Levi showed slides of scenes from the Bible. Cardinal Rossi of São Paulo, honorary president of the Council, formed 14 teams to prepare for the implementation of the Ecumenical Council decrees in his diocese; one study group was assigned to work on changes in liturgy and didactic texts.
In January, on the occasion of the anniversary of the founding of São Paulo, Rabbi Pinkuss was one of six religious leaders who addressed a special session of the city council.

The Jewish community gave generous aid to victims of three national disasters: torrential rainstorms in Rio de Janeiro-Guanabara, in which 200 lost their lives; widespread forest fires in Paraná, and a severe draught in the Northeastern Brazil.

Intergroup relations, especially in the smaller towns, were good; in Recife, for example, B'nai B'rith invited non-Jews to monthly dinner parties.

Mrs. Yedda N. R. Benzecry was named to sit on the Council of the Fundação Nacional do Bem-Estar do Menor (National Foundation for the Welfare of Minors) in Rio de Janeiro (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 299), with another Jew, Professor H. Rattner of São Paulo, as her alternate.

Jewish organizations which received tax-exempt status were the Lar dos Velhos (home for the aged) (January) and the Center for Religious Education which supports the Orthodox-oriented Bet Hinnukh school and Javne College in São Paulo (March).

In São Paulo, a school was named in honor of the late Brazilian Jewish minister Horácio Lafer.

Human Rights

The United Nations organized a seminar on apartheid in Brasília (Aug.-Sept.) to which the Coordinating Board of Jewish Organizations sent an observer.

The Instituto Brasileiro de Direitos Humanos (IBRADIU—Institute of Human Rights; AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 299) was represented at the 22nd session of the UN Committee for Human Rights in April by its secretary general, Isaac Schifnagel.

The regional delegates of the nongovernmental organizations, among them the Instituto Brasileiro-Judaico de Cultura e Divulgação, marked Human Rights Day, December 10, at a social gathering in the São Paulo municipal theater. The entertainment included a performance by the A Hebraica choir. Brazilian Deputy Cunha Bueno who was also president of IBRADIU, stressed the importance of Human Rights Day in a speech in the congress.

Religious Activities

The number of rabbis remained unchanged. Rabbi M. M. Masliah of Rio de Janeiro, left for Mexico; at the same time, Rabbi Chaim Begun, a native Brazilian educated in the Lubavitcher yeshivah in New York, was appointed as spiritual leader in a São Paulo congregation.

Two students of the Buenos Aires Rabbinical Seminary came to São Paulo during the High Holy Days where they served with the Congregação Israelita Paulista as assistant rabbis. The A Hebraica club in São Paulo which is plan-
ning to construct its own synagogue held religious services on the High Holy Days, with Sidor Belarsky famous Yiddish singer, as hazzan.

The Keneset Israel synagogue in São Paulo celebrated its golden anniver-
sary in November. In August, the Comunidade Israelita de Copacabana in Rio dedicated its new synagogue Bet-El. It was designed by Elias Kaufman and had stained glass windows painted by Emeric Marcier.

In Belo Horizonte three Jewish organizations joined to form the Comu-
nidade Israelita Mineira (CORIM). The community had two synagogues, both Orthodox—Tefferet Israel and Bet Yakov.

**Education**

The central office of Jewish education which had moved from Rio de Janeiro to São Paulo (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 300), began work on several projects under the direction of its president, Marcos H. Firer. It was developing a general program of education, as well as educational material and plans for more advanced training of kindergarten and other teachers and assistant teachers in national seminaries, along with supplementary courses in Jewish culture. The agency also participated in the World Jewish Congress for Education held at Geneva in August; the Education Commit-
tee of the World Zionist Organization; the Education Committee of the Action Committee of the World Zionist Congress, and the Congress for Edu-
cation in Uruguay.

Brazil had 33 Jewish schools which were supervised by the central office for education. Thirteen of the schools, including kindergartens, elementary and secondary schools, a college and teachers training institute were in São Paulo; 13 similar schools, as well as a yeshivah, in Rio de Janeiro; one ele-
mentary school with 95 pupils in Salvador; one school with 26 pupils in Recife; one in Curitiba; one in Pôrto Alegre; two—the Theodor Herzl school with 100 pupils and the Israelita Brasileira with about 60 Jewish and 22 non-Jewish children in Belo Horizonte, and one school in Niteroi (state of Rio de Janeiro).

Altogether 10,409 students attended these schools: 2,907 attended kinder-
garten and pre-primary schools (pré-primário); 4,611 were enrolled in gram-
mar schools (primário); 2,383 attended college (ginásio), and a total of 508 went to secondary and teachers training schools. In addition to these officially listed schools there may be several more in the smaller cities, which are not listed with the central office, as for example a grammar school in Belém do Pará which has 45 pupils.

A yeshivah college with campus was opened at Petrópolis near Rio in February. By the end of 1966, students from six different towns or cities in Brazil were in attendance.

In an effort to raise the educational standards of Jewish schools, the Sho-
lem Aleichem college (established in August as an extension of the Sholem Aleichem school) held a three-day symposium for teachers and experts in the field of education in September.
Fifteen candidates graduated from the Hebrew Teachers’ Seminary which is under the supervision of the Conselho Educativo of the São Paulo Federation and officially connected with the Casa de Cultura e Língua Hebraica (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 304).

Youth

There were no changes in the organizational setup of youth movements (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 300). B’nai B’rith held its first youth seminar at the Associação Religiosa Israelita center in Rio de Janeiro in June. It was attended by university students from Belo Horizonte, Campinas, Curitiba, Manaus, Rio de Janeiro, Salvador, Santos, and São Paulo. The São Paulo Federation’s Youth Council and central office for education held their first seminar for the training of youth leaders in November. Seventeen youth leaders, representing all groups, went to Israel on a Jewish Agency sponsored training tour in preparation for teaching careers in Brazil.

Grupo Universitario Hebraico (Organization of Jewish University Students) was given offices at the Casa de Cultura e Língua Hebraica.

Cultural Activities

Instituto Brasileiro-Judaico de Cultura a Divulgação (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 189), in cooperation with local agencies, arranged audio-visual educational programs in Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Belo Horizonte, Recife, and Salvador; organized a Jewish book exposition at São Paulo in December, which was hailed as a significant cultural event by the general press; published several booklets, including AJC—O que é—O que faz (“The American Jewish Committee: What It Is, and What It Does”) by John Slawson; Dez Comunidades Judáicas (“Ten Jewish Communities”) and Simpósio sôbre Educação Judáica (“Symposium on Jewish Education”), a report on a symposium at the Associação Religiosa Israelita center in Rio de Janeiro. Comentário the Portuguese quarterly of the Instituto, began its 7th year of publication.

Nobel prize-winner S. Y. Agnon was honored at a special meeting arranged by the Hebrew section of the University of São Paulo’s department of Oriental studies. Ben Tzion Tomer, cultural attaché of the Israeli embassy, and the well-known Jewish author Jacó Guinsburg, addressed the audience. The Brazilian press praised the works of both Agnon and Nelly Sachs, who shared the prize with him.

In November the A Hebráica club opened its own art gallery as a permanent feature of its cultural program. The club’s organ A Hebráica was developed by its editor José Knoplich from an information bulletin into a monthly magazine with a circulation of 7,000.

Two publishing houses for Jewish books in the Portuguese language were founded in 1966. In São Paulo Jacó Guinsburg established Editora Perspectiva which planned to publish a Judáica collection of 12 books covering, as
it claimed, "4,000 years on 4,000 pages." Four volumes have already appeared: 40 Contos de I. L. Peretz (a collection of stories); Nova e Velha Pátria ("The New and the Old Homeland"—stories by 31 authors); Conto Idish (a collection of stories in Yiddish by 31 authors), and Contos da Dispérso ("Folktales of Israel"). Editora Perspectiva also will publish Debates, a series of volumes containing Portuguese translations of philosophical and sociological works.

In Rio de Janeiro, a group connected with the leading publishing house Editora Delta founded Editora Tradição (February) which planned to publish Biblioteca de Cultura Judáica, a series of 10 books, as well as translations and adaptations of Nathan Ausubel's The Book of Jewish Knowledge; Howard M. Schar's The Course of Modern Jewish History; Solomon Grayzel's A History of the Jews; Mortimer J. Cohen's Pathways Through the Bible; Cecil Roth's An Illustrated History of Jewish Art and The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia, and David Ben-Gurion's The Jews in Their Land.


Among books on Jewish subjects by Brazilian authors were: Waldirio Bucarelli, O kibutz e as cooperativas integrais ("The Kibbutz and the Integral Cooperatives") published by Livraria Pioneira in April; Jacob Pinheiro Goldberg, A discriminação racial e a lei brasileira ("Racial Discrimination and Brazilian Law"), published by Editora Luanda in August, and Guilherme de Figueiredo, Deus sobre pedras ("God upon Stones"), impressions of a trip to Israel published by Editora José Álvaro, Rio; Geraldo Ferraz, Warchavchik e a introdução da nova arquitetura no Brasil: 1925-1940 ("Warchavchik and the Introduction of New Architecture in Brazil") published by Museu de Arte, São Paulo, in August. The publication of Osvaldo Orico's Pio XII e o massacre dos Judeus ("Pius XII and the massacre of the Jews") was used by some newspapers as an occasion for the censure of writers—especially Rolf Hochhuth—who had condemned Pope Pius for his failure to speak out on behalf of the persecuted Jews. Two books by Rabbi Fritz Pinkuss of São Paulo also appeared in 1966: Quatro Milênios de Existência Judáica ("Four Thousand Years of Jewish Existence"), published by
the São Paulo University Revista Histórica and financed by the American Jewish Committee's community service, and O Caminho de uma Geração ("The Way of a Generation") a selection of his sermons and speeches, published by Congregação Israelita Paulista's Fritz Pinkuss Foundation on the occasion of the congregation's 30th anniversary.

A Franz Kafka exhibit, organized under the supervision of Professor Eduard Goldstiicker of Prague (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 438), was shown at the city library in São Paulo.

Among the São Paulo artists whose work was exhibited at the Salvador Bienal in November, were Mariselda Bumajny, Moyses Baumstein, Paulina Rabinovich, Alice Brill, and Anatol Wladyslaw. The Brazilian Foreign Office (Itamarati) in April bought a number of paintings by Yolanda Mohali, Franz Weismann, Abraham Palatnik, Rubens Gerchmann and Fayga Ostrower, shown at the eighth Bienal in São Paulo (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 302), for Brazilian embassies abroad. Works by Fayga Ostrower were shown at the Bienal in Bahia, at the Galeria Arco d'Aliveri in Rome, and at the Armos Anderson museum in Helsinki, as well as at the Brazilian-American Cultural Institute in Washington.

The Joseph Buloff theater group gave performances of several Yiddish comedies in Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo in September.

In May the 50th anniversary of the death of Sholem Aleichem was widely commemorated; the Instituto Cultural Israelita-Brasileiro in São Paulo observed the day at a gathering in the Teatro Israelita Brasileiro.

The press review of Brazilian Jewish pianist Yara Bernett's recitals in London were very favorable; the pianist Anna Stella Schic went on a European concert tour in February. Isaac Karabchewski, founder and conductor of the famous Renascença madrigal choir (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 351) became assistant to Eleazar de Carvalho, the conductor of the Brazilian symphony orchestra. Nathan Schwartzman, well-known violinist and professor at the University of Brasília, went on a European concert tour which was sponsored by the Brazilian Foreign Office.

Zionism and Relations with Israel

On the occasion of President and Mrs. Zalman Shazar's nine-day state visit to Brazil in July, the entire country did their utmost to show their warm feelings for Israel. Shazar and his entourage first visited Brasilia, where President Castelo Branco officially received him. With the congress in recess, a special parliamentary committee headed by Deputy Cunha Bueno met the president. In São Paulo, at a reception given by state and municipal authorities, Shazar was made an "honorary citizen of São Paulo." The leaders of the Jewish communities, who were officially invited to all state affairs, showed their deep affection for Israel's president at the social gatherings which they organized in his honor. In Rio de Janeiro, the last stage of the visit, there were several more official receptions at which speakers voiced the desire on
the part of both Israel and Brazil for stronger cultural and economic relations. President Shazar received an honorary doctorate at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. The Brazilian daily and weekly press prominently featured all news about the visit. A postal stamp with a picture of Shazar was issued in his honor. A joint statement on future cooperation was made at the end of the visit.

Israel Ambassador Josef Nahmias left Brazil in October and was succeeded by Ambassador Shmuel Divon.

In honor of the Brazilian statesman, Oswaldo Aranha, who presided at the UN General Assembly in 1947 which decided on the establishment of a Jewish state, the Oswaldo Aranha cultural center was founded in the so-called Brazilian kibbutz Bror Chail in the northern Negev with funds contributed for that purpose by Israel Klabin and other members of his family.

In May Israel and Brazil signed a convention on the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Aloysio Regis Bittencourt, Brazilian Ambassador to Israel, started a building campaign for a House of Brazil in Israel on a site donated by the Israel government.

In August the Brasil-Israel Chamber of Commerce in Tel Aviv published its first Portuguese and Hebrew language bulletin, edited by Salomon Tocker.

Ney Braga, former governor of Paraná and senator-elect, visited Israel in November. Fourteen graduates of the Brazilian Escola Superior da Guerra visited Israel in November as guests of the Israel army command.

Rabbi Israel Goldstein, President of the Keren Hayesod, and Netanel Lorch, Israel ambassador to Peru, visited Brazil in April.

The 1962 Treaty of Recife (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 190) formed the basis for an intensive agricultural program in Brazil in which Israel actively cooperated. Israeli irrigation and soil conservation experts were often in Brazil and Brazilian agriculture students spent much time in Israel. Raanam Weitz, head of the Jewish Agency colonization department spent three weeks in June in Brazil, investigating methods of developing and colonizing Northeastern Brazil. His visit was sponsored by the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Brazilian government. Israel and the state of Rio Grande do Norte agreed on a $100,000 project to establish a joint wells and irrigation enterprise. Arrangements were also made for the special training of Latin American heads of production centers in Israel. In February ARTENE (Promotion of Artisans in the Northeast of Brazil) was invited to participate in the Tel Aviv International Fair, as were Brazilian firms. Israeli Minister of Agriculture Hayyim Gvati came to Brazil in May to discuss cooperation in the field with the Brazilian Minister of Agriculture, Ney Braga.

Among other Israelis who visited Brazil were: Kneset member Rabbi Salomon I. Gross of Agudat Israel (November); Moshe Ron, secretary-general of the Association of Journalists (August), and an impressive list of
scientists including Chaviv Etery, director of the Institute for Biological Research.

Professor Pedro Calmon, Atos de Silveira Ramos, Fritz Feigl and Israel Klabin were chosen by the Weizmann Institute of Israel to form a special commission for permanent exchange of scientists (August).

Several Hebrew University professors visited Brazil in 1966: Felix Bergmann of the pharmacology department, to attend the Congress of Pharmacology in São Paulo; Hilel Nathan of the medical faculty; Daniel Zohary of the botany department, to attend the International Symposium for Genetics in Piracicaba in São Paulo, and Aharon Shulov, zoology department, to participate in an international symposium on animal poisons at the Butantan snake farm in São Paulo.

Professor Warwick E. Kerr of the University of São Paulo medical school in Ribeirão Preto went to Israel in January. The psychologist Cintra Menezes represented Brazil at an Israel government sponsored seminar on the fight against illiteracy among women (August). The renowned Brazilian author Erico Veríssimo went on a 20-day tour of Israel to gather material for his forthcoming book, April in Israel.

The Israeli artist Rico Blass exhibited his paintings in Rio de Janeiro and in São Paulo (April). The works of five Israeli artists were shown at WIZO-organized exhibits in São Paulo in November and in Rio de Janeiro in December. Brazilian artist Augusto Barbosa showed his paintings in Tel-Aviv in August, and an exhibit of the works of Danilo di Prete, Manabu Mabe, Yolanda Mohali, and Arcangelo Lanelli, organized by art critic Lisette Levi, called "Four Brazilian painters" was opened at the Tel-Aviv art museum in November.

In March Professor Alfredo de Mello gave a talk on Israeli music in Rio. Israel participated in the International Festival of Folksongs in Rio de Janeiro in October. João Bethencourt represented Brazil at the UNESCO-sponsored International Congress for Theater at Tel Aviv in June.

Alexander Schemer, director of the Casa de Cultura e Língua Hebraica in São Paulo (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 349; 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 304) returned to Israel in August. He was succeeded by Josef Lefkowitz of Israel. The Casa Hebrew-language courses had an enrolment of 400 persons. Its program also included lectures, conferences, and exhibits of all kinds. It offered instruction in Israeli folk dancing in preparation for public performances at official functions.

**Antisemitism**

In Curitiba, capital of Paraná, the Jewish cemetery was again desecrated (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 192). Federal authorities have been alerted to watch the situation in this state where new immigrants from many European countries are living in closed groups, perpetuating their old-world prejudices. Sporadic rumors that Josef Mengele and Martin Borman were seen and that
former Nazis had established training camps in Brazil remained unconfirmed. Occasional swastika daubings in Rio, São Paulo, and elsewhere were condemned by the authorities and in the press.

Attempts by the Arab League to foment antisemitism in Brazil by means of anti-Israel propaganda remained unsuccessful. In general, the press took little note of Arab declarations; nor did a visit in November of a trade delegation from five Arab countries make headlines. Talk of the possibility of extending the Arab boycott to Brazil evoked a strong statement from acting Foreign Secretary Pio Correa in October. He made it clear that his government would not tolerate polemics against any nation, and would take the strongest measures if the Arab League, which was permitted in Brazil only as a cultural and welfare agency, engaged in political activities.

The Confederação Israelita do Brasil strongly protested a single incident when a Brazilian firm, Companhia Italiana de Navegação Linea C, gave up its representation of the Israeli steamship line ZIM as a result of pressure by the Arab League boycott committee.

Although the sale of the Portuguese edition of Hitler's Mein Kampf, had been prohibited in Brazil, copies of it were still in circulation.

**Personalia**

In April, architects Jorge Wilheim and Rosa Kliass were chosen by São Paulo Mayor Faria Lima to plan the urbanization of the Tietê river valley. The São Paulo community leader Carlos Katzenstein was elected president of a nonsectarian health organization fighting tuberculosis among the poor population (October). David Kopenhagen, honorary president of the Latin American MACABI, was elected vice-president of the Macabi World Union in December. In December Dr. Pedro Bloch, oculist, playwright, and active in Rio de Janeiro's Jewish cultural life, was made honorary citizen of Guanabara. Colonel A. Chahon was promoted to the rank of general; General Waldemar Levi Cardoso became a marshall when he was transferred to the reserve. The governor of Paraná appointed Saul Raiz secretary of state for transportation and public works. In Bahia, the governor appointed Boris Tabacow secretary of the treasury, and Bernardo Spector secretary for welfare.

Gabriel Kibrit, leader of the São Paulo Sefardi community died in February at the age of 72. Marcos Constantino, an attorney and for many years a leader in Jewish communal organizations, died at Rio de Janeiro in October at the age of 56. Eduard Horwitz, who had been president of the now defunct Centro Hebraico Brasileiro died at Rio de Janeiro in October at the age of 71. Isaak Koifmann, one of the founders of the Sholem Aleichem college and library in Rio de Janeiro, died in November at the age of 73. Henry Szulc, journalist and former director of JDC in São Paulo, died in December at the age of 67.

Alfred Hirschberg
Mexico

When Gustavo Díaz Ordaz became president in 1964, he initiated government policies new in the history of Mexico. During his first two years in office, he firmly maintained the country’s political and economic stability. Great emphasis was placed on agrarian reform, and land was distributed to the farmers who worked the fields. But while the standard of living in rural areas, where the majority of Mexicans lived, improved, it could not keep pace with that in the cities. The industrialization of the country was particularly effective.

Jewish Community

The Mexican Jewish community, which has been in existence for more than 50 years, numbered about 45,000, or 0.1 per cent of the general population. The figure was an estimate based on the membership in various communal institutions and organizations, as well as on the number of Jews known to be living in the various states of the Mexican Republic. No comprehensive records had ever been kept. Immigration of Jews since the end of World War II has been practically nonexistent because of stringent anti-immigration laws. The community was therefore composed mainly of second- and third-generation Jews, who are Mexican citizens with the same rights and duties granted to all Mexicans by the Constitution.

There were in Mexico several groups of “Jewish Indians” claiming to be descendants of marranos and of Spanish Jews who arrived in the country during the period of Spanish conquest (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 353). The best known communities of these “Jewish Indians”—their exact number was undetermined—were in Venta Prieta, in the state of Hidalgo, and in Cocula, in the state of Guerrero. There was also a group in Mexico City, with its own synagogue in a poor section of the city.

For many years the very existence of these “Jewish Indians” produced a passionate controversy over the true origin of Mexican Judaism. The diversity of opinions depended as much on the individual’s religious as on his historical point of view. Except for their religious belief and their synagogues, these communities had no connections with Mexican Jewry. However, they have, on various occasions, displayed interest in coming close to and identifying with the larger Jewish community and its institutions.

Communal Activities

The Comité Central Israelita (Central Jewish Committee), the representative organ of the Mexican Jews, consisted of 21 delegates representing the
various Jewish communities on a proportional basis: 11 from the Kehilá Ashkenazi Nidje Israel, the Ashkenazi community which was believed to comprise 60 per cent of all Mexican Jews; three from the Unión Sefaradi (Sephardí Union); three from the Alianza Monte Sinai, the organization of Jews from Damascus, Syria; two from Zedaká Umarpé, the community of Jews from Aleppo, Syria; one from Emuna, for Hungarian Jews, and one from the Hatikva Menorah, for German Jews. The Comité represented these communities as a national and social entity in all dealings with the government. It also spoke for Mexican Jewry in the World Jewish Congress and other international Jewish organizations. The committee’s president was Gregorio Shapiro.

Kehilá Ashkenazi, modeled after the East European kehillot, recently built a community center with offices and conference rooms, which was also the meeting place for many organizations. Simón Feldman has been its president for more than a decade. It supported a number of Orthodox synagogues, had two rabbis, a cemetery, and carefully supervised stores in which kosher meat was sold. It supported the religious Yavne school, had its own hevra kaddisha, and maintained Eshel, a home for senior citizens located in the city of Cuernavaca.

Only five years ago, a group of young people founded the Bet-El Congregation (Conservative), which soon became an important part of the life of the young generation of Mexican Jews. They built a temple and social facilities for more than 300 families.

Another Conservative congregation, the Bet Israel Community Center, consisted largely of English-speaking North American Jews temporarily living in Mexico.

The Consejo Mexicano de Mujeres Israelitas (Mexican Council of Jewish Women), was part of the Comité Central Israelita, but operated as an autonomous communal agency. It provided fellowships for university students, educational material for numerous schools and aid to crippled children. It maintained cordial relations with many non-Jewish women’s groups in an effort to advance the important need for Mexican-Jewish rapprochement.

The Centro Deportivo Israelita (Jewish Sports Center), planned and built by the young generation of Mexican Jews, has grown rapidly in recent years. Its original function as a sports center has been superseded by its new role as an important social institution (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 355). It had a membership of over 20,000—the largest of any Jewish institution in Mexico—coming from all parts of the country and from all walks of life. Over 200 non-Jewish Mexicans applied for membership, and were accepted. The Centro resembled a small city, with an outdoor sports arena, gymnasiums, restaurants, swimming pool, functional entertainment rooms, an ample library, and art exhibits. It undertook cultural projects in Spanish as well as in Yiddish, and organized two theater groups performing in both languages.

The Mexican Jewish community also had several social service institutions
doing important work. Among these the Hilfsfarein, dedicated to the assistance of the indigent, was the first to be founded. The Froienfarein (Society of Jewish Women) aided needy Jewish women and their families. The Sociedad Mexicana OSE cooperated with the Centro Médico OSE (OSE Medical Center) in offering medical assistance to the poor. In addition, it maintained a vacation home for the special use of children from poor families.

In June 1966 the American Jewish Committee opened an office for Mexico and Central America. Among its first diverse activities was the issuance of two Spanish-language publications, Para su Información and Cuaderno, providing information on current Jewish affairs.

The Banco Mercantil de México, S.A. (The Mexican Mercantile Bank), a substantial and prestigious financial institution servicing primarily Mexico's Jews, has for many years also played an important role in national economic affairs.

**Education**

The Mexican Jewish community took particular pride in its educational system. In Mexico City alone, there were seven Jewish secular schools and two yeshivot. In addition to the Sunday school of the Bet Israel community center and the Talmud Torah of the Bet-El congregation, there were two secular schools in the interior, one in Guadalajara and one in Monterrey. Approximately 65 per cent of all Jewish children attended these institutions. The secular schools used the ministry of education curriculum, which was supplemented by Jewish studies including Hebrew and Yiddish. Graduates of the secular schools, however, had only scant knowledge of Jewish subjects because too little time was devoted to these studies, and their content was quite outdated. The teachers in these schools were graduates of the Seminario de Maestros de Yiddish y Hebreo (Seminary of Yiddish and Hebrew Teachers), conducted under the auspices of the Kehilá Ashkenazi. A number of others were sent from Israel for temporary teaching assignments at the schools.

**Culture and Publications**

One of the many worthwhile projects of the Kehilá Ashkenazi was the establishment of a Commission of Culture, under Tuvia Maizel, which for years has been organizing round-table conferences in Yiddish, with foreign Jewish intellectuals as participants. The commission also supported a Yiddish theater and a Month of Jewish Music. The latter took on national significance in 1966, when Brazil’s Public Education Minister Agustín Yañez presided over its main concerts that took place in front of the Palace of Fine Arts.

Malkah Rabell's book, *The Modern Jewish Theatre*, in Spanish, was published by the Theatre of the University of Mexico. The Foundation of Economic Culture published the *Common Collective in Mexico* by Salomón
Eckstein, a graduate of the National University in Mexico and now head of the department of economics at Bar-Ilan University in Israel. Abel Eisenberg, an esteemed musician, was appointed director of the National Conservatory of Music symphony orchestra. A mural by the artist Fanny Rabell is at the National Museum of Anthropology.

The Jewish press in Mexico played a vital role in the education and orientation of the Jewish community. The publications were: Der Weg, a bi-weekly Yiddish and Spanish publication; Di Sh'time, a Yiddish bi-weekly; Prensa Israelita, a Spanish weekly; Horizonte Israelita, Tribuna Israelita, and Revista Israelita de México, Spanish monthlies; Forois and Fraind, Yiddish monthlies; Kojavim, a Yiddish, Hebrew, and Spanish publication devoted to children, and Voz Sefaradi, a Spanish review. Several other publications of the various Zionist parties, youth groups, and schools, appeared sporadically. Mexico had an Association of Jewish Writers and Journalists.

**Antisemitism**

In 1965 a number of Mexico City synagogues were daubed with swastikas and other antisemitic symbols, but the police failed to establish the identity of the perpetrators. At the end of 1966, 32 gravestones in the city's Jewish cemetery were desecrated in the same manner. Blatantly antisemitic books continued to be published and sold at a low price in large quantities to libraries and private individuals throughout Mexico, and to all other Latin American countries. As a result, Mexico has become the headquarters for the distribution of antisemitic propaganda throughout the Spanish-speaking world.

The Arab monthly Al Gurbal in Mexico City carried on a continuous anti-Jewish and anti-Israel campaign, as propaganda agent for the Arabs.

A pamphlet entitled, "Food for Thought for the Greatest Progress in Vatican Council II," appeared in 1965 and was widely distributed throughout the country. Its author was Joaquin Sáenz de Arriaga, doctor of philosophy and theology, of the archdiocese of Mexico, who had published other anti-Jewish books. The pamphlet advocated a 20th century Inquisition in Mexico. Typical antisemitic articles now and then appeared in the Mexican press, especially in provincial newspapers.

These various attacks on the Jews moved Mayor Alfonso Corona del Rosal of Mexico City to issue an official statement which said: "Mexico, under the leadership of President Díaz Ordaz and guided by a traditional international policy of respect for human rights and justice, will not permit the disruption of the climate of tolerance at home or the attack on the democratic principles which characterize the social life of the country."

**Zionism and Relations with Israel**

The largest Zionist organization in the country, the Zionist Federation of Mexico, consisted of Poale Zion, Sionistas Generales (General Zionists), Partido Liberal (Free Party), Herut, Mapam, and Mizrachi parties, as well as
of the WIZO and the Damas Pioneras (Pioneer Women). The various young grupos jalutzianos (pioneering groups), with central headquarters in the Young Zionist Federation, received financial and moral support from the Zionist Federation of Mexico. Keren Kayyemet and Keren Hayesod were also active within the Zionist movement. The unaffiliated Organización Sionista Sefaredí (Sephardi Zionist Organization), had its own youth group and a cultural committee called "Victor Mitrani."

The strong Zionist orientation of the Mexican Jews was reflected in the community's general attitude. However, the decrease of Zionist activity among young people in recent years has become a problem for the Zionist movement.

Relations between Mexico and Israel remained very cordial. The diplomatic services performed by Israeli Ambassador Shimshon Arad have been extended to the cultural, social, and artistic spheres. Among the eminent Mexicans who visited Israel as guests of the government were Minister of Public Education Agustín Yañez; Ruth Rivera, director of the department of architecture of the National Institute of Fine Arts; Martín Luis Guzmán, revolutionary writer and director of Tiempo magazine; Donato Miranda Fonseca, member of a special commission appointed by President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz; José Luis Martínez, prominent intellectual and director of the National Institute of Fine Arts, and Minister of Hydraulic Resources José Hernández Terán. A large number of Mexicans went to Israel to attend different courses and seminars. Many prominent Israelis have visited Mexico on various missions.

For many years Israel has been giving technical assistance to Mexico, in agriculture and the establishment of cooperatives. The Mexican-Israeli Cultural Institute, headed by Senator Andrés Serra Rojas has undertaken a number of cultural and artistic ventures. Progress has also been made in trade between Israel and Mexico through the efforts of the Mexican-Israeli Chamber of Commerce. For the first time, in June 1966, Mexico was represented at the Tel Aviv fair.

Personalia

The economist Benjamin Ratchkiman was named private secretary of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Jacobo Zabludovsky, journalist and television commentator, was appointed professor of journalism at the School of Political and Social Sciences of the National University. Drs. Samuel Fastlicht, Fernando Katz, Horacio Jinich, and Rubén Lisker were named members of the National Academy of Medicine.

Dr. Marcos Moshinsky, prominent nuclear physicist, received the 1966 science award of the Elías Sourasky Fund, which gives annual prizes to Mexicans for their contributions to science, art, research, and other fields. The Jewish community suffered the loss of Salomón Kahan, writer and musicologist; Yosef Winiecki, journalist, and novelist Meyer Corona.

SERGIO NUDELSTEJER
The general election in March 1966 returned the Labor party to power with a working majority of 100, as against the knife-edge margin of three which had forced Prime Minister Harold Wilson to rely on Liberal support during the previous year. The election was fought out between the party leaders on national television. Local issues and candidates counted for less than ever before.

Despite a detailed and appealing platform, Edward Heath, the new Conservative leader failed to live down the distaste of the electorate for his party’s choice of Sir Alec Douglas-Home as its previous leader. Harold Wilson received credit for 15 months of skillful government with an active but moderate legislative program.

A seamen’s strike during the summer, rising home demand, and overheating of the economy precipitated severe balance-of-payments difficulties and devaluation rumors. These were dealt with by very stringent and unpopular deflationary measures. Large tax increases, budgetary expenditure reductions, and orthodox financial restraints were coupled with new laws prohibiting price and wage rises. By year’s end, unemployment had risen and business profitability had declined, the booming prosperity of the Southeast being less affected than that of the areas dependent on engineering and heavy industry. The new tax increases can be expected to bite hard into British domestic prosperity in 1967.

Large finds of natural gas were made under the North Sea and the Yorkshire mainland, promising Britain a major relief from her dependence on imported fuel.

New antitrust laws were passed requiring the prior consent of the Monopolies Commission for any large business merger. Under these, Canadian newspaper tycoon Lord Thompson was allowed to take over The Times. Other permitted mergers were British Motor Corporation’s purchase of Jaguar and Leylands’ acquisition of Rover in the depressed car industry.

Harold Wilson’s policy of limited economic warfare against the Ian Smith administration in Rhodesia failed, largely through South African blockade breaking. Smith and Wilson met but failed to reach agreement to end the
conflict. The British government then went to the United Nations and, with American support, on December 16, procured a declaration of selective mandatory economic sanctions against the Smith regime.

The Race Relations Act passed into law. It set up local race relations boards to hear complaints and reprimand offenders. For persistent offences there was recourse to court injunctions ordering an end to discriminatory practices in places of public resort. In December the Court of Appeals quashed the first conviction under this act of a youth who had placed a "Blacks Not Wanted Here!" poster on the front porch of a member of parliament's home. The court held that the provisions of the act did not cover this offense. In December Lord Brockway attempted to introduce a stiffer law in the House of Lords, but was defeated. The Times commented that legislating against discrimination was like trying to hold quicksilver in a sieve.

Six former colleges of advanced technology were reopened in the fall with full university status. The government appointed a Public Schools Commission to advise on the integration of public (i.e. private) schools into the state (i.e. public) system, the aim being to end the class divisions in British education. Most Church schools and many Jewish schools were already within the state system.

The Archbishop of Canterbury paid an official visit to the Pope and was received in the Sistine Chapel. The event received world-wide press and television coverage.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Forty Jews were elected to the new parliament—three more than in the previous election. (Jews now constitute 6 per cent of the parliament, as against one per cent of the population.) Two are Conservatives and holders of inherited baronetcies; the others support Labor. No political issues in the election affected Jews, as such. As the community's prosperity has increased, more of its votes have seemed to go to the Conservatives in the last four or five elections.

The vital statistics of the Anglo-Jewish community were uncertain. In the fortunate absence of a religious or racial census, the combined Jewish population of Great Britain and Northern Ireland can be estimated at about 350,000. Of these, 240,000 lived in the greater London area.

The population trend was away from the small provincial towns into the cities, and out of the older, central city districts into the newer outlying suburbs. London's Bayswater synagogue closed for redevelopment, and the impending closure of the Dalston synagogue was announced. The closing down of some small communities in South Wales was reported.

The one figure published in 1966 was for synagogue marriages. These showed a steady downward trend, with the average yearly number for the past five years at 18 per cent below the corresponding figure a decade ago:
The community has still not adjusted to the change-over from an oligarchic to a democratic tradition. At the beginning of the century, the communal institutions had been controlled by a small group of old-established, interrelated wealthy families. Nahum Sokolow called them the "Grand Dukes" (with Lord Rothschild as Czar!). Their sons had been encouraged to enter community work when young, and to train for leadership. Many of them had been alumni of the only Jewish house at an English public boarding school—Polack's House, Clifton College. All United Synagogue presidents before Sir Isaac Wolfson had come from this background. Of recent years, however, the older families—and Clifton—produced few community workers; young men were not being attracted to the field. The new leaders were more observant and closer in feeling to their constituents than their predecessors, but there were not enough trained men to fill vacant offices. More responsibility fell on the shoulders of paid officials, whose salary and standing had yet to be upgraded to an adequate level.

The Board of Deputies of British Jews acquired a new secretary, Abraham J. Marks, but the future of its presidency was uncertain.

Religion

The election of Dr. Immanuel Jacobovits of the Fifth Avenue Synagogue, New York, as Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Commonwealth was the main event of the year. Born 46 years ago in Königsberg, East Prussia, he came to England in his early youth. He graduated from the London rabbinic seminary, Jews' College, and served in various ministerial posts in the British Isles and as Chief Rabbi of Ireland for nine years, before accepting a call to New York in 1958. It was announced that Sir Isaac Wolfson and his brother Charles would endow a new Chief Rabbinate Center, with library and office accommodation, in London.

There was a squabble between the independent Federation of Synagogues and the United Synagogue (Ashkenazi). The Federation was a small, old-established group of synagogues with 15,000 members, some of whom also belonged to the United Synagogue. Although it had at one time accepted
the jurisdiction of the Chief Rabbi and his Beth Din, the Federation now appointed its own Rav ha-Rashi and Beth Din, and set up its own marriage registration office, education board, and kashrut commission. The outsider had the impression that the key to this dispute was the Kashrus Commission's control over the issue of profitable kosher catering franchises. The Beth Din announced that marriages in Federation synagogues would not be recognized without the Chief Rabbi's license. The Sephardi community, which had left the original Kashrus Commission some years ago, rejoined it. A synagogue in Glasgow went over to the Israeli Hebrew pronunciation and was criticized for doing so by the Glasgow Beth Din.

Many members of the majority Orthodox community were reluctant to accord de jure recognition to the small but expanding Reform (Conservative) and Liberal movements for fear of enhancing their prestige and giving them greater opportunities for local self-advertisement. Conversions and marriages contrary to halakhah were another cause of friction. A joint meeting of students from the Orthodox and Reform rabbinic seminaries, Jews' College and Leo Baeck College, was cancelled. There was a dispute in Newcastle-on-Tyne about the new Reform Synagogue's claim to membership of the local Jewish Representative Council. A new Reform (Conservative) prayer book for the Pilgrim festivals (Succot, Pesah, and Shavuot) was published. Rabbi Louis Jacobs (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 363; 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 311) was interviewed on BBC television. Two other national television programs were devoted to Jews and Judaism: one in a series on minorities in Britain, the other in a series on world religions.

Education

A £50,000 ($143,000) grant from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture enabled the Hebrew department of London University to expand into a comprehensive center for Jewish studies. It now offered new honors degree courses in Jewish history, and in Hebrew literature combined with Jewish history.

The Jews' Free School (secondary) in London was being expanded to accommodate 1,500 pupils (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 364).

The Wolfson Foundation and Ford Foundation combined to endow a new college at Oxford University.

Carmel College, England's largest private boarding school for Jewish boys, received a £325,000 ($1,000,000) gift from Charles Wolfson for a new girls' boarding school, to be opened in 1967.

An institute for higher rabbinic studies (Kolel) was opened at the Gateshead Orthodox yeshivah. The Manchester Kolel celebrated its first anniversary.

Antisemitism

Overt antisemitism was out of fashion in contemporary Britain. People
still remembered that British fascists had been ready to betray their country during World War II and that some had worked for the enemy. The antisemitic political parties were small, divided, and unpopular. In December Colin Jordan’s National Socialist party had a paid-up membership of 35, presumably including some outside intelligence agents. Popular racist feeling was mostly directed against colored immigrants, particularly in areas suffering from severe housing shortage. The Indian and Pakistani immigrant communities now nearly equaled Jews numerically (approximately 300,000) and there were substantial settlements of West Indian Negroes (90,000) in London, Birmingham, and other cities.

The year 1966 was notable for a number of criminal court cases involving members of antisemitic organizations. Effective enforcement of the law gave reassurance to all minority communities in Britain. A gang of adolescents which had attacked two yeshivah students and stabbed one of them in 1965 in a Jewish area of North London (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 313) was brought to trial and convicted. The 14-year-old ringleader was sentenced to three years’ detention, and the others to various degrees of detention and probation. Jewish Chronicle reporter June Rose courageously called at the homes of some of the convicted hooligans and interviewed them and their families, and found a squalid background of deprivation, delinquency, and hatred.

The arsonists who had burnt down the Bayswater, Clapton, and Brondesbury synagogues and set fire to four others during the summer of 1965 were apprehended, tried, and convicted. They were members of Jordan’s party and, although evidence was given that Jordan and his wife had incited them to fire synagogues, no legal action was taken against the Jordans. The defendants received a wide range of sentences: Hugh Hughes, 27, was given five years’ imprisonment, three others three years’ each, and four of the younger men were released after a nominal sentence. The judge’s leniency toward the younger men was criticized by the Jewish Board of Deputies. After being released, two of them wrote to the Jewish Chronicle, apologizing for their actions. The Bayswater Synagogue was closed as had been planned before the fire; the Brondesbury Synagogue was to be rebuilt with £80,000 ($228,500) of insurance money.

In March John Tyndall, leader of the minute anti-Negro, anti-immigration, and antisemitic Greater Britain Movement, and six of his followers were convicted of carrying offensive weapons. Three Jewish youths were also found guilty of assaulting them. In November Tyndall was again before the courts for carrying a firearm without a license. He received three months’ imprisonment, appealed, and had his sentence doubled. In December his movement merged with A. K. Chesterton’s diehard imperialist League of Empire Loyalists to form a new National Front.

Lord Russell of Liverpool won a libel action against the tabloid Private Eye which suggested in a 1962 article that his book The Scourge of the
Swastika stimulated "unnatural inhuman and barbarous interest in war crimes" and described him as "Lord Liver of Cesspool." He was awarded £5,000 ($14,300) damages and costs.

**Interfaith Relations**

Cardinal John C. Heenan, Archbishop of Westminster and head of the Catholic hierarchy in England, set up a small national commission under Christopher Hollis, a Catholic author and former member of parliament, to give practical effect to the Vatican Council's declaration on the Jews. The commission's objectives were to arrange lectures and talks on Judaism for Catholic training schools and university students, and on Christian-Jewish relations for Jews, and to initiate high-level theological dialogue between Catholic and Jewish representatives. The first part of the program got well under way during the year. In August Catholic delegates attended the International Congress of Christians and Jews in Cambridge (one priest dressed up as an Orthodox Israeli kibbutznik to show his amity for Israel). Jews' College students heard a talk by a Catholic priest. In November the Apostolic Delegate addressed a Jewish audience on the implications of the Vatican declaration; and Christopher Hollis addressed another Jewish group on a similar subject. Cardinal Heenan attended a Jews' College commemorative dinner. The Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool spoke to the Merseyside Jewish forum.

The second part of the Catholic program seemed less likely to meet with success. Despite bitter memories, most British Jews warmly welcomed the prospect of friendlier relations with the Catholic Church, but the novel idea of a theological dialogue between Catholicism and Judaism seemed fraught with difficulties, chief among them the lack of an agreed common purpose. There was, however, much scope for improved mutual understanding and personal friendship.

Relations with the Church of England and other denominations continued to be friendly. As part of Westminster Abbey's 900th anniversary celebration, a small exhibition demonstrating Jewish worship and history was shown in the crypt by the Council of Christians and Jews, alongside the treasures of the Abbey. The Dean of Westminster borrowed a synagogue chupah to use as a processional canopy for a Greek Orthodox patriarch. The loan was criticized by one Orthodox rabbi. A Liberal rabbi's participation in an Abbey interfaith service also evoked adverse comment.

Seventeen young people from a German Protestant church stayed in London as guests of the S.W. Essex Reform (Conservative) synagogue. This event received national publicity and evoked much discussion both within and outside the community.

**Zionism and Relations with Israel**

An estimated 6,500 Jews from Great Britain emigrated to Israel in the
period from 1949 to 1964. The recent average annual *aliyah* figure was approximately 700.

In 1966, the Joint Palestine Appeal raised £2,269,000 ($6,500,000), 10 per cent more than in the previous year. The Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, which once opposed Zionism, emulated the Orthodox community and, for the first time, had a *Kol Nidre* appeal for Israel in all their synagogues.

The planting of the 300,000-tree Winston Churchill Forest—subscribed for by British Jewry—commenced near Nazareth in November.

David Ben-Gurion visited London and addressed a well-attended meeting of Anglo-Jewish youth.

The chairman of Leylands, one of the largest British truck, autobus, and automobile manufacturers, complained of Israeli government commercial policies. He stated that his firm had made large investments in Israel and endured the Arab boycott but that it had not received the trade protection it had been led to expect.

**Cultural Events**

An exhibition of the Jordanian Dead Sea Scrolls at the British Museum aroused great public interest and attracted large attendances. So did the beautifully displayed Massada exhibition of *The Observer*, which was briefly on show in London in the fall, before moving on to the New York Jewish Museum. The demonstration of Israeli archaeologist Yigael Yadin's unique discoveries at Massada drew such large crowds that many people had to be turned away. The British Museum planned to show the Israeli-owned Dead Sea Scrolls in its Western Asiatic department in 1967.

Saul Friedlander's book *Pius XII and the Third Reich* was published in November, and the author was interviewed on national television. Robert Henriques' biography of the late Sir Robert Waley-Cohen, for many years lay leader of Anglo-Jewry, was favorably reviewed in December and then temporarily withdrawn pending a threatened libel action.

In November the proposal of two Jewish impressarios to bring the Oberammergau Passion Play to London evoked protests from the community, and the project was dropped.

**Personalia**

Life peerages were conferred in February on Israel M. Sieff, Zionist leader and brother-in-law of the late Lord Marks and on Labor politician, Mrs. Beatrice Serota. In the New Year's honors (January), Professor Max Rosenheim was elected president of the Royal College of Physicians and given a knighthood, and Anna Freud, daughter of the late Sigmund Freud was awarded a C.B.E. (Companion of the Order of the British Empire), the first such decoration given "for services to psychoanalysis." In March Dr.
Alick Isaacs was elected Fellow of the Royal Society. John Silkin, M.P., was appointed Government Chief Whip in the House of Commons. Lord Goodman was appointed a member of the trust controlling the national Sunday newspaper *The Observer*, a position from which Jews were at one time excluded.

The year 1966 saw the deaths of three pioneer British Zionists who helped to lay the background of the Balfour Declaration and the foundation of the *yishuv*: Murray Rosenberg, sometime honorary secretary of the English Zionist Federation, in July at the age of 94; Mrs. Vera Weizmann, widow of Israel's first President Chaim Weizmann, in London in September at the age of 85; Mrs. Rebecca Sieff, WIZO leader, the wife of Israel M. Sieff and sister of the late Lord Marks, died in Tel Aviv in January at the age of 75. Other deaths included: Victor Weisz ("Vicki"), leading political cartoonist, in London in February at the age of 53; Ivan Greenberg, editor of the *Jewish Chronicle* from 1936 to 1946, at the age of 53; Isidore Wartski, communal worker, at the age of 78; Sir Edward Beddington, Field Marshal Montgomery's commanding brigadier in World War I, in April at the age of 82; Leon S. Creditor, Yiddish journalist and sometime editor of *The Jewish Voice*, and father of Baroness Gaitskill, at the age of 91; Edward Iwi, solicitor and author of legal works, in June at the age of 61.

*Edgar R. Samuel*
France

THE POLITICAL SITUATION

France's political balance sheet for 1966 was epitomized by President Charles de Gaulle's public and demonstrative handshake with Jacques Duclos, the old French Communist leader, at the reception for Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin on the occasion of his state visit to France early in December. Jacques Duclos and General de Gaulle had not met since 1945.

The main ingredient of the new Gaullist foreign policy was a determined effort to support the policies of the East European Communist states. France's position on the war in Vietnam and the almost complete alignment of her views with those of the so-called "Socialist" bloc, created a gulf not only between France and her American ally, but also between France and most of her close neighbors—West Germany, England, Italy, as well as Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg—who were still operating within the Atlantic framework. Current French policy and diplomacy have been almost systematically anti-British. Franco-German relations were particularly affected by Gaullist pressure on the Bonn government to break away from the United States. Caught between the necessity of Franco-German agreement and the inevitable need for American backing and support, the Erhard government found itself faced with a dramatic choice as a result of the great French about-face.

"Anti-Atlanticism," as well as closer ties with the Communist East, encountered no serious opposition and, what was most important, created no dissension within France. (De Gaulle's methods of governing and his social policies, on the other hand, often gave rise to criticism and complaints, even with Gaullist groups—at least the left-wing.) It was understandable that the Communists and the parties closest to them, notably the Unified Socialist party, supported de Gaulle's foreign policy. However, there was no real opposition from any other faction on the left including the center-left. François Mitterand's left-wing Federation (encompassing the Socialists and Radicals as well as several small leftist groups and "clubs"), which was preparing for the big 1967 electoral battle for the legislature, still had no domestic program and its foreign policy was vague. Jean Lecanuet's center has always strongly supported the North Atlantic Alliance and European integration; but even its members or adherents were more concerned with domestic policy. Only the fascist extreme right of Jean Tixier-Vignancour favored a pro-Western stance.

In the course of 1966, the political "market" of Eastern Europe was systematically explored. Foreign Minister Couve de Murville visited Rumania
(April), Bulgaria (April), Poland (May), Czechoslovakia and Hungary (July), and Yugoslavia (September). De Gaulle went to Soviet Russia (June 20–July 1); Minister for Scientific Research Alain Peyrefitte and Minister of Economic Affairs Michel Debré followed in the fall. An agreement, in November, established a direct telephone line between de Gaulle and the Kremlin.

On his world tour to Africa, Asia, and Indonesia, in August and September, de Gaulle made his famous speech at Pnom-Penh (Cambodia), which was practically a unilateral indictment of American policy in Vietnam. He also held two press conferences (February and October) in which he stressed the need to go back to the Geneva agreement for a settlement of the Vietnam conflict, as well as Communist China’s indispensable role in any peace negotiations.

When Alexei Kosygin visited France late in the fall, the Champs-Elysées and other main arteries in the capital saw the Soviet banner, adorned with hammer and sickle, floating in the breeze. In a message of welcome to Kosygin, Grand Rabbi Jacob Kaplan of France protested the lack of religious and cultural freedom for Soviet Jews. Kosygin disputed the existence of a Jewish problem in his country and declared that Soviet Jews who had relatives abroad and wished to join them would receive permission to do so (p. 387).

The Ben Barka trial, with its many political implications, was held during September and October. It was interrupted by the sudden appearance of the Moroccan security chief Ahmed Dlimi who came to place himself under arrest—most probably with the approval of the king of Morocco. As a result of the Ben Barka affair, France and Morocco broke off diplomatic relations.

In December Jewish groups staged various demonstrations, notably in the vicinity of the German embassy in Paris, to protest the resurgence of German nationalism (p. 360). As in other protests in recent years, the key role fell to the left-oriented MRAP (Movement against Racism and Antisemitism, and for Peace) which easily enlisted the support and participation of most Jewish institutions, organizations, and even rabbis. Although it was a demonstration against Germany, MRAP did not miss the opportunity to use Communist-style pro-North Vietnam slogans. The other, politically neutral, agency for combatting antisemitism, LICA (International League against Antisemitism), seemed to be losing momentum and was being eclipsed by MRAP. In mid-December, Willy Brandt, the Socialist Foreign Minister in Kiesinger’s new West German government, came to Paris for talks with General de Gaulle (p. 369). The mere prospect of an attempt by the German diplomats at a rapprochement with Eastern Europe meant a certain improvement in Franco-German relations, which had become very cool of late.

Toward the end of the year Paris also received a visit from the Algerian Foreign Minister Abdelaziz Bouteflika for talks aimed at the resumption of Franco-Algerian economic ties.
Problem and Fact of Antisemitism

Antisemitism, especially of the organized, vocal variety, was considered disgraceful in present-day France. No party, no ideological group or faction of a political or religious nature, openly appealed to such principles. The tendency of automatically associating the right—and, of course, the extreme right—with inherent antisemitism seemed no longer justified. In recent years an extremist right movement grew among students who had veered to the extreme left after World War II. During the latter part of 1966 active rightist propaganda groups, such as the Etudiants Nationalistes and l’Occident, provoked many incidents at the universities in Paris and elsewhere. There were riots and the full range of violence typical of such confrontations, but none of the groups involved have so far made antisemitic statements.

Still, there seemed to be dormant anti-Jewish bias among the people of France. A poll conducted in November by Roger Sadoun, director of the French Institute of Public Opinion (IFOP), to determine the attitude of the French toward the Jews (published in *Le Nouvel Adam*, December 1966) indicated that one out of every three Frenchmen would have objected to having a son- or daughter-in-law of the Jewish “race,” and one out of two, to having a president of Jewish origin. Seventeen per cent of the same sample were of the opinion that French Jews were not really French (this compared favorably with 43 per cent of the sample in a 1946 poll). The large majority (77 per cent) condemned Hitler’s gas chamber as a “monstrous weapon.”

Several incidents may serve to illustrate anti-Jewish prejudice: In Paris, a landlady turned away a lycée teacher and his Jewish wife because she “did not accept either Jews or foreigners as tenants.” Criticism of the landlady’s attitude in the weekly *France-Dimanche* (June 25, 1966) called forth an avalanche of letters from readers defending her position.

The 1967 edition of the Alsatian almanac-directory *Der hinkende Bote* (“The Lame Messenger”), which had been published in Alsace for a good many years and still appeared in the German language, carried a story, “Der Betrogene Wucherer” (The Usurer Deceived), which was a classic example of medieval antisemitism. The almanac had wide circulation in the Alsatian countryside and was read by almost the entire peasant population.

Professor Gerard E. Weil, director of the Institute of Semitic Studies at the University of Nancy, filed a complaint with the district attorney against George Ross Ridge, an American citizen and author of a viciously antisemitic leaflet which he distributed to the university faculty. Ridge claimed, among other things, that he was forced to live in exile to escape a Jewish conspiracy against him. The United States embassy in Paris stated that Ridge did not appear on its list of American citizens living in France.

In November giant swastikas were painted with lubricating oil on some 40 buildings in the little town of Longuyon (Meurthe et Moselle) in the eastern part of France.
The Jewish lower classes in France, half of whom originally came from North Africa, were developing an intense desire for advancement and higher social status. Here, they found opportunities which had never existed in North Africa. For example, the little Jewish secretary from Algeria, working in a large French government office, could marry a non-Jewish department head and thus advance to upper middle-class society. As a result, there was a considerable increase in intermarriage among North African Jews, especially among Algerians who were French citizens and relatively well assimilated. At the same time, there seemed to be (though there was no data to support it) a relative decrease in intermarriage among old-established Jews of East European descent, precisely because most of them had already achieved social advancement.

It is an interesting and encouraging phenomenon that Jewish intellectuals of diverse background, religious conviction, and opinion were developing an ever stronger sense of identity with the Jewish people. The once familiar figure of the Jew who is somewhat ashamed of his Jewishness has practically disappeared from intellectual circles. Although this new awareness was often limited (Jewish identity was frankly affirmed, while its significance was parenthetic), it still pointed to recent changes in attitude among Jews. For example, in a survey conducted among Jewish University of Paris students of various origins, more than 90 per cent not only admitted their Jewish origin, but stated that their Jewishness was meaningful to them.

Communal Activities

The Fonds Social Juif Unifié (FSJU-United Jewish Philanthropic Fund) continued to coordinate all social welfare and religious activities which were not the direct responsibility of the consistory or other special institutions. It also acted as the central agency for all cultural activities, except for advanced Jewish studies which were increasingly becoming a part of the university curriculum. At the end of 1966, FSJU had 15,500 contributors.

OSE opened several new dispensaries in Paris to meet the medical needs of the growing number of Jews from North Africa. ORT established a new technical training center in Toulouse. By the end of 1966, its schools had an enrolment of 5,500.

Under the leadership of Jacques Lazarus, editor of Information Juive and former secretary-general of the North African section of the World Jewish Congress, the Association of Jews of Algerian Origin (AJOA) continued its social and cultural activities. But there was a growing tendency to restrict its sphere of activity—the natural result of the integration of most repatriated Algerian Jews into France's economic structure and into Jewish cultural and religious life. For the constantly growing numbers of Tunisian and Moroccan Jewish immigrants, however, integration, especially at the economic level,
remained a problem that threatened to become worse. Since the special ties binding Morocco and Tunisia to France had been severed, Tunisian and Moroccan Jews have been classed as foreign nationals with no special privileges in the labor market. And with the onset of an economic recession in France, the rule of giving job priority to nationals was once again applied, mainly at the expense of the North African Jewish immigrants. Algerians who were French citizens were exempted.

A French committee of Brith-Am, composed of Vidal Modiano, Mrs. Gilberte Djian, and Georges Chiche, was set up in the Sephardi section of Paris in December. The parent organization had been founded in Israel in 1964 by André Narboni, former president of the Algerian Zionist Federation, and André Chouraqui, deputy mayor of Jerusalem and permanent Alliance Israélite Universelle delegate to Israel, to facilitate the integration and social advancement of French-speaking immigrants, most of whom came from North Africa. The French Brith-Am, which intended to cooperate in this work, was sponsored by the Sephardi and North African Jewish groups in France, including AJOA, the Association of Jews of Tunisian Origin (AJOT), the Association of Jews of Moroccan Origin (AJOM), the Union of Sephardi Jews in France, and the Union of Sephardi Zionists.

Another organization, known as “Groupe 5740” and largely composed of intellectuals, was recently established under the sponsorship of Emile Touati and Professor Alex Derczanski. Modeled after the political clubs on the French left which were not affiliated with any one party, the organization was to be a “dissenting force” in French Jewish life, especially in Paris communal and institutional activities. Pending the formulation of a definite program, the club was proceeding with independent scientific studies of contemporary Jewish problems, such as Jewish education in France.

A little-known, totally nonpolitical youth group functioning in Strasbourg and other large Alsatian Jewish communities was Jeunesse Juive de l'Est (JJE—Jewish Youth of Eastern France). It engaged in general cultural activities and arranged annual study tours to Jewish communities in other parts of the world. The young people had already visited Greece, Hungary, and several East European countries.

The influx of North African Jewish immigrants into Caen, a rapidly expanding industrial center in Normandy, considerably strengthened its formerly small Ashkenazi community. It built a new synagogue (recently inaugurated by Chief Rabbi Jacob Kaplan) which was to serve also as a regional community center for those repatriated Algerian Jews who had settled in small urban centers and villages outside Caen. Another regional community center, for the large Lyons district and especially for the Rhône Département, was inaugurated at Lyons. The city's Chief Rabbi Jean Kling became spiritual head of the entire Lyons district extending to Burgundy in the north, and to Provence in the south. In December a community center was also opened in Bordeaux, the historic cradle of the French Sephardi community.
By the end of 1966 the Nice community had not yet found a successor to Rabbi Saül Naouri (son of the former Chief Rabbi Nahamim Naouri of Bône) who had resigned after a disagreement with the directors of the city's new Alliance Israélite Universelle lycée.

**Education, Culture, and Publications**

There was a slight increase in the total enrolment of students in Jewish secondary day schools (lycées), Talmud Torahs for elementary-school children, and supplementary afternoon classes in religious instruction. However, in view of the natural growth of the Jewish population and the resultant increase in the total number of school-age children, the ratio of those attending Jewish schools decreased by 12 per cent in 1966. There was a marked decline in the number of students, Jewish and non-Jewish, who chose modern Hebrew as a foreign language in French secondary schools. This was attributed partly to the growing competition from Russian language courses in the curriculum.

The constant growth in advanced Jewish studies, on the other hand, enticed an increasing number of young Jews, many of them from “dejudaised” families, to explore Jewish learning at the university level. Under the direction of Léon Askenazi, the Centre Universitaire d'Etudes Juives (CUEJ; University Center of Jewish Studies) in Paris offered to its 60 matriculated students a series of courses on such diverse subjects as Talmudic exegesis, Hebrew philology, the Midrash, Jewish mysticism, and contemporary Jewish sociology. Some of the lectures were open to the public and often attracted a large number of outsiders. CUEJ offered no extension courses in provincial university towns, but it sponsored lectures in the principal university centers. Lecture series in Hebrew, to complement courses in Judaism or Jewish civilization, were given in the university towns of Lille, Montpellier, Besançon, and Aix-en-Provence. The University of Strasbourg had its own permanent chair of Jewish studies, held by Professor André Neher.

A recent survey of Jewish population changes, conducted by the writer Georges Levitte, dealt with a completely new and unprecedented activity in the history of French Jewry. There was in Paris a group of some 300 Jews, most of them merchants or members of the liberal professions (not intellectuals) and ranging in religious commitment from traditional to nonobserving, who met weekly for the purpose of studying the Talmud. The one thing they had in common was the belief that a true evaluation of Judaism must be based on experience or knowledge other than can be acquired at general assemblies, receptions, and festivities.

The eighth conference of French-speaking Jewish intellectuals, sponsored by the French section of WJC, was held in October. The topic under discussion, "Does the World Need Jews?", attracted a large crowd and, particularly, many young professors. The Union des Etudiants Juives also held confer-
ences and round-table discussions. One (in November) dealt with the problem of violence.

The number of Jewish publications and their circulation remained relatively stable. An estimated 60,000 persons read the French Jewish press. The circulation of the AJOA organ *Information Juive*, which also carried material of general interest to Jews, rose considerably to 21,000. The Strasbourg Jewish bimonthly *Bulletin de nos communautés* recently became *Organe des communautés juives européennes de langue française* (Organ of the French-Speaking Jewish Communities of Europe) extending its coverage to the French-speaking Jews in Belgium and Switzerland. Jewish Communists published a French-language weekly *Presse Nouvelle*, an “adjunct” of their declining Yiddish daily of the same name. Among the non-Jewish publications aimed at fighting antisemitism were the MRAP organ *Droit et Liberté* (Rights and Liberty) and the LICA organ *Droit de Vivre* (The Right to Live).

Many books of special interest to Jews appeared in 1966. The outstanding ones are listed here: Jean François Steiner’s *Treblinka* (*Éditions Fayard*) with a preface by Simone de Beauvoir, touched off a very heated polemic among Jews and in French literary circles. The author was a young native of Paris, who had been a paratrooper in the French army in Algeria and later lived in a *kibbutz* in Israel. Although the book’s value as a document was strongly contested (Steiner never was interned), many readers and certain critics had high regard for its spiritual, metaphysical, and even religious approach to the tragedy of Jewish genocide and to the responsibility of the Jews for failing to offer resistance.

The French edition of Hannah Arendt’s *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, published by Gallimard, called forth a lively debate, as it had in the United States and elsewhere. The publication of lengthy extracts of the book in the extreme leftist weekly *Le Nouvel Observateur* brought letters of protest and clarification from many persons, among them the French Jewish philosophers Elianne Amado-Lévy-Valensi and Emmanuel Levinas.

Albert Memmi’s *La Libération du Juif* ("The Liberation of the Jew"), published by Gallimard, was the sequel to his *Portrait d’un Juif* ("Portrait of a Jew") which appeared three years ago. As in the previous volume, the author struggled with what he called the “absurdity” of being a Jew, favored a Jewishness basically stripped of spiritual Judaism, and saw commitment to Israel as an acceptable solution.

Two books by Elie Wiesel were published almost simultaneously by *Éditions du Seuil*: a collection of short stories, *Le chant des morts* ("The Song of the Dead"), and observations on the USSR, *Les Juifs du silence* ("The Jews of Silence"). The volume on the Soviet Jews, whose publication coincided with Premier Kosygin’s state visit to France, had a considerable effect on both critics and readers, and sold very well.

Among the many French translations of books of Jewish interest, deserving special mention, were Saul Bellow’s *Herzog* (Gallimard) which was
highly acclaimed by the press, and Norman Fruchter's *Coat Upon a Stick* (Buchet Chastel) which stirred admiration as a young author's first work. French translations of two of Professor Gershom Scholem's essential works (his *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* had been translated earlier) were also published in 1966: *The Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* (Editions Payot), and *The Origins of the Kabbalah* (Aubier). A book of Jewish poems by Michel Salomon, *L'Exil et la mémoire* ("Exile and Memory"), was published by Editions Universitaires. The 1899 edition of the Bible for the French rabbinate, which had been out of print, appeared in a new pocket-book edition.

Nobel prize-winner S. J. Agnon visited France in December, and was honored at receptions at the Universities of Paris and Strasbourg. The Paris reception was held at the Sorbonne; the minister of national education was honorary chairman, the dean of the university presided, and Professor Neher introduced the guest of honor.

**Personalia**

The very gifted Jewish novelist Anna Langfus, recipient of the 1962 Prix Goncourt, died suddenly in March at the age of 46. She had been suffering from a heart ailment since the Nazi occupation. Born in Poland, she had witnessed the Warsaw Ghetto uprising from the "aryan" side, and described that tragic spectacle in her most outstanding novel *Le Sel et le soufre* ("The Whole Land Brimstone").

Léon Meiss, jurist, founder and president of Conseil Représentatif des Israélites de France (Representative Council of the Jews in France), and guiding spirit of the Central Consistory, died in June at the age of 70. He had been a deeply religious Jew of Conservative leanings and an exponent of a united Jewry.

André Spire, whose fame as the greatest French Jewish poet was incontestable, died in Paris in July at the age of 98. He had been a leading advocate of Zionism, defending its position at the Versailles peace conference with the competence of a great lawyer (he was a member of the Conseil d'Etat) against the orientalist Sylvain Levi, a well-known opponent of Zionism. A new edition of Spire's *Poèmes Juifs* ("Jewish Poems") had appeared in 1958. He pursued his writing and poetry almost to the day of his death and left many unpublished works.

Samuel Saüì Levy, industrialist and leader of French Orthodox Jewry, died in Paris on August 2 at the age of 82. He had been chairman of the Conseil Représentatif du Judaïsme Traditionnaliste de France (Representative Council of Traditionalist Judaism in France) and of the Board of Directors of the Aix-les-Bains yeshivah, as well as president of the Paris Orthodox Rue Cadet synagogue and Yabné lycée.

The poet Henri Hertz, a member of the original Surrealist school, died in October at the age of 78. His active interest in Judaism began only in World War II when he had become one of the pillars of Jewish resistance, collabor-
ating especially with the Centre de Documentation Juive Contemporaine (Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation) which Isaac Schneerson had secretly established in Grenoble.

Roger Nathan, honorary undersecretary of the ministry of economic affairs, professor at the School of Political Science, and president of French ORT, died on November 7 at the age of 69.

Arnold Mandel
A center-right coalition government of the Social Christian party (PSC, Catholic) and the conservative Liberty and Progress party (PLP), headed by Prime Minister Paul Vanden Boyenants, PSC's president since 1961, took office on March 19. This was the first time PLP came into power since its reorganization in 1961; it had been the opposition party despite polling a majority of the votes in the 1965 elections. The new cabinet was composed of 14 Catholics and 9 members of PLP, with outgoing Prime Minister Pierre Hamel as minister of foreign affairs, replacing the veteran Socialist leader Paul-Henri Spaak.

Hamel's government fell in February when the Socialists pulled out of the coalition because they felt they could not support the conservative fiscal program of the Social Christian party. The immediate cause of the government crisis, however, was its failure to conclude the months-long negotiations with Belgium's physicians, aimed at eliminating the heavy deficit of the health-insurance program. The physicians threatened to strike because they believed that the government's plan would lead to the socialization of medicine (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 378).

The new government assigned high priority to curbing government spending and balancing the budget. In order to stop the growing inflation, Minister of Economic Affairs Jacques Van Offelen, in May, ordered prices frozen for a three-months period. However, they rose by about 5 per cent, and two salary and wage increases of 2.5 per cent each followed. The economic growth in 1966 kept pace with that of 1965—about 3.5 per cent of the national income—but did not match the growing trend of expansion in previous years. Unemployment remained at a low level, but there no longer was a need to recruit foreign labor.

In May parliament agreed to the transfer of the Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE) from France to Casteau near Mons, the Walloon part of Belgium. The resultant additional costs to Belgium were expected to be balanced by the new jobs SHAPE would create for the local population.

Language Battle

When the new government took over, it declared a two-years truce in the language battle between the Flemish- and French-speaking Belgians, which was never far below the surface of Belgian politics. Soon thereafter (May), Jan Verroken, a Flemish Catholic member of parliament, requested that the linguistic agreement of 1963 (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 378) be applied to universities. Such a move would have affected the University of Louvain, the
world's largest Catholic university which was in the Flemish territory. Its transformation into a Flemish institution would have meant expulsion of the French-speaking student body and faculty to French-speaking territory in the South of Belgium. Cardinal Leo Suenens, the primate of Malines, and Belgium's bishops, however, ruled out the separation of the French-speaking section as harmful to the integrity and needs of the university. Flemish nationalists organized street demonstrations in Antwerp, Ghent, and other Flemish towns in protest against the clergy's stand, and the new university year began with a four-day march of students from all Flemish cities to Louvain. Although the Belgian Catholic population as a whole did not follow the extremists, the linguistic battle cast its shadow on domestic life for many weeks.

**Neo-Nazism**

The acquittal of Jan Robert Verbelen, former leader of the Flemish Nazi party, in Vienna in December 1965 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 326) provoked violent protests from Belgian patriotic organizations and former resistance fighters who also pointed to the danger of growing neo-Nazi activities in Belgium. A committee representing 36 Belgian organizations, including Jewish youth groups, organized a poster campaign to alert the population to this danger. In parliament, Senator Maurice Allard asked for strict measures to curb the movement. But Wim Maes, leader of the Flemish nationalist youth movement during the Nazi occupation, resigned from the Volksunie, the Flemish nationalist party, because he found it not radical enough.

The Brussels daily *Le Soir* reported that nationalist groups were training storm troopers and para-military units in Antwerp and Ghent, which could be mobilized within 24 hours' notice. *Le Soir* also stated that a "European Committee to Honor Heroes," was set up by former Nazi collaborators in Antwerp to assist their comrades, when necessary, and to pay tribute to those who had died. Despite a ban, neo-fascists tried to organize a memorial meeting in June for August Borms, a leader of the Flemish Nazi party, who had been executed as a war criminal. The police used teargas to disperse the crowds which gathered in Merxem, a suburb of Antwerp where Borms was buried. The Antwerp city council in February banned Rolph Hochhuth's *The Deputy*, which was to have been presented by a French-speaking theater group of Brussels, to prevent any possible nationalist demonstrations.

In October the Contact Committee, the coordinating body of the various patriotic organizations, expressed its firm objection to the application of a statute of limitations to Nazi crimes and other crimes against humanity. It also pledged full cooperation with the Council of Europe (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 325n) in its effort to establish a commission of government experts for the formulation of a European convention on crimes against humanity.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

The Jewish population of Belgium was estimated at 40,000; approximately
24,000 lived in Brussels, 13,000 in Antwerp, 1,500 in Liège, 1,000 in Charleroi, and 500 in various scattered communities throughout the country. A small decrease in Brussels' Jewish population was compensated by the influx of Jews who wanted to escape their isolation in provincial towns. Assimilation was one of the major problems in Brussels. It was generally believed that about 30 per cent of the Jews intermarried. Antwerp Jews, on the other hand, led an intensive Jewish communal life, and intermarriages among them was extremely rare.

Community Organizations

The Jewish community organizations were seriously affected by the cut in JDC-CJMCAG funds, and efforts increased to raise local contributions (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 328). The Centrale d'Oeuvres Sociales Juives, the welfare and fund-raising agency in Brussels, raised $104,000 in 1966 for the work of 11 beneficiary agencies, including the Service Social Juif, youth centers, home for the aged, and vacation camp programs. The Centraal Beheer, Antwerp's central Jewish welfare agency, asked its members to double their dues to wipe out a deficit of $40,000. Its annual budget of $240,000 covered costs of maintaining a 110-bed home for the aged, a children's vacation camp, and social services.

The Conference Permanente d'Oeuvres Sociales Juives Belges (COPEB), coordinating body for the Centrale and the Service Social Juif in Brussels and the Centraal Beheer in Antwerp, was set up in September. Its purpose was to act as spokesman for the Jews in their contacts with Belgian social service institutions and to promote the exchange of information between the agencies. Joseph Komkommer, president of the Centraal Beheer, became its chairman.

Religious Life

In June the smallest Jewish community in Belgium, the 60 Jews of Arlon (Luxembourg province), celebrated the centennial of its synagogue, the oldest in the country. Members of the Belgian parliament, the mayor of Arlon, as well as many Catholic and Protestant lay leaders attended the ceremony. The community's president Max Lodner, Chief Rabbi Robert Dreyfus, and Paul Philippson, president of the Central Consistory, participated.

Rabbi Shemariah Karelitz of the Orthodox Mahazique Ha-dat (Orthodox with Mizrachi orientation) community in Brussels returned to the United States after a three-year stay in Belgium (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 382). The Belgian minister of justice, who administered the budget for religious affairs, allocated $54,000 for the year 1966 to pay the salaries of 21 rabbis, shohatim, and other religious functionaries.

A liberal Beth Din for Europe, headed by Rabbi Jacob Soetendorp of Amsterdam, was established in Brussels in May at a conference of progressive rabbis. The new body, the conferees held, would answer the needs of the
growing number of progressive congregations in Europe which were seeking guidance and assistance in important religious questions.

Welfare

The new 21-bed wing of the Heureux Séjour home for the aged in Brussels was opened in June by its president, Leon Maiersdorf. The Service Social Juif moved to new premises housing also a medical-psychological center and a day center for senior citizens. In 1966 the Service Social Juif assisted some 1,000 persons (700 families), 40 per cent of them aged—a slight increase from the previous year.

The Central Beheer in Antwerp aided 800 needy persons. It also opened a new vacation camp at the Coxyde seashore, accommodating 65 children in each of two summer sessions. In answer to an appeal from the Conseil Résidentatif du Judaïsme Traditionaliste de France, the camp accepted 20 refugee children from North Africa who had arrived in France shortly before the vacation period. When the camp was not used for children, it was a vacation center for the aged.

Education

In the preface to Het Joods Onderwijs in België (“Jewish Education in Belgium”), a B'nai B'rith pamphlet on Jewish education, Chief Rabbi Robert Dreyfus appealed to parents to send their children to Jewish schools. According to a survey on Jewish schools in western Europe (published in Geneva, March 1966), 2,430 students attended seven Jewish schools in Belgium in 1965, compared to 1,720 in 1959. It estimated that about 85 to 90 per cent of all Jewish children in Antwerp attended Jewish schools; the percentage for Brussels was 20.

In Brussels, the Gadenou school for primary school children (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 381), was enlarged and had an enrolment of about 150; the Ecole Israélite (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 328), with grades from kindergarten through high school, had an enrolment of about 400. Both schools had a traditionalist, pro-Israel orientation.

In Antwerp, Rabbi Hillel Medalie of the Shomer Ha-dat community laid the cornerstone of the new Tashkemoni (traditionalist, with Zionist orientation) school building which will have an enlarged kindergarten section. Its student body of 700 ranged in age from 4 to 18. The Yesode Ha-torah (Orthodox, with Agudath Israel orientations), the largest Jewish school in the city, had 1,300 students and was planning to enlarge its facilities.

Rabbi Medalie was appointed chaplain for Jewish students, among them American medical students, at Louvain Catholic University. They received kosher food parcels and were invited to special sedorim at the Antwerp home for the aged.
Communal Affairs

Belgian Jews were asked to raise $100,000 for the erection of a monument at Anderlecht, a suburb of Brussels, in memory of the 25,000 Belgian Jews who were killed by the Nazis. Jean Bloch, president of the Centrale d'Oeuvres Sociales Juives in Brussels, and Joseph Komkommer, president of the Central Beheer in Antwerp, acted as co-chairmen of the building committee.

A one-week exhibit of documents on the Nazi occupation and the deportation of Belgian Jews to Nazi death camps was arranged in Antwerp in July by the Belgian war veterans' organization Croix de Guerre.

Some 1,000 Belgian Jews went on the tenth national pilgrimage to the General Dossin Barracks at Malines, to commemorate the deportation of the Belgian Jews. Rabbi Pierre Kalenberg, the Belgian army chaplain, led the assembly in prayers for the dead.

Christian-Jewish Relations

Cardinal Leo Suenens, the Belgian primate, requested in an interview with Philip E. Hoffman, a leader of the American Jewish Committee, that the Jews make clearly known what they feel is inappropriate or harmful in the Christian presentation of Judaism. Cardinal Suenens commented also on the extensive research program carried on at Louvain University to determine to what extent Roman Catholic texts and religious materials may promote anti-Jewish prejudice. He thought that the study could have significant practical results for Catholic teaching and expressed the hope that, in keeping with the Vatican Council's declaration on the Jews, other countries would conduct similar studies.

Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

The fifth plenary assembly of the World Jewish Congress (WJC), meeting in Brussels from July 31 to August 9, was the outstanding event in Belgian Jewish life. Nearly 500 delegates and observers, representing major Jewish organizations in 44 countries, participated. At the opening session addresses of welcome were delivered by Belgian Deputy Prime Minister Willy de Clercq, Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban, Chief Rabbi Dreyfus, and Alexis Goldschmidt, president of the Belgian section of WJC.

In his opening address, Nahum Goldmann, president of WJC, stressed the danger of assimilation: "We won the struggle for the right to be equal; now we must fight for the right to be different." Leaders of world Jewry, including Professor André Néher of the University of Strasbourg; Professor Nathan Rotenstreich, rector of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and Professor Leon Dujovne of the University of Buenos Aires discussed the cultural and educational needs of the Jews. General community problems were discussed by Judah J. Shapiro, secretary of the National Foundation for Jewish Culture in New York; Tobias Kamenszain, chairman of the Wa'ad Ha-kehilot of
Argentina; Astorre Mayer, chairman of the Standing Conference of Euro-
pean Jewish Community Services, and Rabbi Moses Rosen, Chief Rabbi of
Rumania. A special session was devoted to human rights problems.

Controversy arose over the participation of Eugen Gerstenmaier, president
of the West German Bundestag, in the symposium on "Germans and Jews." Before the opening of the session, spokesmen for Herut, Mapam, and Ahдут
Ha-'avodah in Israel expressed their parties' objections, and left the room.
Goldmann stated that Gerstenmaier was invited not because Nazi crimes had
been forgotten, but because it was necessary for Jews to coexist with the Ger-
mans. Besides Gerstenmaier, Professors Gershom Scholem of the Hebrew
University, Salo W. Baron of Columbia University, and Golo Mann of Zu-
rich addressed the meeting, dealing with the problem in its broad historical
perspective. The following day, the delegates found crude swastikas smeared
on the large WJC poster outside the Palais des Congrès and the slogan
"Joden kapot" (Jews perish) inside the building. It was assumed that the
outrage was committed by members of the Flemish nationalist organization.

At the closing session the assembly adopted resolutions appealing to the
Soviet government for equal treatment of Soviet Jews; urging all governments
to prevent the application of statute of limitations for war crimes and crimes
against humanity; expressing dismay at the leniency of charges against Nazi
war criminals in Germany, and urging the German government to speed up
the processing of indemnification claims.

Relations with Israel

At a meeting in June of the mixed commission, set up for the periodic re-
view of the trade agreement between Israel and the Common Market (AJYB,
1965 [Vol. 66], p. 384), the Israeli delegation stated that the current agree-
ment was inadequate and that Israel sought full association with the common
market. Between 1958 and 1965 trade between Israel and the Common Mar-
ket showed a deficit of $700,000,000. While exports of agricultural products
and diamonds rose by 15 and 40.0 per cent respectively, there was no rise in
exports of industrial products. In October Israeli Ambassador to Belgium
Amiel Najar submitted a formal application for Israel's full association with
the Common Market. Najar was appointed dean of the diplomatic missions
accredited to the Common Market.

In May Aron Rawit, an economist working for the treasury at Jerusalem,
was appointed commercial attaché to the Israeli embassy in Brussels.

Armand Taubes, Belgian director of the Israel Bond drive, became gen-
eral secretary to the Israel-Belgium-Luxembourg Chamber of Commerce in
Brussels.

In May a Knesset delegation headed by its chairman, Reouven Barkatt,
came to Belgium at the invitation of the Belgian government to attend meet-
ings of the parliament and to visit factories in Brussels, Antwerp, Ghent,
and Bruges.
Queen Fabiola became a patroness of the Belgian Friends of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

General Joseph-Pierre Koning of France opened the Magbit (campaign) in Antwerp in February at a banquet chaired by David Seifter, the new president of the Keren Ha-yesod. Contributions for 1965 were 100 per cent larger than the year before. The Brussels appeal was launched in March by Mrs. Levi Eshkol.

The first national conference of the Israel Bond drive for Belgium and Luxembourg was held in Antwerp in June to spur the sale of bonds. The conference decided that a president and a vice-president would be elected each year to head the drive.

**Awards**

Medals of the Order of the Crown were awarded by the Minister of Public Health Raphael Hulpiau to Moshe Fixler, Wolf J. Holzer, Kopel Konarski, Abraham Neiger, Charles Rechtschaffen, Israel Steinbach, and Samuel Tenenbaum, all members of the Centraal Beheer board of directors. President Josef Komkommer and Honorary President Nico Gunzburg received special plaques. Arthur Ancel, Joseph Rosenfeld, and August Schatz, Antwerp diamond merchants and members of the Chambre de Conciliation et d'Arbitrage, were also decorated with the Order of the Crown.

**Personalia**

Marcel Ginsberg, president of the city's Diamond Exchange, for many years a member of the board of the congregation, was elected president of the Shomere Ha-dat congregation in Antwerp to succeed the late Josua Horowitz.

Among those who died during the year were Mathieu Meyer, the oldest Jew in Belgium and recipient of numerous Belgian and French decorations, at Brussels in May, at the age of 103; Heinrich Landau, former president of the Comité Central Israélite in Brussels, board member of the Ecole Israélite in Brussels, and, since 1961, economic adviser to the Burundi government in Belgium, at Brussels in June, at the age of 61; Abraham Ryba, member of the board of the Ahдут Ha-avodah and, during the war, editor of the Yiddish underground paper *Unzer Wort*, at Brussels in September, at the age of 70; Tobias Sjouwerman, for 17 years secretary of the Shomere Ha-dat, at Antwerp in October, at the age of 56.

**HERBERT KELLNER**
ON MARCH 10, 1966 the controversial marriage of the Dutch Crown Princess Beatrix and Claus von Amsberg, a former member of the Waffen-SS, was solemnized (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 333). The procession from the church to the royal palace was disturbed by a mob of youths hurling smoke-bombs and shouting anti-monarchist slogans. Protest demonstrations in Amsterdam, and also in the Hague, Rotterdam, and Utrecht, took place throughout the month. The bridal couple appeared on television, asking the Dutch people to be patient; the new “Prince Claus,” repeatedly denied that he knew about the Nazi atrocities committed against the Jews, and affirmed his belief in democracy and his good will toward the Jewish people. He also proclaimed his willingness to meet with representatives of the Jewish community. The chief rabbis of the three representative Jewish congregations had been invited to attend the church ceremony, but declined.

Elections for the provincial parliaments were held in March, and elections for the town councils, in June. The Catholic People’s party (KVP) and the Socialist Labor party (P.v.d.A.) lost votes, while the right-wing, neo-fascist, Farmer’s party (Boerenpartij), headed by Hendrik Koekoek, claimed a victory. The Pacifist Socialist party (PSP), which seemed to have learned from the experiences of the Communists, made big gains.

In June a severe riot broke out in Amsterdam in the wake of a demonstration by workers which claimed one dead. The protest was against a two per cent deduction from the nonorganized workers’ summer holiday bonus, to be used to meet administrative costs. Damage was heavy and many were wounded.

The appointment, in June, of General Johann Adolf Count von Kielmansegg, a German panzer commander and veteran of the Nazi invasion and conquest of Poland, as commander-in-chief of the NATO forces, and the transfer of NATO headquarters to the Netherlands caused violent resentment among the Dutch. They called for the general’s resignation despite efforts by the German and Dutch press to picture him as a hero of the German resistance movement. Some Liberals in the Dutch House of Commons (Twede Kamer) questioned the minister of defense about the general’s reliability in the light of his World War II activities. The minister stated that he saw no reason for the Dutch government to alter its position.

During the summer, Dutch Minister of Justice Ivo Samkalden had released Willy Lages, one of three German war criminals still in custody, from Breda prison on the ground that he was incurably ill, and sent him to Germany for medical treatment. Letters of protest from Jewish congregations and non-Jewish student groups were sent to the government, and many demonstrations were held in Amsterdam and other cities.
In October Prime Minister Joseph M. L. T. Cals' cabinet was asked to resign, when it failed to receive a vote of confidence because of its financial policies. Scarcely a month later, an interim government was formed under the new Prime Minister Jelle Zijlstra, the former director general of the Netherlands Bank. Elections for the Dutch House of Commons were to be held in February 1967, two years earlier than usual.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

The Jewish population was estimated at 30,000, though a new demographic study sponsored by the Jewish Social Work Foundation (Stichting Joods Maatschappelijk Werk), put the figure at 27,000. The study did not take into account Jews who were not registered. There has been no emigration of Jews, except for some 200 persons of all ages who settled in Israel during the year. Immigration also was at a standstill; only a small number of East European and North African Jews and a few returnees from Israel entered the country.

**Communal Activities**

A move to confederate the three Jewish communities (Nederlandsch Israëlitisch Kerkgenootschap, Portugees Israëlitisch Kerkgenootschap, and Liberaal Religieuze Joden in Nederland) failed despite efforts of a special committee to provide a solution acceptable to all. The communities did, however, agree to cooperate in all affairs involving the Jewish community as a whole. In April all the youth organizations, including the various Zionist groups, the Liberal youth organization "Scopus," and some small Orthodox, nonpolitical youth leagues, gathered in the Joodse Schouwburg (Jewish theater) for commemorative services, conducted by the spiritual heads of the three Jewish communities. This theater, once used by the Nazis as deportation center of the Dutch Jews, was later dedicated by the city of Amsterdam as a memorial to these victims of Nazism.

The cause of unifying Dutch Jewry was ill served by the refusal of the Orthodox rabbis to allow representatives of their congregation to attend inauguration ceremonies of the new Liberal synagogue and youth center. Two prominent leaders of the Orthodox community, Hans Eyl, president of the Amsterdam Jewish Community Council, and Isaac Dasberg, president of the Ashkenazi Federation, resigned their posts in protest against the rabbis' prohibition. For months to come, the Jewish press carried discussions of the repercussions.

The financing of the new Liberal center fell mainly on the shoulders of individual members. The Jokos foundation, a Jewish organization concerned with indemnification, provided substantial assistance, and the Amsterdam municipality partially subsidized the youth center.

Internal difficulties arose in the Orthodox community when the younger leaders demanded a more important and responsible role in community
affairs. They particularly wanted greater representation on the Jewish Community Council (Kerkeraad) and on the board of deputies of the Ashkenazi Orthodox Community Federation. The "old guard" opposed these demands because they did not feel that the younger men were ready for such responsibility. There was heavy opposition to the fact that no member of the young generation was represented on the new executive board of the Federation of the Ashkenazi Orthodox Jewish Communities, which included Isaac Dasberg, president (who recently resigned), Isaac Zadoks, vice president, Judge Salomon Boas, Samuel Eisenman, Herman Hijmans, and Jacob A. B. Gomperts.

Social Welfare

The Jewish Social Work Foundation (Stichting Joods Maatschappelijk Werk; AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 334), which formerly concentrated largely on case work, now expanded its activities to include community development and organization. Semi-official institutions for community organization (Provinciaal Opbouw Orgaan) had been set up in the 11 Dutch provinces as a vehicle for the discussion of local problems between representatives of non-governmental agencies and appropriate government officials. The main obstacle to Jewish participation was the Orthodox community's unwillingness, at a time when it had its own problems, to cede any of its responsibilities or influence to the community organizations.

A start in the direction of community development was made in Amsterdam Buitenveldert, a new middle-class community of 15,000 largely young people with many children. The community's 1,500 Jews belonged largely to the Liberal congregation, which had been directing all the activities of the Jewish community center. However, when the center's fine facilities began to attract to the community many elderly people, the Buitenveldert residents turned to the Jewish Social Welfare Foundation to help establish a club for senior citizens and to organize all other social and cultural activities because they no longer wished them to be under the direction of the religious communities.

The annual fund-raising campaigns of CEFINA (Centrale Financierings-actie voor Joods Sociaal Werk in Nederland) and the Joint Israel Drive (Collective Israel Actie) raised $400,000, about 10 per cent less than in 1965.

A planning committee for the building of a new central old-age home in Amsterdam, to replace both the Joodse Invalide and Beth-Menuchah, was established. Its members were Eduard Spier, president of the Jewish Social Work Foundation; Walter Van Dam, president of the Joodse Invalide; Emanuel J. Joëls, member of the board of Beth-Menuchah; Cornelis Verhagen, director of the Amsterdam municipal old-age homes, and Gerhard Taussig, director of the Jewish Social Work Foundation. The committee's first act was to reserve a building site in one of Amsterdam's new resort areas.
In January the Verbond, an organization for assisting Jews in Eastern Europe, celebrated its 20th anniversary at the Amsterdam Hilton Hotel.

**Cultural Activities**

Early in 1966 the Sephardi Chief Rabbi Isaac Nissim of Israel suggested that the unique and extensive Etz Haim library of the Amsterdam Portuguese synagogue be moved to Jerusalem because of the danger that this valuable collection may some day be lost in view of the steadily decreasing number of Jews in Holland. A spokesman for the Amsterdam Portuguese community, who was interviewed on the Dutch Catholic Radio, rejected the proposal.

One of the important happenings of the past year was a teach-in on Jewish community policy in Amsterdam, attended by 500 young people. They accused the Jewish community leaders of passivity in political and cultural affairs, criticized the oldfashioned ways of the leadership, and demanded reforms. An expression of the same criticism was the fact that the income from a four-day exposition on postwar fascism, arranged by the students of the Jewish Maimonides Lyceum in Amsterdam at the suggestion of their history teacher, was earmarked for the Defense and Aid Fund for South Africa.

The Society for the Jewish Sciences in the Netherlands (Genootschap voor de Joodse Wetenschap), which had a membership of 174, published the 1966 issue of its five-year periodical work. It contained an essay by Maurits de Jong on *A Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel*, a dialogue written by the sixteenth century Portuguese poet Solomon Usque, and an article on the German-Jewish ship magnate Albert Ballin by Abraham S. Rijxman.

The Leerhuis, an interfaith center for the study of Judaic and Christian biblical traditions, was established in 1966. Jacob Ashkenazi, its director and an Israeli Jewish scholar, began his lecture series on the Torah, Talmud, Midrash, and the Hebrew language; the Liberal Rabbi Jacob Soetendorp conducted a course on the Prophets; the Protestant theologian Professor Theo C. de Kruif discussed the role of the Prophets in the New Testament; Mozes Koenig, a leader of the Federation of Orthodox Communities, spoke about the basis of Pharisaic thought, and Reverend Karel H. Kroon discussed the Pharisaism of Jesus and Paul. The Leerhuis also held lectures in the Dutch provinces.

In November a congress of the World Union of Jewish Students met in the Hague (Scheveningen). The main subject of the discussions was the question of whether the Great Catastrophe had already become history, or whether it would always remain a living reality. Among the speakers were Israel's Attorney General Gideon Hausner; Asher Ben-Natan, Israeli ambassador in Bonn; Simon J. Roth, director of the London Institute of Jewish Affairs; Saul Friedlander, the French historian and famous author of *Pius XII and the Third Reich*, and Rabbi Simon Haliwa of the Netherlands.

The Jewish Family Archives Foundation, under the leadership of Joseph
Weijel, was engaged in the study of Jewish registers in preparation of a history of Jewish names in the Netherlands. The Jewish Historical Museum in Amsterdam featured an exhibit on Jewish marriage, which was very well attended.

Jewish and Israeli painters, such as Salomon Mendoza, Shalom Lixenberg, Joël Kass, Einan Cohen, and Harry van Kruiningen exhibited their paintings in Amsterdam and other cities.

The *Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad* (Jewish Weekly) celebrated its 100th anniversary. An enlarged jubilee edition, with contributions from well-known Jewish Dutch writers, poets, politicians, and community leaders, was published with the financial assistance of the Prince Bernhard Fund, a non-Jewish organization.

**Zionism and Relations with Israel**

In the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Dutch government supported the resolution condemning Israel for reprisals against Jordan.

Israel's Minister of Posts Elijah Sasson and Minister of Social Welfare Joseph Burg visited Holland. Burg discussed the cultural problems in the State of Israel at a meeting of the Dutch Mizrachi in Amsterdam.

During the year, the Israeli ambassador in the Hague, David Shaltiel, was replaced by Daniel Lewin, who had been one of the first Israeli attachés to the Israeli Embassy in the city. Israeli Consul-General Eliezer Yapou left Amsterdam after a tour of duty of three-and-a-half years.

In the fall, Israel's Gadna Orchestra of 80 young people, under the baton of Shalom Ronly-Rikis played at Kerkrade, a small town in the southern part of the Netherlands, where it had earlier participated in several music festivals. All 80 members of the orchestra were lodged with Dutch families without charge. This year, Gadna won the Silver Lyre prize (in 1965 it took first prize) in a competition of 230 orchestras from 19 different countries. The event was televised.

A great number of Israelis arrived in Amsterdam and Rotterdam in search of employment. As Israel had no special agreement with the Hague concerning the admission of workers to Holland, only highly qualified and skilled applicants were given work and residence permits. There was no change in number of Israeli students matriculated in Dutch universities.

The Tarbuth center of the Dutch Zionist organization (*AJYB*, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 387) held a Hebrew seminar at Noordwijk, in which 160 young people, many of them French, participated. The interest among youth for Hebrew was increasing, probably as a consequence of the activities of the Israel-oriented youth movements, Ha-shomer Ha-tza'ir, Habonim, and Bnei Akiva. The Netherland Zionist Student Organization, together with the other Jewish youth groups, held a demonstration protesting the persecution of Soviet Jews. The group submitted to the Soviet ambassador in the Hague a petition, which, however, was not accepted.
In October an Israeli book week was held in the Anne Frank House in Amsterdam; the Israel publishing center and the Amsterdam publishers and bookdealers, Meulenhoff & Co. and Joachimsthal, displayed more than 500 books.

With the exception of the youth groups, the activities of the Dutch Zionist organization showed a steady decline. Its annual meeting, in January, was largely attended by elderly persons. The circulation of its monthly periodical, *Joodse Wachter*, declined accordingly, and a decision was reached to suspend publication in a year if there was no improvement.

**Personalia**

Professor Hans Bloemendaal, who only a year ago became professor of biochemistry at the Catholic University of Nijmegen, was appointed a member of the scientific council for the fight against cancer of the Dutch Royal Academy of Sciences. Mozes H. Gans, editor-in-chief of the *Nieuw Israëlietisch Weekblad* (New Jewish Weekly), received a high Dutch distinction from the queen.

Isaac Keesing, the founder of the well-known "Keesing system," a kind of Dutch encyclopedia, died in Amsterdam in August at the age of 80. Israel J. Wislicki, member of the council of the Jewish community of Amsterdam, as well as of the board of the Jewish Social Work Foundation and the Verbond, died at the age of 63.

GERHARD TAUSSIG
Spain

July 18, 1966 marked the 30th anniversary of the Spanish Civil War, which cost Spain 500,000 to a million dead before it ended in 1939. After 27 years of "peace under dictatorship" and the rule of Generalissimo Francisco Franco, the increasing prosperity of the 1960's has finally begun to reach the impoverished countryside, with an annual increase in the gross national product (GNP) of about 8 per cent and an income rise in the last five years from $500 to $600 per capita. It has also meant an industrial breakthrough, with implications for changing notions of supply and demand, earnings, and living standards.

The economic gains meant political stability and popular acceptance of the existing authoritarian paternalism, now slightly modified in form. However, this well being has also stimulated a desire for political modernization and for bringing Spain closer to the Western democracies. The forces for change have increasingly come from the middle class, laborers, reform-minded Church elements, intellectuals, and university students.

Labor, repressed for years in "vertical" unions of workers and employers that are controlled by the government, was edging toward action. Illegal worker's commissions have grown up as freely-elected, effective leadership groups within the official unions. While these commissions are repressed through arrests and trials, the regime, at the same time, is counting on them to keep labor peace. Labor demands are simple: an end to the controlled vertical unions and higher minimum wages. Although political parties remain illegal, groups of socialists, Communists, anarchists, and Catholic militants compete for leadership in the organized unions. In some cases they have joined with liberal-minded Roman Catholic priests.

In Catalonia there were manifestations of social discontent nurtured by economic conditions and certain government and church attitudes that disturbed the region's nationalist pride. Royalist elements continued to press for a return of the monarchy to succeed the aging Franco, with competing factions supporting either the young Prince Juan Carlos or his father Don Juan de Borbon y Battenberg, the pretender and son of the late Spanish king, now living in exile in Portugal.

The new forces in Spain in the last two years arose from a renascence that has affected her world position as well. Spain has launched a new, aggressive foreign policy designed to win full acceptance into European affairs, but on her own terms. According to Foreign Minister Fernando Maria Castiella y Maiz, Spain was now seeking an independent foreign policy without "second class" position. She was determined to use her strategic geo-political position to gain full Western partnership, with the return of Gibraltar to her
sovereignty and membership in NATO. Belated admission to the United Na-
tions; the impending retirement of Franco, possibly in favor of a constitu-
tional monarch; the rise of an articulate middle class; the annual incursion
of millions of free-moving and free-talking tourists, and the uplifted econ-
omy, all contributed to this stand. Until recently, however, Spanish leaders
insisted that their people were neither mentally nor psychologically prepared
for the exercise of some degree of religious or social freedom, regarded as
normal in other Western countries.

Nevertheless, what has been called a "certain improvement" of religious
tolerance in Spain was expressed in a new constitution and proposed legisla-
tion, undoubtedly the result of several factors. The flow of United States aid,
close to $2 billion in the last 13 years, has at times been protested by Cath-
olics, Protestants and secular groups in the United States. Franco, who only
recently achieved associate membership in the European Common Market,
still sought to prove the legitimacy of his regime. Even more important,
however, was the fact that history was catching up with Catholic attitudes.
The ecumenical thought of Pope John XXIII, and the decisions of Vatican
Council II and Pope Paul VI, have impressed on Catholic prelates the need
to disavow Spanish church intransigence as no longer consistent with reality.

Spain also tried to strengthen ties with the Soviet Union and Eastern Eu-
rop e, review relations with Cuba, cement contacts in the Arab world, and
increase her influence in Latin America with economic and technical aid.
To Spanish officials this did not mean a lessening of ties with the United
States, which actively supported Spain, but a search for flexibility in a rapidly
changing world. Undoubtedly, it will inject a sense of Spanish nationalism
into foreign affairs at a time when the country approaches a transition from
the Franco regime.

The Catholic Struggle

In a country where over 99 per cent of the population was Roman Cath-
olic, the Church was considered the single most important source of stability
of the Franco regime, followed only by the army. Since 1965, a conflict
has emerged between progressive-minded clergy influenced by the Ecumeni-
cal Council, and the older clergy of the old, authoritarian Franco Spain. The
entire social order and the Church was being affected by the new attitudes
of the younger clergy, who were also better educated and in closer contact
with the Spanish people and outsiders. A larger number came from the ex-
panding middle classes and, moving with the times, were attempting to close
the gap between the Church and the workers and peasants. Many observers
believed it was merely a matter of time before the new generation of clergy
would dominate the Spanish Church. In the meantime, the rift was widening
and, for the first time in centuries, the Spanish Church seemed divided. A
series of events in 1966 apparently brought to a critical point the simmering
unrest of young priests and lay activists.
In Catalonia, young priests and students joined in open demonstrations against the regime. In May policemen in Barcelona clubbed several priests protesting on behalf of an imprisoned student leader. The Workers Brotherhoods of Catholic Action (HOAC) have had difficulties defending workers against the authorities. Two Catholic publications—the youth weekly SIGNO and the Jesuit periodical La Voz del Trabajo—were in trouble with authorities for printing critical articles, indicating that the new press law has not changed government censorship dramatically. The struggle, no longer kept secret, has become the subject of frank discussion in the press and a major factor in Spanish politics. The headline over the cover story of the Madrid weekly SP in early July read, “Climate of Tension in the Spanish Church.”

The conflict within the church and the lack of decision on how to resolve the struggle, were illustrated by the release, on July 1, of a document on “The Church and Temporal Order in the Light of the Vatican Council” prepared by the 18-man permanent commission of the Spanish Episcopal Conference, the Catholic Church’s ruling body. Seeking to steer a middle course and parting with the government, it urged the acceptance of the Council’s directives on political and trade union freedoms, but forbade priests, and especially Catholic Action, to engage in “temporal” politics in the name of the church.

The bishops stated in the conference memorandum that, in light of the Council’s directives, they had no quarrel with the authoritarian regime of Franco, even though it had confiscated some liberal Catholic periodicals and took police action against demonstrating priests. The document, considered one of the most important church pronouncements of the century, thus displeased the conservative hierarchy for “going too far,” and the liberals for endorsing the regime rather than urging swift dissociation.

On July 11 the Roman Catholic hierarchy opened the National Episcopal Conference meeting in Madrid to deal, among other things, with a revolt by liberal members. On the same day, a Catholic labor weekly attacked the regime-controlled trade unions. High on the conference agenda was Catholic Action, which had become the focus of the liberal-conservative schism in the church. Catholic Action, which called itself the “lay apostolate,” was a group of 11 church-related organizations directed by the hierarchy and devoted to the dissemination of Christian ethics. It worked with youth, workers, professionals, teachers, farm workers, and business management. Within Catholic Action, however, some members did not share all progressive views or agree that it should participate in secular politics.

On July 22 the National Episcopal Conference announced the formation of a secretariat for relations with non-Catholics, non-Christians, and non-believers. It also modified a previous stand by its permanent commission ordering all nation-level meetings of Catholic Action canceled. In the reversal, the bishops agreed to permit Catholic Action to continue its normal program of national activities, but insisted that they be devoted “to doctrinal and practical problems connected with the lay apostolate.” This would curtail
Catholic Action support of demands for reforms in the nation's social, cultural, and economic life. In October, the conference attempted to weaken Catholic Action by removing four of its top liberal leaders.

Early in September word leaked out of a secret group of Roman Catholic priests and laymen, calling themselves Operation Moses, who were seeking an open split in the church and reportedly caused great concern in the hierarchy. It was an organization of groups of priests, formed in Madrid, Seville, and other centers in May after the open clashes between priests and the Barcelona police. Operation Moses apparently sought to force a split within the church, hoping this would lead to Papal intervention or arbitration. It advocated the complete separation of church and state and, more immediately, the retirement of all Spanish cardinals and bishops over 75, on the theory that younger men would modernize the Church. Some liberal bishops reportedly oppose the group, in the belief that its policies and methods are too radical.

The group issued a document, described in Catholic circles as being without precedent, which charged the Catholic hierarchy with "complicity and a compromise with the established temporal order," and described the Vatican Council as "perhaps the only hope for the church and the Christians of Spain." Word of the document's existence became known outside Spain in November, apparently after Operation Moses had threatened to send it to the Vatican, with a request for Papal intercession for the fulfillment of the Ecumenical Council's decisions, if the hierarchy in Spain failed to issue a public statement on it.

In December the Spanish College of Bishops agreed to share church control through the creation of two new councils. One would include lower-ranking clergy who would share with the bishops the responsibility for running a diocese, a move calculated to appease the forces urging liberalization. The other, a pastoral council with lay representation, was "recommended" for the diocese but was not clearly defined.

In another move, at a December 6 meeting in Madrid, the Episcopal Conference urged Spaniards to vote on December 14 for the constitutional referendum according to conscience and with "respect for the legitimate opinion of all citizens." Its failure to take a stand on the Constitution, as it had done in 1947 when it endorsed Franco's law of succession, was interpreted as a partial response to demands that the Church cease its identification with the regime.

Religious Liberty

For the last two years Spanish Jews and Protestants had looked towards a possible change in their status. The Ecumenical Council's vote in November 1965 in favor of the draft declaration on religious liberty was generally believed in Spain to reopen the way for the introduction of a long-awaited statute of freedom for non-Catholics. In January 1965 General Franco, in a New Year message, foreshadowed recognition of the legal rights of non-
Catholic minorities, but little was heard for over a year. It was understood that the government was persuaded to delay the matter until the Vatican Council had taken a decision on the draft declaration. These tactics were apparently aimed at the Protestants who were still bitterly disliked in many conservative Catholic religious circles, especially for their success in converting members of the poorer classes.

On December 3, 1966 the draft of a law on freedom of religion and worship, in preparation for over 10 years, was revealed and then sent to the Cortes (parliament). As soon as its contents were known, conservative Church elements raised objections. The Spanish Episcopal Conference reviewed the draft at the time the text was released, which was very soon after the Cortes voted for the new constitution. The proposed constitution, approved in a national referendum on December 14, gave legal foundation to the principle of religious liberty; the law on religious liberty was to give it form. Speaking at the American Jewish Committee headquarters in New York on the eve of the referendum, Max Mazin, head of the Madrid Jewish community, expressed confidence that “despite conservative opposition the future legislation will take into account the interest of the Spanish government to provide equal rights to non-Catholics.”

Both the new constitution and the proposed specific law were aimed at making freedom of worship not merely a matter of tolerance by the state—as has been the case since 1945—but a positive legal right. The anticipated passage of the law was considered the first major result in Spain of the Ecumenical Council’s decree on freedom of worship and its more liberal attitude toward Jews. At the same time, the entire issue had become another element in the deepening split in the Catholic Church—the conservative majority, which opposed the Council’s decree and the liberal, mostly younger, minority.

The approved text of the Spanish draft law, made public on February 25, 1967, retained the relatively liberal provisions of several earlier forms. Originally rejected by the Council of Ministers on February 10, it had been brought back for reconsideration on February 24. Thus, objections raised by conservative cabinet ministers and by the conservative Catholic hierarchy had been overruled. Franco had apparently sided with the liberal forces.

The final draft guaranteed the basic freedom of worship for Spain’s religious minorities, limited only by normal requirements of public order which would exclude “physical or moral coercion, seduction, threat, suborning or other illegal forms of persuasion directed at winning followers from one religion and deviating them from another.” This clause is obviously open to broad interpretation. Thus, some Protestants feared that it could be so applied as to prevent them from seeking converts, although such activities were not specifically forbidden.

The major gain to the Jewish community and to the Protestant groups was that the new draft legislation would allow them to worship in public, to have identifying signs on synagogues and Protestant churches, and to form
religious societies. As a result, the transfer to both Jewish and Protestant societies of buildings housing churches and synagogues, which until now were registered in the names of "second persons" or corporations—in some cases fictional—would be possible. The draft also provided that all citizens, without distinction, could hold any public office, except that of chief of state, which remained restricted to Roman Catholics. Non-Catholics would no longer be required to attend Catholic worship in the army or in prison, or catechism courses in the school, or to obtain clearance from the diocesan Catholic bishop before getting married.

Non-Catholics would also be permitted to have their own cemeteries, publish religious literature, and to meet freely in houses of worship, cemeteries and other authorized localities. For other meetings, they would still need special permission which could be refused if local authorities deemed them to be not "in accordance with the respect due to the Catholic religion" or in violation of "public order." Finally, the document provided for the establishment of a central commission for religious liberty that would deal with questions concerning non-Catholic religious associations and individuals. The draft was to be debated by the Commission on Fundamental Laws of the Cortes, and then submitted to the full parliament for debate and approval, subject to final amendments.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

According to figures released by the Jewish community on June 1, 1966, about 3,000 Jews lived in Madrid, 3,000 in Barcelona, and most of the remaining 1,000 in Malaga, Ceuta and Melilla, in Spanish Morocco, with scattered families in Seville, Valencia, Majorca, and the Canary Islands (AJYB, 1962 [Vol. 63], pp. 319–20).

The immigration of Jews from Spanish Morocco brought the largest Jewish population growth in the last few years to Madrid, from 300 a decade ago to about 3,000 today, equaling the more stabilized Barcelona community. These newcomers created problems of employment, housing, and integration, but they also provided a basis for a more conscious expression of Jewish life. Thus, for Sabbath services, the Madrid Synagogue, which was opened in 1959, was overcrowded, and on the High Holy Days, a nearby hotel hall had to be rented. A fund-raising campaign was launched for a new synagogue and community center to serve the larger community now that open manifestations by religious minorities were to be permitted.

In the last five years about twenty Jewish families, mostly from Casablanca and Tangier, settled at Las Palmas in the Canary Islands, where weekly Friday evening services were held at the homes of community members.

Communal Organization

The formation of an unofficial Council of Jewish Communities of Spain as the overall body of the Madrid, Barcelona, Ceuta, and Melilla Jewish
communities had been reported on June 4, 1964. Max Mazin, president of
the Madrid Jewish community, had announced that he would seek official
government recognition for the council, and for Spanish Jewry as a religious
community. A similar request had been submitted without result a decade
earlier. But, late in 1964, information was received that a further application
would be sympathetically considered. Legal status was finally granted to a
Madrid council in March 1965, two months after the heads of the Madrid
and Barcelona Jewish communities had been received by General Franco—
the first meeting between a Spanish head of state and Jewish leaders since
1492. However, the Madrid Jewish community was not given public recogni-
tion as a religious body, but only as a private association. This was the only
non-Catholic religious association with juridical status. At the same time,
the community was asked to change its name from "La Comunidad Israelita de Madrid" to "La Comunidad Hebrea de Madrid" to avoid confusion
with the state of Israel. The Barcelona community did not try to obtain
recognition as a religious organization which it believed to be of dubious
value to the community as a whole; it had received *de facto* recognition years
ago. This pointed to the still relative lack of unity among Spanish Jews.
Hakesher, the Spanish-language publication of the Council of Jewish Com-
munities reported local and international Jewish affairs, and served to link
the new communities together. It had also limited circulation outside of
Spain, including neighboring Portugal.

An indication of the more liberal atmosphere in Spain was government
approval of the first public Jewish service on the island of Majorca since the
Inquisition. It was a Sabbath evening service conducted on July 29, 1966 in
the Anglican Church at Palma, by Dr. Leon Framm of Temple Israel in
Detroit, Michigan. Foreign Jewish residents had invited the rabbi who was
on his way to a World Jewish Congress meeting in Brussels, to stop and offi-
ciate in Majorca. Among the worshipers were several descendants of the
Chuetas, Majorca Jews who had been converted to Catholicism during the
Inquisition. Although devout Catholics, and now assimilated into the larger
Catholic community, the Chuetas had, until fairly recently, lived in ghettos.
Many of them remembered their Jewish ancestry and showed an interest
in Judaism.

**Education and Welfare**

In 1965 a kindergarten was organized by the Madrid community, and
the first primary school class was added in 1966. It was hoped that these
would develop into an all-day Jewish school. There were Sunday schools in
Madrid and Barcelona for children attending secular schools; a Jewish day-
school in Melilla, and a two-year old summer camp near Madrid that had
been opened with financial help from JDC.

For many years the Barcelona Jewish community, which had always been
the best organized, has had a Talmud Torah where children receive religious
instruction, were prepared for bar mitzvah, and learned Hebrew. The community also supported a teacher who gave Hebrew and religious instruction in the French lycée attended by most Jewish children. The local community council, or a few selected people, acted as an unofficial Beth Din in cases involving Jewish businessmen who wished to settle disputes among themselves.

A Jewish youth movement for children between the ages of 7 to 16 served the five major Jewish centers. Financial assistance for some refugees and aged in Madrid and Barcelona, which had an old-age home, was still being provided by Jewish agencies outside Spain.

Community Relations

Because few Jews lived in Spain until recently, there has been little or- ganized antisemitism. Nevertheless, admirers of Nazi Germany did infiltrate various segments of Spanish society, especially the fascist Falange party, and these elements are still active. They were reinforced by Germans living in Madrid and Barcelona, especially by former Nazis who had sought refuge in Spain.

Antisemitic groups published hate material, much of it illegal, but rarely undertook other overt anti-Jewish activities. They have had some influence on leading journals, such as the right-wing Juanperez, which occasionally printed antisemitic articles. They also may have participated in the arson attempt on the Barcelona synagogue in August 1966, the first since the Jewish communities were reestablished. So far, the perpetrators have not been apprehended.

Of great concern to local Jewish leaders were the attitudes of the over- whelming Catholic population which has been exposed to the centuries-old concept of contempt for the Jews as a “deicide people.” Occasionally public utterance was given to this teaching, as in “A Matar Jueus” (Death to the Jews), featured in a 1966 calendar printed in Catalonia. Vigorous protests resulted in the confiscation of the calendar.

The official attitude discouraged overt antisemitic manifestations. To a great extent, this was due to a desire to reestablish ties with the approximately one million Sephardi Jews throughout the world as the spiritual descendants of Spanish culture.

(The attitude of the regime was first enunciated, in this century, in the 1924 measure sponsored by the dictator, General Primo de Rivera, which offered Spanish citizenship to Sephardi Jews throughout the world, based on the concept of jus sanguinis but did not require their return. During World War II, Jews from Nazi-occupied Europe were given refuge; others crossed Spain's frontiers in transit. Some remained and settled in Spain. In 1949 General Franco again offered citizenship to all Sephardi Jews. In 1954 a synagogue with facilities for Sephardim and Ashkenazim was opened in Bar-
In June 1964 General Franco established by decree a center for Hispanic-Jewish (Sephardic) studies and a special museum in the famous 14th century El Transito synagogue, in Toledo. The decree was issued in conjunction with a 10-day officially endorsed symposium conducted in Madrid by the Institute of Sephardic Studies which discussed the geographical distribution and social status of Sephardic culture and people throughout the world. The symposium also formulated measures for renewal of bonds with Spanish culture and the preparation of a Ladino dictionary.

In March 1965 an ancient reproduction of the 14th century Haggadah of Sarajevo—the original was still in the Yugoslav town—was made available by the Jewish Community Service of AJC as the main exhibit in the newly established museum. Distinguished Hispanic scholars attended the exhibition, as did Spanish officials concerned with art and culture. Four months later the Spanish government transferred to the museum more than $16,000, contributed by an anonymous Jewish donor in appreciation for Spanish efforts on behalf of Jewish culture. The government also issued a new postage stamp with the picture of the El Transito synagogue. *Heja de Lunes*, a Madrid Monday morning newspaper, featured the story, suggesting that the regime wished to emphasize a new policy of encouraging religious tolerance. The paper called the Jews "our brothers."

For the first time, in December 1965, the Spanish public viewed the telecast of a Jewish leader explaining the basic principles of Judaism. It was Max Mazin of the Madrid community, who is also co-chairman of the Jewish-Christian Friendship Association (Amistad). He appealed to the Roman Catholic hierarchy to implement the decisions of the Ecumenical Council and answered questions put to him by Father Munoz Iglesis, director of religious broadcasting. Father Iglesis introduced the program by reading the Vatican Council declaration on the Jews.

Mazin spoke again on April 4, 1966, this time at the Dominican monastery of Saint Tomas in the walled city of Avila. Standing where the Grand Inquisitor Tomas Torquemada lay buried, he told the assembled priests and friars, who invited him to speak, about the Jewish faith. The meeting was arranged by the Amistad.

It was not until October 16, 1966, after nearly five hundred years, that the Jews returned to the Toledo Synagogue for the first public Jewish ceremonial since the expulsion. It was attended by 200 persons, among them five Roman Catholic priests and two Capuchin monks, who heard Provincial Governor Enrique Thomas de Carranza, speak of past glories of Toledo Jewry. It was believed to have been the first time that a ranking Spanish government official participated in a Jewish meeting of this kind.

**Relations with Israel**

Although Spain had a consul general in Jerusalem long before the State
of Israel had been created, no official diplomatic relations existed as yet between the two states. Pressure for the recognition of Israel mounted in Spain. One of the reasons was the desire to preserve Ladino (Judaeo-Spanish), which would require close association with the approximately 300,000 Jews in Israel who still retained links with Ladino language and culture, and even published a Ladino newspaper, El Tiempo.

Scholars were anxious to find a way to preserve the Spanish roots of Ladino and direct it into the stream of modern Spanish culture, without arousing Arab hostility. In March 1964 Dom Ramon Menendez Pidal, the director of the Royal Academy of Letters in Madrid, went to Israel to study Sephardi culture and meet with Israeli scholars. After his return, the newspaper El Cruzado Español (The Spanish Crusader) criticized Don Ramon because he had urged helping the Ladino-speaking Israeli Jews. It implied that this would be a "political" rather than a "cultural" act and would jeopardize Spanish influence in the Arab Middle East.

In the meantime, there was some increase in the insignificant trade between the two countries, resulting from commercial agreements between Spanish and Israeli banks. In July 1964 the first delegation of Israeli businessmen arrived as guests of the Madrid Chamber of Commerce for discussion on the possible strengthening of bilateral trade. Trade relations suffered a minor setback in 1965, when Israeli shipping was refused harbor facilities. Even without diplomatic ties, Spain had always encouraged tourism and provided port facilities to Israeli ships, but Arab boycott authorities reportedly pressed Spain to sever all commercial ties with Israel. The Spanish Foreign Ministry announced on April 1, 1965 that "Israeli ships with tourists" would be able to stop at Malaga and Palma de Majorca, the usual ports of call, but at no other port. It insisted that this restriction was "administrative," since Israel had no consular representatives, and denied pressure from "any foreign country" or allegations that the decision was based on political considerations. A week later ZIM Israel Lines, the only Israeli company using Spanish ports, signed an agreement with the Spanish maritime undersecretary, resolving the dispute.

On January 26, 1967 the influential Catholic daily Ya urged Franco to create normal diplomatic relations with Israel, asserting that Spain was the only Western nation still refusing to recognize it. Referring to the fact that this situation existed because of Spain's ties with the Arab world, the editorial declared that Spanish friendship with the Arab nations "must become compatible with a not less well-founded friendship with the Jews." Shortly thereafter, at a press conference in Beirut, Lebanon, Spanish Minister of Information and Tourism Manuel Fraga Iribarne reaffirmed his country's ties of friendship with the Arab states and said that it would not recognize Israel.

Jerry Goodman
The year 1966 saw significant political changes in Italy, which began with the resignation of Prime Minister Aldo Moro's center-left coalition government. On January 21, after almost 18 months in power, the government suddenly and unexpectedly found itself in the minority when a bill providing for the creation of state nursery schools was defeated under cover of a secret ballot, by a vote of 250 to 221. The bill had been one of the pillars of the center-left coalition agreement in which the Socialists had received assurance that not all new schools would be under church auspices.

The vote revealed a strange alignment resulting from a struggle within the Christian Democratic party between a faction led by Prime Minister Aldo Moro and the followers of the dissident Foreign Minister Amintore Fanfani. Neo-fascist deputies voted with the Communists, while Pietro Nenni's Socialists in the coalition asked the government to resign in order to force a clarification within the center-left majority whose program was held in check by dissension among the Christian Democrats.

The crisis lasted 33 days, ending on March 15 with the formation of a new center-left government, again headed by Moro and consisting of 16 Christian Democrats, six Socialists, three Social Democrats and one member of the Republican party. This uneasy alliance carried through the rest of the year amidst sporadic rumors that the two wings of the Socialist party, now functioning as independent political parties, would merge and seek ways to assert a unified program. The merger of the two groups into the Socialist party took place with much show on October 29.

The hotly contested municipal and provincial by-elections in June revealed trends in the Italian electorate's thinking which were expected to set the political tone until the 1968 parliamentary elections, when national issues will again be involved. The Communists, who for years have shown slow but steady progress, failed in their strong bid for the control of the Rome and Florence municipal councils. The four-party center-left coalition received popular endorsement; the Democratic Socialists, who ran on a separate ticket, emerged with the largest gain. (This accelerated plans for a unified Socialist party.) The Church threw its weight behind the Christian Democrats and, to quote the New York Times the morning after, "the threat of excommunication for those voting Communist has never seemed effective. The Communists were set back for mundane reasons."

After a fourteen-months period of austerity the Italian economy seemed to be moving forward. The mid-year report in June showed that industrial production rose 11 per cent over the corresponding period in 1965, and unemployment, which always plagued the country, decreased 6 per cent. The
country's foreign currency reserves grew even more rapidly than France's, whose economic recovery had been considered the miracle of Europe. Italy was reaping the harvest of the restrictive measures it had adopted in the fall of 1963. Its progress was the most pronounced of all Common Market countries.

After four years of decline, the stock market began to show vigorous, though erratic, activity with broad sweeps between high and low periods, reflecting a general business revival. New car registrations, always an important index, were 6.5 per cent higher in the first half of 1966 than during the comparable period in 1965; for the same period, increases in steel and cast iron production were 9.4 and 31 per cent, respectively.

Late in the year, however, Northern and Central Italy were hit by unprecedented floods which left many thousands of acres of arable land unproductive for years to come and caused incalculable property damage. Government officials estimated that the natural catastrophe would set back Italian economy by ten years; it had wiped out all post-war gains in just a few weeks.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

The estimated size of the Jewish community in Italy continued to be 33,000. The largest concentration remained in Milan and Rome with about 9,000 and 13,500 Jews, respectively. The balance of about 10,500 were scattered in 21 communities, including both relatively large centers in Turin (1,661) and Florence (1,438), as well as small groups in Gorizia (32) and Parma (60). Although there was still considerable transit of Jewish refugees from Eastern Europe migrating to Israel, the United States, and Canada, only very few of them remained in Italy.

Most of the Jews belonged to the middle and upper classes; an estimated 65 per cent of their working population were independently employed. They were well integrated and denied that their normal economic and social progress was in any way hampered by anti-Jewish prejudice. The community, however, remained alert to manifestations of political antisemitism at home and abroad.

**Community Activities**

The major event of the year was the three-day congress of the Unione delle Comunità Israelitiche Italiane (Union of Italian Jewish Communities; AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 340). This congress, which by statute must meet every five years, elects a council of representatives of the various Jewish organizations and offers the only occasion for a meeting where an exchange of views of all the elements of Italy's Jewish population is possible. The opening session on May 15, at which the Unione was awarded the government's Gold Medal of Civil Merit, was addressed by Minister of the Interior Paolo Emilio Taviani and received a message from President Saragat.

The congress heard reports and debates on assimilation, antisemitism, cul-
tural programs, organization of the Jewish community, rabbinical studies, adequacy of legal dispositions concerning religious minorities, and financing of the Unione’s work through community assessments. The most heated debate centered around a proposed revision of the Unione’s statutes which dated from the days of the fascist regime (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], pp. 338-39). The matter was referred for further study to a special committee, which was to report on it a year later. The delegates reserved judgment on the Vatican’s declaration on the Jews. They simply took note that the Church, “after centuries of immobility and conservatism,” had reviewed its position in the world and instituted several changes with regard to superstitions which had had such tragic consequences for Jews. At the session on finances, the JDC matching the sum raised by the communities, announced a contribution of $20,000. The funds were to be used to wipe out the Unione’s deficit and to put its work on a sound financial basis for the next five years. Judge Sergio Piperno was reelected president of the Unione for a five-year term.

In February the newly-elected president of the Rome Jewish community, Professor Gianfranco Tedeschi, inaugurated a novel series of public meetings with Roman Jewry at which the problem of maintaining community services in the face of a serious financial crisis was discussed. The success of the public debate led to plans for regular meetings of this type which served to bring the community members closer to community problems. In the annual community elections, Signora Gemma Coen Sabbatine was voted in as a member of the council. This was the first time in the community’s history that a woman held such an office. Her special interest in the problems of Jewish youth was expected to give impetus to more intensive cultural programs in their behalf.

Milan’s Jewish community received a gold medal from the municipal government in recognition of its work in welfare and education and of its “great dignity in sacrifice” during the years of racial persecution. On the occasion of the Italian republic’s 20th anniversary, President Sarragat made Astorre Mayer, president of the community, a Knight of Labor, one of the highest awards in the field of public service. In July Mayer resigned as president, a post he had held for many years, because of his increasing involvement in world Jewish affairs. (He was elected in January to serve on the WZO executive, as one of the seven non-Zionists who were added to its membership.) Mayer was succeeded by Guido Jarach, a well-known engineer, industrialist, and bank president, and long active in the community.

Education

Jewish education was an important preoccupation of all sizable Jewish communities, since there was a reluctance on the part of Jewish parents to send their children to the strongly Catholic-influenced public schools. Eight communities had day schools; those of Milan and Rome, with a combined enrolment of about 1,500 students, also offered secondary education (AJYB,
Communities in 17 other cities had Talmud Torahs on the kindergarten and elementary school levels.

In Rome, the Collegio Rabbinico Italiano had 15 students, three of whom were taking advanced studies, and 15 students attended the Davide Almagia' Seminario.

Publications

There had been some concern in Jewish circles that the publication *Rassegna mensile d'Israel* ("Monthly Review of Israel") would not long survive without Dante Lattes, its distinguished and scholarly editor who died in 1965. However, the well-known Jewish historian Professor Yoseph Colombo agreed to become the new editor, and the magazine continued to appear regularly. The Unione delle Comunità Israelitiche initiated a series of *Holiday Books* to fill a gap in Italian-language educational material. The first books on Purim, Passover, and Shavuot came off the presses in 1966. After an interval of 28 years, the Collegio Rabbinico Italiano was able to resume publication of a year book containing scholarly articles on various subjects of interest to Jews. It planned to publish a volume annually. Early in 1966 the Center for Contemporary Jewish Documentation (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 340) published *Diari*, the diary of Emanuele Artome, a young Italian Jew who was a member of the resistance movement in World War II and was murdered in prison.

Florence

The flood, which struck Florence on November 4 and 5 after three days of severe rain, overshadowed all other events affecting Jewish community life, as well as the country as a whole. As the Arno River left its banks and invaded the city, large land masses loosened by the rain slid into the river bed and propelled the waters at a speed of 40 miles per hour. The general state of the city and the damage to its unique art treasures and public monuments has been widely publicized and needs no repetition here.

The damage suffered by the Jewish community was less well-known. The synagogue, community offices, old-age home, and school were all concentrated in one of the most devastated areas. The water level in all the buildings reached ten feet. The residents of the old-age home, who were evacuated to the upper floor, lost all their personal belongings which had been stored in the basement. Heating and electrical installations were destroyed. The first-floor schoolrooms of the school were severely damaged and the basement gymnasium was wiped out. These buildings had recently been completed with the help of JDC-CJMCAG grants: the home in 1964, the school in 1965. In the synagogue, the benches were smashed and 80 Torah scrolls were water-damaged, many beyond repair. The greatest loss, however, was sustained by the large library containing hundreds of rare books and manuscripts, some dating back to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The total damage...
to the community was estimated at about $500,000. Jewish communities in Italy and throughout the world gave assistance in the form of manpower and money. Among those immediately on the scene was JDC, which made available medical, food, and other supplies, as well as $50,000 for the reconstruction fund.

**Attitude Toward Jews**

The Italian Federation of Scientific Associations unveiled a commemorative plaque on the Milan house where Albert Einstein spent six years of his youth (1894–1900). The inscription refers to Einstein's acceptance of the world as his country, with borders only in the universe. Jewish victims of Nazi persecution were honored by other municipalities. Leghorn named a square in the center of the city “Jewish Deportees Square” in ceremonies attended by leading civic and Jewish leaders. One of the squares in Genoa was named after Rabbi Riccardo Pacifici who had lived in the city and lost his life in 1943. In an impressive public dedication ceremony, La Spezia (near Genoa) named an elementary school in the newest section of the city in memory of Adriana Revere, a Jewish child who had been deported to a Nazi extermination camp. At the close of the ceremony, students recited poems written by Jewish children in the Theresienstadt camp.

**Ecumenical Council**

It was to be expected that interpretation and consultations would be necessary for an effective implementation of the declaration on the Jews and Judaism, adopted by Vatican Council II. In January Augustine Cardinal Bea, who had been entrusted with drafting the schema and bringing it before the Council, issued a statement advising the Catholic clergy on how best to understand and carry out the aims of the document. He noted that the declaration was the most debated item on the Council agenda “not so much for religious reasons but because of the unfortunate political circumstances of the moment.” The declaration, he explained, had once been deleted from the agenda, but was again included when Pope John expressed his agreement with Cardinal Bea’s views “as to its importance and responsibility of our interest in it.”

Bishop Luigi Carli of Segni, who was one of the strongest spokesmen for the Conservative group at the Council later restated his views on how the declaration should be interpreted. In a 45-page article in the semi-monthly clerical review *Palestro del Clero* (April) he declared that, although Judaism continued to survive, it carried with it “the judgment of condemnation by God” and whoever, knowing Jesus, consciously and freely followed Judaism “participates in conscience in that judgment of condemnation.” Carli also stated that the term “deicide is theologically unexceptionable; even the only fitting one,” and that the same applied to collective responsibility of the Jews for the crucifixion of Jesus. Cardinal Bea also dealt with the theological aspects
of the declaration in *The Church and the Jewish People*, published by Morcelliana in June. Although he dismissed the accusation of "collective guilt" and of "deicide," he reaffirmed the Christian doctrine condemning the Jews for refusing to accept Jesus as the Messiah. While expressing regret that his statements might be painful to the Jews he reiterated the hope that they would eventually embrace Christianity. He outlined ways and means "to establish and develop in a constructive way" the relations between Christians and Jews, "until all Israel shall be saved."

Support of Vatican Council II came from unexpected quarters in Italy. At the eleventh congress of the Italian Communist party in January, Secretary General Luigi Longo devoted a large part of his five-hour speech in praise of Vatican II, especially its advocacy of "the total independence of the Church from all political systems," which he interpreted as "a criticism of the principle of the political unity of Catholics and even the concept of a Catholic party." He made a special point of expressing the party's "absolute respect of religious liberty" and its opposition to "a state which attributes privilege to an ideology, a philosophy, or a religious faith."

**Relations with Israel**

In July Ehud Avriel, a high official in the Israel ministry of foreign affairs, became Israeli ambassador to Italy, succeeding the much-mourned Maurice Fisher, who died 11 months earlier.

The celebrated Italian author Ignazio Silone spoke of his own experiences in a kibbutz at an exposition called "A Day in a Kibbutz." The exhibit was arranged in Rome in February by the Italy-Israel Association. The association also organized a public meeting on "Impressions of a Voyage to Israel" which was addressed by Silvo Tardaro, president of the Italian supreme court, and other well-known Italians who had visited Israel.

Israel participated in the annual Milan industrial fair with an imposing exhibit of its export industry. The fifth congress of the European Common Market free trade unions, held in Rome on November 14, approved a resolution asking for "quick and satisfactory" action on Israel's request for associate status in the Common Market (p. 364).

Through the initiative of the Rotary Clubs of Israel and Italy, in cooperation with Alitalia and El Al airlines, 112 Jewish and non-Jewish teenagers from flood-stricken families in Florence and their teachers were flown to Israel in December for a three-week visit during which they were to continue their classes.

In June Chief Rabbi Isaac Nissim of Israel visited Rome where he was honored at a community reception. He addressed the congregation at Sabbath services.

Italian Jews were particularly proud that the Chagall mosaics in the Knesset building in Jerusalem were installed by specialists from Ravenna, and that
an antique ark from Soragna (near Parma) stood in the building's small synagogue.

**Personalia**

Luciano Camerino, 39, member of the executive of OSE-Italy, died of a cerebral hemorrhage while helping to bring relief to the flood-stricken Jewish community of Florence. A public subscription was opened in behalf of his widow and three small children, to which President Saragat personally sent $150.

Leonard Seidenman
Central Europe

West Germany

FOREIGN POLICY

When Chancellor Ludwig Erhard’s coalition government suddenly collapsed in October 1966, none of the Federal Republic’s major foreign policy goals, such as the reunification of Germany and the improvement of relations with its Eastern neighbors, with France, NATO, the Arab countries, and with the new African nations had as yet been achieved.

Relations with the United States

What actually brought the political and economic crisis into the open and hastened Erhard’s downfall was that he returned empty-handed from his September visit to President Lyndon B. Johnson. Erhard appealed to Johnson for an extension of the date when payment of $3 billion was due for military equipment which West Germany had bought from the United States to balance dollar expenses for keeping American troops in West Germany. (By the end of 1966, Germany paid DM2.9 billion of the total DM5.4 billion, provided in the agreements between the United States government and the Germans late in 1965. The remaining DM2.5 billion were to be paid in 1967.) During these talks Erhard also expressed his government’s wish that American troops in West Germany remain at their present strength. Although Erhard’s reception in Washington and Texas was friendly, he gained no major concessions. Late in October the United States and the United Kingdom began talks with the Federal Republic on major economic and military problems.

Relations with France

When Erhard visited France in February, President Charles de Gaulle gave reassurances that France would not recognize the East German regime, that he would advocate the cause of Germany in Moscow, and that he would
approve intensified political and cultural cooperation between the six Common Market powers—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. When de Gaulle soon thereafter announced France's withdrawal from NATO, Erhard reasserted Germany's loyalty to the North Atlantic community. Earlier, in May, successful negotiations began between France and the Federal Republic to secure the continued presence of French troops on West German territory.

**Relations with the Soviet Bloc**

The West German government on March 25 transmitted to all powers a "Peace Note," a basic document expressing its interest in improving relations with the East European countries; emphasizing that the 1938 Munich agreement with regard to the Sudetenland was without legal basis and that therefore Germany had no territorial claims on Czechoslovakia; appealing to all non-nuclear powers to abandon plans for the development of such weapons (a promise that the Federal Republic had given in 1954), and pledging not to prepare for aggressive warfare. In May, the Warsaw daily *Trybuna Ludu* replied that peace in Europe could be promoted only by a change in West Germany's attitude toward the Socialist states and by her acceptance of the Oder-Neisse frontier. The Soviet Union simultaneously suggested a European conference on the German question from which the United States would be excluded. It further stated that any peace treaty with Germany would have to take into account the post-war boundaries, and suggested the dissolution of NATO and the Warsaw pact.

On May 17 Rumanian Foreign Trade Minister Gheorghe Cioara began conversations with West German Foreign Minister Gerhard Schroder and Minister for Economic Affairs Kurt Schmucker, aimed at improving economic relations between the two countries.

**Relations with Arab Countries**

In July President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia paid a visit to Bonn. Hopes that he would make successful efforts to improve Germany's relations with the Arab nations did not materialize mainly because the Arabs had taken amiss Bourguiba's proposal for a peaceful solution of the "Palestinian question." (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 432).

**Domestic Affairs**

The year 1966 was doubtless the most difficult in the thus far successful development of the Federal Republic.

Relations between Bonn and the Deutsche Demokratische Republik (DDR, Soviet zone) became more strained. In March the Socialist Unity party (SED) of DDR suggested to the West German Socialist party (SPD) an exchange of speakers. SPD agreed to a plan for SED members to address mass
meetings at Essen, and for SPD speakers to go to Karl-Marx-Stadt. However, SED deemed a Bundestag law exempting its speakers who entered the Federal Republic from possible persecution an insult, and cancelled all arrangements. Later, negotiations conducted between the West and East Berlin authorities concerning permits for West Berliners to visit their relatives during Christmas were repeatedly broken off and ultimately failed, mainly because no agreement could be reached on the terminology to be used in the agreements. Hardship cases could pass the "Wall" frontier at any time.

On September 3 the Federal Cabinet passed a resolution (with two dissenting votes) advising President Heinrich Lübke of West Germany to abandon his threatened court action against persons in the Soviet zone who had accused him of involvement in the construction of concentration camps while being employed as supervisor of armament installations. Such attacks had been made before, and were intensified during the year. In the fall a document published by the ministry of the interior attempted to refute the accusation and described the East German records as falsifications.

Late in August the highest officers of the Defense Forces, Inspekteur der Bundeswehr General Heinz Trettner, as well as Luftwaffe Inspekteur General Werner Panitzki and General Günther Pape (Commander in the Düsseldorf area), resigned, allegedly because they disapproved of an order permitting trade-union activities in the armed forces. Subsequent hearings revealed their actual reason to be disagreement with the then Defense Minister Kai-Uwe von Hassel on major issues, among them measures taken by the ministry regarding the safety record of the American-designed fighter-bomber, Starfighter. Shortly after this "Bundeswehr crisis," General Ulrich de Maizière was appointed General Inspekteur of the army, and General Johannes Steinhoff became the new Luftwaffe chief.

**Elections**

Local

The city council elections in Bavaria and Schleswig-Holstein in March brought noteworthy gains to the Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands (NPD) which had polled only 2 per cent of the total vote in the September 1965 federal elections (p. 362; AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 355). The NPD now scored between 8.1 and 10.6 per cent in the medium-sized cities of Northern Bavaria which had been a Nazi stronghold before 1933 and where, during the Third Reich, its Gauleiter Julius Streicher published the notorious Stürmer. In several Schleswig-Holstein cities NPD also polled as many as 10 per cent of the votes.

In the Hamburg municipal elections in March, SPD gained an impressive victory, with 59 per cent of the total votes; the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Free Democratic party (FDP) trailed with 30 per cent and 6.8 per cent, respectively. NPD polled 3.9 per cent of the votes, which was short of the 5 per cent required for representation.
In the state parliamentary election in North Rhine-Westphalia in July, SPD received 49.5 of the popular vote, a rise of over 3 per cent, and 99 of the 200 seats. Yet, CDU, which had lost 3.6 per cent of the total vote (polling only 42.8 per cent and barely managing to retain control of the government), and FDP with 7.4 per cent of the votes, again formed a coalition government under Prime Minister Franz Meyers. In December, after eight and one-half years in office, he was succeeded by SPD state chairman Heinz Kühn who headed a new SPD-FDP coalition having 114 seats.

In the provincial elections in Hesse in November, the NPD took 7.9 per cent of the vote and placed eight of its candidates in the provincial legislature. Two weeks later, in the Bavarian elections, it did still better, gaining places for 15 of its candidates, though winning only 7.4 per cent of the vote (p. 361).

**Federal**

The “creeping crisis” of Erhard’s administration began with the resignation, on September 15, of Ludger Westrick, his personal advisor in the cabinet and close associate for 15 years. Two weeks later, the cabinet adopted a 1967 budget of DM73.9 billion ($18.4 billion), as compared with the 1966 budget of DM69.5 billion ($17.2 billion) to cover the projected payment of the $3 billion to the United States (p. 349). When Erhard returned from his unsuccessful trip to the United States, he was strongly criticized by the Socialists for having permitted too heavy a strain on the budget. In addition, SPD demanded the resignation of von Hassel and his state secretary Karl Gumpel as an aftermath to what was called the “revolt” of the military leaders in August (p. 351).

By the middle of October, the projected deficit in the 1967 budget had risen to at least DM5 billion. FDP was unwilling to resort to an increase of taxes and left the coalition on October 27. Erhard at first contemplated continuing as head of a minority government (CDU-CSU against SPD and FDP), but President Lübke suggested that he too resign. Long negotiations ensued, and it became apparent that large sections of the population favored a government of SPD (which had not been in any German administration since 1930), preferably in a “small coalition” with FDP. Late in November the SPD leadership, mainly upon the instigation of its deputy chairman Herbert Wehner (whose earlier proposals for increased contacts with the East German regime and a possible economic community of the two Germanys had been denounced by the new West German government as useless and dangerous, and had had a similar reception in the DDR), decided in favor of a “grand coalition” of CDU-CSU and SPD, because the “mini” solution would have meant a small majority of two or three representatives, at best, for the parties in the new administration.

A new government was then formed fairly quickly, with the 62-year-old Kurt Georg Kiesinger, for many years respected minister-president of the
state of Württemberg-Baden, at its head. SPD leader Willy Brandt, until then Lord Mayor of Berlin, became his deputy and foreign minister. The formation of the government was hastened by the election results in Hesse and Bavaria where the big parties had not done badly (they either gained, or lost slightly), but where NPD made spectacular inroads.

The choice of Kiesinger, and his election, stirred up controversy. He had been a member of the Nazi party from 1933 to 1945, and an official of the ministry for foreign affairs during the Second World War. In the judgment of numerous foreign and domestic observers (notably Gräfin Marion Dönhoff in the weekly Die Zeit) this should have barred him from the chancellorship. Others, among them former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, did not share this view. Heinrich Grüber, world famous Berlin Protestant minister and savior of many Jews during the Nazi regime, was particularly strong in the defense of Kiesinger, and attacked his American critics. Jewish leaders, such as Hendrik George van Dam of the Central Council of Jews in Germany and Karl Marx, publisher of the Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden, pointed to Kiesinger's active anti-Nazi efforts between 1933 and 1945 and his later immaculate record as an outstanding and cultured man. Documents on the denazification proceedings against Kiesinger in 1948, released to refute charges of Nazi activities, reinforced these statements. Yet, mainly because the idea of the "grand coalition" was opposed by huge numbers of protesting SPD functionaries and members, 131 of the 473 Bundestag members failed to vote for him. And since only 46 FDP representatives cast their votes, the assumption was that 80 or 90 SPD members had resisted the decision of their party and refused to vote for Kiesinger.

Kiesinger's cabinet was composed of ten CDU-DSU and nine SPD members: Willy Brandt (SPD), foreign minister and deputy to the chancellor; Paul Lücke (CDU), interior; Gustav Heinemann (SPD), justice; Franz Josef Strauss (CSU), finance; Professor Karl Schiller (SPD), economic affairs; Hermann Höcherl (CSU), agriculture; Gerhard Schröder (CDU), defense; Hans Katzer (CDU), labor; Herbert Wehner (SPD), all-German affairs; Werner Dollinger (CDU), post and telecommunications; Kurt Schmücker (CDU), treasury; Georg Leber (SPD), communications; Lauritz Lauritzen (SPD), housing; Käte Strobel (SPD), health; Bruno Heck (CDU), family and youth affairs; Gerhard Stoltenberg (CDU), research; Hans Jürgen Wischnewski (SPD), economic cooperation; Carlo Schmid (SPD), Bundesrat affairs; Kai-Uwe von Hassel (CDU), refugees. The cabinet was obviously the result of many compromises along sectarian, geographic, and other lines. It brought together such men as Strauss, who had been notorious even before his part in the Spiegel affair of October 1962 (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 246; 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 344), and his arch-enemies Brandt and Wehner, as well as former foreign minister Gerhard Schröder and his many opponents in the ranks of his own (CDU) party. Few political experts predicted that the "grand coalition" would last until the next Bundestag elections in 1969.
Many believed that, in the absence of a radical party on the left (the Communists had been banned since 1955) and the inability of SPD as partner in the coalition to offer effective opposition, NPD would gain adherents and become a catch-all for all the discontented. Whether the FDP, now the only opposition in the Bundestag, would survive or even gain strength was a matter of speculation. It was generally expected that the coalition (having far more than the two-thirds majority needed to change the constitution) would attempt to alter the election laws to make it difficult, or even impossible, for the small parties to gain seats in the Bundestag.

ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

There were varied symptoms of a mild recession in the economy of the Federal Republic. Due to the financial policy of the Erhard administration and the Federal Bank at Frankfurt, severe restrictions were placed on the availability of liquid funds. (Some of these were removed when Kiesinger became chancellor.) Many other signs pointed to a slowdown. There were only 195,000 miners left in the Ruhr territory, compared to 450,000 in 1956, and 17 million tons of coal found no market. Between 1957 and 1964 the number of independent enterprises had decreased by 200,000. Large companies, such as the Badische Anilin- und Soda-Fabrik at Ludwigshafen, NSU (motor vehicles) at Neckarsulm, and the Krupp Steel and Ironworks at Essen, reduced their labor force extensively, as did smaller companies in Berlin, Franconia, and elsewhere. Since October 1965, production of investment goods had decreased by 3.4 per cent and the construction of buildings by 5 per cent. At the same time, plans for subways in some larger German cities were indefinitely postponed, and the construction of private dwellings and super highways came to a virtual standstill.

At the end of September there were 1.3 million foreign workers in West Germany; their number decreased during the last quarter of 1966. By the middle of December, unemployment had increased to 327,300, or 1.5 per cent of the total labor force, as compared to 177,900, or 0.8 per cent, in December 1965, and available jobs had decreased to 319,000 late in November. This was the first time in eight years that the number of unemployed exceeded available jobs. (During the height of post-war prosperity the ratio of unemployed to unfilled jobs had been 1 to 8.) Still, the Federal Republic remained one of the economic giants of the world: It was the third largest producer of industrial goods (6.7 per cent of the world production in 1965), trailing only the United States (31.0 per cent) and the USSR (17.7 per cent). It was the second largest foreign-trade nation after the United States; 1965 exports amounted to DM71.65 billions, and imports to DM70.45 billions. On the other hand, the total indebtedness of the federal, and municipal governments was DM69.6 billion, an increase of about 40 per cent in one year.
**FORMER NAZIS**

Two former members of the Nazi leadership, Baldur von Schirach, first Youth Leader of the Third Reich and later governor (*Statthalter*) of Austria, and Albert Speer, Hitler's minister of armament and war production, both sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment by the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal, were discharged from Spandau (West Berlin) prison on October 1. While newspapers, radio, and TV networks from all over the globe covered the event, the German public seemed rather disinterested. The only prisoner remaining in the huge jail, guarded by hundreds of American, British, French, and Russian soldiers, was Rudolf Hess who had been sentenced to life imprisonment. Since he had already been considered mentally deranged during the Nazi period (he had escaped in a small plane to England on a one-man “peace mission” and had been incarcerated ever since), there was some demand for his release. Others felt that, if he remained imprisoned, he should be transferred to a smaller jail since the annual cost of keeping him at Spandau would be close to a million marks.

Fritz Arlt, an official of the German-French youth exchange, resigned in January from this position when it was revealed that he had held a high position in the SS.

The funeral in April of former SS leader and convicted war criminal Sepp Dietrich, who had been living at Ludwigsburg since his release in 1955, attracted 4,000 former members of the armored SS from all over Europe.

Hans Globke, state secretary in former Chancellor Adenauer's government, testified at the Sobibor trial at Hagen, in May, that the Nuremberg Laws, to which he had provided a commentary, had tended to limit the evil intentions of the Nazis toward the Jews (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 247). He claimed that he had not realized their injustice at the time and that he had been unaware of the extermination of Jews at the Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor camps.

In May a planned meeting of HIAG (organization of former members of the armed SS) at Munich did not take place when strong public protests were voiced (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 414).

Erich Lindner, 34, of Oldenburg and an American citizen, Reinhold Ruppe, 24, who had been under arrest since Easter 1966, were each sentenced by the federal supreme court in November to two years' imprisonment on the charge of having conducted subversive rightist activities and having planned the assassination of Willy Brandt, then mayor of Berlin, and of Fritz Bauer of Frankfurt, leading state prosecutor.

**TRIALS OF NAZI CRIMES**

A survey covering the first 8 months of 1966 reported that 46 trials for murder or complicity in murder were being held before West German *Schwurgerichte* (assizes courts). Of a total of 176 defendants, the courts
sentenced 26 to life imprisonment and 96 to penalties of shorter duration, and acquitted 54 (30 per cent). The press pointed out that close to 52 defendants who had given orders or otherwise played a leading part in the killings, received little more than the minimum 3 years' imprisonment.

Shortly before Christmas, a huge trial of 15 former SS leaders accused of mass murder in the Lvov area opened at Stuttgart. The first of 148 witnesses to be heard was Simon Wiesenthal of Vienna, who had been held by the Nazis at Lvov and who has since been devoting his life to uncovering major Nazi criminals.

The Tarnapol trial ended in Stuttgart in July. The defendants, Hermann Müller, 57; Paul Raebel, 60; Walter Lambor, 60; Willi Hermann, 56; Paul Mellar, 54; Horstgünter Winkler, 49; Thomas Hasenberg, 57, all former leaders or members of the SS, were convicted of complicity in the murder of some 20,000 Jews in the Tarnapol area. The penalties ranged from 3½ years' to life imprisonment. During the proceedings Müller astounded the spectators by what was tantamount to a confession of guilt. He publicly apologized to Jakob Wolf Gilson, an Israeli witness whose parents were believed to have perished in one of Müller's deportation actions.

By contrast, Hendryk Friedländer, another Israeli witness who testified in October in the Stanislow trial at Münster, later said that he was treated in court as if the "murderers of Jews in the service of the Third Reich were still functioning."

The defendants in the Neu-Sandez case, which also closed at Bochum in July, were found guilty of murder or complicity in murder. Heinrich Hamann, 57; Johann Bornholt, 62; Josef Ronenhoff, 54, and Bruno Baunack, 63, all former officers of the Neu-Sandez security police, were found guilty of having ordered, or committed, the murder of 17,000 Jews who had been evacuated from the Belzec concentration camp, and received life sentences. Ten other defendants were sentenced to from three years and two months' to 10 years' imprisonment.

The second (or "small") Auschwitz trial at Frankfurt (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 347) ended in September. Josef Erber, 69, former SS-Oberscharführer and chief of the reception center in the women's camp (Birkenau) at Auschwitz, received a life sentence for complicity in at least 70 murders; Wilhelm Burger, 62, and Gerhard Neubert, 56, were sentenced to imprisonment of 8 years and 3 years and 6 months, respectively. The prosecuting attorney and Friedrich Kaul of East Berlin, attorney for the victims, pleaded for more severe punishment, as did a spokesman of the International Auschwitz Committee.

In the Kowel trial, in September, Erich Kassner and Fritz Manthei were both sentenced to life imprisonment. After 13 months' proceedings and the testimony of some 100 witnesses, the court found both defendants guilty of leading roles in the killing of thousands of Jews and partisans in the Ukraine. Defense counsel's method of attempting to discredit the reliability of witnesses was found improper. The behavior of the defendants and their at-
torneys in the trial against former SS Hauptsturmführer Hans Krüger and others, which had opened at Münster in January, also by far exceeded the bounds of propriety. Krüger, charged with mass murder in Galicia, joined the attorneys in insolent attacks against Jewish witnesses who had come from Israel and other countries to testify. Many of them expressed dismay and the resolve never again to set foot on German soil.

Other major trials, initiated in 1965 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 349) and concluded in the course of 1966, were the trial at Munich of former SS Hauptsturmführer Alfred Renndorfer, 56, and former SS Untersturmführer Wilhelm Dadischek, 52, for the mass murder of Jews in White Ruthenia (sentenced on January 21 to 5 years' and 3 years and a month's imprisonment, respectively; the retrial at Kiel of former SS Sturmbannführer Martin Fellenz, 56, for complicity in the murder of more than 40,000 Jews (found guilty only in four cases, and sentenced on January 27 to 7 years' imprisonment; the trial at Essen of former SS Hauptsturmführer Kurt Matschke, 57, for the murder of two Jews (sentenced on February 10 to 5 years' imprisonment) and SS Untersturmbannführer Eduard Spengler, 55, members of an Einsatzkommando responsible for the mass murder of Jews in Klinzy, USSR (sentenced to 3 and 4 years' imprisonment, respectively); at Essen, also, former SS officers Friedrich Meyer of Münster, Claus Hüser of Harburg, and Ebert Stanker, for participating in the murder of Russian Jews (sentenced to from 2 years' to 2 years and 6 months' imprisonment); at Lüneburg, Kurt Jerich, 57, and Paul Degenhardt, a 72-year-old retired police official, for the murder of Jews in the Czestochow ghetto (sentenced on June 1 to life imprisonment, co-defendant Otto Loebel, 51, was acquitted); at Hechingen, former SS Hauptsturmführer Franz Johann Hoffmann who had been sentenced in the first Auschwitz trial (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 110, 199; [Vol. 67], p. 347) to life imprisonment, for complicity in manslaughter (sentenced on March 11 to additional 13 years' imprisonment); also former SS officers Stephan Kruth, 48, and Helmut Schnabel, 52, for crimes committed in camps in Estland, France, and Germany (sentenced to 12 years' and 10 years' imprisonment, respectively); at Frankfurt, Adolf Harnischmacher, 56, head of Sonderkommando in Mogilev, USSR, for the murder of 70,000 Jews (sentenced on March 13, to 4 years' imprisonment); at Berlin, SS officers Wilhelm Wiebens, 60, Heinz Tangemann, 54, and Karl Rath, 56, for murder and complicity in mass murder of Jews and gypsies in Vitebsk-Smolensk area (sentenced on May 6 to life, 6 years', and 5 years' imprisonment, respectively); at Hanover, in the so-called "gas-van trial," former SS Sturmbannführer Friedrich Pradel, 65, and Harry Wentritt, 63, for complicity in mass murders by constructing gas vans used for the extermination of Jews (sentenced on June 6 to 7 and 3 years' imprisonment respectively; at Düsseldorf, former members of an Einsatzkommando, Karl Jung, 53, and Horst Huss, 56, for participating in mass killings in the Ukraine (sentenced on August 5 to 3 years and 6 months' and 7 years' imprisonment, respectively); in the Sobibor trial at Hagen, Karl Frenzel and 5 other defendants, for complicity
in the murder of more than 150,000 Jews (sentenced on December 20 to life imprisonment, and prison terms ranging from 3 to 8 years, respectively; the chief defendant Karl Bolender, 54 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 349) had committed suicide during the trial.

A Munich court on April 1 acquitted on grounds of insufficient evidence former SS Obersturmbannführer Horst Eicher, 55, and former police official Jakob Lögen, 69, charged with having aided and abetted in the murder of 279 Poles in execution of Hitler's plan to liquidate the Polish intelligentsia.

In some areas, particularly in Lower Saxony, convicted Nazi war criminals were released from prison "for reasons of health." While the most notorious was the case of Otto Bradfisch, now living in Munich, the Hanover minister of justice had to admit that there were at least three similar cases. Since 1945, 37 Nazi criminals had been convicted in this state.

Wilhelm Harster, 61, former Gestapo chief in Holland; Wilhelm Zöpf, 57, and Gertrud Slottke, 63, all accused of complicity in the murder of more than 83,000 Dutch Jews, were arrested at Munich on January 13. The Swiss government also surrendered to West Germany Erich Kroeger, former head of an Einsatzkommando, charged with the murder of 3,000 Jews and others.

INDEMNIFICATION AND RESTITUTION

Following adoption of final indemnification legislation (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 413; 1966 [Vol. 67], pp. 351-52), two implementing decrees were passed in March and April. Although, according to the September 14, 1965 law, the deadline for filing new claims was September 30, 1966, one of the decrees provided that documentation for these claims could be submitted until March 31, 1967.

Before the new coalition government came to power, the Social Democrats conducted an inquiry in the Bundestag on charges that wholesale errors had occurred in computing pensions for the victims of Nazi persecutions. The then Minister of Finance Rolf Dahlgrün defended the government against these charges in a detailed statement.

Early in 1966 Nahum Goldmann, president of CJMCAG, urged Jewish organizations to cooperate with the German authorities in clearing up allegedly false indemnification claims. A case in point was that of the Viennese attorney Hans Deutsch who had been held under investigative arrest in Bonn since November 1964 on the charge of having defrauded the federal treasury of DM17.6 million ($4.4 million) in litigations involving the heirs of Hungarian Jewish victims of the Nazis. The ailing attorney was released in April on DM2 million bail, pending trial.

In May the Düsseldorf arms manufacturing concern Rheinmetal agreed to make compensation payments of DM3.5 million (about $900,000) to former concentration camp inmates whom it had used as slave labor during the Nazi regime. The agreement followed pressure from the United States government, the West German Defense Ministry, and Jewish agencies. (Simi-
lar arrangements had previously been concluded between CJMCAG and Krupp, IG Farben, AEG, Telefunken, and Siemens-Halske.)

In November, one of the highest courts of the Federal Republic (IV Zivilsenat of the Bundesgerichtshof) declared that indemnification claims may be made under the pertinent legislation by Jews who suffered discrimination "for reasons of race" even before Hitler came to power. Previously, January 30, 1933 had been recognized as the starting date.

Late in December Israel Foreign Minister Abba Eban announced that, according to the late Nehemia Robinson of New York, the Nazis had directly or indirectly confiscated from Jews property valued at a minimum of DM116 billion ($29 billion). German estimates of individual indemnification payments made thus far totaled DM15 billion (not quite $4 billion), he added.

**ANTISEMITISM**

The growth of nationalism in 1966 did not bring with it a parallel increase in antisemitic incidents. The latest report by the minister of the interior indicated, however, that there had been 291 Nazi and antisemitic incidents in 1965, as compared to 74 in 1964.

In 1966 desecration of Jewish cemeteries took place in the old Munich Jewish cemetery (March) where two teen-agers damaged some 30 to 40 gravestones and later, upon the advice of their pastor, apologized to the local rabbi; at Mannheim (July) where 100 gravestones were broken, and at Krefeld and Lübeck (August) where 34 and 44 gravestones, respectively, were damaged. A detailed analysis by the Federal Criminal Investigating Agency at Wiesbaden reported 212 Jewish cases of a total of 521 in 1948–59; 75 of a total of 232 in 1960–64; a total of 78, all Jewish, in 1965, and 10 of a total of 26 in the first three months of 1966. (A later statistical survey revealed 19 desecrations of Jewish cemeteries during the entire year.)

A fire in the Berlin Jewish community building in July was believed to have been an antisemitic act, but the police was unable to solve the case.

In November the Jewish memorial on the site of Dachau concentration camp was defaced with swastikas and antisemitic slogans. Although the state criminal investigating agency doubted that the outrage was political in character, the organization of former Dachau inmates linked it to the NPD election successes in Hesse and Bavaria.

There were many expressions of concern in Germany and abroad about vestiges of Catholic antisemitism. Although Bishop Josef Hiltl of Regensburg had promised in 1961 that paintings portraying alleged anti-Christian acts by medieval Jews and their punishment would be removed from the Grab Kirche at Deggendorf, this had not yet been done. A demand by Pater Gunther Krotzer of the Niederalteich Benedictine abbey for their immediate removal was opposed by Hiltl's successor, Bishop Rudolf Graber, on the ground that neither the pictures nor the annual pilgrimages to the church were antisemitic in character.
More heated was the issue of the Oberammergau Passion Play which had been severely criticized in 1950 and 1960 (it is presented every 10 years) for its passages accusing the Jewish people of deicide. When the town council refused to substitute an earlier, possibly less offensive text by the baroque author Ferdinand Rosner, the woodcutter Hans Schwaighofer, the play's director who was also cast for the role of Christ in the 1970 production, resigned (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], pp. 353-54). Although Julius Cardinal Döpfner, Bishop of Munich, allegedly asked for a revision of the offensive text, Oberammergau mayor Ernst Zwink and the town people hesitated and delayed all changes.

Antisemitic references in the press and in the other mass media were still considered taboo. Yet, neo-nationalist weeklies—above all the notorious Deutsche National- und Soldaten-Zeitung (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 354) and the less popular official organ of the NPD, Deutsche Nachrichten of Hanover, frequently catered to antisemitic tendencies among their readers. Though they did not officially condone Nazi crimes, headlines such as "The Power of the Jews in Germany" (No. 42, October 1966) and "The Lie about Six Million Murdered Jews" (No. 49, December 1966), in the Deutsche National- und Soldaten-Zeitung, and "World Jewry Incites against NPD," in the December 16, 1966 issue of Deutsche Nachrichten were reminiscent of Nazi propaganda. So was the term "international world Jewry" which frequently appeared, with or without quotation marks.

An anonymous book Ich war Hitler's Ratgeber ("I Was Hitler's Advisor"), published by E. Schreiner at Lindau, contained outspoken antisemitic passages. It was, however, not obtainable through ordinary book trade channels.

Nationalism

In 1966 the Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands (NPD) established itself as a political force that could no longer be taken lightly. All observers agreed that, actually, the NPD successes in the November diet elections hastened the decisions of the two major parties to form a "grand coalition." It also moved them to consider pressing for a change in the election law which would possibly keep the NPD out of the federal parliament. The FDP, however, felt that this change was basically aimed at forestalling its own further election successes.

Political experts were not in full agreement on whether the NPD was neo-Nazi or "only" ultra-nationalist in character. The party described its program as one of sound nationalism, as distinguished from what it called unhealthy chauvinism. However, it stressed in all its publications and, above all, in its party platform, Manifesto of 1966, that it was democratic and that it in no way violated the Federal constitution. It accused the other political parties of being undemocratic. It also charged that the press had been "licensed" by the post-war occupation powers, that it was still controlled by them, and that it allegedly did not reflect the national thinking and the aspirations of the
German people. Antisemitism was officially strongly condemned ("NPD: No platform for Antisemitism," *Deutsche Nachrichten*, IV/66, p. 3). In interviews with the widely-read weekly *Der Spiegel* (No. 15, April 4; No. 47, November 14, and No. 49, November 28) NPD leaders not only expressed disapproval of anti-Jewish acts or statements, but stated that the party would welcome Jewish members whose thinking was along "national" lines. Two essential elements of Hitler’s Nazi party, the *Führerprinzip*, with its authoritarian party structure, and racism, were not expressly included. Yet, it was undeniable that the percentage of so-called "old Nazis" (former NSDAP members) in the NPD presidium was unusually high and that, at NPD rallies, antisemitic remarks could frequently be heard, though from the audience rather than from the official speakers. The NPD did not openly endorse undemocratic ideas or practices in 1966. Had it done so, it could have been outlawed under Article 21 of the Federal Constitution.

The 1965 report of the minister of the interior showed that NPD had swiftly and skillfully exploited a growing nationalist trend. Its estimate of the membership growth in rightist groups for that year was 6,100—from 22,500 at the end of 1964, to 28,600 at the end of 1965. The minister warned that more than half of the NPD’s presidium had been registered Nazis even before Hitler came to power, and that the radical elements seemed to direct tactics and propaganda. He also pointed to the fact that the circulation of the *Deutsche National- und Soldaten-Zeitung*, whose ideological position was very close to the party’s, had increased beyond 100,000 and was steadily growing. It had become one of the largest political weeklies, surpassed only by *Die Zeit* and *Der Spiegel*, both published in Hamburg.

The forecasts of the minister, whose office up to 1965 had consistently minimized the danger of the rightist groups, were amply borne out by the 1966 election results. Elections for city councils in Bavaria, Schleswig-Holstein, and Hamburg in March gave the NPD its first striking successes; 8.1 per cent of the vote in Ansbach; 10.6 per cent in Bayreuth; 9.5 per cent in Erlangen; 7.5 per cent in Nuremberg; 9.2 per cent in Passau; 10.0 per cent in Oldenburg, and 10.5 per cent in Schashagen. Even in the traditionally liberal city of Hamburg NPD gains jumped from 1.8 per cent in September 1965, to 3.9 per cent in March 1966.

In the state of Hesse, where an SPD administration had been in power for years (it was reelected by the new diet in December 1966), NPD received 7.9 per cent of the total vote and sent eight members to the diet at Wiesbaden. In some localities its share was well beyond 8 per cent: Giessen, 10.1 per cent; Darmstadt, 10.4 per cent; Wiesbaden, 9.6 per cent; Hanau, 9.4 per cent; Marburg, 9.8 per cent; Frankfurt, 8.4 per cent, and the small city of Grünberg, as high as 18.0 per cent.

The Bavarian state elections in November verified this trend. Even in this predominantly Catholic and conservative state, NPD gained 7.4 per cent of the vote and 15 representatives in the diet, replacing FDP, the old liberal party. An editorial comment on the election by the Würzburg Catholic *Sonn-
tagsblatt (May 1), had expressed the hope that NPD would gain enough votes to rid the Bavarian parliament of liberals. Subsequent requests (by the FDP politician Josef Ertl and the Jewish publicist Hans Lamm) for withdrawal of the remark were heeded neither by the weekly nor by the Bishop of Würzburg. While it was true that NPD polled more votes in the Lutheran districts of Bavaria (especially Central Franconia above all) than in Catholic areas, it received 8.5 per cent in Catholic Würzburg. The success was greater still in other cities: Berchtesgaden, 11.5 per cent; Bayreuth, 13.9 per cent; Coburg, 11.0 per cent; Kulmbach, 11.2 per cent; Ansbach, 13.4 per cent; Erlangen, 11.2 per cent; Fürth, 13.3 per cent; Nuremberg, 13.1 per cent; Schwabach, 13.6 per cent; Kitzingen, 13.2 per cent; Kaufbeuren, 14.9 per cent. Even in Munich, with its popular SPD Mayor Hans-Jochen Vogel, NPD scored 6.9 per cent (compared to 2.0 per cent in the municipal elections eight months earlier).

An analysis of the NPD electorate, published by the Bonn government in December, found that most voters were between 40 and 60 years of age, that the smallest group was between 21 and 25, and that men by far out-numbered women. Party support was heavily concentrated in the Protestant nonindustrialized areas and came especially from refugees and expellees from Eastern European countries. Neu-Gablonz, a Bavarian city settled largely by former Sudeten Germans, produced 22.7 per cent of the vote for NPD—more than three times the average for the state.

After Kiesinger's election, Rudolf Augstein, editor-in-chief of Der Spiegel, predicted that NPD would poll 20 per cent of the popular vote in the Bundestag elections of 1969. At the time, his statement was given little credence. NPD inroads in Hesse and Bavaria, however, shocked large segments of the population, particularly students and trade unionists, who organized protest rallies in many cities throughout West Germany.

INTERGROUP RELATIONS

Early in 1966 a group of American Reform rabbis announced that they were planning to visit the Federal Republic to disseminate information on Judaism and the Jews, mainly among German youth. The Zentralrat (Central Council of Jews in Germany), which had not been consulted, expressed misgivings about the project. Still, in June and July, Rabbi Bernhard Cohn of Congregation Habonim in New York City, Professor Samuel Sandmel of the Hebrew Union College at Cincinnati, and Rabbi Ernst M. Lorge of the Rabbinical Association of Chicago toured West Germany for three weeks, lecturing at teachers' seminaries, high schools, and universities. They expected to carry this project further since they felt that neither the Jewish communities nor the societies for Christian-Jewish understanding were sufficiently equipped to fill the vacuum on this kind of information.

The annual observance of Brotherhood Week, sponsored by the Coordinating Council of the Societies for Christian-Jewish understanding in March,
featured lectures, discussions, expositions, showing of films, etc., in 44 cities. At the same time, the coordinating Council began publishing the periodical Blätter (now called Emunah). The Allgemeine Wochenzeitung der Juden in Deutschland devoted two special issues to Brotherhood Week and to the commemoration of its 20th anniversary. Other publications advocating Christian-Jewish understanding were the monthly of the Germania Judaica library for the history of German Jewry in Cologne and Tribüne, a non-Jewish quarterly "for the understanding of Judaism," now in its fifth year.

In April the University of Hamburg officially opened its Institute for the History of German Jewry. The Catholic Institutum Judaicum, formerly located in Jetzendorf near Pfaffenhofen, was reopened early in May at Munich. Its director, the 75-year-old Catholic priest Franz Rödel, had actively fought antisemitism for more than forty years and had been awarded the Leo Baeck Prize (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 257).

The Conference of German Catholics held a special session on Jewish problems in July at Bamberg. Addresses by Eugen Gerstenmaier, president of the West German Bundestag, and others on "Germans and Jews," the subject to which a session of the World Jewish Congress meeting (p. 324) at Brussels was devoted, aroused much interest in Germany. Gerstenmaier subsequently stated, in an interview with the Cologne weekly Welt der Arbeit, that he considered German demands for reconciliation with the Jews premature.

The cities of Verden, Lower Saxony, and Buttenhausen, Wurttemberg, unveiled memorial plaques at the sites of synagogues which had been destroyed by the Nazis in November 1938.

RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL

The agreement, signed in May between the Federal Republic and Israel, granting Israel DM160 million in economic aid in 1966, was of major importance. This sum was in addition to the DM75 million granted on December 31, 1965 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 358). This new aid program of long-term loans followed the expiration of a 1952 agreement providing Israel with DM2.4 billion ($600 million) worth of goods.

At the same time, German imports from Israel had increased from DM400,000 in 1953 to DM206 million in 1965 (or a total of 1.11 billion for the 13-year period). Exports from Germany to Israel had risen from 20.6 million to 276 million for the same period (or a total of 1.26 billion).

The embassy of Israel was moved from Cologne to Bad Godesberg, near Bonn. In January Ambassador Asher Ben-Natan visited all federal states, including Berlin and Baden-Wuerttemberg, where he was given cordial official receptions. In April Ben-Natan's appearance in an interview over a German television network left a deep and favorable impression. In October the ambassador submitted to the German government a request for its support of
Israel's application for full association with the Common Market (p. 347).

German-Israeli relations were put to a severe test during former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's visit to Israel in May. Although Adenauer was a proven friend of the Jews and of Israel, some anti-German demonstrations took place. In recognition of his friendship, however, he was made an honorary fellow of the Weizmann Institute; was welcomed by Prime Minister Levi Eshkol, President Zalman Shazar, and other officials, and was honored by Felix Shimar, who established a £500,000 (over $260,000) fund for the advancement of youth exchange programs between Israel and Germany. After his return home, Adenauer expressed deep satisfaction over the visit. In the second volume of his memoirs, published late in 1966, Adenauer discussed at length the post-war problems of the Jews and his efforts to aid in their solution.

Many other Germans, among them officials, students, professionals, and trade union leaders visited Israel in 1966. (Their number was expected to exceed the 13,000 visitors in 1965.) Among them was Professor August Marx of the College for Economics (Wirtschaftschochschule) at Mannheim, the first German professor invited to hold lectures at the University of Tel-Aviv, and Eugen Gerstenmaier, who attended the inauguration ceremonies of the new Kneset building at Jerusalem in August.

Prominent Israelis touring West Germany included 32 youth leaders who visited Munich and Berlin in April; Amos Ben Vered, foreign editor of the Tel-Aviv daily Haaretz, who traveled to seven major German cities; L. Kohn of the Jerusalem Post, and five leading pedagogues, headed by Shaul Levin, director of the educational system of Tel-Aviv, who visited Munich and Bonn to promote the exchange of educators and students as well as the revision of German textbooks on Israel.

A donation of DM3.6 million ($900,000) by the renowned Hamburg newspaper publisher Axel Springer to the Jerusalem art museum for the erection of a huge library with an auditorium of 430 seats was announced in that city in September.

Gertrud Luckner of Freiburg, Pastor Heinrich Grüber of Berlin, Werner Krumme of Munich, and Herman Maas of Heidelberg were honored publicly by Israel and its ambassador to Germany for the heroic aid they had given to Jews during the Nazi regime.

In his first policy statement to the Bundestag in December, Chancellor Kiesinger, expressing the hope that the Arab States would resume diplomatic relations with Germany (broken off when Germany established such relations with Israel; AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 358), stated: “Terrible crimes have been committed against the Jews under the false allegations that this was done in the name of our people. These crimes have made our relations with Israel problematic and difficult. These have been improved and furthered by the establishment of diplomatic ties and the federal government will continue on this path.”
On October 1, 1966 the number of registered Jews in West Germany was 26,005—14,122 men and 11,883 women, an increase of 311 over the year before. (It had grown by 60 per cent in a decade: 1955, 15,684; 1961, 21,563; 1965, 25,694). An estimated additional 5,000 to 10,000 Jews were not members of congregations. Close to 70 per cent of the Jews were concentrated in large cities: 5,991 in Berlin, 4,168 in Frankfurt, 3,345 in Munich, 1,579 in Düsseldorf, 1,500 in Hamburg, and 1,304 in Cologne. There were an estimated 500–700 Jews in Stuttgart and, in addition, 30 communities with 100 to 500 members each, and 33 with less than 100. The Jewish community of Seesen in Lower Saxony, once an important center of German-Jewish life, ceased to exist in January. Its six Jewish inhabitants joined communities elsewhere.

As in previous years, a sizable re-immigration rather than natural increase contributed to the growth of the community. Only 90 Jewish children were born, and 482 persons died. At the same time, 498 Jews emigrated, while 1,289 entered the country.

According to a lengthy study, "Jews in the German Economy," in the November issue of the economic monthly Capital, 35 per cent of Germany's Jews were gainfully employed; 25 per cent lived on pensions, and 40 per cent were unemployed and were supported by members of their families. The study further indicated that no Jews held top managerial posts in industry or in any other branch of the German economy.

Communal Affairs

The Central Council of Jews in Germany (Zentralrat; AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 360) held a meeting at Düsseldorf (May), chaired by the president of its directorate, Professor Herbert Lewin of Offenbach. S. Lipschütz of Düsseldorf stressed the importance of Jewish schools. H. G. van Dam, secretary of the Zentralrat, presented a 37-page report showing how the persecution of Jews in the 20th century, the establishment of Israel, and the reorganization of Jewish communities on the bloodstained soil of Germany, affected the community's life. The report was criticized in the Allgemeine unabhangige jüdische Wochenzeitung of May 27 for its neglect of the communities' cultural and religious problems. These were quite substantial, since only the largest centers had possibilities of developing adequate programs.

A 1966 report was available only for the Berlin community, the largest in West Germany. It employed two rabbis and six preachers, and maintained three schools. Its kindergarten and other centers provided care for 90 preschool children. During the summer 45 youngsters were sent to recreation areas in Baden and Bavaria. The community's budget showed the following allocation of funds. 6.3 per cent for youth and child care; 12.2 per cent for the indigent (291 cases); 24.7 per cent for maintenance of institutions; 28.7
per cent for religious purposes and education, and 27.1 per cent for administra-
tion and legal aid.

For the first time since the collapse of the Third Reich, Jewish primary
schools were opened in Frankfurt, in the spring, and in Munich, in the fall.
B'nai B'rith maintained lodges in Berlin and Frankfurt, and, in November,
opened a third at Munich.
Maccabi athletic associations were established in Frankfurt, Düsseldorf
and Munich.

The Federal Association of Jewish Women, the coordinating agency for
all women's groups in the communities, held its eighth working conference
at Munich in June. Main speakers were Heinrich Grüber, Gabriele Strecker
of Bonn, Hans Lamm of Munich, Heinz Galinski of Berlin, Rita Bockelmann
of Frankfurt, and Israeli Ambassador Leo Savir.

Religious Activities

There were 11 ordained rabbis in the Federal Republic in 1966. They
served 91 houses of worship in different localities (11 of them in West Ber-
lin). According to a survey in the Düsseldorf bi-monthly *Jüdische Illustrierte*
of May, 48 synagogues had been rebuilt in West Germany since the end of
World War II. To these must be added 41 smaller prayer halls (Betsale) erected throughout the country. New synagogues were dedicated at Konstanz
in July and at Wiesbaden in September, the latter providing space for 112
men and 62 women. The prayer hall in Mainz was enlarged.

Cultural Activities

The state of Jewish cultural activities remained unchanged. Several lead-
ing professors of the Hebrew University, among them David Flusser, were
invited by the Friends of the Hebrew University to lecture in various cities.
An exposition "Graphics in Israel" was shown at Kassel in January. The
Russian-Jewish author and translator Lev Ginsburg of Moscow lectured at
Munich. On the first anniversary of Martin Buber's death (June 13) Jewish
communities held memorial meetings; a Berlin street was renamed in his
honor; a bust of Buber by the Garmisch sculptor Schrott was unveiled in an
adult education center at Leoni near the Lake Starnberg, and the Zentralrat
published the lecture on Buber delivered by Rabbi N. Peter Levinson of
Heidelberg in June 1965 (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 360). The Zentralrat also
published a lecture by Ministerialrat Ernst Blum on the social problems of
the blind in December 1965 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 362).

The Leo Baeck Prize of 1966 was awarded to Ludwig Wörl of Munich
who had saved the lives of many Jews in various concentration camps. At
the ceremony, addresses were delivered by Lord Mayor of Munich, Hans-
Jochen Vogel, as well as by H. G. van Dam and Professor Herbert Lewin,
representing the Zentralrat.

There was an unusually large number of books on Jewish subjects and

**Zionism**

The activities and fund raising of the Zionist groups received an impetus from Ambassador Ben-Natan's frequent visits throughout Germany. Keren Kayyemet reported for 1966 an increase of almost 10 per cent in contributions collected by its 45 local committees. A similar increase resulted from more intensive activities by Keren Ha-yesod (Magbit), Children's and Youth Aliyah and the Israel Bond Campaign. In January, February, and March, Nahum Goldmann addressed fund-raising functions at Berlin, Hamburg, and Stuttgart.

The publication of the Keren Hayesod ten years' manual *Israel and We* in the summer was a major event. The 400-page volume, edited by Mendel Karger, which was widely acclaimed in Germany and abroad, contained 95 articles on subjects relating to the history of Zionism in Germany and the development of Israel, a *Who's Who* listing 165 Jewish communal leaders in West Germany, 79 of them native Germans. (The community membership had a higher percentage of Eastern European Jews.) Rabbi I. E. Lichtigfeld of Frankfurt succeeded Professor Herbert Lewin as president of Keren Ha-yesod in February.

**Personalia**

Werner Marx, professor of philosophy at Freiburg University, received the Ruhrpries (March) which he donated to the Leo Baeck Institute.

Dr. Simon Snopkowski, 41, of the Zentralrat, was appointed head surgeon of the municipal hospital at Munich-Oberfohring.

Federal medals of honor (Bundesverdienstkreuz) of high degrees were bestowed upon Heinz Galinski, president of the Berlin community; Fritz Unikower, legal advisor to the Hesse Jewish communities, and Paul Baruch, president of the Nuremberg Jewish community.

Joseph Neuberger, 64, a leader of the Düsseldorf Jewish community and
of the Zentralrat, was appointed minister of justice in the North Rhine-Westphalia cabinet. After World War II, he had returned from Israel to his birthplace, Düsseldorf, where he was elected to the city council and to the diet, and served as president of SPD.

Alfred Rosenberg, 62, was reelected first president of the Deutsche Gewerbebund, head organization of all German trade unions.

Wolfgang Hildesheimer, 50, well-known German-Jewish novelist, received the City of Bremen's literature prize for 1966.

The greatest loss sustained by German Jewry since the end of World War II was the death of Karl Marx, the 69-year-old founder and publisher of the Allgemeine Unabhängige Jüdische Wochenzeitung, published in Düsseldorf since 1946 and read in more than 50 countries. At his funeral, which took place on December 18 at his birthplace Saarlouis, he was eulogized as the historic builder of bridges between Germany and Israel, and as an outstanding Jew and publicist. Among the speakers were Rabbi Fritz Bloch of Stuttgart; Ernst Lemmer of Berlin, former minister of all-German affairs; Heinz Galinski; Hermann Lewy, editor of the Allgemeine Wochenzeitung; an Israeli official, and members of the German press office.

Among other well-known Jews who died in 1966 were: Paul Loewenstein, 74, a leading jurist, at Düsseldorf; Professor Walter Gottschalk, 75, librarian and orientalist at Frankfurt; Max Lippmann, 59, director of the German Film Institute, at Wiesbaden; Ferencz Stern, 72, teacher and cantor of the Bremen Jewish community, at Saarbrücken; Gustav Levy, 80, leading lawyer and active member of Christian-Jewish association at Saarbrücken; Julius Dreifus, 70, for many years leading official of the Jewish communities in North Rhine-Westphalia at Düsseldorf; Ludwig Meidner, 82, world-famous painter at Darmstadt; Benno Wallach, 75, oldest contributor of the Jewish Allgemeine at Düsseldorf; Gustav Baum, 86, leading merchant, at Düsseldorf; Leo Ascher, 69, former administrator of the Jewish Hospital, at Hamburg; Martin Berliner, 70, famous actor and Joseph Plaut, 87, world-famous raconteur, at Detmold.

HANS LAMM
Austria

For more than twenty years, the Second Republic had been governed by a coalition of Austria's two major parties, the conservative People's party and the Socialist party. Coalition on the highest level of government had gradually led to equal representation of the parties in every branch of public administration, and had become part of the Austrian way of life. Although constantly attacked and occasionally ridiculed within as well as outside the country, the system permitted the government machinery to function under bipartisan rule in an environment of comparative harmony.

In October 1965, however, the coalition government of Josef Klaus (People's party) resigned in disagreement over the 1966 budget, and the country prepared for national elections. Ostensibly, the two major parties had not given up their intention to form a new coalition. Yet, the campaign was fierce. It was joined by the Freedom party, representing nationalist tendencies, and the Democratic Progressive party, which had been founded by Franz Olah, a former Socialist party official; three small groups, the Communists, the Liberals, and the Marxist-Leninists, set up candidates in some election districts only.

On March 6, 1966, 93.81 per cent of all eligible Austrians went to the polls. (Voting was compulsory under Austrian law, but this provision has never been enforced by the courts.) The People's party polled 2,191,128 votes, the Socialists 1,928,922, and the Freedom party 242,599, giving them 85, 74, and 6 seats, respectively, in the Nationalrat (upper house of the parliament). The parliamentary majority won by the People's party was the first any party had held since the first postwar parliament in 1945. It gained not only in its rural strongholds, but also in Vienna and other cities that were traditionally Socialist. The Democratic Progressive party, with 148,521 votes, and the three small parties, with a combined total of 20,694 votes, were not represented in the government.

The elections revealed a trend toward the strengthening of the conservatives' position. Before 1962, the distribution of seats of the two major parties in the Nationalrat was nearly equal: 79 for the People's party and 78 for the Socialists. In 1962 the People's party won two seats from the Socialists. Throughout that period the right-wing Freedom party held eight seats. In the 1966 elections, however, the conservatives won two seats from the Socialists and another two from the Freedom party. The basic coalition terms which the People's party now offered to the Socialists would have left the People's party free to carry out its program even if the Socialist members opposed it. The Socialist party congress rejected the terms; Klaus formed a People's party government in April 1966, and, for the first time since the war, the
Socialists went into opposition. Chancellor Klaus's program, submitted to parliament on April 20, dealt with domestic economic and social matters as well as with some aspects of Austrian foreign policy: the continued negotiations for future affiliation with the European Economic Community (EEC, Common Market) and with the urgency of a settlement of the Alto Adige (South Tyrol) conflict.

The limits of Austria's possible involvement with the Common Market became apparent during Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin's visit to Vienna in November, when reports stressed the importance of Austria's independence and neutrality, and the possible danger of a link with the Common Market.

A more pressing and explosive issue was the Austro-Italian tension over Alto Adige (AJYB, 1962 [Vol. 63], p. 358; 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 261). Over the last five years, the separatist German-speaking South Tyrolians had been joined by German and Austrian nationalists in a series of acts of violence against the local administration. The involvement of Austria and Germany in these incidents was evident from the fact that eight Austrians and eight Germans were among the 36 terrorists convicted in Alto Adige in April 1966. Violence flared up again in September, and the Italian government blamed the new wave of terror on neo-Nazi elements based in Austria's Innsbruck area. In a speech before the United Nations General Assembly on October 5, 1966, the Austrian Foreign Minister Lujo Toncic pointed to the difficulties of implementing the 1946 Paris agreement which had aimed at complete equality of rights for the German- and Italian-speaking South Tyrolian populations, and to the General Assembly resolution of October 31, 1960, which had urged both parties to resume negotiations with a view to resolving differences. Toncic was cautiously optimistic about the chances of an early settlement.

The new trend in Austrian politics after the election became apparent in the government's attitude toward former Archduke Otto von Hapsburg, son of the last Austrian emperor (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], p. 342; 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 261). Although a passport was issued to him on June 1, the Socialist opposition made an attempt a week later to block his return by introducing a motion that he be declared undesirable in Austria. A similar step, taken in 1963, had actually prevented Otto's return. Now, the motion was defeated 87 to 74, and on October 31 the heir to the Austrian throne paid his first visit to Innsbruck.

The years 1965 and 1966 also brought changes in Austria's political leadership. On February 27, 1965, during his second six-year term in office, President Adolf Schaerf, died at the age of 75. He was succeeded by the Socialist Franz Jonas, who had been the mayor of Vienna since 1951. The post of mayor was filled by Bruno Marek, a Socialist municipal assemblyman. Leopold Figl, Austria's first chancellor after World War II and signer of the State Treaty of 1955, also died in 1965.

The general economic situation showed steady improvement with an in-
crease in per capita income, in consumer goods, and particularly in the proceeds from tourism, which had doubled between 1961 and 1965. The 1962 federal budget was at a record high of $3.1 billion and was specifically designed to speed long-term economic growth, while maintaining the stability of the Austrian schilling.

**Antisemitism**

Foreign minister Toncic maintained that there no longer was any antisemitism in Austria, although there were some antisemites. In October, the Austrian Ambassador to the United States Ernest Lemberger told Joachim Prinz, chairman of the American Jewish Congress Commission on International Affairs, that his government was determined to prevent the rise of neo-Nazism. Chancellor Klaus stated on a similar occasion that he and his government considered it their duty to do everything in their power to combat antisemitism. Franz Cardinal Koenig, Archbishop of Vienna, ordered all parish priests to condemn antisemitism from the pulpits as a grave offense against religion and law. In March 1965 Christian Broda, who was minister of justice at the time, had ordered the investigation of certain judges, civil servants in his ministry, attorneys, and professors of law, who had been accused by the Austrian resistance movement of participation in the prosecution of Jews during the Nazi occupation.

Such investigations, statements, and reassurances had become necessary in the light of recent incidents. Two politicians injected antisemitism into the 1966 election campaign. Olah, a former Socialist who had been interior minister before his expulsion from the party and founder of the Democratic Progressive party, referred to members of the former coalition government as Jews who tried to reach for power. He also made denigrating remarks about some officials because they had lived abroad during the years of Nazi rule in Austria.

Alois Scheibenreif, a People's party deputy, directed antisemitic insults against Bruno Kreisky, Socialist Minister of Foreign Affairs in the coalition government, who was of Jewish origin. He used an invective which had been in common use in Austria for generations, but were being avoided by politicians of contemporary Austria. The People's party thereupon unconditionally condemned racial and religious bias, and Scheibenreif withdrew his remarks "with regret."

Controversy arose over Taras Borodjkewycz, professor of economic history at the Vienna College for World Commerce, who boasted of his Nazi past and made vicious antisemitic statements in his lectures. Demands for an investigation and for his dismissal grew until, in March 1965, Minister of the Interior Franz Soronics ordered an investigation to determine whether or not Borodjkewycz was engaged in neo-Nazi activities. The students took sides and, on March 31, 1965, approximately 6,000 participated in a demonstration and counterdemonstration. In a clash, an elderly former member
of the underground resistance was knocked to the ground by the notorious neo-Nazi student, Günther Kümmel. The old man died from the injuries and Kümmel, though cleared of murder, was sentenced to ten months' imprisonment for exceeding the legitimate exercise of his right of self-defense. A five-minute general strike was called in protest against the incident: Former resistance fighters marched in silence; Catholic and Protestant organizations expressed mortification over the discrimination against Jewish compatriots; the chancellor as well as the archbishop of Vienna deplored the new manifestations of antisemitism. Although the investigators found that Borodijkewycz was not a neo-Nazi, they corroborated the charges that he had made outright antisemitic remarks in the course of his lectures and that he had taught history with a bias. He was declared totally incompetent to teach at an Austrian institution of higher learning and, in May 1966, the college's disciplinary commission placed him in permanent retirement.

**Nazi Trials**

The deep-rooted antisemitism within the native population became evident during the trials of Nazi war criminals in Austria. Chief among them was Robert Jan Verbelen, a former leading collaborator with the Nazis in Belgium, whom a Belgian court had sentenced to death in absentia (1947) for crimes committed during the German occupation (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 326). He had been charged with organizing terror and murder commandos, betraying Belgian politicians and resistance group members, and signing deportation orders that sent thousands of Dutch Jews to death. Verbelen fled to Austria where he acquired citizenship under an assumed name. As a result, all Belgian requests for extradition were refused. However, his citizenship was eventually revoked, and he was arrested and stood trial in Vienna in December 1965. His acquittal by the jury on grounds that he had acted under orders from his superiors caused some misgivings in Austria. It was severely criticized in the Belgian parliament as a revival of Nazism in Austria and an insult to Belgian justice. Justice Minister Broda's reply was that the Austrian authorities were powerless against judiciary decisions, and that they had done their part by indicting Verbelen.

Two Polish-born brothers, Wilhelm Mauer, 48, and Johann Mauer, 52, former members of the Nazi Elite Guard, were indicted in Salzburg for participating in the systematic slaying of 12,000 Jews in the Stanislaw ghetto in Poland and committing individual murders. About 200 witnesses for the prosecution were heard in preparation for the trial. Some of these testified during the trial, in February 1966, that they had watched the brothers torture and kill persons whom they had suspected of working with the resistance movement. During the trial, cheers for the defendants could be heard in the audience. The jury found the brothers not guilty because they had acted under "irresistible coercion." The judge refused to accept the decision which, he felt, was in total disregard of the evidence given, and the case was re-
ferred to the supreme court. Student demonstrations and editorials in Viennese newspapers denounced the jury's verdict. The supreme court ordered a retrial in Vienna, and, in November, Wilhelm was sentenced to 12 years' and Johann to eight years' imprisonment.

Franz Novak, Adolf Eichmann's chief transport officer, had been sentenced in 1964 to eight years' imprisonment for participating in the deportation of 400,000 Hungarian Jews. Upon the appeal of the defendant, the supreme court, in December 1965, found the verdict "incomplete and contradictory," but ordered Novak held in custody pending a retrial. At the retrial, the jury found Novak guilty of having aided and abetted murder; the jury was, however, deadlocked on the question of whether or not Novak had been bound by orders he could not disobey. Since, under Austrian criminal law, a hung jury means acquittal, Frank Novak was immediately freed. The prosecution appealed the acquittal. In a dramatic gesture of protest against the acquittal, the Vienna Jewish community, as it informed Chancellor Klaus, canceled all celebrations planned for the national holiday on October 26, 1966 and, instead, held a solemn Memorial service for all Nazi victims.

Preparations for an Austrian Auschwitz trial have been underway for the past six years. It was expected that about 50 former death camp personnel, now living in Austria would be indicted. Among them were physicians, former SS men, and others, some of whom were said to have been responsible for the installation of gas chambers.

The failure of some juries to bring indicted Nazis to justice revived an old Austrian controversy on the value of jury courts as an institution. Archbishop Koenig, however, pointed out in a statement during the national holiday celebration that the blame did not rest on the jurors who merely acted both as representatives and as victims of the dangerous Austrian mentality that was unwilling to face the responsibility for its own past, and attempted to exonerate itself by blaming others. On the same occasion, President Jonas answered those who continuously pleaded for an end to Nazi trials so that the Austrian population could be done with the past. He made it clear that ignoring the past was not the way to overcome it.

There could be little doubt of the Austrian government's earnest desire to combat antisemitism and to continue the prosecution of Nazi criminals. On March 16, 1965, the cabinet amended the criminal code to abolish the statute of limitations with regard to the arrest, prosecution, and punishment of capital crimes, including specifically all crimes committed by the Nazis between 1938 and 1945.

**Restitution**

There were no significant changes in restitution laws in 1965–66. At the end of 1965 an agreement was reached for the payment of 22.7 million schillings (about $873,000) by the Austrian Republic in settlement of all
claims not covered by present legislation. A law to this effect was expected in the near future.

On June 1, 1966 the Austrian cabinet approved a grant of $140,000 to the Histadrut in Israel, the legal successor to the Hechalutz whose workshops and farms (which it had conducted in Austria before the Anschluss) had been confiscated by the government in 1938. An additional grant of approximately $200,000 was approved for the establishment of a school and cultural center in a settlement of former Austrians near Jerusalem, as compensation for Jewish property destroyed by the Nazis in the Burgenland.

A law was also being considered to restore a small number of formerly Jewish-owned paintings, still in state custody, to the CJMCAG collection units (Sammelstellen).

JEWISH COMMUNITY

The number of registered Jews in Austria was 9,537 in 1965, and remained about the same number in 1966. Since it was assumed that about 2,000 persons may not have registered with the community organizations, the total number of Jews was estimated at 11,500. Jews registered with the Vienna community numbered 8,930 in 1965 and 8,769 in 1966. Of these, approximately 65 per cent were over 50 years of age, and only about 3.4 per cent were children below the age of ten. This age distribution, in the light of the trend of the past years, pointed to a steady decline of the Jewish community in the future.

The civic status of the Jews was affected by a law, which made it possible as of July 1, 1966, for former Austrian nationals who had lost their citizenship as a result of political and other persecution during the Anschluss, to regain it.

Communal Activities

The Vienna Jewish community (Kultusgemeinde) elections in December 1964 had brought no political change and, in January 1965, Ernst Feldsberg, whose party had retained an absolute majority, was reelected president for a term of four years. Karl Lasar and Otto Wolken were elected vice-presidents. All three belonged to the non-Zionist Bund werktätiger Juden (League of Working Jews). For the first time in the history of the Vienna Jewish Community, two women were elected to office.

A highlight of Jewish life in the capital was the inauguration, on April 24, 1966, of the Austrian Jewish Youth House, a center for Jewish education and recreation which was erected on the site of the community kitchen destroyed by the Nazis. Representatives of the federal government, the municipality, the Austrian Jewish communities, the State of Israel, JDC, and various international bodies and restitution organizations attended the cere-
monies. Especially noted was the presence of Vienna's Mayor Bruno Marek, an old friend of the Jews and a spokesman for restitution.

The community operated a home for the aged for some 120 inmates; a hospital that took care of about 800 patients and 300 outpatients annually; a welfare program mainly concerned with the aged and the sick; a documentation center which answered inquiries and requests for information, and an education program. The Vienna and Linz Jewish communities reached an agreement with JDC, at the end of 1965, to take over full responsibility for the lifetime care and maintenance of a small hard-core group of Jewish DP's and Hungarian refugees who still remained in these cities, against a one-time JDC payment. Thereafter, JDC limited its activities to aid to transmigrants and grants to cover Jewish community needs.

Education and Culture

More than 200 children attended the community's Jewish schools: a day school, fully recognized by the Austrian ministry of education and two Talmud Torahs. Some 400 children attending public schools in Vienna, Lower Austria, and the Burgenland were given religious instruction outside regular school hours. The local communities of Graz, Linz, and Salzburg had similar educational programs. The Vienna Kultusgemeinde also financed vacation camps for children and adolescents between the ages of three and 17.


During the first three months of 1966, a series of adult education lectures
and discussions were held in Vienna on “Österreichische Probleme: Gestern und Heute” (Austrian Problems: Yesterday and Today). Prominent Jewish and non-Jewish speakers dealt with such problems as the Nazi trials, the position and attitude of the Catholic Church, antisemitism, and Austrian nationalism.

**Personalia**

Wilhelm Krell, executive director of the Vienna Kultusgemeinde received the Gold Decoration of Honor for Services to Austria in July 1965 for contributing to the formulation of the restitution law.

The Silver Order of Merit was awarded by President Jonas to Georg Kuenstlinger, author and owner of the only Jewish monthly *Neue Welt*, in August 1965.

Hans Kelsen, authority on international law and creator of the *reine Rechtslehre* (pure jurisprudence) who was mainly responsible for drafting the First Republic’s constitution, celebrated his 85th birthday in 1966; he was presented with the “honor-ring” of the city of Vienna.

Margaret Feiler
During the period under review the team of First Secretary Leonid Brezhnev and Premier Alexei Kosygin continued to control the party and the state. At the 23rd party congress, held in Moscow at the end of March 1966, it was decided that the ruling party presidium be renamed Politburo, as it was known under Stalin, and that the title first secretary be changed to general secretary, the title held by Stalin. Party spokesman Nikolai Yegorichev stated that the return to the old terminology did not mean a return to Stalinism. In addition to Brezhnev and Kosygin, the top members of the ruling group were Nikolai Podgorny, Mikhail Suslov, Genady Voronov, Andrei Kirilenko, and Aleksander Shelepin. There was no indication of stress within the collective leadership. On the contrary, one may assume, on the basis of available information, that the structure of the Soviet power system and methods of state management were very much in line with the policy pursued since Brezhnev’s and Kosygin’s accession to power in October 1964.

There was ever-increasing reliance on technical experts and on efficiently conducted, businesslike procedures. Both Pravda and Izvestia in Moscow and the local press elsewhere emphasized the achievement of well-run and profit-oriented enterprises as an important socialist goal. While the party apparatus doubtless retained general control of the state bureaucracy, evidence pointed to the growing importance of scientists and other experts in decision-making processes. In fact, there was emerging in the Soviet Union, as in the West, a new power elite of scientists and experts in many fields, whose special knowledge was needed for the development of Soviet technology. Again and again the press acknowledged this fact, and indicated that the party could not “control the activities of the administration of research institutes in the so-called academic or theoretical category” without risking a repetition of the Lysenko-type situation that created such havoc in Soviet biology.* Moreover, speaking to the 23rd party congress, Brezhnev criticized the interference of local Communist party officials with the work of state

* Trofim Lysenko developed the anti-Mendelian theory that acquired characteristics are hereditary.
and local institutions. At the same time, the Soviet press called for wider powers for the Supreme Soviet to permit deputies of both chambers to examine and debate various government proposals.

While the Brezhnev-Kosygin team did nothing to change the continuing process of "liberalization," Soviet authorities, in February 1966, brought to trial two Soviet writers, Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuli Daniel, on the charge that they had published anti-Soviet writings abroad under the pseudonyms Abram Tertz and Nikolai Arzhak (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 368). Both were sentenced to hard labor, Sinyavsky for a term of seven years and Daniel for five years. The sentences handed down by the supreme court provoked a protest movement among Western intellectuals, many of whom were associated with the Communist left. The noted French Communist poet Louis Aragon, denounced the trial, as did the Communist newspaper L'Unita in Rome, the Daily Worker in London, and many others. It was reported from Moscow that some Soviet writers and intellectuals objected to the official legal proceedings as violating the freedom of writers to choose the form and content of their works. As if to underline the importance of the independence of the writer, Aleksander Twardowsky, the well-known editor of the liberal Novy Mir, published a tribute to the late Anna Akhmatova, who had been bitterly attacked and silenced by Stalinist censorship. But, like Boris Pasternack who had been a target of the Khrushchev regime, she remained a great example of upcoming Russian writers (Novy Mir, Moscow, #3, 1966).

In an effort to discredit the condemned writers further, Soviet propaganda branded them as antisemitic scribblers; this despite the fact that Daniel was a Jew and that both dealt with Jewish problems in some of their writings. Sinyavsky's The Trial Begins, a title apparently alluding to the infamous "doctors' plot," centered on the case of the Jewish physician Rabinovitch, who was accused of performing an illegal abortion. While, for the time being, the trial seemed not to have affected the situation of Soviet writers, it was clear that the Kremlin rulers had decided to use the case, and more particularly the "smuggling" of the works abroad, to draw a line between "liberal ideas" considered permissible under Soviet conditions and actions and ideas falling into the category of criminal collusion with "enemies of the state." In this connection it should be noted that the official Soviet press still referred to Kamenev, Zinoviev, and Rykov, colleagues of Lenin who had been liquidated by Stalin, as "enemies of the party" and "saboteurs" (Pravda, Moscow, November 18, 1966).

Economic Policies

The 23rd congress approved the guidelines of the new five-year plan (1966—1970) which technically should have gone into effect on January 1, 1966, when the preceding seven-year plan came to an end. While the party was discussing the new economic goals, it faced the perennial problem of ailing Soviet agriculture. The total 1965 grain crop was estimated at 120
million tons, or some 30 million tons below 1964. According to available statistics, the rate of industrial production rose from 7.1 per cent in 1964 to 8.6 per cent in 1965. Unlike the ebullient Khrushchev, the present Soviet leadership showed caution in projecting goals for the next five-year period. In his report to the 23rd congress, Kosygin promised higher living standards and thorough-going reform of both industry and agriculture. He also promised higher wages for workers, lower prices of consumer goods, and, more important, a shorter work week. Kosygin predicted that, by the beginning of 1968, about one-third of employed labor would be working in enterprises based on incentive bonuses, profits, and a larger degree of autonomy for factory management.

**Foreign Policy**

Moscow continued its military assistance to North Vietnam, and Soviet propaganda used every possible channel to condemn American policy in Asia, and particularly in Vietnam. Soviet foreign policy, however, gave all indications that the Kremlin rulers were bent on the continuation of peaceful relations with the United States and the West European powers. In Tashkent, in January 1966, Kosygin acted as the successful mediator in the conflict between India and Pakistan, restoring peace to these warring members of the British Commonwealth. There was no doubt that the Soviet Union was deeply interested not only in establishing peace in a sensitive geographic area, but in trying to prevent a possible move by China which might be willing at an appropriate moment, to experiment with its theory of revolutionary war.

There were persistent reports during the period under review, of the movement of Soviet troops along the frontiers of China. These reports could not be verified; but, in January 1966, Brezhnev visited Ulan-Bator and concluded a 20-year mutual-assistance pact with Mongolia, the major area of confrontation between Moscow and Peking. After the beginning of the “Mao cultural revolution” and the ensuing attacks on Soviet personnel in Peking, Soviet-Chinese relations reached a new level of open enmity. The Soviet leaders made it abundantly clear that border regions “created by the hands of our forefathers and covered with the sweat and blood of our people” would, if necessary, be defended by the USSR with every means at its disposal.

**Jewish Community**

The new climate of developing Russian nationalism and the continuing policy of Russification created many problems for the Jewish group. Under the pressure of new technological demands and in the total absence of any type of Jewish education, the tempo of assimilation rose visibly. Younger Jews were also faced with a new dilemma of choosing between the Russian language, the language of communication at the top and of the advanced technical establishment, and the local languages of the areas where they hap-
pened to live—the Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Georgia, among others. In many of the new republics the local inhabitants expected their Jewish minority to adopt the language of the area, which was used in the state-controlled enterprises. Available information seemed to indicate that the majority of young Soviet Jews were opting for the Russian language, in keeping with the traditional pattern of behavior in the various national districts of old Russia.

Population

The number of Jews in the Soviet Union at the end of 1966 was estimated at 2,543,000, or slightly more than 1 per cent of the total population of some 234,000,000. This estimate was based on the assumption that the natural increase of the Jewish population was the same as that of the general population: 17 per 1,000 in 1959, 1960, and 1961; 15 per 1,000 in 1962; 14 per 1,000 in 1963; 13 per 1,000 in 1964; 12 per 1,000 in 1965, and 11 per 1,000 in 1966.

Communal and Religious Life

There was no change in the general situation of the Soviet Jewish community. As before, Jewish religious and communal activities were discouraged. No Jewish welfare agencies or Jewish schools existed in the USSR. Local synagogues functioned around dvatzatkas, the formal associations required for opening houses of worship. There was no central Jewish organization to coordinate the work of rabbis or synagogue activities. Altogether 97 synagogues existed in the Soviet Union (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 370). Although there were minyonim and shitlach in some places, it was obvious that the number of synagogues was inadequate for Soviet Jews. The Soviet authorities looked with disfavor on the synagogue not only because of the state’s commitment to atheism, but also because the synagogue remained the most important, in fact the only place where Jews could meet as Jews for purposes of interest only to them. It was reported that the only remaining minyon in Minsk, which met in a private apartment, was closed in September 1966. The old prewar place of worship of the Chertkover Rebbe in Chertkov (Western Ukraine) had been converted into a restaurant. While the authorities have always had an eye on the composition of the dvatzkatkas, they have of late increased efforts to control their membership by bringing in individuals with only a remote interest in religious activities. Direct government intervention in Jewish religious affairs occurred whenever it was deemed necessary. Thus, in the summer of 1966, the supervisor of religious cult dismissed Chaim Oks, a trustee (gabbai) of the Cherkisovo synagogue in Moscow. Shlomo Shapiro, head of the Dushanbe (Tadjikistan) synagogue was also dismissed. Similar measures were taken to eliminate “undesirable” elements in the Greek Orthodox Church. (In this connection it is interesting to note that, as part of the present opposition to the policy of accommodation pursued by the Greek Orthodox Church, some Jews who had converted...
to Christianity now emphasized their "Jewishness." A leading role in the opposition was played by A. Levitin, one such convert who was a teacher by profession and, according to the atheistic journal Nauka i Religia [October 1966], wrote under the pen name Krasnov.

An interfaith delegation visiting Moscow in January 1966 reported that Chief Rabbi Judah Leib Levin was always closely watched when foreign visitors came to see him, and therefore in no position to speak freely. In their opinion, the plight of religious Jewry stemmed largely from "fear on the part of the Jewish leadership of reprisals." Although the promised 10,000 copies of a prayerbook have not been printed (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 370), Rabbi Levin again repeated in a June 1966 letter to Rabbi Bernard Poupko of Pittsburgh, "We hope, please God, that within several months the siddur will appear." Reliable observers, who had occasion to visit synagogues in the Soviet Union, reported that the continuing lack of prayerbooks, tallit, and phylacteries had made it impossible for many religious Jews to participate in religious services. From all indications it would appear that Soviet authorities have done nothing to relieve these shortages.

Rabbi Levin continued to deny reports that Moscow's Yeshivah Kol Jacob had been closed (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 370). Ephraim Kaplan, an administrator of the Moscow Central synagogue, stated that the yeshivah was again functioning, with a total enrolment of 14 students between the ages of 21 to 45, coming from Odessa, Kiev, Riga, Moscow, Georgia, and Bukhara. Only two were studying for the rabbinate; the others were preparing to become cantors and shohatim.

The 1965 relaxation of regulations governing the baking of matzot for Passover was extended in 1966; it was reported that Moscow Jews had enough matzot for the holidays, and that reasonable supplies were also available in Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov, Odessa, and other centers. In the smaller cities the situation with regard to both supply and distribution was still unsatisfactory. In Moscow members of the foreign colony attended the seder at the Israel embassy, which was conducted by Israeli ambassador Katriel Katz. The Jews continued to experience difficulty with regard to burial in consecrated ground. Old cemeteries were being filled up, and Soviet authorities discouraged the establishment of new ones, forcing Jews to use mixed grounds.

Notwithstanding the clearly inimical attitude of the Soviet authorities and powerful social pressure, Jews appeared to be maintaining their attachment to Jewish religious traditions. Rabbis Z. Garkavi and A. Shauli published in 1965 in Israel a small volume, Shomere ha-gahelet ("Guardians of the Flame"), which contained responsa and theological essays from the Soviet Union and some of the satellite countries. While some of the material bore a necessarily Soviet stamp, it would seem that even under the existing difficult conditions religious Jews continued to ask their rabbis questions on religious laws, as they applied to their life in a Communist-dominated society.

P. A. Ulitzky, a Ukrainian Jew living in the small town of Korsun-Shev-
chenko, wrote to the Ukrainian atheist magazine *Ludina i Svit* (Kiev, April 1966) "defending the ethical teachings of the Torah." American tourists who spent Passover in the USSR stated that services were attended by large crowds. Thousands of Jews blocked the streets outside the Moscow Central synagogue during Rosh Ha-shanah and Yom Kippur services. Similar reports were received from Leningrad, Kiev, Tbilisi, and many other cities. Among the Jewish worshipers were many young people who seemed to pay no attention to anti-religious propaganda and the outright social pressure of the Communist establishment.

**Antisemitism**

For many years the Jews were hardly mentioned by Soviet publications except in critical and even outright antisemitic presentations. Of late, there has been a noticeable change. While forays against the Jews in the Soviet press have not stopped, the Jew as an individual and Jewish life in general have become objects of genuine interest. At times, the subject Jew, which had heretofore been taboo, was treated openly and often with undisguised sympathy, and even friendliness. *Novy Mir* (#5, 1966), for example, carried a story by Lev Slavin, "Predvestyie Istiny" (Foreboding of Truth), about a Jewish family, rabbis, and Jewish workers. Whatever its literary merits, the story recalled the familiar style of pre-World War I Jewish-Russian magazines.

Other works of similar character appeared elsewhere, and *Babi-Yar* a documentary novel by Anatoly Kuznetzov, which originally appeared in the magazine *Yunost* (Youth; Moscow, #8, 9, 10), was later translated into English. The Western press misinterpreted the novel as furnishing proof that Babi-Yar was essentially a Jewish tragedy, in contradiction to the well-known statement by Khrushchev in his polemic against Evtushenko (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 274). While it is true that the author first showed a somewhat new attitude toward Jewish suffering in his compassionate description of the massacre of Kiev Jews, the latter parts of the book were obviously meant to support Khrushchev's contention that there was nothing specifically Jewish about the executions at Babi-Yar. An article by the Soviet sociologist J. Kon on "The Psychology of Prejudice" (*Novy Mir*, #9, 1966), also illustrated the more liberal treatment of Jewish subjects. While it dealt chiefly with American sociological research into prejudice, its frank treatment of the subject, which went beyond narrow Marxist interpretation, opened to the Soviet reader a completely new view of antisemitism, as understood by Western scholars.

At the same time, however, antisemitism continued to manifest itself in many ways. Both the local and central press continued to make use of anti-Jewish stereotypes. Journalists obviously exaggerated daily occurrences involving individuals with Jewish names by emphasizing their "anti-social behavior." Two such pieces appeared in *Pravda* (Moscow, June 19 and July
Although reports of so-called economic trials in which Jewish persons stood accused of various “economic” crimes have largely disappeared from the Soviet press, such items were published from time to time. One reported the death sentence imposed, in August, on a man named Rabinovitch for allegedly masterminding a ring of embezzlers (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 272).

The propaganda against the Jewish religion also had a peculiarly anti-Jewish tone. The well-publicized volume Religion in the History of the Peoples of the World by S. A. Tokarev (Moscow, 1965) emphasized the “reactionary, anti-democratic” meaning of the Old Testament and its adherents’ claim to superiority. Tokarev claimed that the Prophets fought for strict observance of the law, but did not protest against social injustice. He described Judaism as a religion full of bloodthirstiness and cruelty. The recently published anti-religious tract, Zakat Judeiskoi Religi ("The Twilight of Judaism") by M. Shachnovitch (Moscow, 1965), criticized the cruder forms of anti-religious propaganda. The author took note of Western reaction to the books of Kichko and Mayatski, and devoted a special chapter to what he called “lies about persecution of Judaism in the Soviet Union” (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 371).

There were continuing signs of deep-seated prejudice against the Jews among both the people and the bureaucracy. Soviet Jewish students reported anti-Jewish feelings even among the younger generation. Reliable reports spoke of anti-Jewish acts by officials in Kiev, the Ukrainian capital, such as the harassment of a Jewish milkman, who was arrested by local police on charges of diluting his milk with water and “forcibly” interrogated for many days, but who never acknowledged guilt of the crime with which he was charged. Foreign visitors to Kiev reported that local authorities interfered in many ways with Jews who were baking matzot for Passover. In Lvov, in the Western Ukraine, Jews also experienced many difficulties in their dealings with local authorities.

Discrimination

After the 23rd congress of the Communist party and the elections to the Supreme Soviet, it was obvious that the Kremlin rulers were continuing their policy of excluding Jews from top government and party positions. An interesting development of this congress was the substantial increase in non-Russian members of the Politburo. Moscow was giving much attention to the problems of the many nationalities in the Soviet Union, and the newly-elected Politburo included, in addition to Slavs, one member from Latvia (A. Pelshe), one from Kazakhstan (D. Kunaev), one from Georgia (V. Mzhavanadze), and one from Uzbekistan (Sh. Rashidov). Among the 195 members of the central committee of the party was one Jew, Benjamin E. Dimshitz, who was also a deputy premier and chairman of the State Committee for Material Technical Supplies. There were only five Jews among the
1,517 members of the two chambers of the Supreme Soviet. Benjamin E. Dimshitz (district of Chabarovsk) and Yuli Khariton (Gorki district) were in the union chamber; Rafael Khersonski (Birobidjan district), Ilya Ehrenburg (Birsky district in Bashkiria), and Aleksander Chakovski (Torber district of Moldavia) were in the nationalities chamber. It may be significant that among the Jewish Supreme Soviet members were two writers, Ehrenburg and Chakovski, who represented the so-called “liberal” and “reactionary” wings of Soviet literature, respectively. No Jews held top positions in the army or the diplomatic corps, and they had disappeared also from major policy-making posts. There were, of course, many Jews in the arts and sciences, but only because of their special talent or knowledge.

Western Reaction to Soviet Antisemitism

The plight of the Russian Jews and the failure of the authorities to take political steps to improve the situation were sharply condemned by Jewish and non-Jewish organizations in Western countries. In July, 130 MPs of all parties in the British government signed a motion expressing their concern over “the continuing difficulties confronting Jews in the Soviet Union.” Also, a group of leading British intellectuals, in a letter to the London Times, protested against the treatment of Soviet Jews. Lord Russell indicated that Jews in the Soviet Union were “still facing the problem of national survival.” Twenty-five Jewish organizations in the United States united in the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry, which held many special meetings protesting against the inequalities of which Soviet Jews were victims. The conference organized open air demonstrations in which a large number of Jewish congregations and synagogues participated. In May the Socialist International, at its world congress in Stockholm, unanimously adopted a resolution expressing regret over the deprivation of cultural and religious rights suffered by Jews in the USSR.

The obvious anti-Jewish policy of the Soviet Union was also condemned by some Western Communists. In an unprecedented act, the British Communist party made a public appeal to the Soviet Union on behalf of Russian Jewry. A statement issued by the party referred to “remnants of antisemitism against which there is, and must be, a continuous struggle.” The Communist party of the United States also expressed concern about antisemitism in the Soviet Union. Rex Mortimer, a leading member of the Australian Communist party, stated that there had been “an inadequate response” by Soviet authorities to queries from abroad about the situation of the Jews. The Italian Jewish Communist Senator Umberto Terracini called upon Moscow to restore full rights to Soviet Jews. It should be noted that during the March 1966 United Nations debates on the draft convention eliminating religious intolerance, which called on all states to combat prejudices such as antisemitism, the Soviet Union abstained from voting after having noted its objection to all references to antisemitism.
On June 10 Soviet Weekly, organ of the Soviet embassy in London, reported on forthcoming developments in Soviet Jewish affairs. It revealed that a Yiddish school and a Yiddish theater were to be opened in Moscow, and that plans were under way to establish a Yiddish magazine in Kiev and to publish a Russian-Yiddish dictionary. This report, allegedly based on information received from the official Novosti agency, was later denied by its editor Solomon Rabinovitch, a well-known Soviet apologist. At this writing there was neither a Yiddish school nor a legitimate Yiddish theater in the USSR. While Aron Vergelis, editor of Sovetish Heymland and quasi-official spokesman for Jewish affairs, repeatedly declared that Soviet Jews were not interested in additional Jewish activities, Gershon Kenig, editor of the Communist Naye Presse in Paris, stated after a visit to the USSR that Soviet Jews showed strong national Jewish feelings and were eager to have a centralized Jewish organization that could provide for their needs. Despite many promises, only two new Yiddish books appeared in 1966: Trot fun doyres ("March of the Generations"), a novel by Peretz Markish, and Mayn Oytser ("My Treasure"), a volume of poems by Samuel Halkin. Since 1948, only fifteen books in Yiddish have been published in the Soviet Union.

While Soviet authorities did not promote Jewish cultural activities, the new, more permissive climate encouraged interested Jewish groups, writers' unions, and some specialized academic institutions to take important initiatives in this area. The 50th anniversary of the death of Sholem Aleichem was commemorated in many Soviet towns. Special meetings were held in Birobidjan (May 13), Czernovitz (May 16), Kiev (May 19), and Moscow (May 31). The Leningrad public library had a special Sholem Aleichem exhibit organized by Leib Wilsker, comprising some 180 items associated with the Yiddish writer. The Moscow Yiddish drama ensemble, under the direction of Benjamin Schwarger, presented eight performances of Sholem Aleichem's works. The state television agency in Kharkov, Kremenchug, and Gomel presented Sholem Aleichem in Ukrainian translation. The city of Kiev, where Sholem Aleichem lived and wrote, named a street for him, as did Minsk and Odessa. The Melodia record factory issued two discs of Sholem Aleichem's Tevye der milkhiger ("Tevye the Milkman") read by the Yiddish actor Joseph Kolin.

Many academic bodies undertook projects in the field of Jewish studies. In connection with the 50th anniversary of the October revolution, the Academy of Science prepared a five-volume study of Soviet languages. Eliahu Falkovitch headed the study of Yiddish which, he maintained, was presently spoken by some four million persons throughout the world, including the USSR. At the second congress of Soviet semitologists in Tbilisi in June, two papers were presented on Hebrew and Yiddish. The Leningrad Institute for Theater and Music was in the process of arranging the archives of the late Moishe Beregovski on Yiddish folklore.
While the authorities obviously did not wish to establish a legitimate Yiddish theater, Yiddish revues, plays, and concerts were heard throughout the Soviet Union. The performances were staged by various art and music groups that have sprung up with the help of professional artists and amateurs. The best known were the Vilna Yiddish Drama Circle, the Leningrad Art Ensemble, the Czernovitz Art Ensemble, the Kovno Drama Ensemble, the Kishinev Drama Ensemble, the Moscow Drama Ensemble, and the recently organized Yiddish Art Ensemble of Tallin. Their repertoires included modern plays as well as Yiddish classics, including Goldfaden. Many Yiddish artists and singers, such as Sidi Tal, Nehamah Lifshitz, Dinah Roitkop, Mikhail Alexandrovitch, and the late Benjamin Chaitovski, attracted huge audiences that included also non-Jews. On Nehamah Lifshitz's program was a song about Babi-Yar which was particularly appreciated by her listeners. A new anthology of Yiddish songs, with original text, music, and Russian translation, was prepared by Aron Winkovitzki.

Sovetish Heymland continued to appear twelve times a year. Its content was broadened in 1966 to include more frequent reports on Jewish life abroad and more articles of historical and literary character. Issue No. 6 noted the death in Israel of Jacob Lestshinsky; No. 3 contained an appreciation of Nochem Stutchkov, and No. 2 reviewed the Yiddish exposition organized by the New York Yivo. In the course of his visit to London, in December, Vergelis mentioned a plan for the insertion of a special Russian-language section for those Jews who cannot read Yiddish. It was reported that the Birobidjaner Shtern, the only Yiddish newspaper in the Soviet Union, had increased its circulation from 1,000 to 12,000.

The Novosti agency in Moscow and the Yiddish publishing agency Yiddish Bukh in Warsaw announced a joint program of publication of books in Yiddish. Among the first books to be published was The October Revolution and Yiddish Literature, by Rivka Rubin and Hersh Remenik. Some two years ago the joint enterprise published Mashe Rolnick's volume, Ich muz dertseylin ("I Must Tell It") (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 374).

Lev Penkovsky, the well-known Russian poet and translator, gave readings from his Russian translations of Yehuda Halevi at the Cultural House of Writers in Moscow; Mikhail Zand of the Institute of Eastern Studies discussed Halevi's works and importance.

The Jewish artists Mendel Gorshman and Meir Axelrod, whose works often depicted Jewish subjects, were represented at the Moscow exhibit of graphic art and painting in the fall of 1966. Sovetish Heymland recently printed reproductions of works by Soviet Jewish painters who specialized in Jewish art.

Five of the 19 scientists who were awarded Lenin prizes in 1966—Vitalyi Ginsburg, Samuel Reinberg, Vladimir Broude, Emanuel Rashba, and Evgenyi Gross—were Jews. In addition, ten Jews, Solomon Khazan, Benjamin Zilberberg, Evseyi Benenson, Aron Rabinovitch, Ilya Tepman, Isaak Khanin,
Relations with Israel

Soviet policy toward Israel remained hostile, and Soviet propaganda continuously identified the State of Israel with United States "imperialist designs." According to the official Moscow Tass news agency, "one could see the activization of aggressive and extremist forces of Israel directed against the neighboring Arab states." (Pravda, May 28, 1966). This statement was made after Premier Kosygin's official visit to Cairo, earlier in May, when he again assured the United Arab Republic of Soviet friendship and support. In exchange, the Soviet rulers wanted Nasser to join ranks with other Arab countries against the "reactionary" Arab regimes of Saudi-Arabia and Jordan. Pursuing its policy of penetration into the Middle East, Moscow sided with Syria during the Israeli-Syrian border clashes in July, saying that "Tel-Aviv should not forget that [such actions] would meet with decisive resistance by all interested in peace and security on this part of the globe."

From time to time, Moscow authorities harassed Israeli diplomatic personnel. In August David Gavish, second secretary of the Israeli embassy, was ordered to leave the Soviet Union. Tass accused Gavish of "activity incompatible with the status of an accredited diplomat," a charge which the Israeli government rejected outright. Again, in September, Moscow accused Ephraim Taz, a member of the Israeli mission, of "disseminating dirty Zionist propaganda." Still, Israel and the Soviet Union continued a steady cultural exchange program. The Soviet violinist David Oistrakh gave a concert in Tel Aviv in March, and the Soviet Yiddish actor Meyer Braude presented an evening of Yiddish readings. Soviet cellist Mstislav Rostropovitch and vocalist Galina Vishnevskaya also visited Israel in 1966. Israeli singer Geula Gill and Juki Arkin gave a series of concerts consisting of Hebrew and Yiddish songs in Moscow, Leningrad, and other cities. A Histadrut delegation, headed by Bezalel Shachar, visited Moscow at the invitation of the cultural department of Soviet trade unions. However, an exchange between the Moscow State Orchestra and the Israeli Philharmonic Orchestra, originally scheduled for May, was later cancelled by the Soviet Union.

In 1966 there was a substantial increase in the number of Soviet Jews who were permitted to join relatives abroad, mainly in Israel. In a conversation with French journalists in Paris in December, Kosygin stated that "with respect to reunions of families, if some families want to meet, or if they want to leave the Soviet Union, then the road is open and no problems exist in this respect" (p. 310). At this writing, it was difficult to judge to what extent Soviet authorities would permit emigration. It was estimated that some 500 to 600 Jewish families had left the Soviet Union, chiefly for Israel, but also for other countries. Most of the emigrants were elderly persons. It was reported that Soviet newspapers printed articles having clearly anti-Jewish overtones against the would-be emigrants.
Commemoration of the Catastrophe

According to the Soviet press agency Novosti, ten designs were prepared for a memorial to be erected at Babi-Yar in Kiev, which was to bear inscriptions in several languages, including Yiddish. In July a group of 22 American rabbis visited Babi-Yar where they conducted a memorial service for the Jews who had been executed by the Nazis. Reports indicated that Soviet Jews were giving increasing attention to the commemoration of Jewish victims of Nazism. A large meeting was held in Tallin in memory of Estonian Jews killed during the occupation. A similar gathering in Riga commemorated the 25th anniversary of the murder of Latvian Jews in the Riga ghetto in November-December 1941. Dinah Roitkop read Yiddish ghetto songs at this meeting. In Kovno, a meeting was held in remembrance of the 25th anniversary of the Nazi murder of thousands of Lithuanian Jews. It was also reported that the remains of some 2,000 Jewish victims of Nazi killings were reinterred in the Jewish cemetery at Baku, Azerbaidjan. All these memorial meetings took place in outlying areas having old traditions of autonomous Jewish life.

Personalia

Soviet writers celebrated the 75th birthday of Ilya Ehrenburg, the well-known Russian writer who, at the beginning of World War II, had been one of the leaders of the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee.

Benjamin Chaitovski, a well-known concert singer, died early in 1966 at the age of 49. Nahum Shalfin, first vice-chairman of the Jewish autonomous region of Birobidjan, died in June. Chaim Braginski, director of the Crimean Yiddish Theater during the Jewish colonization efforts in that area, died in Simferopol, Crimea, in September. Professor Lev Zilber, a renowned Soviet virologist, died in Moscow in November at the age of 72. Moishe Teiff, a leading Yiddish writer, died in Moscow in December at the age of 62.
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No changes in the political setup in Poland occurred in 1966. Władysław Gomułka continued as undisputed head of both the Communist party (PPZR) and the state machinery. Edward Ochab remained in the post of chairman of the State Council of Poland, formally the top position in the country. Although Gomułka had conquered the opposition of the “liberals” on the left and “partisans” on the right, a deep social malaise was felt throughout the country. The Communist leadership repeatedly called for a sharp struggle against the social evils of “indifference to principles of public morality, nepotism, economic crimes, and corruption.' In 1965, 6,400 individuals were reportedly expelled from the party for accepting bribes and other acts of dishonesty, among them 219 directors of enterprises, 179 accountants, and 1,150 persons holding responsible positions. In March 1966 a trial was held in Lodz of a group of high officials accused of stealing meat worth 15 million zlotys (at the official rate, $1 = 24 zlotys). Twelve of the 13 defendants were found guilty and sentenced to prison terms of six to 15 years; the ringleader, Henryk Golebiowski, received a life term. The frequency of such economic incidents has become a matter of serious concern to the leadership. It should be noted that, in contrast to the situation in the Soviet Union, these trials had no special Jewish aspects.

Uneasiness among intellectuals and writers persisted; authorities made it clear that “excessive” pronouncements contradicting fundamental party dogmas would not be tolerated. The general congress of the Polish Writers Union, meeting in Krakow December 3-5, proceeded in a calm atmosphere; Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz was reelected the union’s president.

The one thousandth anniversary of Poland was celebrated with great pomp throughout the country, but the event underlined the continuing tension between the state and the church. Stefan Cardinal Wiszynski celebrated mass in the ancient cathedrals, and state officials organized parades and other civic festivities. On May 3 the clergy prayed at the holy shrine at Częstochowa and in nearby Katowice and the government organized various choral and theatrical performances; Ochab participated in the banner-bedecked festivities. The celebration came to a close in October, with the Congress of Polish Culture representing the scholarly, literary, and artistic elite of the country. In his address to the congress, Zenon Kliszko, a member of the Politburo, warned against propagating “ideas hostile to socialism or to the vital interests of the Polish state.”

The propaganda war between the Polish episcopate and the state in connection with the exchange of letters between the Polish bishops and the Germans continued (see AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 379). The government
felt that the Church should not interfere in the very touchy area of German-Polish relations. In January Cardinal Wiszynski was refused a passport to go to Rome where he was expected to participate in a special celebration of 1,000 years of Christianity in Poland. At the same time, it was reported that the Church had increased its opposition to state control over teaching religious subjects in the 48 seminaries training future members of the clergy. Both state and Church, however, avoided any move that could endanger the existing delicate truce.

Polish ruling circles repeatedly emphasized the reestablished friendship with France. At the same time they promoted tourism, trade, and various other forms of cooperation with other East European countries, particularly Czechoslovakia—a situation which, to a degree, was akin to that of pre-World War II days. These moves could be construed as a modest assertion of independence from the Soviet Union, but they were doubtless also dictated by economic necessities that forced East European countries to work together.

Stanislaw Mikolajczjk, the last non-Communist premier of Poland who fled his country in 1947, died in the United States in December 1966.

**Jewish Community**

Polish Jewish leaders stated that 30,000 Jews were living in Poland in 1966, but did not indicate their geographic, age, or sex distribution. Reliable Jewish observers, who visited Poland, estimated the Jewish population at about 25,000 including those who did not identify with the Jews. While there was no official interference with Jewish emigration, only small numbers of Jews left Poland in 1966. It was estimated that some 2,000 Jews were white-collar workers and members of professions, over 2,000 were in the producer cooperatives, and about 500 were skilled workers. About 1,500 were reported to be retired because of age or disability.

**Antisemitism**

Notwithstanding the official ban on antisemitism, anti-Jewish feelings existed among all groups of Polish society. Reliable sources indicated that some intellectuals fought anti-Jewish prejudice, but with little success. In October Jan Nowak, a fireman of Walbrzych who, in a state of drunkenness, had attacked David Malewitch, a Jewish co-worker, and made antisemitic remarks, stood trial in the district court. He was sentenced to six months in prison.

Jewish organizations were particularly concerned with widespread anti-Jewish sentiment among the younger Poles, who apparently have learned little from the experience of their elders under Nazi occupation. Reports emanating from émigré circles indicated that, under Soviet pressure, many Polish Jews have been purged from responsible positions in the state and local bureaucracy; some were said to have been forced to retire on pensions.
While there was no way to check the accuracy of these reports, it appears that the influence of Jews within the party apparatus and in the state machinery has substantially diminished. However, General Waclaw Komar, a Jew, member of the party’s liberal wing, and one of the veteran Communists who had fought in the Spanish Civil War, was promoted to deputy minister of the interior.

Communal Life

Jewish communal life centered around the Communist-dominated Cultural and Social Union of Polish Jews. The union’s fifth congress took place on May 5-6, with some 200 delegates of local unions and fraternal organizations participating. While the union still had a membership of about 7,500 in 26 cities, Jewish leaders were concerned about the growing disaffection and loss of interest in Jewish affairs among both the older generation and Jewish youth. In an attempt to remedy the situation, the union set up special social commissions for specific tasks and for directing programs, in cooperation with the local unions, where the latter were unable to do so alone. At the end of 1966, 114 such commissions had been established. Leib Domb was reelected president and Edward Reiber secretary general of the Cultural and Social Union.

Construction of the House of Jewish Culture on the Place Grzybow in Warsaw was progressing, but at the time of this writing it was not known when the project would be completed.

Religious Life

Jewish religious life continued to deteriorate. Reliable observers maintained that the younger generations showed little or no interest in religious activities. Rabbi Asher Zives, who had been the only rabbi in Poland, left the country, and the Jewish community had neither rabbis nor mohalim. A few remaining shohatim traveled from town to town, making it possible for observing Jews to have fresh kosher meat. In June seven Israeli shohatim came to Poland for a year to prepare kosher beef for sale in Israel. In a number of synagogues older congregants conducted services, but the number of worshipers was diminishing.

The Union of Jewish Religious Congregations (Wa’ad Ha-kehillot) under the presidency of Isaak Frenkel, has of late succeeded in reasserting itself in many areas of communal endeavor. It is significant that some of its activities were reported in the official Folks-shtimme, which, on September 13, carried New Year’s greetings by the Union. The Wa’ad Ha-kehillot claimed a membership of 7,000 in 20 affiliated local kehillot. However, only three cities had religious schools (hedarim); the number of bar mitzvah celebrations was dwindling, and some localities were without anyone qualified to prepare the youngsters for the ceremony. There were enough matzot for all families who observed Passover.
Great concern of all sections of the community over the continuing deterioration of the Jewish cemeteries was discussed in Folks-shtimme (September 28, 1966) by Michael Mirsky of the Cultural and Social Union and Isaak Frenkel of the Union of Jewish Religious Congregations. Apparently, little was done to alleviate the situation, for a joint meeting of the presidium of the Cultural and Social Union, and the Union of Jewish Religious Congregations set up a commission to speed up necessary repairs and provide for safeguarding the cemeteries. Some financial help was to be forthcoming from the National Council, the local municipalities, and the All-Polish Council for Monuments.

Jewish Education

Five Yiddish state elementary schools functioned in the cities of Wroclaw, Legnice, Lodz, Szczecin, and Walbrzych, with a total enrolment of about 1,000, including many non-Jewish pupils. The schools in Wroclaw, Legnice, and Lodz also had secondary education (lycée) programs. At the end of the 1965–66 school year, there were only 27 pupils in the graduating class in Wroclaw and 19 in Lodz. Attendance in the primary grades was so small that there was serious question about how long these schools would be able to function. Since Jewish children did not know Yiddish, a Yiddish language textbook designed for rapid learning had to be especially prepared to enable them to follow instruction in Yiddish subjects. The absence of competent authors made for general shortage of textbooks, particularly for Yiddish subjects.

Written examinations given to students in the Jewish lycées included such themes as the impact of new social and economic forces on the life of Russian Jewry at the end of 19th and beginning of the 20th century, as reflected in Sholem Aleichem’s Tevye der Milkhiger and Menachem-Mendel, and the concept of good and evil in the works of Peretz. No doubt, the Yiddish schools were trying to do important educational work, but their situation had reached a critical stage. The Jewish leadership therefore called on the youth clubs “to share a great part of the task of Jewish education,” to teach the Yiddish language, Jewish history, and other subjects, since “there was no other way to impart this knowledge to Jewish youth in Poland.

Social Welfare

A most serious problem of the Jewish community was the continually increasing number of aged, who had neither family, trade union, nor anyone else, to look after them. The Jewish home for the aged in Warsaw, with a capacity of some 100 inmates, was unable to meet the need. Plans were in progress to add a new pavilion, with the aid of JDC.

The general JDC-supported welfare programs were conducted locally through relief committees representing both the Cultural and Social Union and the Union of Jewish Religious Congregations. In mid-1966, they assisted
some 10,000 persons, 5,600 with cash relief, 1,650 with medical aid, and 250 with student aid. JDC also supported 10 kosher kitchens, supervised by Wa'ad Ha-kehillot, feeding some 500 persons daily. As of October there were some 560 individuals in the various training programs of ORT, 350 others were enrolled in the technical divisions of Jewish schools. About 2,600 Jewish children benefited from the summer camp program.

**Producer Cooperatives**

There were, in 1966, 16 Jewish producer cooperatives employing 2,150 workers, including 700 home workers. About 1,500 (or 70 per cent) of those employed by the cooperatives were members of the Social and Cultural Union (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 435). The total value of production in 1965 was 283 million zlotys, and the net profit approximately 9 million zlotys. The cooperatives continued to constitute one of Polish Jewry's important economic bases, as well as a substantial source of revenue of the Social and Cultural Union, to which they allocated approximately 20 per cent of their income. The 15-member economic commission of the Cultural and Social Union, under Edward Reiber, administered the producer cooperatives.

**Cultural Activities**

In 1966 the Cultural and Social Union supported 31 art ensembles and drama circles, 47 youth clubs, and 15 reading groups. Not all libraries sponsored by Jewish groups had Yiddish books. Because competent personnel for conducting Jewish cultural activities was difficult to find, the cultural commission of the Cultural and Social Union devoted a month (October 10 to November 10) to the intensive training of local persons for various functional activities. When interest in many of the old endeavors waned, an attempt was made to expand the content of cultural activities. A varied program was devised for Jewish participation in the celebration of the millenium of the Polish state and of Jewish life in Poland. The Jewish Youth Festival, conducted in Krakow July 13-15, was dedicated to Jewish fidelity to Poland. It featured a symposium on the significance of the anniversary, and a pilgrimage to the ancient Rama synagogue. Speaking to the Congress of Polish Culture (p. 388) in the name of the Social and Cultural Union, David Sfard, stated that Polish Jews, while deeply loyal to Poland, nevertheless wished to live their own cultural life. He complained that little of specifically Yiddish creative effort was available to the Polish reader, and called for a brotherly relationship between the two cultures.

Among the finalists in a Yiddish art competition, held in June, some 16 amateur singers and actors received special prizes for excellence.

The Jewish publishing house Yiddish Bukh continued its activities, but had difficulties reaching large numbers of readers. Yet each of its new books was printed in 2,500 copies.

The Jewish Historical Institute carried on its research and publishing
activities. Berl Mark, the director and author of many volumes on the history of the catastrophe in Poland, died on July 4 at the age of 58, and Aron Eisenbach, the well-known historian of Polish Jewry, was appointed to replace him. It was reported that the Institute recently compiled a list and photograph file of all remaining synagogues in Poland.

The Warsaw Communist Yiddish newspaper, Folks-shtimme, appearing four times weekly, celebrated its 20th anniversary in 1966. For this occasion it published a special issue on November 12. A number of special meetings were held to propagandize the paper which reportedly had a circulation of 5,000. The Yiddish State Theater started its 1966 fall season with a new play, “Where is Mr. David?” by British writer S. P. Taylor. It was directed by Ida Kaminska and was received with great interest.

Leon Shapiro
Czechoslovakia

The 13th Congress of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia met in Prague from May 31 to June 4, 1966. Some time before it convened the party bureaucracy took action against relaxation of party control, which had made slow progress in recent years. The literary magazine Tvar ("Form") was discontinued on January 1, when its editors refused to accept the line laid down by the official Writers' Union. Knižní Kultura ("Book Culture"), a periodical which, though published by the Ministry of Education and Culture, had frequently voiced critical opinions, met with the same fate several weeks later. The authoritative voice of the party Zivot Strany ("Party Life") repeatedly attacked the concept of ideological coexistence and stressed the irreconcilability of Communist and bourgeois thinking. The editorial board of Literární Noviny ("Literary News") was reorganized after having been charged with opening the pages of the magazine to irresponsible elements.

At the congress, the delegates endorsed the policies of the party leadership. It did not even attempt to come to grips with the continuing economic and social crisis, and economic reform was a slogan rather than a reality. Czechoslovakia remained a faithful ally and follower of the Soviet Union; Soviet party boss Leonid Brezhnev and party boss Walter Ulbricht of the Deutsche Demokratische Republik (Eastern Germany) were the only leaders of other Communist parties to attend the congress. There were no meaningful changes in the composition of the newly elected central committee. The most discredited prewar Stalinists, who had been dismissed in 1963, and included such men as Karol Bacílek, Bruno Koehler, and Viliám Široký, did not reemerge. Nor did any of the rehabilitated victims of the purge and trials of the late forties and early fifties move into positions of influence.

A drab affair with no unexpected developments, the 13th congress confirmed the undisputed control of the group in power, which promptly proceeded to assert its "leading role" in cultural matters. At the October meeting of the new central committee, First Secretary and President of the Republic Antonín Novotný expressed dissatisfaction with the direction of Czechoslovakia's artistic and literary life, and shortly thereafter, two writers were jailed. The government precipitated an international incident by waylaying (with Russian connivance) and arresting Vladimir Kazan-Komarek, an ex-refugee who had become an American citizen and the owner of a travel agency in Cambridge, Mass., on charges of having organized and operated an anti-Communist escape ring in Czechoslovakia in 1948. Kazan-Komarek was seized on October 31, when the Soviet plane, on which he was returning from Moscow to Paris, made a detour and an unscheduled stop in Prague.
JEWSH COMMUNITY

The accentuation of the hard line had no palpable consequences for the approximately 15,000 Jews in Czechoslovakia, except that permits to leave the country were again more difficult to obtain. Jews who applied for temporary permits experienced lengthy delays and, more often than not, were denied permission to visit Western countries. "We don't trust the Jews," an informant reported having been told when he insisted on seeing an official of the Ministry of the Interior about his application for a permit to visit his mother in the United States.

Officially, however, there was no discrimination, and no obstacles were put in the way of the free exercise of religious observance. Rabbi Arthur Schneier of the Park East Synagogue in New York, who visited countries behind the Iron Curtain in 1966, called on the Soviet Union to give its Jewish citizens the same religious freedom he had found in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. He reported that there was no official interference in Jewish life, and he ascribed its weaknesses to the small number of Jews rather than governmental restrictions.

In its propaganda material aimed at attracting tourists from the West, the Czech tourist office described the importance and beauty of the Jewish quarter of Prague, its synagogue which is the oldest still in use in Europe, and its medieval cemetery. The impressive collections of Jewish religious art, ritual objects, and other memorabilia in the Prague Jewish State Museum, and its several permanent exhibits, were also listed high among tourist attractions.

Communal Organizations and Religious Life

In Bohemia-Moravia, the Jewish population remained organized in five religious communities, each subdivided into a number of synagogal congregations. The communities were located in Prague, Plzeň (Pilsen), Usti (Aus sig), Brno (Bruenn), and Ostrava (Ostrau). Their central administrative agency was the Rada židovských náboženských obcí v krajinách českých (Council of Jewish Religious Communities in the Czech Lands) in Prague. The Jewish congregations in Slovakia were supervised directly by the Ustredný sváz židovských náboženských obcí na Slovensku (Central Association of the Jewish Religious Communities in Slovakia). František Ehrmann, chairman of the Prague council, resigned in February and was succeeded by its former vice-chairman František Fuchs. The chairman of the Slovak association was Benjamin Eichler.

The communities had three rabbis altogether: the 91-year-old Chief Rabbi Richard Feder of Bohemia-Moravia, in Prague; Slovakia's Chief Rabbi Eliáš Katz, in Bratislava, and the district rabbi for Eastern Slovakia, Moses Friedlaender, in Košice (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 385). In October the religious community announced that Ervín Šalamon, an 18-year-old youth from Košice, had been sent to the Budapest rabbinical seminary with the consent of
the Czech authorities. The understanding was that he would be appointed rabbi of Prague, after completing his studies.

The new synagogue at the J. F. Kennedy International Airport in New York received a menorah as a gift from the Prague Jewish community. The accompanying letter expressed deep respect for the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy, the "great president of the United States who represented the noble ideas of world peace and the dignity of all men of all races and religions."

Communal Activities

Věstník ("Gazette") the 12-page monthly of the Jewish Religious Communities in Czechoslovakia, edited by Rudolf Iltis, covered religious news and local congregational news consisting mostly of obituaries. But this lively, well-written journal also devoted a good part of its space to subjects of literary and historical interest.

The 25th anniversary of the establishment of the Terezín (Theresienstadt) ghetto by the Nazis was widely commemorated. Close to 150,000 Jews had passed through, or died in, Theresienstadt. A handful survived. About one-half of its inmates had been Jews from Bohemia and Moravia; more than 40,000 had come from Germany, about 15,000 from Austria, and 5,000 from the Netherlands. It was Chief Rabbi Feder who called attention to the fact that nothing in contemporary Theresienstadt, a town of 2,500 inhabitants, reminded the visitor that, during the Nazi era, it had been the site of the largest Jewish concentration camp in Central Europe.

1966 was a year of increased organizational contacts with Jewish representatives from the East as well as the West. There were visitors from Israel, from Western Europe, and from the United States and Canada, among them delegations from Hebrew Union College, B'nai B'rith, and the American Jewish Congress and the Canadian Jewish Congress. Rabbi Eliáš Katz visited the United States, and an official Czechoslovak Jewish delegation traveled to Yugoslavia. In September a group from the Evangelical Academy of West Berlin visited Prague, attended religious services in the Old-New and the Jerusalem synagogues, and met with the board of the Jewish council.

On Rosh Ha-shanah Bishop František Tomášek, the Apostolic administrator of Prague, sent greetings to the Jews, invoking "the blessing of the Lord, our common father, for the welfare of the Jewish community." Židovská Růčenka ("Jewish Year Book") and The Jewish calendar for the year 5827 appeared in September.

Cultural Activities

The success of Czechoslovakia's film industry was partly related to its artistically successful presentation of Jewish themes. The Shop on Main Street was received everywhere as a major film event. Sweet Light in a Dark Room, the story of a Czech boy and the Jewish girl he sheltered from deportation by the Nazis, won acclaim and international recognition. Directed by
Jiří Weiss, the movie was originally called *Romeo and Juliet and the Dark*, the title of the book by Jan Otčenášek. The top award of the Monte Carlo television film festival went to another Czech film, *A Prayer for Catherine Horowitz*, whose setting was a Nazi extermination camp.

The Jewish architecture of Prague and the treasures of the Jewish State Museum were the subject of a color film with commentaries in seven languages, including Hebrew. Rudolf Iltis, the editor of the *Gazette*, and Vilém Benda, the director of the Museum, acted as advisers to the producer.

The State Museum published two issues of the semi-annual *Judaica Bohemiae*, written partly in German and partly in French. It featured articles on the history of Jewish names in Bohemia, on tombstone inscriptions in Jewish cemeteries, and other specialized historical essays. One dealt with the relationship of Franz Kafka, the most important Jewish-German writer of this century, to the actor Yizhak Löwy. There was growing interest in the works of Kafka and other internationally known German-Jewish writers from Prague, such as Franz Werfel and Max Brod. Until a few years ago they were hardly ever mentioned. A commemorative plaque was affixed to the house where Kafka was born.

The State Museum also published an English anthology, *The Prague Ghetto in the Renaissance Period*, and a German-language volume, *The Prague Jewish Community of the Sixteenth Century: Its Spiritual Life*. New exhibitions at the State Museum included works of the painter Robert Guttmann, who had died in the Lodz ghetto, and a collection of objects reflecting Jewish traditions and mores. The museum was the subject of a monograph, *Příběh Židovského Musea* ("The Story of the Jewish Museum"), written by Hana Volavková, its former director, which appeared in December.
Hungary

During the period under review the ruling Communist party of Hungary made efforts to regenerate the cadres of its machinery. It reduced the membership of the Politburo from 12 to 11, and replaced two old members with much younger men. One of the new members, the former Social Democrat Rezso Nyers, was particularly interested in economic affairs. The membership of the Central Committee was reduced from 119 to 101, with János Kádár remaining at the helm and Secretary Bela Biszku, second in command. Gyula Kallai continued as premier. Official sources in Budapest maintained that the Politburo changes had no political significance and merely indicated the continuing emphasis on Kádár’s economic reforms.

Full realization of the economic plan was expected to take some three years, with partial measures introduced in 1966, further changes in planning to be made in 1967, and a new system of prices and incentives to be put in operation in 1968. The economists in charge of the reforms foresaw a central organization that would be responsible for long-term schedules, leaving short-range plans to be worked out by the individual enterprises, in keeping with market requirements. While the reforms in preparation obviously tended to enlarge the initiative of various industrial units, there were indications of a considerable decrease in the number of gainfully employed artisans in Hungary, from 122,770 in 1957 to 70,431 at the end of 1965. This reduction had an important bearing on the economic situation of the Jewish community for many of its older members were artisans.

Coupled with the developing economic reforms was a liberalization of the political regime, permitting the return of some 60,000 of the 200,000 Hungarians who had fled the country during the 1956 uprising. (Hungary also continued to maintain an open-door tourist policy which, according to official reports, brought a total of 1,218,869 visitors from abroad in 1965, a number reportedly exceeded in 1966.) Unrest among the people continued, however, and repeated reports spoke of arrests of persons involved in “a conspiracy against the present regime.” A man named Janos Hamusics was sentenced to death on charges of having committed acts of sabotage against a railway line with eight of his associates. The well-known composer Ferenc Otto was sentenced to two years in prison for “anti-state activities and antisemitism.” Among a number of persons arrested for illegal distribution of Boy Scout literature was Joseph Zimmerman, a Hungarian-born Israeli citizen.

The tenth anniversary of the suppression of the 1956 revolt was prominently featured in the press. Party and government officials emphasized...
Soviet assistance in crushing the "counterrevolution." At the same time, officials pointed to the increasing trade with the USSR, and reported plans for a new pipeline to the Soviet Union to facilitate the flow of much-needed Soviet oil to Hungary. Hungarian leaders sided with Moscow in the Soviet-Chinese dispute. Kádár repeatedly asserted his solidarity with Soviet foreign policy and his support of the Warsaw Pact, and noted that the current international situation required the continued presence of Soviet troops in Hungary.

JEWSH COMMUNITY

It was estimated that there were approximately 80,000 Jews in Hungary in 1966, including some 10,000 who did not participate in Jewish religious or communal activities. Eighty to 90 per cent of the Jewish population lived in the capital city of Budapest. Authorities did not interfere with Jews who wished to emigrate, but only a small number (200 to 300) left for abroad in 1966. Although anti-Jewish acts were forbidden by law, there were occasional reports of antisemitic incidents both in Budapest and in the provinces.

Community Organization and Religious Life

Jewish communal life was centered around the Central Board of Jewish Communities (Magyar Izraelitak Orszagos Kepviselete), which also maintained contact with world Jewish organizations and with Jewish communities in other countries. When in January 1966, Geza Seifert, a practicing attorney, took over the presidency of the board, replacing Endre Sos, its president for almost nine years, he said:

We participated in the rebuilding of our Hungarian fatherland which was destroyed by the fascists and liberated by Soviet heroes. We have participated in the rebuilding of our synagogues and institutions. Our religious demands are determined by the spirit of our holy Torah, the teachings of our Prophets, and also by our Jewish hearts and Jewish feelings.

(Sandor Telepo represented Joseph Prantner, head of the state church office, at the ceremony.)

Both the Orthodox and Neolog (Conservative) communities belonged to the central board, but the individual congregations maintained their own different ways of worship. Rabbi Jeno Schuck was Chief Rabbi of the Orthodox community, and Rabbi Imre Benoschofsky of the Neolog. A total of 30 rabbis ministered to the needs of all Jews in Hungary. Reports had it that most of the 34 largely Orthodox synagogues in Budapest conducted regular services, particularly on the Sabbath and on holidays. On some occasions, these reports continued, they could not accommodate the crowds and had to hold services in shifts. Many of the synagogues, among them the well-known
Dohany Street synagogue which is considered the chief one of the city, were in urgent need of repair.

The religious community maintained a miqweh, a hevra kaddisha, and all necessary institutions for kashrut. Budapest had nine kosher butcher shops and exported substantial quantities of kosher meat which was also approved by religious authorities in Israel. Matzot, baked in a state factory under the supervision of Jewish religious authorities, were sufficient in quantity even for export to Germany and elsewhere.

Welfare, Education, and Culture

The Central Board conducted a widespread system of welfare and educational activities. Cash relief was provided to some 18,000 to 20,000 individuals, mostly older or disabled persons who could find no employment. Communal kitchens in Budapest, served 2,100 kosher noon meals daily. The community also maintained four homes for the aged and a 224-bed hospital. Jewish orphanages, one for boys and one for girls, housed 28 and 30 children, respectively.

The Jewish Theological Seminary, the only institution of its kind in Eastern Europe, had an enrolment of 12 students, three of whom were expected to graduate at the end of the school year 1966–67. Rabbi Alexander Scheiber, the well-known scholar, continued as its head. The Jewish gymnasium (secondary school) was attended by 95 students, 57 from Budapest and 38 from Debrecen, Szeged, Miskolc, Tarcal, and elsewhere in the provinces. The yeshivah qetannah (primary day school) had 40 students, and some 30 Talmud Torahs provided traditional education to about 800 children, approximately 580 in Budapest and 220 in the provinces in Debrecen, Szeged, Pécs, Miskolc, and Tarcal. The Budapest schools had 14 teachers. The seminary, gymnasium and yeshivah qetannah received support from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture.

The Central Board continued its substantial program of research and publication. Among its undertakings was the Monumenta Hungariae Judaica, a multivolume project of which volumes 10 and 11 were in preparation. Volume 9, covering the period from 1282 to 1739, appeared in 1966 under the editorship of Scheiber. This scholarly work was made possible by a grant from the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany and, since 1965, from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture. The Central Board also continued publication of its magazine Uj Élet.

While Jews in Hungary enjoyed considerable freedom of cultural and religious expression, the younger generation was facing a difficult problem of choice between the tradition of their fathers and the pressures of the atheistic state on which their livelihood depended. Success in life and a position of status often depended on membership in the party, and such membership would largely preclude a life of active religious observance. The
reported notable decrease in the number of religious marriages and ritual circumcisions attested to this situation.

**Personalia**

Marcel Steiner, for many years identified with Jewish communal work, and particularly with the *hevra kaddisha*, died in September 1966.

**Leon Shapiro**
In 1966 the Communist rulers of Rumania continued to pursue a vigorous policy of national sovereignty and economic independence from the Communist bloc. Their firm determination to follow this path, despite the growing anger of their powerful Soviet neighbor, was most forcefully expressed in a nationalistic speech by the First Secretary of the Communist Party Nicolae Ceausescu on the occasion of the party's 45th anniversary celebration in Bucharest on May 7. The greater part of this four-hour speech was devoted to a historical review of the relationship between the Russian and Rumanian parties, which revealed the damaging effect of constant Russian interference in Rumanian affairs on the Rumanian Communist party as well as on the Communist movement generally. Above all, he condemned the existence of military blocs and the presence of Soviet troops on foreign soil as harmful to the Communist cause. At the same time, Ceausescu strongly defended Rumania's policy of economic independence, formulated in 1964 in what was called a "declaration of independence" (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 445).

The speech, considered abroad the toughest statement ever made in Rumania and one that could have farreaching historical significance for Eastern Europe, brought the immediate visit by Soviet party leader Leonid Brezhnev. Concerning the outcome of this visit, the Rumanian press agency Agerpress merely stated (May 30) that there had been an exchange of views regarding the "steady development of mutual cooperation between the two countries."

Although no comprehensive survey of the functioning of Rumania's national economy appeared in 1966, isolated items and eyewitness reports pointed to remarkable achievements in certain fields. A further indication was the upward revision of the goals of the current five-year plan, which was to end in 1970. On June 28 the Central Committee and the Grand National Assembly announced that the industrial output would be raised by 1970 to 73 per cent above 1965, instead of the originally planned 65 per cent, and agricultural output by 32 per cent instead of 26 per cent. In industry, priorities were assigned to electronics and metal and machine tool production.

Foreign trade had expanded as well. In an interview with an Italian correspondent, published in the Rumanian Communist party organ Scinteia of June 18, 1966, Ceausescu revealed that, while 69 per cent of the country's foreign trade still went to Communist bloc nations—35 per cent to the Soviet Union—Rumania's second largest customer was West Germany. After a promising beginning, trade relations with the United States suffered a setback when the Firestone Rubber and Tire Company did not live up to an
agreement to construct a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], pp. 392–93).

Two important foreign investments, announced in 1966, were the planned construction of two fertilizer plants, at a cost of $2.6 million, by the West German firm Didler Werke Aktiengesellschaft, and of a slaughterhouse and canned meat factory (mainly for export to the United States), at a cost of $6 million, by a New York investment firm headed by Milton A. Gordon.

No great changes occurred in Rumania's internal affairs, although some incidents during the year at times disrupted daily life. Among these were reported disturbances at a Bucharest metal works between followers of Ceausescu and of the late Rumanian President Gheorge Gheorghiu-Dej, and the continued harassment by the authorities of political prisoners released from jail in the last few years (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 393). Many of them were sent to villages to do farm work.

Membership in the Rumanian Communist party, as reported in the New York monthly *East Europe* of June, increased by about 10 per cent to 1,518,000 in 1966 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 392).

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

In an interview with the London *Jewish Chronicle* (March 3) Chief Rabbi Moses Rosen described the situation of the Jewish community as "greatly improved."

The Jewish population has been much reduced by emigration (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 393). Rabbi Rosen put the number of Jews in Rumania at 100,000, an estimate apparently based only on those registered with the Jewish communities or with congregations. A more realistic figure, suggested by other sources, was 120,000. Bucharest had 50,000 Jewish inhabitants. Throughout the country there were 72 organized Jewish communities and about 300 synagogues. A program, recently inaugurated with government aid, aimed at repairing existing synagogues. Some, whose condition was beyond repair, were being demolished, but none without Rabbi Rosen's knowledge.

The Federation of Jewish Communities, with Rabbi Rosen as its president, was the officially recognized representative body of Rumanian Jews. A conference of the Jewish communities of Moldova, where the majority of the Jewish population was concentrated, was held in Yassy at the end of June. It was attended by delegates of the local communities and by representatives of the federation, including Rabbi Rosen; Emil Schachter, the president of the Bucharest community; Daniel Saniel, and other dignitaries.

A report in the Federation's tri-lingual (Rumanian, Yiddish, Hebrew) organ, *Revista Cultului Mosaic* indicated that, in the cities, kosher meat was sold under rabbinical supervision in government shops, from which smaller communities had to get their supplies. *Shohatim*, who were certified by the Federation, toured the country to prepare the meat.
The most vexing problem now facing many Jewish communities was the rehabilitation and fencing of cemeteries. In the once densely populated and flourishing Jewish communities of Moldova and Southern Bucovina, there were large cemeteries with very old graves of many famous and highly venerated rabbis and spiritual leaders. During the war, these cemeteries were not only neglected, but also desecrated by villagers who often used them as pastures. The shrunken communities in the small towns of Moldova were now called upon to shoulder the burden of rehabilitating and maintaining these large cemeteries, without help from the government or any other source. The size of the undertaking may be illustrated by the fact that the news of the completion of the fence around the cemetery in Yassy was cabled by JTA (December 29) to the Jewish press around the world—the kind of coverage reserved for great national achievements. According to this dispatch, the fence was two kilometers long and, in part, constructed of prefabricated material at a cost of 300,000 lei.

Impressive observances memorialized the 25th anniversary of the Nazi massacres of the Rumanian Jews. (The three-day pogrom in Bucharest, January 21–23, 1941, took the lives of 120 Jews; the persecutions in Yassy, in June of 1941, when Jews were deported in sealed cattle cars, claimed over 10,000 victims. At that time, massacres also took place in Dorohoi and many other towns and cities of Moldova.) The Rumanian government was represented at the memorial celebrations by a number of high officials, including State Secretary Viorel Tiron and Dumitru Andronic of the department for religious affairs. A representative of the Orthodox Metropolitan of Moldova and delegations of local clergymen also participated. There were memorial services in Bucharest, Yassy, Târgu Frumos, Roman, Radăuț, and many other cities.

Some 3,000 Torah scrolls from synagogues in depopulated Jewish communities were being sent as a gift of Rumania to Israel, with the request that they be placed, if possible, in synagogues used by Rumanian immigrants. The first group of 1,058 scrolls was transferred in August to Vienna, where Israeli Minister for Religion Zerah Warhaftig was to receive them. This friendly gesture of the Rumanian government toward Israel was very well received in the Jewish world. In New York, the Jewish Daily Forward (December 24) pointed out that the Rumanian government could easily have sold the scrolls for $1 million and that, in choosing to give them to Israel, it was making a gift of some significance.

As in the past, Revista Cultului Mosaic, the only Jewish publication in Rumania, avoided all mention of Jewish cultural activities. It ignored even the two Yiddish state theaters, whose performances were occasionally reviewed in the Rumanian language press. Correspondence in the Warsaw Yiddish Folks-shtimme, October 6, 1966, revealed that a Bucharest Yiddish troupe toured many cities and small towns in Rumania with great success. Other reports indicated that the state theaters had become focal points for other cultural activities, such as lectures and recitals. One of the lectures was
on the late American-Yiddish novelist Joseph Opatoshu. The Folks-shtimme (July 19, 1966), also stated that a new volume of Sholem Aleichem’s novels was issued by the government publishing house in 1966. The omission of any references to Jewish cultural life in Rumania seemed to indicate that, except for narrow religious observance, all aspects of Jewish life were being discouraged by the regime.

JOSEPH KISSMAN
Yugoslavia

In recent years Yugoslav ruling circles continued the liberalization policy enunciated earlier by President Josip Broz Tito. The constitutional court, established by the 1963 constitution and invested with powers to test the constitutionality of laws, actually acted as defender of strict legality, often without regard to demands by governmental organs. In June 1966 the Socialist Alliance of Working Peoples, a national coalition organization directed by the Communist League, called for full consideration of diverse opinions and for tolerance of the views held by non-Communist members of the alliance. In July the league ousted Aleksandar Rankovic, second in command in Yugoslavia, from his government post of vice president and his party post of secretary of the Central Committee for Organizational Affairs. He was charged with promoting his own “one-man rule” of the secret police and with obstructing the implementation of “democratically-arrived-at decisions.” In October Marshal Tito was elected to the newly-created post of president of the Communist League, whose secretary general he had been since 1937. Together with Edward Kardelj and Veljo Vlahovic, two of the highest-ranking party men, Tito was elected to the 35-member Central Committee. While the party undoubtedly retained full control of the country, there was a continuing process of change, encouraged by Tito and his top leadership. The party seemed to move toward gradual decentralization of its structure, with corresponding decentralization of the state machinery.

However, the case of Mihajlo Mihajlov, the writer and university lecturer whose critical writings occasionally appeared abroad, demonstrated continued party control. His difficulties with the state began in 1965, when the literary magazine Delo published his critical essay, “Moscow Summer 1964,” considered inimical to a friendly foreign state. At the end of 1966, under a Tito amnesty, Mihajlov as well as the well-known writer and Tito’s former deputy Milovan Djilas were freed. Mihajlov’s subsequent independent stance and his announced intention to issue an opposition magazine were viewed by the authorities as being against the interests of the state, and he was sentenced to ten months’ imprisonment for “spreading false information among the population.”

In the course of moves toward reorganizing the state machinery, the ruling circles emphasized the development of a uniquely Yugoslav system of industrial management, known as workers councils, which they believed should be the basic social units of government structure. At the same time, the government signed an agreement with the Vatican that re-established the diplomatic ties, broken in 1952. There were vast differences between the Communist policies of the Soviet Union and those of Hungary, Rumania,
and Czechoslovakia; the “road to socialism” pursued by Tito’s Yugoslavia was fundamentally different from all systems in the Soviet bloc.

**JEWISH COMMUNITY**

**Jewish Population**

According to available information, the Jewish community of Yugoslavia had 6,454 registered members in 1964. The total number of Jews, including those not registered, was about 7,000. It should be noted that the size of the older age group in the Jewish population was disproportionately large. Serbia, including the autonomous districts of Voivodina, Kosovo, and Metohija, had 2,822 registered Jews in 15 communities; Croatia, 2,095 in 10 communities; Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1,350 in 9 communities; Macedonia, 81 in one community, and Slovenia, 106 in one community. There were no Jews in Montenegro.

**Communal and Religious Life**

Jewish communal life was coordinated by the Federation of Jewish Communities with which 36 local communities were affiliated. Its officers were Lavoslav Kadelburg, president, and Luci Petrovic, secretary. The federation enjoyed full freedom of activity and was accorded recognition by state authorities. With the approval of the authorities, the federation affiliated with the World Jewish Congress and maintained constant close contact with Jewish communities and organizations abroad, including the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, the Joint Distribution Committee, and the Standing Conference of Jewish Organizations in Europe.

Depleted by the Nazi persecutions during World War II and by subsequent emigrations to Israel, the Yugoslav Jewish community was beset by many difficulties. It had a severe shortage of rabbis, Jewish teachers, and qualified communal workers. Rabbi Menahem Romano of Sarajevo, who was quite old, was the only spiritual leader; repeated efforts to bring a rabbi from abroad remained unsuccessful. If Sabbath and holiday services were held in the large cities, they were usually conducted by laymen. *Jevrejski Pregled* (“Jewish Review”) reported that at the Rosh Ha-shanah and Yom Kippur services in Zagreb, Hinko Geld, a layman, chanted the mussaf, and Cantor Leon Altarac officiated. In Osijek, High Holy Day services were conducted by Mavro Vizner, an active member of the congregation; in Split, they were conducted by Mento Altaras, the secretary of the community. Many foreign visitors, including tourists from the United States, participated in the services at Split. Special festivities were organized in the larger communities to celebrate Purim, Hanukkah, and other holidays. In Skoplje, the Albert Vajs Jewish community center, erected in memory of the late president of the Federation, was inaugurated in October 1966.

The problem of maintaining the more than 150 Jewish cemeteries con-
continued to burden the communities, which had difficulty obtaining the necessary funds, especially for cemeteries in towns no longer inhabited by Jews. Plans were under way to transform all sectarian cemeteries in Sarajevo, including the 400-years-old Jewish cemetery, into public parks. Since the Yugoslav community had no shohet, it found it almost impossible to obtain kosher meat or to assure kashrut. The Federation issued a Jewish calendar for the year 5727, compiled by Rabbi Romano.

Cultural Life

The cultural and educational programs of the Federation of Jewish Communities were partially supported by the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture. Local leaders put great emphasis on youth activities, which they conducted with the help of specially trained youth instructors from Israel. Youth clubs were active in such cities as Belgrade, Zagreb, Sarajevo, Subotica, Osijek, Novi-sad, Skoplje, and Split. Some 100 young persons participated in a conference of youth clubs held in Sarajevo at the end of 1965. A delegate of the youth clubs attended a seminar for youth instructors, organized by the Standing Conference of European Jewish Community Services in Paris. In the fall of 1966 two Yugoslav youths participated in a seminar of the World Union of Jewish Students. In July Jewish youths from Belgrade, Sarajevo, Novi-sad, and other cities spent several weeks at Kibbutz Gat in Israel.

The federation maintained Jewish libraries in Belgrade, Zagreb, Sarajevo, Novi-sad, Subotica, Osijek, and Skoplje. Its expanded publication program included the periodical *Jevrejski Pregled; Kadima*, a magazine for youths which devoted many pages to Peretz, Bialik, and Mendele, and the annual *Jevrejski Almanah* ("Jewish Almanac") with a collection of essays, stories, and poetry of largely Jewish content. The last *Almanah* for 1963–64 appeared in 1965. The law faculty of Belgrade University published a special volume dedicated to the memory of Albert Vajs, who was one of its professors and, at the time of his death in April 1964, was president of the federation. The Jewish Historical Museum moved into new quarters, and plans were being made for new exhibits. The Jewish choral groups, Brothers Baruch of Belgrade and Mosa Pijade of Zagreb, continued to give concerts featuring local music as well as traditional Jewish and Israeli songs.

400th Anniversary of Jewish Life in Bosnia and Herzegovina

The 400th anniversary of the Jewish community in Bosnia and Herzegovina was celebrated in Sarajevo in October, amid pomp and festivity, the first such celebration in Eastern Europe in many years. Jewish delegations came from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, West Germany, Chile, Luxembourg, and Switzerland. Among the guests were Rabbi Eliahu Pardes and David Sitton of the Jerusalem Sephardi community: Rabbi Solomon Gaon, Chief Rabbi of Sephardi communities
of Great Britain; Mark Uveeler of the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture; Gerhard Riegner and Armand Kaplan of the World Jewish Congress; Herbert Katzki of JDC, and many others. At a solemn meeting, which was part of the celebration, greetings were extended by Salko Lagumdzija, president of the Sarajevo municipal assembly; Dzemal Bijedic, vice president of the assembly of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Moni Finci, director of the Museum of the Revolution. A special commemorative volume was published under the editorial supervision of Samuel Kamhi, Moni Finci, Jakob Gaon, Avram Pinto, and Joza Engel. It contained much valuable material on the history of the Bosnia and Herzegovina Jews, including articles on the Sarajevo Haggadah by Muhamed Karamehmedovic, the Ashkenazim in Bosnia and Herzegovina by Julije Hahamovic, and on Jewish writing in Bosnia and Herzegovina by Haim Kamhi. A closing banquet brought together some 150 local leaders and representatives from abroad.

Social and Welfare Activities

Jewish welfare activities, including aid to the indigent, aged persons, and orphans, were partially supported by JDC. The home for the aged in Zagreb had a capacity of 114 beds. Religious services were conducted during the High Holidays, and holiday dinners were provided for all the inmates. Summer camps for children and youth, with special lecture programs on Jewish subjects, were organized.

Relations with Israel

Yugoslavia continued its friendly relations with the State of Israel. The Jewish community celebrated the founding of the state, and Jevrejski Pregled noted the occasion by publishing a special article expressing warm congratulations to Israel on the occasion. On June 9, 1966 the trade agreement between Yugoslavia and Israel was extended to May 1967. Avigdor Dagan, the Israeli minister in Yugoslavia, estimated that the volume of trade between the two countries would reach some $25 million. During the opening ceremonies of the Zagreb trade fair, President Tito and President of the Federal Assembly Edward Kardelj visited the Israeli pavilion, where Dagan welcomed them.

Leon Shapiro
Bulgaria

No changes occurred in 1966 in the political situation of Bulgaria, which remained loyal to the Soviet Union in both foreign and domestic policy. However, Bulgaria did not adopt the new organizational principle of filling the two top positions in party and government with two different persons, as practiced by the USSR and the countries of the East European Soviet bloc. Since Bulgaria has no opposition party, 416 members of the Fatherland Front were elected to the People's Assembly in February 1966. The new parliament reelected Todor Zhivkov premier; he also retained the post of first secretary of the Communist party.

While traditionally devoted to the Soviet Union, Bulgaria showed signs of slowly moving toward the firmer establishment of an independent policy toward the West and, in many ways, also toward its immediate neighbors, Turkey, Greece, Rumania, and Yugoslavia. Reforms in the country's economic program were not as extensive as in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, but it also emphasized the need for incentives and more efficient methods of marketing. Bulgaria and the Soviet Union signed a new, farreaching trade agreement for 1966–1970, which involved 53 per cent of Bulgaria's foreign trade. In October Zhivkov, accompanied by Defense Minister Dobry Dzhurov, visited the USSR, where they were received with warmth and expressions of friendship. In the same month Bulgaria also signed a military and cultural pact with the Soviet Union.

During the debate in the United Nations on an Israeli complaint against incursions from Syria, the Bulgarian delegate defended Syria and suggested that Israel was representing "imperialist forces."

JEWISH COMMUNITY

There were about 7,000 Jews in Bulgaria, 4,000 in the capital city of Sofia, 1,000 in Plovdiv, and the remaining 2,000 mainly in Varna, Rus, Yambol, Pazardzhik, Pleven, Burgas, and Khaskovo.

Religious and Communal Life

Jewish religious life continued to disintegrate (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 297–98). There were no qualified rabbis, and religious services, if any, were conducted by old men who were reared in the tradition of Judaism. Sofia had a hazan, Chaim Meshulam. There were no Jewish religious schools, and very few bar mitzvahs were celebrated. The rate of intermarriage was increasing, and in some communities the young people were losing all ties to Judaism. The Sofia Central synagogue, said to have been declared "a national cultural monument," was opened to tourists.

Jewish religious affairs were administered by the Jewish Religious Council
under the direction of Isaak Moskona, who was also a member of the cultural committee of the community's lay organization. This organization, the Cultural and Educational Society of Jews in Bulgaria, was now in charge of all Jewish activities in Bulgaria. It was a Communist-dominated, non-religious group based on the ethnic principle, created in 1957 to replace both the old Consistoire, which had coordinated religious and all other communal affairs, and the separate Jewish religious communities. The society had a central committee of 31 members and an executive committee of 11 members, chaired by Josip Astrukov. David Asa was vice-chairman, and Leon Rubenov, secretary. Among the active leaders were also Solomon Bali, Beti Danon, Bezalel Markov, Israel Meier, Isidor Solomonov, Buko Isaakov, Yerocham Pardo, and Moise Pasi.

According to its own statements, the Cultural Society's principal aim was the mobilization of Bulgarian Jews around the slogans of the Communist party and, more particularly, their participation in "the building of a socialist society in Bulgaria." It organized its efforts in such a way as to "emphasize specific problems and the progressive traditions of Bulgarian Jewry and to promote feelings of love for their socialist fatherland and feelings of pride at being [allowed] to live in and defend their fatherland." The society was also conducting an ideological campaign against the Zionist movement, upon which it looked as the "representative of international reaction and imperialism."

Cultural Life

The Cultural and Educational Society had at its disposal a Jewish House of Culture, where it conducted a continuous program of lectures, concerts, exhibits, and others. Similar programs were also presented in the local Jewish communities. Press reports indicated that many lectures were devoted to general political propaganda. The society had its own theater group and a choral ensemble, whose performances were highly appreciated also by non-Jewish audiences. Recently, an exhibit was presented on the martyrdom of the Jews under Nazi occupation. Among some 100 items, many dealt with Jewish resistance. The society also continued publication of its bi-weekly Jevreiski Vesty ("Jewish News") under the editorship of Isidor Solomonov. In addition to general party material, it contained articles of Jewish interest taken from the Warsaw Folks-shtime, the Paris Naye Presse, and the Moscow Sovetish Heymland, and some news items from Israel.

The old Jewish library was taken over by the Jewish Institute, an old-established institution devoted to the study of Jewish history and economics, which had recently been incorporated into the Institute of Balkan Studies (AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], p. 298). It contained over 2,000 rare old manuscripts, many of them unique and dating back to the 16th century. The institute was preparing a catalogue of this extant collection, of which Part I, compiled by Eli Eshkenazi and Strakhil Gitschev, was nearing completion. As part of an overall research program, the institute was sponsoring a study
by Sniejka Panova of the economic activities of the Jews in the Balkans in the 16th and 17th centuries, and another of Jewish folk music in the Balkans by Stamatka Kaludova. Plans were also under way for the preparation of a history of Bulgarian Jews and for a study of the use of Ladino in Bulgaria. In 1966 the first yearbook of the Jewish Cultural Society, Godishnik (vol. 1) was published in Sofia. Its editorial board, headed by David Benvenisti, included Eli Eshkenazi, Isidor Solomonov, Israel Meier, Klara Pincas, Renata Natan, and Salvator Israel. Included were articles on the history of the Bulgarian Jews and on the situation of the Jews under Nazi occupation, as well as an essay by Sniejka Panova, dealing with the subject matter of her larger study mentioned above. There were no statistical data or detailed information on the current Jewish situation.

**Attitude toward Jews and Relations with Israel**

While the government strongly discouraged contact between Bulgarian Jews and Jewish communities abroad, they enjoyed full equality at home. The constitution of December 4, 1947 proclaimed full equality of all citizens and made punishable every type of act involving racial, national, or religious slander. If any anti-Jewish feelings existed, they were weak and not vocal. The Jewish Cultural and Educational Society enjoyed recognition as a representative of the Jews. At the end of 1965 it received a special award for its "work for peace." Many Jews staffed government-run institutions and enterprises; they also occupied prominent positions in literature, the arts, and the professions. Among them were Ruben Avramov Levi, a member of the central committee of the party and a director of the Institute of Party History; David Solomon Elazar, alternate member of the central committee, and David Isaac Davidov, vice-chairman of the committee for labor and remunerations of the Council of Ministers. The first two volumes of Jack Melamed's trilogy, *Yellow Horizons* and *The Great Stone House*, dealing with the life of Jewish youth in Bulgaria, was received with great interest by Jewish and non-Jewish readers alike.

Among the many personalities in the arts, who were honored by the state in 1966, were Dora Gabai, noted poet; Mati Pincas, singer with the Sofia Opera Company, and Nioma Belayorski, well-known theatrical producer. Jews recently honored for special achievements in the industrial field included Jack Kalderon, Solomon Solomonov, and Isi Danon. State authorities and the party continued to commemorate Jewish heroes who died fighting the Nazis by holding special annual services on the anniversary of their death. Among the many so honored were Leon Tadzher, Violet Yaakov, Emil Shekerdjiski, Miko Papo, Ana Ventura, Jack Benbasat, and Solomon Aladzh.

While the authorities did not object to emigration, there were, in fact, no departures for Israel. There was, however, a lively Bulgarian-Israeli tourist trade which used the facilities of El Al Israeli Airlines. The Israelis continued to emphasize the warm friendship of the Bulgarians for the Jews.

Leon Shapiro
The period under review (the middle of 1961 to the end of 1966) witnessed the restoration of order in Turkey after two coups in 1960 and the execution on charges of corruption and treason of Adnan Menderes, former prime minister and leader of the defunct Democratic party. These events were followed by the eventual return to democratic practices and a multi-party system.

In the middle of 1961 a new constitution (AJYB, 1962 [Vol. 63], p. 393) drafted by members of a temporary constituent assembly was approved by the controlling military junta, the Committee of National Unity, under the leadership of General Cemal Güres. The junta considered the existence of this constitution one of the prime conditions for the promised return to civilian government. When, on July 9, 1961, the constitution was submitted to the people in the form of a referendum, over one-third of the ballots were cast against it, indicating that a large number of citizens were still partisan to the recently overthrown Democratic party. After the referendum, political activity intensified in preparation for the first post-coup elections to be held on October 16, 1961.

The elections demonstrated that the memory of Menderes was sufficiently poignant to muster 34.8 per cent of the votes for the Justice party. The middle-of-the-road Republican People's party (RPP), headed by İzmet İnönü, received 36.7 per cent of the votes; the liberal New Turkey party, 13.7 per cent, and the slightly right Republican National People's party, 14 per cent. Thus, no party won the required 226-seat majority in the Assembly or the 76-seat majority in the Senate, and, for the first time in Turkey's political history, a coalition was to be formed.

In order to head off any possible tendency toward a return to Democratic party principles, the Committee of National Unity invited the leaders of the major parties to a conference a short time before the new parliament was to meet. The conferees pledged that 1) no actions taken by the Committee of National Unity during the period immediately after the revolution, as it was called, would be exploited for political gain; 2) all parties would work to-
ward the principles of Kemalism;* 3) freedom of religious belief and conscience for all would be respected; 4) Turkish laws would be preserved (to bar pardons for any of the 400 Democratic party members who had been convicted at the Yassiada trials); and 5) every attempt would be made to oppose elements of both the extreme left and the extreme right. These principles were set down at the insistence of the Committee of National Unity to counteract any measures the Justice party (the successor to the Democratic party) might take, were it to gain control in parliament or in future elections.

Fears that the military leaders would again intervene were unfounded. The consensus was that the military establishment would respect the results of the elections provided İnönü headed the coalition government. With the support of, and pressure by the Army, General Gürsel was elected President of the Republic.

İnönü, who became premier, immediately set about forming a workable coalition made up of the opposing Justice and Republican People's parties. The new government, however, made no tangible progress toward political stability or toward badly needed economic reforms. Doubts began to arise about the very viability of Turkey's democratic life. İnönü was soon forced to introduce in parliament a bill designed to prevent publication of blatantly anti-democratic articles in the press. After an attempted third coup by dissident military elements on February 22, 1962, the government coalition ended on May 31. It was followed by a three-party coalition composed of the Republican People's party, the New Turkey party, and the Republican National People's party. This coalition, in turn, fell in November 1963 after another unsuccessful coup in May 1963, and after local and provincial elections (November) in which the opposition Justice party polled 45.4 per cent of the votes, as against the Republican People's party's 36.2 per cent. In December İnönü formed a government of the Republican People's party and independents. This third coalition government lasted but a few months and, in February 1965, was succeeded by a four-party coalition (excluding the RPP) headed by Suat Hayri Ürgüplü, an independent senator. This coalition governed Turkey until the national elections in October 1965.

The October 1965 election results were somewhat of a surprise. Despite changes in the electoral law, adopted in 1964 and 1965 with a view to preventing the Justice party from gaining control, the Justice party won by a solid majority—53 per cent of the total vote. The RPP lost heavily, with 29 per cent; the smaller parties could not be considered a factor. Süleyman Demirel, an American-educated engineer, became the new premier.

Two important political events had occurred under İnönü's premiership: the outbreak of trouble between the Greek majority and the Turkish minority on Cyprus in December 1963, and the growing leftist tendencies among Turkish intellectuals which had their focal point in the recently formed

* The doctrines and programs of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, founder of the Turkish Republic and the father of modern Turkey.
socialist Labor party. Both events had aroused some bitterness among the Turkish public towards the West in general, and the United States in particular. However, when the Justice party came into power, the Turkish government returned to a pro-American attitude and a liberal approach to social and economic development, with greater freedom for private enterprise.

The Justice party administration has not been very successful in implementing its programs. By June 1966, only six measures were passed by parliament. In contrast, İnönü, standing at the head of the opposition RPP, vigorously continued to support planned development, centralized authority, land reforms, and communal development. While remaining in the Western camp, he advocated greater freedom in Turkey's foreign policy decisions.

With some justification, İnönü accused Justice party members of exploiting the religious feelings of the Turkish peasants. The question of exploiting religion for political gain continued to center around the recent rapid growth of such fanatic Islamic religious groups as the Nurcus, the Süleymancis, and the Ticancis. The propaganda activities of these sects, which found strong support among the religious peasants, provided a basis for radical rightist tendencies that were considered as dangerous to the country as a swing to the extreme left. Despite accusation and counter-accusation, the Justice party, in the partial Senate elections of 1966, piled up 57 per cent of the votes, while İnönü's RPP received only 30 per cent.

The armed services, especially the army, occupied a position of power and influence in political life. The chief of staff, the heads of the army, navy, and air force and several ministers sat on the National Security Council, established in 1961, which had to approve for "security reasons" all governmental decisions before they could be put into action. Also, President Gürsel, who had lapsed into a coma long before his death late in 1966, was succeeded in March by the former commander-in-chief, General Cevdet Sunay.

Recent events made the political situation even more complex. Forty-one senators appealed to the Constitutional Court to declare unconstitutional that part of the August 1966 amnesty bill which pardoned former Democratic party leaders and members convicted at Yassiada in 1960. Meanwhile, Minister for Religious Affairs, Ibrahim Elmali, who had encouraged certain radical religious groups, was removed from office—a step that was taken to mean that Demirel would not bow to the whims of an arch-religious faction in the Justice party.

Lastly, the opposition Republican People's party, in electing its new leaders, vested control squarely in the hands of its left wing. This swing to the left will weaken the power of the growing Labor party and will, at the same time, leave a clear field on the right for the Justice party.

**Attitude toward Minorities**

The present government continued in the footsteps of the military government of the Committee of National Unity and the coalitions under İnönü in guaranteeing to Turkish citizens full equality and protection by law, irre-
spective of race or religion. In the wake of the recent accusations by the Republican People's party regarding the Justice party's exploitation of religious groups for political gain, Demirel and Foreign Minister Sabri Çağlayangil reiterated the government's intentions of preventing unfriendly acts against the minorities. In fact, fear of such acts arose among these groups only at the height of the Cyprus crisis. But the only action taken was the revocation of resident permits of Greek citizens living in Istanbul, and their subsequent expulsion.

It is significant that although the government, at the beginning of 1965, published two pamphlets concerning minorities—an analysis of and apologia for the Armenian problem, and an analysis of and polemic against supposedly hostile Greek elements—it devoted no more than one sentence in either to the Jewish minority. In a recently expressed private opinion a government official stated that Jews never constituted a political or social "headache" for, or threat to, the security of the country, as did, in the opinion of many, the members of the Greek minority.

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Population figures were based on the 1960–61 national census, on data available at the time of writing from the 1965–66 national census, and on estimates by various Jewish officials. While the official estimates put the Jewish population of Turkey at almost 45,000, a more realistic figure would probably be 42,000, or a little less than two-tenths of one per cent of the total population of 31,000,000. The Jewish community was the third largest minority, after the Greeks and the Armenians. While the total absolute population increase in Turkey for the five years under review was 25 per cent, it was perhaps no more than 5 per cent for the Jews. As in the general population, there were slightly more Jewish women than men.

Ninety-seven per cent of the Jews were concentrated in areas having more than 10,000 inhabitants: Istanbul with 34,000, or 2 per cent of a total population of almost two million; Ankara with 1,000, or one-tenth of one per cent of a total of 902,000; Izmir with approximately 5,000, or one per cent of a total of 420,000. There were smaller but still active communities to be found in Çanakkale (approximately 550), Edirne (400), Bursa (350), Tekirdağ (200), Adana (200), Kırklareli (150), Gaziantep (125), Muğla (50), Kars (40), Iğdır (40), and in the area near Mersin and Iskenderun in Hatay province (150). Small groups were still to be found in Adiyaman, Amasya, Antalya, Balikesir, Diyarbakir, Erzurum, Kocaeli, Manisa, and Maras.

Census statistics demonstrated the decline in the use of Ladino (a Judeo-Spanish dialect current among Sephardic Jews who were expelled from Spain in 1492 and who settled in the Mediterranean area among Turkish Jewry). The 1960 and 1965 censuses contained questions concerning the "mother-tongue"—interestingly enough called Yahudice (Jewish) in 1960, and Mu-
service (House of Moses language) in 1965—of those interviewed. In 1960, Ladino was given as mother-tongue by 19,000 persons, almost all living in the large cities; an additional 4,300 Jews, whose mother-tongue was Turkish, gave Ladino as their second language. According to the 1965 census, this figure may have dropped by 30–50 per cent, to 8,000–10,000. A curious fact was the listing in the 1960 census of some 100 Jews speaking Yahudice in the far eastern city of Van—probably the remnants of a Kurdish-speaking Jewish community which, after heavy emigration to Israel a few years ago, had almost completely vanished. A number of Jews claimed as their mother-tongue or second language German and Slavic languages (mainly in the Istanbul Ashkenazi congregation), English, Italian, and French (as indicated by the large number of Jewish youth still sent to schools in which those languages were the languages of instruction).

As for literacy, almost an equal number of Jewish men and women in Turkey were able to read and write. Only ten per cent of the entire Jewish community of Turkey, one-third men and two-thirds women, were illiterate, as compared with more than one-third of the general population. In further contrast, there were twice as many illiterate Moslem Turkish women as men, and, among the women, only 20 per cent were able to read and write.

The Jews were well represented in every sphere of the country's economic life. Ninety-six per cent of their available work force were gainfully employed; approximately one-tenth of these were women. The percentages were similar for the general population. A majority of the Jewish work force was classed as holding administrative or managerial jobs (5,000), or as being salesmen or merchants (5,100). There were 1,000 skilled or semi-skilled workers in the textile, electrical, communications and other industries; 700 were craftsmen—tailors, furriers, shoemakers, etc.; 600 were employed as domestics and in allied jobs, and 575 were in the professions and arts, including medicine, architecture, engineering, education, law, music, literature, and the fine arts.

Emigration and Immigration

While large-scale emigration to Israel occurred earlier with the permission of the Turkish government, no such emigration was in evidence during the period under review. Most of the financially disadvantaged half of Turkish Jewry had left the country; those who chose to remain were full citizens of the Republic both under the law and in reality. The number of emigrants may have reached 400 during a particular year, but the annual average probably did not exceed 200. Most of these continued to go to Israel, but there was also a larger westward movement to Jewish centers in North and South America. It must be noted that Jews did not leave because of disenfranchisement or persecution, but seemingly because they were seeking a better life for themselves and their children.

No figures existed for Jewish immigration to Turkey, and it was assumed
to be negligible. The Chief Rabbinate has, on occasion, assisted Jews arriving in the country, but these have been mainly transients.

Community Organization and Communal Affairs

Essentially, the Turkish government continued its policy of full recognition of the Chief Rabbinate and its religious council, but did not permit them to control the administration or affairs of the secular community. Although the Chief Rabbinate maintained liaison with communities throughout Turkey and represented them in all official business with the government, it was actually able to control only the activities of the community in Istanbul, where it had its seat. Each community was autonomous and directly responsible to the government; intercommunity relations disintegrated somewhat, and there was no possibility of establishing an overall communal body.

Each property and endowment for religious purposes was controlled and administered as a separate Vakif (foundation). In Istanbul, some 40 full-time employees administered the Vakifs of the Chief Rabbinate and carried out the functions of Chief Rabbi Dr. David Asseo and various other officials.

Jewish Education

The Istanbul community maintained three primary schools, two in Galata and one in Ortaköy; a secondary school of the lycée-type in Beyoğlu, and a rabbinical seminary in Hasköy. Midway in the period under review, the primary school in the old Jewish section of Hasköy was closed because of insufficient enrolment. The enrolment in the primary and secondary schools remained approximately 2,500. Since many of the Istanbul Jews had moved to the more northern Şişli section of the city, it was planned to transfer the secondary school from Beyoğlu to this area in the near future. The rabbinical seminary had 35 students.

The only other schools operated by a Jewish community were in Izmir. These are primary schools, one financed by ORT, and the other by contributions from B’nai B’rith. Here, too, the enrolment did not change substantially.

Religious and Organizational Life

There were approximately 75 synagogues in Turkey, perhaps 35 of them in actual use. Of the 50 in Istanbul, 10 to 15 were in daily use and 10 others conducted services only on the Sabbath. Synagogues in Adana, Ankara, Bursa, Edirne, Izmir, and a few other larger communities had regular services. Two of the Istanbul synagogues were maintained by the Karaite sect and one by the Ashkenazi community; all others followed the Sephardi ritual.

Organizations of a political nature, such as Zionist organizations, were barred by the Turkish government. A Jewish communal center in Beyoğlu was maintained by the Istanbul community for cultural and social activities. Some twenty nonpolitical sport, cultural, and “friendship” clubs, with pre-
dominantly Jewish memberships, but not sponsored by the Jewish community, were in operation, mainly in Istanbul.

**Social Services**

Communal social service organizations in Istanbul were under the supervision of a lay council composed of members of the communities. These included the orphanage in Ortaköy; the Laura Kadoorie Or ha-Hayyim Hospital in Balat; Mishneh Torah and Tsedakah u-Marpe, which helped needy students and poor children; a home for the aged in Beyoğlu; La Goutte de Lait, an organization providing food to undernourished youngsters; a fund to aid tuberculars, and a fund to provide a doctor for the needy two or three times a week. The Izmir community maintained a hospital and a home for the aged in a similar manner.

**Publications**

There were few indications of interest in Jewish scholarship on the part of Turkish Jews. Although, for example, the Chief Rabbinate had an impressive collection of firmans (decrees of the Sultan during the period of the Ottoman Empire) specifically dealing with the Jewish community, as well as several religious tracts, no scholarly investigation of these has been attempted by Turkish Jews.

The Chief Rabbinate continued to issue publications of a religious nature, such as a time schedule for the beginning and ending of the Sabbath and capsule summaries of Jewish law and the Bible, primarily designed for use as texts in religious instruction in the Jewish schools. Two independent Istanbul Jewish weeklies, *Salom* (edited by Avram Leyon and Victor Apalacı) and *La Vera Luz* (edited by Eliezer Mende and Luna Horman), written almost entirely in Ladino (with Turkish orthography) continued to provide information of specifically Jewish communal interest, mainly for Istanbul Jews. The French-language daily *Journal d'Orient*, owned by Alber Karasu, a member of the Istanbul Jewish community, was not a specifically Jewish paper but featured subjects of interest to Jews.

**Cultural Activities**

Jews have made minor contributions to the cultural life of Turkey. Some of the more prominent Jews engaged in cultural activities were Sami Kohen, a political columnist for the newspaper *Milliyet*; Beki Molho, a minor painter; Josef Habib Gerez, an upcoming minor poet who also filled the post of civil secretary to the Chief Rabbi, and Professor Eskenazi, a prominent mathematician at the Istanbul Technical University. Books containing general information about Jews and Judaism, such as the recently published *Musa ve Yahudiler* ("Moses and the Jews") by Hayrullah Örs, continued to appear. Immediately after the 1966 Nobel Prize for Literature was awarded to Israeli
author S. Y. Agnon, two of his stories were translated and published under the title *Tilsim ve Sözlü* ("Ido and Enam" and "The Betrothed"). They were well received by the Turkish reading public.

**Antisemitism**

Antisemitism has almost never been a national issue in Turkey. Anti-Free Mason, anti-leftist, and anti-Jewish newspapers such as *Büyük Doğu* ("The Great Orient") edited by the notorious Necib Fazil Kısakürek (AJYB, 1960 [Vol. 61], p. 282; 1962 [Vol. 63], p. 396) were replaced by *Yeni İstiklal* ("The New Independence") and writers such as Cevat Rifat Atıhan and Mehmed Şevket Eygi. These aroused no public interest and remained on the fringe. At times, extreme rightist members of parliament attempted to blame Free Masons, Jews, and imperialists for Turkey's problems. Recently, certain radical groups sponsored the Turkish translation and publication in the fall of 1966 of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Rightist elements have also gone so far as to hold the Jewish wife of the prominent Turkish author, Yaşar Kemal, responsible for his left-wing socialist views. None of these activities, however, could be construed as providing a basis for an outbreak of antisemitic feeling in Turkey.

**Relations with Israel**

Turkey continued her efforts to improve relations with various Arab countries. However, the Turkish government repeatedly stated that any pressure brought to bear upon her by others (presumably the Arabs) to sever relations with Israel would be viewed as a hostile attempt to dictate her foreign policy. A recent example of this attitude may be seen in the joint communique issued by President Habib Bourguiba and President Sunay after Sunay's state visit to Tunis in December. While Sunay expressed sympathy for the plight of the Palestinian refugees and recognized the necessity for a just solution, he declined to state, with Bourguiba, that aggression had been committed by Israel against the Arabs and that, by this act, Israel was totally responsible for endangering the peace and security of the Middle East. Turkey and Israel have continued to be represented in each other's capital by chargés d'affaires.

At the invitation of Chief Rabbi Asseo and Israel Menase, the president of the Istanbul Jewish community, Chief Rabbi Isaac Nissim of Israel visited Istanbul for four days in July 1966. Turkish authorities fully cooperated in opening to him libraries, institutions, and historic sites usually closed to visitors, and many Istanbul Jews attended a special gathering in his honor.

Events surrounding the disastrous earthquake in the eastern Varto area in August 1966 also attest to cordial relations between the two countries. Sixteen Hebrew University medical students, co-sponsored by the university's student union and the Turkish government, were sent to the disaster area. The Tel Aviv-Jaffa municipality donated a large consignment of food, medicine, and clothing to the Turkish Red Crescent society for the earthquake victims,
and El Al Israel Airlines specially shipped a 5-ton British Red Cross con- 
signment of essentials to Turkey.

In the summer of 1966, several Tel Aviv University professors and students 
were guests at Atatürk University in Erzurum during a study tour. In addi-
tion, Israeli technicians continued to work in Turkey as consultants and 
teachers, several of the latter at the Middle East Technical University in 
Ankara.

The country as a whole, and the ruling Justice party in particular, faced 
major problems of vital importance to the future of a modern Turkey. Such 
problems as the liquidation of feudalism in the east and southwest, the fight 
against religious obscurantism and illiteracy, the population explosion, and 
the reorganization of the economy still had not been completely resolved. But 
the prognosis was good, and there was little likelihood that the situation 
would lead to any political or social crises which could endanger the position 
of the minorities, including the Jews.

Alan C. Harris
After his success at the general election of November 1965 as leader of the Mapai-Ahdut Ha-avodah Alignment, Prime Minister Levi Eshkol formed a new cabinet with the support of the National Religious party, Mapam (United Workers' party), the Independent Liberals and Po'ale Agudat Israel. The main opposition parties were Gahal (the Herut-Liberal bloc) and Rafi (the Israel Labor List) led by former Premier David Ben-Gurion.

The government's main problem in foreign affairs was the growing border tension which led to three complaints to the United Nations Security Council. At home, there were economic difficulties, partly due to a drop in immigration and partly to the government's policy of slowing down economic activity in order to check inflationary tendencies and to narrow the gap in the balance of payments.

In the cultural field, the outstanding event was the award of the Nobel Prize for Literature to Samuel Joseph Agnon, the veteran Hebrew author, jointly with Nelly Sachs of Sweden.

The Hebrew University, the Technion, and other institutes of higher learning suffered from growing financial difficulties and could not accommodate all applicants for admission.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND DEFENSE

Israel-Arab Relations

Israel's foreign relations continued to be dominated by the problem of Arab hostility. While there were some signs of a tendency to accept the fact of Israel's existence (inter-Arab dissension prevented the achievement of a common anti-Israel front), no Arab government showed any inclination to act on Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba's idea of trying to attain Arab aims by offering to negotiate with Israel (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 432). The Arab states rejected all proposals to solve any aspect of their disputes with Israel by peaceful means and openly proclaimed their determination to destroy her by force when the time was ripe.

The most uncompromising and virulent hostility was maintained by Syria,
where an extreme wing of the Ba’ath party, with strong pro-Communist leanings, had overthrown the previous moderate Ba’ath regime on February 2. While Egypt and Jordan favored a waiting policy in view of Israel’s strength, the new Syrian leaders pressed for immediate action in the form of an Algerian-type “people’s war of liberation.” Syrian frontier guards frequently fired on Israeli farmers, land improvement workers, and army patrols, and mines were laid in the vicinity of the frontiers. The Syrian government encouraged and publicized the activities of the unofficial al-Fatah Arab terrorist organization, with its military arm, al-Asefa, which trained and organized armed raiders to commit acts of sabotage in Israel.

Many of the al-Fatah raids were carried out through Jordanian, and some through Lebanese, territory. Israel pointed out that, under the armistice agreements the governments of the neighboring countries were responsible for ensuring that “no warlike act or act of hostility” was conducted against Israel from their territories.

In January the water reservoir at the village of Yuval near the Lebanese and Syrian frontiers was seriously damaged by explosives, and, in February, Syrian military posts repeatedly opened fire across the frontier. The most serious of a number of incidents in April were the laying of six explosive charges in the village of Beit Yosef, in the Beit She’an Valley, and the explosion of a land-mine on a railroad track between Arad and Masada, near the Hebron area. Both incidents were attributed to al-Fatah raiders entering from Jordan. On the night of April 29–30, Israeli forces crossed the border and, after evacuating the civilian residents, blew up four houses in Kala’at village in the Beit She’an area and ten in Deir Rafat, south of Mt. Hebron.

In May two Israeli soldiers were killed by Jordanian fire near the Mt. Hebron area and two civilians were killed by a Syrian land-mine near Alma-gor. Israel submitted a note of protest to the Security Council on May 17. In July two persons were killed and two were wounded in four incidents near the Syrian frontier. Israeli air force planes immediately retaliated by striking at Syrian vehicles and engineering equipment engaged in the diversion of the Jordan River tributaries. A Syrian Mig 21 plane was shot down by an Israeli Mirage. The UN Security Council, discussing Syrian and Israeli complaints, failed to reach a conclusion; a motion to censure Israel, proposed by Jordan and Mali, received only six votes (p. 113).

In August Syrian artillery and planes fired on an Israel police patrol launch, which had drifted onto a sandbank about 50 meters from the northeastern shore of Lake Kinneret (Sea of Galilee). One Syrian plane was shot down by machineguns of the launch and another by Israeli planes which had been summoned to the rescue. After some negotiations concerning the salvaging of the grounded launch and the downed Mig, the Syrians announced that their frogmen had recovered the plane and the pilot’s body at night—a claim denied by the Israelis—and did not interfere when the launch was brought home to the western shore.

On August 16 an Iraqi Roman Catholic pilot flew his Mig 21 jet fighter
to Israel and asked for asylum. There was some anxiety that the USSR would resent it if the plane were inspected by representatives of a Western power, but nothing further was heard of the matter.

On October 7 two blocks of flats in the Romema quarter of Jerusalem were damaged by demolition charges laid by men who entered from Jordan; the next morning four members of an Israeli police patrol were killed and two wounded by a landmine near Sha'ar Hagolan, south of Lake Kinneret. On October 9, Damascus radio broadcast a communique from the "general staff of al-Asefa" claiming credit for the Jerusalem explosion and other terrorist acts. A day later, Syrian Premier Yussuf Zu'ayin warned, "We shall set the entire area afire and any Israeli movement will result in a final resting place for Israel," while his Chief-of-Staff General Ahmed Sueidani maintained that the acts were "legal activities, and it is not our duty to stop them but to encourage them and strengthen them."

Israel complained to the Security Council, and Foreign Minister Abba Eban, who presented the case on October 14, emphatically denied allegations that Israel was planning, alone or in league with others, to overthrow the Syrian regime. He declared:

We have no interest in the character of her regime, in its social philosophy or the orientation of its international policies. Our policy towards Syria is governed by one consideration alone: by her readiness to affirm and to practice the obligations which she has contracted towards Israel by her signature of the Charter and by her bilateral agreement with us.

Eban declared that armed infiltrators organized in Syria had committed 61 outrages on Israeli territory since January 1965, and he called on the Council "to express itself in clear condemnation of a concerted, organized and proclaimed policy of aggression."

While the Security Council was deliberating, border attacks continued at various points between She'ar Yashuv at the northern tip of Israel, to Ein Gedi on the Dead Sea. Seven incidents were recorded in two weeks, culminating in the derailing of a freight train near Jerusalem on October 27. Israeli public opinion was disturbed that these attacks continued at a time when Israel's hands were tied by the Security Council's proceedings. An American-British motion "inviting" Syria to take steps to stop sabotage activities originating in her territory was supported by 10 members of the Security Council on November 5, but vetoed by the Soviet Union.

Prime Minister Eshkol announced in the Keneset on November 8 that the period of compulsory military service for men, which had been reduced to 26 months in December 1963, would be restored to 30 months, women continuing to serve for 20. The decision was made, Eshkol explained, "to enable the Israel Defense Forces to improve their readiness and capacity to fulfill their basic tasks" and to carry out their training program without interruption, as well as to ensure "effective patrolling by the Army and the Border Police."
The first serious border incident after the Security Council decision involved Jordan. On November 12 three Israeli soldiers were killed and six wounded by a landmine in the Mt. Hebron area, about a mile south of the armistice demarcation line. Next morning, an Israeli force, including armored cars and tanks, crossed the line and, after evacuating the residents, blew up 40 houses in Samo'a and two other villages known to have sheltered marauders. Fifteen trucks carrying Arab Legion reinforcements were blown up and a Jordanian plane shot down. Eshkol, speaking at the World Conference of WIZO in Tel-Aviv on the day of the Israeli action, said:

The purpose of our action was to bring home the gravity of the situation to the people and the authorities of the neighboring countries and show them that they cannot escape the heavy responsibility that rests upon them.

We stand firm in our view that the blame must fall both on the country that encourages, trains and dispatches the saboteurs and also on those countries through whose territory the saboteurs pass.

On November 25 the Security Council censured Israel for the Samo’a raid by a vote of 14 to 0, with New Zealand abstaining. Two days later, at a cabinet meeting, Eshkol expressed his regret that the Council had “ignored the causes of the tension,” namely “the policy of hostility and aggression which the Arab government conducts against Israel,” and added:

So long as the Security Council has not adopted effective measures to stop the aggressor, it is the duty and the right of an attacked state to defend itself by virtue of the right reserved to every country by Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

Foreign Minister Eban summed up Israel’s policy in the Kneset on December 6:

Israel frequently adopts a policy of self-restraint, sometimes prolonged, in the face of aggressive provocation. But sometimes, confronted by an accumulation of acts of hostility and violence, she has to make a choice. One possibility is inaction, which is liable to intensify, encourage and foster aggressive impulses, to give them license and immunity. A second possibility is to exercise the right of self-defense in order to stop and discourage violence.

Referring to the threats to King Hussein of Jordan by Syria and Ahmed Shukairy’s Palestine Liberation Organization after the Samo’a raid, Eshkol said in Tel-Aviv on December 23:

Israel's policy is the continued preservation of the status quo in the area. If the status quo is violated, as in the case of Jordan, Israel will reserve freedom of action.

No serious border incidents were reported for about a month after the Samo’a operation, but towards the end of the year, several landmines were found near the Syrian frontier and Syrian posts fired on Israeli farmers.
Relations with the United States

In February Eban met President Lyndon B. Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and other leaders for comprehensive talks. On February 5, the State Department announced that the United States had agreed to sell Israel Patton tanks because “The United States cannot be indifferent to the potentially destabilizing effect of massive Soviet sales of arms to the area.” On May 20, the Israeli Foreign Ministry announced that agreement had been reached during Eban’s visit to Washington for the purchase of a number of United States “tactical military aircraft” over a specified period of time. It was believed that President Shazar’s private visit during the summer on his return from a South American tour had a deeper significance because of the cordial reception he received from President Johnson and other government officials (p. 103).

A number of American senators, governors, and congressmen visited Israel in 1966. The Kennedy Memorial, erected by JNF with monies contributed mainly by American Jews, was dedicated on July 4 by Prime Minister Eshkol and United States Chief Justice Earl Warren. A week later, the foundation stone of the Harry S. Truman Peace Center was laid in Jerusalem.

The American industrialist and philanthropist Jacob Blaustein, who received the Scopus award of the Hebrew University in November, announced on that occasion a gift of $500,000 for the construction of a center for American studies on the Jerusalem campus of the university. Its purpose, Mr. Blaustein stated, was to “further an increasing understanding of the United States and a more fertile dialogue between Israelis and American Jewry.”

Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, President Johnson’s special envoy who went to Israel in December to discuss the joint American-Israel desalting project, particularly its financial aspects, told the press in Tiberias:

There is reason to believe that the United States will continue to give Israel its support for the development of water resources, as it has given in the past for her other economic enterprises.

Western Europe

Political, scientific, and cultural relations with France continued to develop in 1966. There were numerous visits by French members of parliament, mayors, and other public officials. Israel’s exports to France reached a record figure. Considerable significance was attached in Israel to the fact that France did not permit her friendship with Israel to hamper an improvement in her relations with the Arab countries.

A Keneset delegation visited Belgium in April.

Negotiations on economic aid between Israel and the German Federal Republic, envisioned when diplomatic relations were established in 1965, were concluded on May 12. Germany granted Israel a loan of DM160 million for 25 years at favorable interest rates (p. 363). Israel expected that fur-
ther sums, on a similar scale, would be granted in subsequent years. Former Premier David Ben-Gurion criticized the agreement on the ground that it was not in keeping with the understanding he had reached in 1961 with former Chancellor Konrad Adenauer for a German loan of $500 million for the development of the Negev. Prime Minister Eshkol and Finance Minister Phinehas Sappir denied that there had been any change in policy. They said that loans under the Ben-Gurion–Adenauer understanding had been obtained only after prolonged negotiations each year, and that the new agreement was part of the continuing fulfillment of the Adenauer promise, on more favorable terms than in the past.

Relations with the Scandinavian countries were cordial, as indicated by the visits of the Danish and Swedish foreign ministers and the president of Iceland to Israel and Eban's official return visits to Denmark and Iceland. An agreement between Israel and the Scandinavian countries stated that visitors to the respective countries would no longer require visas.

Foreign Minister Eban received a warm welcome in London and Ottawa in February; British, Australian, and New Zealand statesmen visited Israel during the year.

**Soviet Russia and Eastern Europe**

When Prime Minister Eshkol presented his new cabinet in the Kneset on January 12, he noted that although little progress had been made toward better understanding with the Soviet Union, Israel "should not despair of the aim itself." He added that an agreement by the Western Powers and the USSR on a policy based on the "support, in theory and practice, of the independence and integrity of all the existing states in the Middle East" would greatly strengthen "the prospects of peace and stability." The somewhat improved relations at the beginning of 1966 again deteriorated during the summer with Soviet press allegations that Israel was concentrating troops on the Syrian border, the expulsion of an Israeli diplomat from Moscow (August) on charges of espionage, and the all-out Soviet support of Syria in the Security Council.

Cultural relations, too, had their ups and downs. Soviet violinist David Oistrakh, and cellist Mstislav Rostropovitch with his wife, Galina Vishnevskaya, gave concerts in Israel, and the Israeli folk singer Geula Gil appeared in Russia. But the scheduled visit of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra to Russia was first postponed and later cancelled by the Soviet authorities.

In May Foreign Minister Eban presided at a meeting of Israeli envoys in East European countries in Warsaw, where he also met Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki. On his return home, Eban said that Israel's relations with these countries varied greatly both in extent and form: relations with Poland were friendly; and while Israel had important trade agreements with Yugoslavia and Rumania, she had practically none with the USSR and Czechoslovakia. A new Rumanian minister, the first to be accredited to Israel since the Sinai campaign, presented his credentials in February.
Latin America

President Zalman Shazar was given a cordial welcome on his state visits to Uruguay, Chile, and Brazil in June and July. The Uruguayan and Brazilian governments issued special stamps to mark the occasion. A visit to Argentina was cancelled because of political developments there, but the new president, General Juan Carlos Ongania, renewed the invitation (p. 280).

There was growing interest among Latin American countries in technical cooperation with Israel, and a number of agreements for scientific and technical cooperation were signed. The most significant agreement, with the Organization of American States (OAS), was signed in Washington during President Shazar's visit. Since the first OAS-Israel agreement in 1962, some 600 OAS scholarship holders had attended training courses in Israel. OAS figures indicated that 40 per cent of all South Americans who were trained abroad went to Israel.

Asia and Africa

Relations with Asian countries were strengthened by the state visits of President Shazar to Nepal and of Chief-of-Staff Major-General Isaac Rabin to Burma, Thailand, the Philippines, Japan, South Korea, and Cambodia.

Cordial relations with African countries were not affected by the coups and revolutions that toppled some of the governments. Prime Minister Eshkol received a warm welcome everywhere on his three-week tour (May-June) to the Ivory Coast, Liberia, Malagasy, Uganda, Congo (Kinshasa), and Senegal.

Cooperation with Developing Countries

In 1966 there were 620 Israeli experts at work in 55 developing countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Mediterranean basin, under the auspices of United Nations agencies or at the invitation of the governments concerned. Between 1962 and 1965, Israeli experts conducted 69 mobile courses for the training of 3,613 persons in these countries. In addition, some 1,600 trainees attended 32 courses in Israel. During the years 1958–66, a total of about 8,800 trainees from 91 countries attended close to 480 courses.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

In January Levi Eshkol's new cabinet, formed after the November 1965 election, received a vote of confidence (71 to 41) in the Kneset. It was the most representative cabinet since that of 1955–59, including the Alignment (Mapai and Achdut Ha-avodah), National Religious party, Mapam (United Workers' party), Independent Liberals and Po'ale Agudat Israel. Golda Meir retired as foreign minister, a post she had held for ten years, and was replaced by Abba Eban, former deputy prime minister. Dov Joseph, who had embarrassed Premier Eshkol by his response to Ben-Gurion's demand
for an inquiry into the procedures and conclusions reached by the 1960 Committee of Seven in the Lavon affair (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], p. 458), was dropped as minister of justice in favor of Jacob Samson Shapiro. Other newcomers to the cabinet included Israel Galili, Israel Barzilai, Mordecai Bentov, and Moshe Kol.

The composition of the new cabinet was: Levi Eshkol (Alignment), prime minister and minister of defense; Hayyim Gvati (Alignment), agriculture; Hayyim Zadok (Alignment), commerce and industry; Moshe Kol (Independent Liberal), development and tourism; Zalman Aranne (Alignment), education and culture; Phinehas Sappir (Alignment), finance; Abba Eban (Alignment), foreign affairs; Moses Shapiro (National Religious), interior; Jacob S. Shapiro (Alignment), justice; Igal Allon (Alignment), labor; Bechor Shitreet (Alignment), police; Elijah Sasson (Alignment), posts; Zerah Warhaftig (National Religious), religious affairs; Solomon Joseph Burg (National Religious), social welfare; Moses Carmel (Alignment), transport; Israel Galili (Alignment), without portfolio.

Deputy ministers: Aaron Uzan (Alignment), agriculture; Tzevi Dinstein (Alignment), defense; Judah Shaari (Independent Liberal), development; Kalman Kahana (Po'ale Agudat Israel) and Aaron Yadlin (Alignment), education; Israel Ben-meir (National Religious), interior. Arye Eliav was appointed deputy minister of commerce and industry in September.

Hayyim Zadok, who had disagreed with Finance Minister Sappir on methods of executing economic policy, resigned in November and was succeeded by Ze'ev Sharef, who had held senior civil service posts before his election to the Keneset in November 1965.

Minister of Police Shitreet, 72, one of the two Sephardi cabinet members submitted his resignation on the ground of age on November 1. He was the only person who had held office continuously since the proclamation of Israel's independence. He was succeeded by Minister of Posts Elijah Sasson. Sasson's portfolio was taken over by Israel Isaiah (formerly Sharabi; Alignment), a former deputy speaker, who became the first minister of Yemeni extraction.

The new Keneset building in Jerusalem was dedicated on August 30. The ceremony was attended by the speakers and deputy speakers from 43 foreign parliaments, Jewish community delegates from 38 countries, and representatives of every town and village in Israel. The building, designed by J. Klarwein and containing works of art by Marc Chagall and noted Israeli artists, cost £20 million (almost $7 million). Most of the funds were made available by the Rothschild Foundation, which acted in accordance with the wishes of the late James A. de Rothschild, as transmitted by his widow to Prime Minister Ben-Gurion on July 15, 1957 (AJYB, 1959 [Vol. 60], p. 235). The Keneset formally opened its proceeding, in March 1949, in the Jewish Agency building in Jerusalem, and at first met in a re-equipped Tel-Aviv cinema hall. In 1950 it was transferred to the Frumin building in the center
of Jerusalem, which underwent periodic make-shift adaptations and enlargements.

At the first session in the new chamber, the prime minister submitted for first reading a draft of the Basic Law of the Government, which brought Israel's constitution an important stage nearer completion. In 1950 the Knesset had decided to enact at various times basic law, which, taken together, would constitute the chapters of the constitution. Basic Laws of the Knesset, of Israel Lands and of the President had been passed in 1958, 1960, and 1964, respectively. Eshkol stated that the present bill, together with a Basic Law of Human Rights, to be submitted during the tenure of the present government, would complete the chapters of the constitution.

Communal Affairs

David Ben-Gurion's 80th birthday was widely, but unofficially, celebrated on October 1. President Shazar, as head of the public committee in charge of organizing the celebrations, traveled to Ben-Gurion's kibbutz home at Sdeh Boker to deliver his best wishes. A message of congratulations was adopted by the cabinet on Prime Minister Eshkol's motion, and delivered by Moses Shapiro and Bechor Shitreet. The ministry of education issued a special pamphlet on Ben-Gurion for use in schools, and radio and television programs presented highlights from his life. The Histadrut, General Federation of Labor, also issued a pamphlet on Ben-Gurion's role in the Federation, of which he had been the first secretary-general; the central council of Mapai, from which he broke away in 1965, honored him at a special session. More than 10,000 persons attended a rally at the Sdeh Boker Negev College, founded by Ben-Gurion. The central event was a pageant staged by Joseph Millo, director of the Haifa Municipal Theater, and featuring prominent Israeli stage stars.

The tenth convention of the Histadrut met in Tel-Aviv in January. The 801 delegates, elected on September 19, 1965, representing almost one million members, were divided as follows: Alignment, 408 (Mapai, 286; Achdut Ha-avodah, 122); Gahal (Herut-Liberal bloc), 122; Mapam (United Workers' party), 116; Rafi (Israel Labor List), 97; Independent Liberals, 35; Israel Communist party, 13; New Communist List, 10. Arab delegates constituted about 10 per cent of the total. In his keynote speech, Secretary-General Aaron Becker asked the Histadrut not to relinquish any more of its functions to the state; he rejected especially the idea of nationalizing Kupat Holim, its medical insurance fund. Despite opposition by Rafi, the convention decided to drop the word "Hebrew" from the full name of the federation. It also resolved that the cost-of-living allowance scheme must be retained, but that basic wages should rise only in proportion to the increase in the net national product. It accepted the principle of arbitration by mutual agreement in public services labor disputes.
Zionist Affairs

Because of a disagreement over the inclusion of a Herut representative in the Jerusalem section, the 26th Zionist Congress had failed to elect a new executive for the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency. The Zionist General Council, which met in Jerusalem in January, elected a new executive representing all parties, with Arye L. Pincus as chairman, and Rose Halprin chairman of the New York section. Lord Sieff of Great Britain, Astorre Mayer of Italy, Rabbis Emanuel Rackman, Simon Greenberg, Leon Feuer, Joseph J. Schwartz, and Dewey Stone, of the United States were elected to the executive, in keeping with Dr. Goldmann's scheme to broaden the basis of the Agency by including non-party members.

Nahum Goldmann, who had been reelected president of the World Zionist Organization, delivered the keynote address at the General Council meeting. He called upon the movement to return to "fighting Zionism"; to strengthen the concept of the unity of the Jewish people, with Israel as its center; to bring in "tens of thousands of intellectuals," and to restore to the Jewish people "the humanistic and idealistic character it used to have, making it a partner in the fight for human rights and social justice." Goldmann explained that the real meaning of the slogan "Facing the Diaspora," proclaimed by him at the 26th Congress in 1964, was "to utilize Israel as the main challenge for the Jewish people." Major subjects discussed were immigration from the prosperous countries, now that immigration from countries of distress and persecution (except for Soviet Russia) was almost completed; Jewish education in the Diaspora; reorganization of the Zionist movement, and improved social and educational services for the fuller integration of recent immigrants.

In September the Jewish Agency executive decided in plenary session to reduce its 16 departments in Jerusalem by about half and, particularly, to bring all units dealing with immigration and absorption under one roof. It adopted for 1967-68 a £317 million draft budget—£45 million lower than the current budget. It was expected that the 1968 Zionist Congress would elect a smaller executive with one member for each department. In the meantime after interparty discussions, some changes were made in its organizational setup.

Jewish Agency chairman Louis Pincus asked the UJA Study Mission in Jerusalem in October to raise $12 million, outside its regular appeal, for the social and educational integration of 250,000 recent immigrants in Israel's development areas.

In 1966 Israeli leaders repeatedly called for more immigration from the West: Eban called on British Jewry to send at least 5,000 of its members to Israel each year when he spoke at the Annual Conference of the British Settlers' Association in February. At the convention of the Association of Americans and Canadians in Israel in March, Eshkol said that the government regarded immigration from Western countries a "matter of major
policy," and promised to investigate and remove any difficulties immigrants may have encountered in securing housing and other facilities. At the same time, he emphasized the importance of improving "the spiritual relationship between Israelis and Jews abroad" and admitted that "We, on our part, must extend and deepen our knowledge of the Diaspora, its life and history."

Forty-two groups of young people, totaling over 3,000, came to Israel in 1966 for various summer projects under the auspices of the Jewish Agency. The Foundation for Cultural Relations with the Diaspora, headed by the former director-general of the foreign ministry, Hayyim Yahil, was set up under joint government-Jewish Agency auspices to enable more Jewish students and teachers to study in Israel and to develop facilities for the study of Jewish culture abroad.

The Arab Population

A group of leading Israeli Arabs established a non-political action committee in June to demonstrate that the majority of the non-Jewish population identified themselves with the Israeli state, to oppose all attempts at armed force against Israel, and to win the confidence of their Jewish fellow citizens.

On November 8, Prime Minister Eshkol announced that military government, which had functioned since the end of the War of Independence in the largely Arab-inhabited border areas, would be abolished on December 1. Its functions were to be transferred to civilian authorities, especially the police. Over the years, military government restrictions had been gradually relaxed, and the present step was taken in fulfillment of pledges made earlier in the year (January 12 and June 18).

Population and Migration

The estimated permanent population at the end of 1966 was 2,656,800: 2,344,500 Jews and 312,300 others, mainly Arabs.

At the end of 1965 the population was 2,598,400: 2,299,100 Jews, 212,400 Moslems, 57,100 Christians, and 29,800 Druses and others. The 59,900 increase in the Jewish population for the year was due to 36,800 natural increase and 23,100 migration balance. The latter was 38.6 per cent of the total increase, as compared to 57.7 per cent in 1964 and 61.1 per cent in 1963. The non-Jewish population rose by 12,900 (migration balance minus 100). Forty per cent of the Jews were native born; 31.3 per cent came from Europe, America, and Oceania; 14.8 per cent came from Africa, and 13.5 per cent from Asia. The Jews in Israel constituted 17.2 per cent of the estimated total Jewish population in the world.

The number of immigrants in 1965 was 30,736, including 2,235 tourists who decided to settle. In addition, 7,827 temporary residents arrived during the year: 1,149 from Asia and Africa, 3,022 from Europe, and 3,656 from America and Oceania. Between 1948 and 1963, 55.4 per cent of the 1,136,878 immigrants had come from Asia and Africa, and 44.6 per cent from Europe and America. The number of emigrants in 1965 was 1,878, of whom 1,633
were Jews. The total number of presumed emigrants, including all those who had resided abroad for over one year, was 7,941, as compared to 9,121 in 1964, and 10,866 in 1963. Although no figures were as yet available for 1966, press reports and articles created the general impression that there had been a considerable increase in emigration, and the subject was widely discussed.

**Economic Developments**

For the first time since Israel's early years, unemployment became a serious problem in 1966, as the result of a slowdown in economic activity; but the gap in the balance of payments continued to fall.

The drop in immigration led to a considerable curtailment in housing construction, which spread to ancillary industries. The resultant fall in domestic demand prevented other industries producing for the local market from absorbing the labor released, and production for export was not competitive enough to fill the gap.

By the end of 1966 the number of unemployed registered at the exchanges rose to 38,000 (compared with 23,000 in the last quarter of 1965), of whom 17,000 were employed in public works. According to the government manpower survey, the number of those not holding jobs (which included rentiers, housewives, and students seeking part-time jobs, young people who had not started work, etc.) rose from 33,200 in 1965 to 96,000 at the end of 1966.

The government announced that it would not adopt an inflationary policy to bring about a short-term improvement, since that would be disastrous in the long run. It called for a freezing of wages, increased productivity, and the transfer of labor and resources to production for export. More incentives were provided for export industries and further concessions were offered to foreign investors.

The 1967-68 budget, presented on December 20, 1966, totaled I£5,130 million (about $1,700 million)—11 per cent more than the previous one. It included I£1,216.5 for development, 29 per cent more than in 1966-67, in order to stem the rise in unemployment.

The gross national product grew by 1.2 per cent (compared with 8.2 per cent in 1965) to I£11.878 million at 1966 prices. National income grew by 10 per cent (18 per cent in 1965) to I£9,220 million.

The slowdown resulted in an improvement in the balance of payments; imports grew by only 3.5 per cent to $1,315 million, while exports of goods and services were 15 per cent higher at $865 million. The import surplus thus fell by $55 million, to $450 million—29 per cent lower than in 1964.

**Education, Science, and Culture**

*The School System*

An estimated 740,000 children and students were enrolled in Israel's edu-
cational institutions at the beginning of the 1966–67 school year. Of these, some 120,000 were in post-primary schools, as compared to 108,000 in the previous year. Fifty-five per cent of the pupils in primary schools (up to the age of 14) attended state schools (without special emphasis on religious education); 20 per cent went to state religious schools, and 7 per cent studied in “recognized” schools (run by the Orthodox Agudat Israel).

The Teachers' Union continued to oppose the recommendations of the Prawer Committee for the reorganization of the school system into primary (6–12 age-groups), junior high (12–15) and senior high (16–18) schools as a prior condition for extending the age limit for compulsory school attendance from 14 to 15 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 409). The government agreed to suspend implementation of the report, pending consideration by a special parliamentary committee on which the teachers would be represented by four observers. The committee held its first meeting on July 5.

In March a pilot project of educational television, consisting of 10 lessons a week in biology, mathematics, and English, was inaugurated by the ministry of education and culture. The Rothschild Memorial Trust provided funds for studios, stations, and school receivers.

In the current school year, 373 schools in new immigrant areas, with more than 125,000 pupils, were recognized as “requiring special attention” because of inadequate educational standards. An estimated 80 to 85 per cent of these children were from families who had immigrated from African and Asian countries. Among the methods used to raise standards were special guidance for teachers by veteran educationists; a longer school day for some 80,000 pupils and an extra month of attendance for another 20,000; grouping of pupils in the 11 to 13 age-groups according to attainments in arithmetic, Hebrew, and English; special programs for backward children in grades 2 to 5 (aged 7–10), and special preparation for post-primary schooling for pupils in the upper quarter of the higher grades.

UJA's Israel Education Fund had collected $15 million for the erection of post-primary schools, mainly of the comprehensive type, and cultural institutions, in new immigrant villages and suburbs. By the end of 1966, 33 such schools, as well as youth centers, kindergartens, and libraries, had either been completed or were under construction or in the planning stage.

Higher Education

An estimated 28,000 students were matriculated in Israel's institutes of higher learning. The Hebrew University in Jerusalem had an enrolment of about 12,000 students, including 1,500 who were continuing their studies at the Tel-Aviv branch (new students in Tel-Aviv went to the local university). Of the total, 6,800 were in the faculties of humanities and social sciences; 1,600 in law; 2,000 in science and mathematics; 850 in medicine; 325 in agriculture, and 200 in social work. Over 300 research projects were being conducted by 665 students, most of them with the aid of foreign grants.
About 250 students were Arabs and Druses and 850 were foreign students, among them 450 from the United States, for whom special courses in English were available. The teaching staff numbered some 1,400.

The Technion—Israel Institute of Technology, at Haifa, had 5,000 students and a teaching staff of 700, many of whom were engaged in the 600 research projects which were under way. Five new buildings were scheduled to be occupied at Technion City on Mount Carmel during the 1966/67 year. On June 3 Alexander Goldberg was elected president of the Technion to succeed Jacob Dori who retired.

Bar-Ilan (religious) University had an enrolment of more than 2,700 students and a faculty of 350. Rabbi Joseph H. Lookstein was elected chancellor of the university and Professor Max Jammer became its president.

Tel-Aviv University had 6,700 students and an academic staff of over 900. The cornerstone of Beit Hatefutsot (House of the World's Jewish Communities) was laid on the campus in October. It was to serve as a center of Diaspora studies for Israelis and as a bridge with Jewish youth abroad.

The University Institute at Haifa, with 1,500 students, and the Institute for Higher Education at Beersheba were conducted under the academic supervision of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

The Weizmann Institute of Science at Rehovot had 400 research projects under way in its 18 research units. It had a staff of 280 scientists; 280 students preparing for the MS and Ph.D. degrees were enrolled in its Fineberg Graduate School.

The growing financial difficulties of the institutions of higher learning moved the government, which covered about half the cost of maintaining them, to institute an increase in tuition fees. In 1951 a committee headed by Supreme Court Justice Simon Agranat had recommended a basic annual tuition of £400, which was to rise at the same rate as the cost-of-living index and salaries of university staffs. An 8-member committee under Israel Kargman, member of the Keneset, was appointed by the government in June 1966 to reconsider the question. Four of its members recommended in September that the fees, which now stood at £640 a year, should be raised to £1,200, to cover the considerable rises in staff salaries which had not been taken into account. The other members opposed any increase on the ground that it would discourage students, without making a worthwhile contribution to the deficit.

When the cabinet on November 27 raised tuition fees to £700 a year, the students declared a strike. They demanded strict adherence to the Agranat committee's recommendations, which they interpreted as permitting increases in keeping with the rise in cost-of-living index only.

In further Keneset discussion of the problem, Deputy Minister of Education Aaron Yadlin stated (November 29) that the universities' cumulative deficits totaled £102 million, while the ratio of fee income to total expenditure at the Hebrew University had fallen from 14 to 11 per cent, and at the Technion from 8 to 6 per cent. Queried about staff costs, Finance Minister
Sappir told the Keneset that academic salaries ranged from about I£12,000 a year for an instructor with full seniority to I£25,000 for a full professor. The government stood by its decision, and the strike was called off on December 7, pending a comprehensive review of the problem by the Keneset education committee.

**Cultural Activities**

Samuel Joseph Agnon was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature (shared by Nelly Sachs, the German-Jewish authoress living in Stockholm) "for his deeply sensitive art of story-telling, with his motifs drawn from the art of the Jewish people." He was born on July 17, 1888, in the little town of Buczacz in Eastern Galicia (then part of Austria-Hungary); his father, Shalom Mordecai Czaczkes, was descended from a long line of Talmudic scholars. His first verses in Hebrew and Yiddish were published when he was 15 years old, and by the time he was 19 a score of his Hebrew stories had appeared in print.

Agnon settled in Palestine in 1908. *Agunot*, the first of his many stories published in Palestine, was signed with the pen name Agnon, which he later adopted as his family name. His collected works (published by Schocken, Tel-Aviv, seven volumes in 1954, and an eighth in 1962), included three full-length novels: *The Bridal Canopy* (1930, revised in 1954) a tale of 18th-century Galicia; *As a Guest for the Night* (1940) a description of the decline of East European Jewry after World War II, and *Only Yesterday* (1954) a story of the early pioneers in Palestine. Other published works were *Books, Writers and Stories* (1938), *Days of Awe* (1938) and *Ye Have Seen* (1958–59). Many of his stories have appeared abroad in translation. *The Bridal Canopy, Days of Awe, In the Heart of the Seas,* and *Two Tales* (“Betrothed” and “Edo and Enam”) have been published in English in book form.

In 1936 Agnon received an honorary doctorate from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. He was awarded the Bialik prize of the Tel-Aviv municipality in 1935 and 1951, and the government's Israel prize in 1950 and 1958.

Israel prizes of I£3,000 each were awarded on Independence Day, April 25, in Jewish studies to Professor Solomon Morag for his book *The Hebrew of the Yemenite Jews*; in religious literature to Rabbi Isaac Arieli, for a series of Talmud commentaries, *Einayim Lemishpat*; in the humanities to Professor Hans Jacob Polotsky for his life work on Egyptian and Semitic linguistics; in science to Professor Moses R. Bloch for his life's work; in art to Professor Alfred Mansfeld and Deborah Gad for designing the Israel Museum.

After the resignation of its chairman, Professor E. D. Bergmann, the Israel Atomic Energy Commission was reorganized, with Prime Minister Eshkol as chairman and Professor Israel Dostrovsky as director general. The new commission held its first meeting on July 18.
An anthology of major works by Chaim Nachman Bialik in Arabic translation was published by the Hebrew University's Arabic-Hebrew Hebrew-Arabic translation project which had been initiated to foster better understanding between the Jews in Israel and other Middle-East peoples. The first work issued by the project was a Hebrew edition of *The Deliverer from Error* by Al-Ghazali, the 11th-century Moslem theologian.

In 1966 the Israel Program for Scientific Translations published 112 books on the natural sciences, most of them translated from Russian. It was also to publish books on more general subjects under the imprint of Israel Universities Press.

Notable theater productions during the year included Shakespeare's *Richard III* and *Othello*; Lessing's *Nathan the Wise*, Jarry's *Ubu Roi*, Ibsen's *Hedda Gabler* and *The Master Builders*, Chekhov's *Cherry Orchard*, Brecht's *A Man's a Man*; two adaptations of Sholem Aleichem stories, *Menahem Mendel* and *Sholem Aleichem's Jews*; Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?*; Kopit's *O Dad Poor Dad*, Genet's *The Maids*; Fiddler on the Roof (in Hebrew and Yiddish); *The King and I*; *Casablan* (musical comedy based on the Hebrew play by Igal Mossonson); Jacob Bar-Nathan's *Our Quarter*, and Amitzur Ilan's *The Dybbuk of Naveh Shaanan*.

Israeli-produced feature films included: *The Two Koony Lemels*, based on the Goldfaden comedy; *Moshe Ventilator*, a farcical comedy of army life; *The Boy Across the Street*, with Arye Elias; and *Fortuna*, a story of new immigrants from North Africa, with Pierre Brassard. *Judith*, with Sophia Loren, and *Cast a Giant Shadow*, with Kirk Douglas, were made in Israel by foreign companies. The department for the promotion of the film industry of the ministry of commerce and industry authorized refund of entertainment tax and stamp duty, loans, customs rebates, and monetary grants for approved films made in Israel.

**Personalia**

Professor Saul Adler, head of the Hebrew University department of parasitology, died in Jerusalem on January 25, at the age of 70. Tsevi Nissanov, one of the founders of the Hashomer Watchmen's organization, died in Tiberias on February 28, at the age of 85. Jacob Lestchinsky, the "dean of Jewish sociologists," died in Jerusalem on March 20, at the age of 89. Nahman Meisel, the Yiddish author, died in Afula on April 27, at the age of 79. Arieh Kubovy, Chairman of the Yad Vashem Memorial Authority, World Jewish Congress leader and former Israel diplomat, died in Jerusalem on May 16, at the age of 69. Murray Rosenberg, the oldest British settler, died in Jerusalem on June 26, at the age of 93. Rabbi Zalman Sorotskin, head of Agudat Israel's Council of Sages, died in Jerusalem on June 26, at the age of 86. David Polombo, the Jerusalem sculptor who designed the gates of the new Kneset building, died in an accident in Jerusalem on August 13. Dr. Nathan Gelber, historian and author, died in Jerusalem on September 24, at
the age of 75. Abraham Ya'ari, author and historian, died in Jerusalem on October 13, at the age of 67. Eliahu Meridor, Herut Member of the Fourth and Fifth Knesets, died in Jerusalem on October 16, at the age of 52. Professor Benjamin De Vries, head of Tel-Aviv University Talmud department, died in Amsterdam on September 30, at the age of 61. Professor Bernhard Zondek, former head of the gynecology department at the Hadassah-University Hospital in Jerusalem, died in New York on November 8, at the age of 75. Professor Nahum Shlousch, archeologist and veteran of the Hibbat Zion Movement, died in Gedera on December 18, at the age of 95.

MISHA LOUVISH
Morocco

The kidnapping and apparent murder of Mehdi ben Barka, exiled leader of the opposition Union of Popular Forces, continued to have repercussions throughout 1966 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 437). The French investigation removed whatever doubt there had been that ben Barka was dead; it also produced substantial evidence that the Moroccan Minister of the Interior General Mohamed Oufkir had been directly and personally involved.

General Oufkir refused to come to France to testify in the investigation, and King Hassan II refused to honor the French warrant for the General’s arrest. He repeatedly expressed full confidence in Oufkir and reappointed him to his cabinet post. French President Charles de Gaulle however, charged (February) that Oufkir’s involvement in the affair had violated French sovereignty, and that it was therefore “inevitable that Franco-Moroccan relations should suffer as a result.”

Six defendants, among them Oufkir’s nephew al-Ghali al-Mahi, were brought to trial in France (p. 311). Oufkir and six others were to be tried in absentia later. Shortly before the trial ended, Oufkir’s deputy Major Ahmed Dlimi surrendered himself to the French authorities, but challenged their jurisdiction in the case. In the light of this development, the trial was reopened, but further sessions were postponed indefinitely to permit a continuation of the investigation. The French newspaper Le Monde suggested that King Hassan had ordered Dlimi to surrender, in a desperate effort to prevent Oufkir’s conviction in absentia.

At home, Hassan continued his direct personal rule (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 436). Opposition activity was largely undercover, although the National Union of Popular Forces (UNFP) and the allied, but independent Moroccan Labor Union, as well as student and other associated groups continued to exist in a state of circumscribed legality. In March Omar Benjelloun, a UNFP leader, was arrested on a charge of circulating pamphlets and inciting workers to strike. In the same month the government responded to a student strike in Rabat by expelling all students boarding at the university and suspending 3,000 secondary school students. In December sentence was pronounced on leaders of a tribal revolt which had taken place in 1960; some received the death penalty.
Military conscription was introduced during the year. It was expected, however, that the conscripts would largely be used for economic development projects.

During the year Morocco received aid from several countries. The United States supplied 100,000 tons of grain for dollars and another 60,000 in the form of development aid to ease a serious grain shortage; other aid continued as in previous years, except for increased military aid to counterbalance Soviet shipments to Algeria. France pledged 100,000 tons of grain, but almost completely withdrew other aid, estimated at $140,000,000 a year, because of the ben Barka affair. Kuwait granted Morocco a $28,000,000 loan from its Fund for Arab Economic Development. King Hassan's visit to Moscow in October brought promises of Soviet technical and other aid in developing the lead, zinc, iron ore, and oil industries, and cooperation in scientific and cultural activities. Under a trade agreement Morocco was to import 500,000 tons of Soviet petroleum a year in exchange for certain Moroccan products. In November, a Soviet aid pledge of $42,000,000 was reported. New agreements for economic and other forms of cooperation were signed between Morocco and a number of countries, including Saudi Arabia, Libya, and Senegal.

The border dispute with Algeria flared up briefly when Algeria nationalized a number of companies, including two which were exploiting resources in the disputed area. One of these was largely owned by the Moroccan government. It was also charged that Algerian troops had entered the territory which was in dispute. The issue remained confined to the diplomatic level, and discussion appeared to be proceeding amicably at the end of the year. There was a marked reduction in tension after an Algerian military mission, headed by Chief-of-Staff Colonel Tahir Zbiri, visited Morocco in October.

The dispute with Spain over Moroccan claims to the remaining Spanish territories in Africa was reactivated in October, when Foreign Minister Mohamed Cherkaoui charged in the United Nations General Assembly that Spain was making no effort to settle the question.

Maurice J. Goldbloom

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Morocco, under King Hassan II, was one of the few Arab countries advocating the peaceful and harmonious coexistence of its Jewish and Moslem populations. Two incidents, in September 1966, were particularly characteristic of this policy. While it had been customary for the governor of Casablanca to attend the High Holy Day services and offer the government's good wishes to the community, Hassan delegated Vice Premier Ahmed Zeghari and Minister of the Interior Mohammed Oufkir to do so on this Yom Kippur eve. Two days later, the king insisted upon personally receiving members of the Casablanca Jewish community and reminding them of the high esteem and good will his family had always felt toward Moroccan Jews. This was
the first audience in three years and, as such, the outstanding communal event of the year.

On the eve of the meeting with the king, former Minister of the Interior Abderrahman Khatib summed up the recent history of Morocco's Jews in a remark to Victor Malka: "It is unfortunate that so many Jews have left Morocco; but I realize that they have been subjected to a certain policy which was partly responsible for their leaving." It seemed unfortunate, indeed, for 1966 was a year of relative calm. The Jews had no political problems. Freedom of movement, which at times had been curtailed, was now total; Jews were able to move to and from any part of the country. The compulsory conversion of young Jewish girls to Islam which had caused quite a stir in 1962 (AJYB, 1963 [Vol. 64], p. 402) had diminished considerably, and the activities of the noisy ministry of Islamic affairs, headed by the antisemitic Allal el Fassi, had been curtailed.

Emigration to Israel became less frequent, partly because of the economic crisis in Israel and partly because of the discouraging news from Israel regarding the status of the Sephardic communities. The "renaissance" of Spanish Jewry (p. 338), however, enticed a number of Moroccan Jews of Spanish origin (from Tangier and from towns in what had formerly been Spanish Morocco—Larache, Tetuan, Arcila) to settle in Madrid, Barcelona, Malaga, and Ceuta.

The Jewish population of Morocco was estimated at about 70,000, of whom 75 per cent lived in Casablanca; Rabat, Meknes, Fez, and Tangier had an average of 4,000 each.

Communal Activities

The Jewish committees created under the French protectorate continued their activities in all cities. They were recognized and assisted by the State. The Council of Jewish Communities, the coordinating body of the Jewish organizations in the various cities, had not met since 1963, indicating an abdication of certain responsibilities on the part of the leaders. A plan for the consolidation of the Jewish communities and the accommodation of their legal position to Moroccan independence, which had been submitted by the legal advisor of the Jewish Communities Council to the Moroccan minister of the interior four years earlier, remained a dead issue. Meyer Obadia, president of the local Jewish Committee in Casablanca and the only Jewish deputy in Morocco's national assembly, had emigrated to France. He was replaced temporarily by Jacob Banon, a friend of Justice Minister Abdelhadi Boutaleb. As for the members of the Jewish committee, they all were well along in years and often far removed from the realities of Moroccan Jewry or, for that matter, from any Jewish reality. Their only merit lay in their large personal fortunes.

On the occasion of Yom Kippur, the committee launched an appeal for donations in order to balance its budget. A study prepared by the committee
noted that, despite Jewish emigration, expenditures for its welfare program had not decreased and that it completely maintained 842 families, representing about 3,000 people. Committee expenditures, the study continued, had been one million Moroccan dirhams ($2,000) for the 1965 fiscal year. The most recent project of the Casablanca community was the establishment of another home for the aged.

The young Jews of the city, however, had no social center, and their possibilities for cultural and spiritual growth continued to diminish. There was a real break between them and the community leaders. The community's organ *La Voix des Communautés*, which had appealed primarily to the young generation, had voluntarily ceased publication in 1963, and the weekly Jewish program, which had been broadcast over the national station for 15 years, had been banned by the Moroccan authorities in 1965 (AJYB, 1965 [Vol. 66], pp. 475–76; 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 438). Following a protest by the Council of Jewish Communities the minister of information proposed that the program be resumed—but in Arabic, not French. The proposal was not followed up.

**Education**

Although the cadres of the Department of Education of Jewish Youth had emigrated to France, several secondary schools set up within recent years under the aegis of independent institutions continued to function. Even though they had tuition fees, they were generally quite successful, as, for example, the schools of the Lubavitcher movement. The Alliance Israélite Universelle (AIU) schools, administered by Ittihad-Maroc, a local Jewish group, had an enrolment of more than 10,000 students. However, AIU teachers who were able to obtain comparable posts in France left Morocco. ORT, as well as OSE and Aide Scolaire (Educational Assistance), in Casablanca, as well as in Tangier, Rabat, Fez, and Meknes, had been receiving subsidies from the municipal council for several years.

**Religious Life**

In the beginning of 1966, Saül Danan, Grand Rabbi of Morocco for more than twenty years, left the country and settled in Israel. He had also been president of the supreme rabbinical tribunal at Rabat which had been abolished in 1965 by the Moroccan government in its move to unify and secularize the country's judicial system (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 439). He and his assistant, Rabbi Michael Encaoua, were then appointed to the Moroccan supreme court. After Rabbi Danan's departure, Interior Minister Oufkir consulted with the Jewish leaders about his successor, and Rabbi Encaoua was suggested for the post of Grand Rabbi. In September 1966 Justice Minister Boutaleb discussed the matter with David Amar, president of the Council of Jewish Communities. There was no indication, however, whether the
new Grand Rabbi would be appointed by Oufkir, or whether the government would permit the Jewish community to elect one.

At the end of 1966, about 30 rabbis functioned as judges in the Moroccan courts. Earlier, in July, they had received a memorandum signed by Boutaleb, informing them that they would now have to work on the Sabbath. The outcry was so great that the order was rescinded several days later. The greatest problem facing these rabbis was that the socially prominent, well-to-do Jews, who might have been in a position to seek court action when necessary, had emigrated to Israel. Another reason for the decreasing number of cases was that the courts were no longer as easily accessible as the rabbinical courts which sat in the Jewish sectors of the cities. Whereas people formerly filed suit no matter what the expected verdict, the need for a taxi to take them to court became a definite deterrent. In certain cities where the number of Jews had become very small, rabbinical judges had practically no work, and they were appointed to other posts. Rabbi Simon Suissa of Mazagan, with a Jewish population of 400, was appointed king's prosecutor for penal affairs and, at the same time, continued to hear cases involving Jews, whenever they arose.

Anti-Jewish Agitation

Antisemitic attacks by a segment of the press diminished as Morocco's Jewish community grew smaller. Occasional articles of this type were published only by the Istaqlal, but these too, had become “moderate” because the party sought representation in the government. However, Istaqlal antisemitism thrived on an incident in May when Sarah Toblay, a young Jewish girl, was arrested for slapping a policeman who had annoyed her and was accused, rightly it seemed, of having called him a “dirty Arab.” The Istaqlal organ _Al ‘Alam_ then launched a series of articles with the support of the ultra-reactionary _Oulemas_ association, specialists in Moslem law. Allal el Fassi, president of the Istaqlal party, published an article in the September 1966 issue, calling France the country of “Rothschild capitalism.” Two days later, the paper took issue with the alumni association of the Alliance Israelite Universelle school in Casablanca for calling itself “Israélite,” a word, the reporter maintained “that should no longer be used in an Arab country.” On the whole, however, these antisemitic outbursts had little appeal for the general public.

A number of young Jews were ready to leave Morocco when compulsory military service was instituted at the beginning of 1966. Only few of them, however, were drafted since the Moroccan army's quota of 15,000 men was rapidly filled.

The essential characteristic of Moroccan Judaism in 1966 was the passivity of its leaders which served to discourage the best intentions of many young people who wanted “to do something” constructive for the community. The
solicitous attitude of the Moroccan authorities towards the small Jewish community gave its leaders the opportunity to build for the future. But it had become more and more difficult to find Jews who were ready to assume communal responsibility.

**Victor Malka**
Southern Africa

Political Developments

Throughout Southern Africa, 1966 was a turbulent year. In the Republic of South Africa, Prime Minister Hendrik F. Verwoerd led the Nationalists to a sweeping election victory, only to be assassinated a few months later. In a decision generally regarded as a victory for South Africa, the International Court of Justice refused to pass on the merits of the suit by Ethiopia and Liberia to invalidate South Africa's administration of South West Africa. The United Nations General Assembly then adopted a resolution revoking the mandate over South West Africa, declaring that it reverted to direct UN jurisdiction, and setting up a committee to consider ways of asserting this authority.

Elsewhere, the High Commission territories of Bechuanaland and Basutoland became the independent states of Botswana and Lesotho. The conflict precipitated by Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence in 1965 continued and intensified, with political and economic repercussions throughout the entire area.

South Africa

The South African economy remained prosperous in 1966. South Africa benefited to some extent from the Rhodesian conflict. For example, Zambia, seeking to reduce her own trade with Rhodesia, found South Africa the best available substitute source of some manufactured goods and coal. The government sought to curb a sharp inflationary trend by imposing credit and price controls, and relaxing restrictions on imports.

In the campaign leading to the South African general election of March 30, the opposition United party charged that the Verwoerd government was giving inadequate support to the Smith regime in Rhodesia, and that it was opening the way to a partition of South Africa by promising eventual independence to the "Bantustans" established under the program of "separate development." The first charge did not impress the electorate since the government, while officially neutral and withholding formal recognition from the Smith regime, was giving it massive assistance in counteracting the effects of sanctions. South Africa was Rhodesia's chief source of oil and other essential
commodities which could no longer be obtained from such normal suppliers as Britain and the United States. To the second charge, Verwoerd replied that complete independence for Bantustans was essential since "Minority control cannot endure in a multi-national and multi-racial society."

In the elections, the Nationalists received 758,345 votes; a total of 537,415 votes were cast for all opposition candidates. Although the vote may not have been completely representative of the electorate—there were many uncontested seats and only the Nationalists and the United party had candidates in most constituencies—it did indicate far greater support of the Nationalists than in the past. They now held 126 seats out of 170 in the new parliament, as against 106 out of 160 in the old. The United party lost 10 seats; the Progressives, the only party with a platform of opposition to racial discrimination, suffered sharp losses. However the one Progressive member of parliament, Mrs. Helen Suzman, retained her seat with an increased majority; she was backed by most English-language newspapers.

Interpreting the election results as an endorsement of eventual independence for the Bantustans, Verwoerd declared that friction would disappear when "the nations of Southern Africa realize that they can only develop their territories and countries properly if they leave one another alone."

In practice, however, "separate development" was slow in taking place. The populations of the projected Bantustans (only one, in the Transkei, had so far been organized) were dependent on employment in "white" areas; most of the funds for the economic development of the Bantustans had been spent on creating industries just outside their borders. Moreover, the chronic labor shortage caused by South Africa's rapid economic development led to the employment of more, rather than fewer, native workers in the cities where they were not allowed to live.

Serious shortages in some occupations moved the government to relax some occupational restrictions on the "native" population: Thus Africans were permitted to attend the universities of Cape Town and Witwatersrand to study engineering because there were no segregated schools which offered such training. They continued to enter other occupations previously reserved for whites, often under titles which disguised this fact and almost always at a small fraction of the wages paid to European workers for the same tasks. After the failure of a government-backed attempt to upgrade African workers in the mines (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 448) an extremist faction of white miners which had led the successful resistance to the upgrading captured control of the white Mineworkers Union from the leaders who had accepted the plan. A new agreement later permitted some upgrading.

At the invitation of the interracial National Union of South African Students (NUSAS), Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York visited South Africa in June. The government granted him a visa but refused entry to foreign correspondents or photographers to cover his "purely private" visit.

During his stay Kennedy spoke out against racism at Cape Town, Stellen-
bosch, and Witwatersrand universities. The government ignored his presence and officials refused to be interviewed. The government imposed restrictions on the movement and activities of NUSAS president Ian Robertson, who had extended the invitation and arranged the visit, on charges which ostensibly had nothing to do with Kennedy's trip and which proved to be unfounded on the basis of evidence brought forward in parliament. The restrictions were later modified.

Penal and administrative measures against dissenters continued. In July, banned persons (interned or restricted as to residence, barred from public activity, and not to be quoted in the press) included 467 listed as Communists, 515 banned under the Suppression of Communism and Riotous Assemblies Acts, and 39 Africans banished (i.e., required to remain in some isolated spot) under the Native Administration Act.

The trial of Abraham Fischer, a leading attorney whose grandfather had been prime minister of the Orange Free State, was the year's most spectacular. He was convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment on charges of holding key positions in the Communist party and conspiring to commit sabotage. Fischer had denied any part in sabotage.

Harold Strachan, a former political prisoner and the fourth person to be tried and convicted of having falsely charged that he and others had been tortured in prison, was sentenced in January to two years and six months' imprisonment (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 449).

In July the International Court of Justice dismissed a complaint by Ethiopia and Liberia against the imposition of apartheid in the mandated territory of South West Africa. After hearing the evidence, the court reversed a 1962 ruling and voted 8 to 7 that Ethiopia and Liberia had no standing to sue and that it therefore found it unnecessary to decide on the merits of the case. The United Nations General Assembly, on October 27, passed a resolution declaring that South Africa had not fulfilled its obligations under the mandate that, therefore, the mandate was at an end, and that South West Africa was henceforth a direct UN responsibility. South Africa announced that it would neither recognize nor give effect to the resolution. Before the resolution was adopted the parliament had voted to extend all South African security legislation to South West Africa. It also purchased some European-owned land in South West Africa on which Bantustans were to be established.

On September 6 Prime Minister Verwoerd was stabbed to death in parliament. His assassin, a temporary parliamentary messenger and a native of Mozambique named Dimitri Tsafendas, was later adjudged insane. Balthazar J. Vorster, who succeeded Verwoerd as prime minister, was known as a hardliner. As Minister of Justice in the Verwoerd cabinet, he had been in direct charge of the government's repressive measures, and, when he became Prime Minister, he announced that he would retain personal control of the police. Although it was expected that his policies would be essentially the same as Verwoerd's, there were some minor relaxations.
Rhodesia

There was little change in the Rhodesian situation in 1966. A long round of "discussions about discussions" led up to a meeting between British Prime Minister Harold Wilson and Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith on board HMS Tiger in the Mediterranean at the beginning of December. This meeting brought forth a series of proposals providing, in essence, for a gradual transition to majority rule, with an immediate increase in African representation and participation in the government. An interim coalition government under Governor-General Humphrey Gibbs was to hold office while a Royal Commission sought the views of the European and African population of Rhodesia on the plan. The plan was accepted by the British cabinet, but the Rhodesian cabinet turned it down because it was unwilling to surrender power in the interim period. The Rhodesian Front members of parliament unanimously supported the rejection. Lord Malvern, prime minister of Southern Rhodesia from 1933 to 1964 and later prime minister of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, called on the government to accept the British proposals. In South Africa, the Nationalist newspaper Die Burger urged Rhodesia to surrender its independence on the ground that it was embarrassing its friends.

After the collapse of negotiations with the Rhodesian regime, Britain asked for selective economic sanctions against Rhodesia in the United Nations. The resolution voted in December was somewhat stronger than Britain had desired, but lacked the teeth that the African bloc tried to insert. It called on all nations to refrain from purchasing Rhodesia's principal exports, and from selling it various goods, including oil. It did not, however, provide for any sanctions against countries which failed to cooperate.

It was questionable whether mandatory sanctions would be much more effective than the voluntary ones already in effect, which had cut Rhodesia's foreign trade by about one-third and damaged rather than disrupted the economy. Oil sanctions had been particularly ineffective for South Africa sent ample substitute supplies by road and rail when Mozambique stopped the flow of petroleum. Perhaps half of the tobacco crop had remained unsold because of the British boycott; in spite of sanctions reduced prices brought some customers, reportedly including the French tobacco monopoly, West Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Communist China.

Internally, the government continued to maintain a state of emergency. The imposition of censorship made an appraisal of the extent of resistance on the part of the African population difficult. It was reported that a number of Africans were imprisoned for sabotage or rioting and numerous others were held in detention camps; some were even sentenced to death. Europeans were also penalized or interned under the emergency regulations.

The arrest and detention of African students and government interference with the administration of the University College of Rhodesia led to many
incidents. Several teachers of foreign nationality were arrested and deported and some Rhodesian teachers were imprisoned on various charges.

In September the High Court ruled that, while the Smith regime and the constitution it had proclaimed in 1965 were illegal, the regime was the only one existing de facto, and the courts were therefore bound to give effect to any actions it had the power to take under the 1961 constitution. This included the emergency regulations under which detentions could be ordered without trial.

Zambia and Malawi

The Rhodesian conflict affected the economy of Zambia more seriously than that of any other nation. Rhodesia had been Zambia's main supplier of consumer goods and raw materials; most of Zambia's electricity came from the Kariba hydroelectric plant, which she owned jointly with Rhodesia but which were located on the Rhodesian side of the Zambesi river, and, prior to 1965, all Zambia's copper had been exported by the jointly-owned Rhodesian Railways. Although Zambia succeeded in finding new suppliers for many imports formerly obtained from Rhodesia and producing some previously imported products herself, she was unable to do without others, including a good deal of coal. And, despite the development of alternative rail routes through the Congo and Malawi and new roads and air routes at considerable expense, she still needed to use Rhodesian Railways for the export of about half her copper.

In December Zambian Foreign Minister Simon Kapwepwe estimated that economic dislocations due to the Rhodesian situation had cost the country some $84,000,000 during the year. Nevertheless Zambia prospered, due to the decision of the copper companies, in April, to sell at the world market price instead of the lower price they had previously maintained. The Zambian government was able to start a four-year plan of over a billion dollars to develop industry, transportation, and education. This was one of the highest per capita investment rates in the world.

Politically, Zambia continued to function as a multi-party parliamentary democracy. The United National Independence party of President Kenneth D. Kaunda continued to have the support of an overwhelming majority of the population.

In August, the all-white National Progress party dissolved on the ground that its existence was no longer appropriate, and its 10 members in parliament, who held seats reserved for the European minority, were left free to follow whatever political course they saw fit. James Skinner, who was appointed Minister for Legal Affairs at the end of the year, became the first cabinet member of European descent since independence.

Malawi continued to be a one-party state under the almost absolute rule of President Hastings Kamazu Banda. A number of former cabinet members
and some of their followers remained in exile; there were occasional small-scale incursions of exiles, based on Tanzania. Relations between Malawi and Tanzania remained strained, despite some attempts to improve them; relations with Zambia, on the other hand, were good. Malawi also maintained fairly close economic ties and avoided outright conflict with Rhodesia, the Republic of South Africa, and Portuguese-ruled Mozambique.

**Botswana and Lesotho**

The High Commission territories of Bechuanaland and Basutoland became the independent states of Botswana and Lesotho on September 30 and October 4, respectively. Before the end of the year both states had joined the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity. They were also members of the Rand currency zone (using the currency of the Republic of South Africa), and of the South African Customs Union.

Both politically and economically, Botswana’s situation appeared to be somewhat more favorable than that of Lesotho. Besides the cattle which she had long exported, Botswana had potentially important mineral resources. Lesotho, however, had little arable land and no other known natural resources except mountain torrents that could become a source of electricity and water for export to South Africa. It was almost without roads and had only a few miles of railroad tracks. Lesotho was entirely surrounded by South Africa; Botswana bordered on Rhodesia and, for a very short stretch, on Zambia as well. Botswana and Lesotho were alike in that most of their working population was employed in South Africa.

President Seretse Khama of Botswana had the support of a large majority of the electorate, and a great deal of personal prestige. Prime Minister Leabua Jonathan of Lesotho, on the other hand, headed a party which had won only 32 per cent of the vote; the division of its opponents had given it a bare parliamentary majority. He was also sharply at odds with King Moeshoeshoe II. Throughout the year there were constitutional conflicts between the prime minister and the king and demonstrations by supporters of the king and the opposition parties, who had formed an alliance. By threatening to depose the king, Chief Jonathan forced him to surrender his constitutional powers and to submit to something approximating house arrest. The political situation remained unstable.

While neither state could afford to antagonize South Africa or attempt to cut economic ties with that country, there were significant differences in their attitudes. Jonathan, who reportedly had received assistance from South Africa during the election campaign, made it clear that he wanted close relations with that country. He conferred with both Premier Verwoerd and his successor, and was the only African chief of state at Verwoerd’s funeral. Seretse Khama, on the other hand, expressed his reluctance to establish diplomatic relations with South Africa; he felt that, although an African diplomat in that country would be subject to “countless indignities,” such relations were
necessary “for the sake of survival.” At the same time, he sought to cultivate close political and economic ties with other countries, especially Zambia. He also visited Israel and arranged for Israeli technical assistance in agriculture.

Maurice J. Goldbloom
South African Jewish Community

The latest official population figure for the Jews in South Africa, reported by the 1960 census, was 116,066 in a European (white) population of 3,088,492 and a total population (all races) of 16,002,797. Unofficial estimates, based on South African Jewry's 1936–60 rate of increase (less an allowance for emigration) suggested that the community had grown to about 120,000 in 1966.

CIVIC AND POLITICAL STATUS

Jews continued to participate as full and equal citizens in all branches of national life. In the general election of March 30 (p. 447) four Jews (all outgoing members of parliament) were reelected: Solomon Emdin and Ephraim Leonard Fisher (both United party), Simon Frank (National party) and Helen Suzman (Progressive party). Two Jewish members of parliament, Hyman Miller and Leonard Barnett Taurog (both United party), were defeated. There was no antisemitism in the election campaign. Charles Barnett and Abe Bloomberg remained in office as members of parliament elected on a separate slate to represent Cape Coloured voters, and E. B. Woolf continued in office as a senator.

South African Jewry's central representative institution, the South African Jewish Board of Deputies, conveyed the community's congratulations to the State President Charles Robberts Swart on the occasion of the national festival in May, marking the fifth anniversary of the establishment of South Africa as a republic. Surveys in the Jewish press reviewed the contributions of the Jews to the country.

When news of Premier Verwoerd's assassination on September 6 reached the people, Jews joined with all other citizens in expressing horror at the crime and offering their condolences to the government and the bereaved family. Leaders of the rabbinate, the Board of Deputies and the Zionist Federation represented the Jewish community at the state funeral in Pretoria. Mourning services were held in synagogues, as in churches, throughout the country. In their sermons at the main services, Orthodox Chief Rabbis Bernard Casper (Johannesburg) and Israel Abrahams (Cape Town), and Reform Rabbis Arthur Super (Johannesburg) and David Sherman (Cape Town) paid homage to Verwoerd's statesmanship and integrity, and eulogized his advance from an anti-Jewish attitude during the Hitler era to an understanding of the Jewish community, and the maintenance of equal rights for Jewish citizens and denunciation of antisemitism during his premiership.

In accordance with custom, a delegation from the Board of Deputies called upon the new prime minister on December 5 to convey to him the good wishes of South African Jewry. Vorster received the delegation cordially and affirmed his good will toward the Jewish community.

Concern was expressed over the omission in a bill for the establishment of an Afrikaans university in Johannesburg—introduced in parliament in October—of the traditional "conscience clause" in South African university legislation, which prohibited any test of conscience or religious belief in staff appointments or the admission of students. The bill made appointments subject to academic and administrative qualifications and subscription to the preamble of the republic's constitution affirming God's guidance in the destinies of South Africa, which the press criticized as a concealed religious test.

The Board of Deputies made representations to the minister of education and the sponsors of the bill to retain the "conscience clause." The sponsors were not prepared to do this, but they amended the bill by transferring the constitutional reference to its preamble (where it did not have the force of law) and rephrasing the clause on staff appointments and student admission to make it clear that these would be governed by merit alone. The minister assured parliament that there would be no discrimination on religious grounds. The Board of Deputies welcomed this assurance (which covered the interests of the Jewish community), but found it no substitute for the "conscience clause." The opposition (with the exception of the lone Progressive Helen Suzman), however, accepted the amended draft and the bill was passed without the clause.

In December three Jews were among the new appointees to the bench. R. N. Leon, Q.C., who had been serving as an acting judge, became a judge of the Natal bench; N. C. Addleson, S.C., a judge of the Eastern Province bench; and Cecil Margo, S.C., an acting judge on the Transvaal bench. In August Percy Yutar, deputy attorney general of the Transvaal, advanced to senior deputy attorney general. Walter Gradner was reelected mayor of Cape Town and Gustav Haberfeld, mayor of Kimberley. David Lazarus, a past mayor of East London, was again elected that city's first citizen. Several other towns had Jewish mayors and deputy mayors.

Antisemitism

In September the South African Council to Combat Communism arranged an "International Symposium on Communism" in Pretoria. The lecturers included Professor Stefan Possony, Director of the Hoover Institute on Peace, War and Revolution at Stanford University (United States), Major Edgar Bundy, Secretary of the Church League of America (United States), Mme. Suzanne Labin, president of the International Conference on Political Warfare (France), and Major-General H. J. van den Bergh, chief of South Africa's Security Police. In the course of his address, van den Bergh said that he was often asked why so many of "our Jewish friends" were listed as Com-
munists and why so many had been arrested for sabotage. He believed that Jews "tend to be involved" because Communism was "an extreme form of Capitalism." In a description of the police raid on Lilliesleaf Farm, Rivonia, in 1963 (in which three Jews were among several persons arrested on charges of planning sabotage and armed revolution; AJYB, 1964 [Vol. 65], pp. 339-40), he mentioned that the police had found the group's "action plan" lying on a table, obviously overlooked in the panic. He added jokingly: "You know, when a Jew gets scared, he gets very scared."

Van den Bergh's remarks evoked sharp criticism in the Jewish press and community. Board of Deputies' chairman Maurice Porter condemned them as "out of place and offensive, coming especially from a person occupying Major-General van den Bergh's responsible position." Zionist Federation chairman Edel Horwitz said they were "deplorable and offensive and would be resented by all right-thinking people."

Van den Bergh issued a statement denying antisemitic intent. He said he did not hold any racial group responsible for the fact that some of its members had become Communists. "I make no such allegations against the Jewish community and I would like to acknowledge with thanks and appreciation the particular help and personal friendship which I received from Jews in my extremely difficult task in the fight against Communism and sabotage."

At the same symposium, Professor Possony, speaking at a later session, warned against introducing antisemitism into the fight against Communism and, in a careful historical analysis, exploded the "Jews and Communism" myth.

This myth was especially exploited by a group called The Patriots' Society for Race Friendship in its publication *Boomerang*, which leaned heavily on the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* forgery and suggested, among other things, that the assassination of President Kennedy was part of a Zionist "international conspiracy." In a letter to the *Southern African Jewish Times*, the society took exception to being attacked as antisemitic; an editorial reply in the *Jewish Times* cited chapter and verse from *Boomerang* to substantiate the charge.

## COMMUNAL ORGANIZATION

Communal expansion marked time in 1966, as problems of fund raising awaited solution. The Board of Deputies continued its varied work, acting as spokesman for the community on matters of Jewish concern; cultivating good relations between Jews and non-Jews; exercising vigilance against antisemitism; coordinating Jewish communal work; sponsoring cultural programs; assisting small rural communities in maintaining Jewish life; servicing Jewish youth, and administering the United Communal Fund designed to help finance the leading national Jewish organizations.

In July Gustav Saron completed thirty years of service as the Board's general secretary, top post in South African Jewry's "civil service," and was
suitably feted by communal leaders. Johannesburg-born, Saron lectured in classics and Hebrew at the Witwatersrand University before practising law and joining the staff of the Board of Deputies. He played a key part in combating Nazi propaganda in South Africa during the Hitler years, and in expanding the Board's scope and activities. In lieu of taking a sabbatical leave, Saron embarked, in October, on a five-months' study tour of Jewish communities in the United States, Europe, and Israel.

The 13th national conference of the Union of Jewish Women of Southern Africa (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 453), held in Johannesburg in April, reviewed the widening services rendered by this representative women's organization through its 60 branches throughout the country. It engaged in goodwill work between Jews and non-Jews; participated in local welfare activities; sponsored friendship clubs and other services for the aged; ran day nurseries and soup kitchens for non-whites; did volunteer work in hospitals, and conducted an expanding adult education division providing audio-visual programs on Jewish and general cultural themes. The Union also participated in work to assist certain Israeli institutions; worked with the Board of Deputies in servicing youth, and conducted the women's campaign for the United Communal Fund. Pearl Mandelstam was elected to succeed Sylvia Silverman as the Union's national president, a position she had held before.

South African Jewish communal leaders participated in world Jewish conferences (World Jewish Congress, COJO, CJMCAG, World Council on Jewish Education), held in Brussels and Geneva in July.

Saul Joftes, director-general of B'nai B'rith's Office of International Affairs, Washington, D.C., toured South Africa in August and laid the foundations for eight new lodges, making a total of 20 in Southern Africa. During his visit, Joftes was received by Premier Verwoerd, who expressed interest in B'nai B'rith's work and commended the contribution of Jews to South Africa.

At its biennial conference in Johannesburg in June, the Hebrew Order of David, largest South African Jewish fraternal organization, reported its expansion to 27 affiliated lodges throughout the country. Harry Friedgut was elected to succeed Sam Jacobsohn as the order's grand president.

**Fund Raising**

In February Board of Deputies' chairman Maurice Porter told a meeting of deputies that the multiplication of fund-raising appeals and the overlapping of campaigns were impeding the United Communal Fund and blocking communal expansion. In March, Deputies' vice-chairman David Mann reported a meeting between leaders of the Board, the Zionist Federation, and the Board of Jewish Education, which resulted in agreement to rationalize and coordinate the main fund-raising appeals. Gustav Saron reported in May that the agreement had been "thrown back into the melting pot" because of claims advanced by the Zionist Federation. In June, Sydney Walt, chairman of the Cape council of the Board of Deputies, stated at his organization's annual
conference that "a position of near-chaos" had been reached in fund raising. He urged new efforts to secure agreement on priorities, regulation of targets, and spacing of campaigns.

In September Neill Maisels, chairman of the United Communal Fund's national planning committee, reported that the fund was running substantially short of its goal because the standard of contribution was too low and the number of workers inadequate. Shortage of funds also hampered the South African Board of Jewish Education. Lord Segal of Wytham came from England, and former Johannesburg Chief Rabbi Louis Rabinowitz from Israel to launch a drive for the Board's Judge Kuper Foundation Bursary Fund in Johannesburg in April. The response was substantial. In the Cape, a special emergency appeal had to be made to augment funds for Jewish education.

Religion

Dr. Israel Bersohn, president of the Federation of Synagogues of South Africa, told delegates to its national conference in Johannesburg in June that the federation now included most Orthodox congregations in the country. A parallel body enjoying cordial relationship with the federation, operated in the Cape and South-West Africa. Because of the passing of the older generation of rabbis and the difficulty of getting replacements from abroad, the conference assigned priority to the training of South African rabbis in the rabbinical college, established in Johannesburg under the auspices of the Federation of Synagogues and supported by the Board of Deputies and the Board of Jewish Education. A small number of students had already graduated and were holding posts with congregations. Building operations began in 1966 on new Johannesburg premises for the Federation of Synagogues and Beth Din, to be known as the Isaac Goldberg Religious Center, in honor of the man who contributed R70,000 (approximately $100,000) towards its construction.

There was a stir in the community when the Johannesburg Beth Din rebuked two Orthodox rabbis, who sent messages of congratulations to a neighborhood Reform temple which had invited them to its 21st anniversary celebration. The Beth Din sent circulars to congregations, warning rabbis and lay leaders against religious "fraternization" with Reform Judaism. Its attitude was criticized in the Jewish press, both at home and in England. The London Jewish Chronicle commented: "It is a pity that rabbis should warn against brotherly relationships between Jew and Jew, and a misreading of history to believe that this is the way to stifle new movements in Judaism. Indeed, what we need most in Jewish life today is more fraternization and less religious apartheid."

Orthodox Jewry in Cape Town, under Chief Rabbi Abraham's leadership, continued to make steady progress.

At the annual conference of the South African Union for Progressive
Judaism, held in Durban in May, its president Percy Moss-Rendell reported that South Africa now had the third largest Reform movement in the world. Taking note of the difficulties of getting new ministers from abroad, the conference projected a scheme to train Reform ministers locally.

New synagogues were dedicated or were under construction in Johannesburg (Orthodox and Reform), Pretoria (Orthodox), Cape Town (Reform), Port Elizabeth (Orthodox), and Klerksdorp (Orthodox).

**Education**

According to a statement made in February by Asher Rivlin, former director of the Cape Board of Jewish Education, the 5,000 children at Jewish day schools in South Africa represented five per cent of all Jewish children attending Jewish day schools throughout the world—"a wonderful percentage" for a community which formed less than one per cent of all Jews in the world. An additional estimated 10,000 children were receiving Jewish education in afternoon classes at Talmud Torahs, Hebrew nursery schools (mornings), Reform Hebrew schools, and a Yiddish school.

Zvi Adar, professor of education at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who came with A. Rosen, another instructor at the university to conduct a refresher course for South African Hebrew teachers in July, called the South African Jewish educational system one of the best in the diaspora. He had made a survey of the schools in 1964 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 454). Adar said that a similar refresher course, held in Europe in 1965, was attended by only 20 teachers. "Contrast that with 150 teachers who flocked to attend our seminar in South Africa," he added.

**Zionism and Relations with Israel**

There was evidence in 1966 of a resurgence of South African Jewry's traditional Zionist fervor, dampened in preceding years by the anti-South African attitude of the Israeli delegation at the United Nations. The resurgence was noted in the increased response to Zionist fund-raising campaigns and record attendances (12,000 in Johannesburg, proportionately high numbers in other centers) at the Yom Ha'atzmaut rallies to celebrate the 18th anniversary of Israel's establishment.

Israeli United Appeal organizers said that contributions to the 1966–67 IUA campaign, launched in August at Johannesburg and Cape Town banquets by Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman, executive vice-chairman of the UJA in the United States, exceeded expectations. Good results were also reported in a special campaign for Israel's Yatir Project, launched in February by former Israeli Minister to South Africa Cecil Hyman and the women's Zionist biennial campaign, launched in May by Israeli emissaries Hannah Gelber and Ruth Tekoah. Women's Zionist work, which largely constituted the backbone of routine Zionist activities and education, reflected the general fillip.

At the South African Zionist Youth conference in Johannesburg in July,
chairman Michael Kuper urged the extension of the organization's work to influence groups outside its ranks, as well as greater participation in communal activity. The conference also projected plans for increased *aliyah*.

The Zionist Federation launched a special fund in October which was to be used to plant a forest of 10,000 trees, if possible near Sdei Boker, in honor of Ben-Gurion's 80th birthday.

The Friends of the Hebrew University, Histadrut Ivrit, Magen David Adom, the South African Maccabi, and other Zionist bodies widened their activities.

At the beginning of the year, Lieutenant-Colonel Jacob Monbaz replaced Colonel Dov Sinai as Israel's Consul-General in South Africa; in July Eliezer Yapou succeeded Azriel Harel as *chargé d'affaires* of the Israel legation. Harry Sabel of Jerusalem succeeded Zvi Wineberg as head of the JNF in South Africa in May.

**Social Services**

Severe drought and inflationary pressures during the year were likely to result in increased welfare calls, warned Oscar Getz, president of the Johannesburg Hevra Kaddisha, the largest Jewish welfare body in South Africa, at its annual meeting in August. A similar warning was sounded at the annual meeting of the Cape Jewish Board of Guardians in November by its chairman Philip Marks. The Johannesburg Hevra Kaddisha's relief bill remained stationary at around R129,000 ($180,000); but the Witwatersrand Benevolent Association had to issue 221 interest-free loans totaling R189,797 ($271,130)—an increase of R27,523 ($39,320) over the preceding year's 180 loans. Jewish orphanages and homes for the aged in Johannesburg and Cape Town won praise from welfare authorities for their high standards. The Selwyn Segal Hostel for handicapped children moved to new model premises in Johannesburg.

Robin Gilbert of the World ORT Union directorate staff visited South Africa in September to stimulate ORT-OSE work including vocational guidance and educational grants, a plastics course at the Johannesburg Technical College, manual training facilities in Jewish day schools, and raising funds for ORT-OSE abroad.

**Cultural Activities**

A week-long Bible exhibit, arranged by the South African Jewish Board of Deputies in Johannesburg in February to launch Jewish Book Month, drew thousands of visitors. It included incunabula, flora and fauna of the Bible, stamps with biblical motifs, and the Bible in translation and in art. It also provided a speaker platform for Jewish and Christian scholars and religious leaders.

Another indication of the wide interest in the Bible was the large attendance at lectures given in July by Professor Abraham Malamat, associate pro-
fessor of ancient Jewish history and Bible at the Hebrew University, who visited South Africa to participate in the Conference of Old Testament Bible Scholars, held at Stellenbosch University as part of its centennial celebrations.

Cultural programs covering a variety of Jewish studies were conducted by the Board of Deputies, the Union of Jewish Women, the Women's Zionist Council, the Histadrut Ivrit, and the Yiddish Cultural Federation.

Books by South African Jewish writers published during the year included: Judaism Today and Yesterday, a book of essays by Chief Rabbi Bernard M. Casper; From Refugee to Citizen, a sociological study of refugees from Hitler Europe who settled in Southern Africa by Frieda Sichel; Beyn rand fun gold ("At the Rand of Gold"), a volume of Yiddish poems by Nathan Berger; White Africans Are Also People, political studies compiled by Sarah Gertrude Millin; The Power of Prejudice in South African Education, a research study by F. E. Auerbach; South African Dictionary of National Biography, compiled by Eric Rosenthal; Who Hangs the Hangman? a discussion of penology by Fanny Gross, and The Beginners, a novel by Dan Jacobson (a South African now living in London).

**Personalia**

Israel Aaron Maisels, Q.C., was appointed judge of the Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland court of appeals in November. The World Council of Synagogues awarded a special citation to member of parliament Helen Suzman in August "for her distinguished leadership in the battle to translate the prophetic vision that 'all men are created equal' into reality." Hyman Miller, former mayor of Johannesburg and member of parliament, received the Pennsylvania State University Altoona campus award, presented to a native of Altoona (from which Miller emigrated to South Africa as a child) in recognition of outstanding service.

Losses suffered by South African Jewry during the year included Edgar Samuel Henochsberg, judge of the Natal supreme court, who died at Durban in March; Ellis Silverman, pioneer of the South African fish canning industry and benefactor of Jewish education, who died at Cape Town in March; Ben Zion Shein, Cape Zionist leader, who died at Muizenberg in June; Theo Ronsheim, secretary of the South African Friends of the Hebrew University, who died at Johannesburg in June; Irma Stern, leading South African artist, who died at Cape Town in August; Bertha Goudvis, veteran South African writer who died at Johannesburg in September; Woolf Senior, veteran Zionist leader and philanthropist, who died at Johannesburg in November; Israel Jaffe, Johannesburg communal leader, who died in November.

Edgar Bernstein
World Jewish Population

It was not possible to ascertain the exact number of Jews in the various countries of the world in 1966. The figures presented below are based on local censuses, communal registrations, estimates of informed residents, and data obtained from a special inquiry conducted in 1966. They will have to be revised when more precise data become available. Questionnaires were sent to 43 major Jewish bodies in selected countries, requesting information about (a) the number of Jews in the country, including nationals and refugees; (b) figures for principal cities; (c) source of the data (census, communal registration, estimate); and (d) methods used in arriving at the estimate. Responses were received from 19 organizations. Most of the data obtained through the inquiry were based on estimates varying in accuracy. In some cases the figures have been adjusted on the basis of known changes. Changes due to natural increase have been taken into account only to the degree reflected in data obtained from local sources. Jewish population movements decreased considerably in 1966. In that year only about 15,000 Jews from North Africa and some areas in Europe emigrated to Israel, as against some 32,000 in 1965.

DISTRIBUTION BY CONTINENTS

The estimated world Jewish population at the end of 1966 was 13,538,000. About 6,700,000 (50 per cent) were in the Americas; 4,025,000 (30 per cent) in Europe (including the Asian part of Turkey and the Soviet Union);

---
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   Yugoslavia: Savez Jevrejskih Opstina Jugoslavije

---
2,460,000 (18 per cent) in Asia; 238,000 (1.5 per cent) in Africa, and 74,000 (0.5 per cent) in Australia.²

**Europe**

Of the 4,025,000 Jews in Europe, some 2,793,000 were in the Communist countries, including 2,543,000 in the Soviet Union. Over 1,225,000 were in the non-Communist countries. France, with an estimated population of 520,000, had the largest Jewish community in Western Europe. In Great Britain there were an estimated 450,000 Jews; some local observers believed

**TABLE 1. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN EUROPE, BY COUNTRIES, 1966**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>1,865,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>7,255,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>9,464,000</td>
<td>40,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>8,200,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>14,240,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>4,758,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>4,639,000</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>48,922,000</td>
<td>520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>76,000,000</td>
<td>31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>55,039,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8,551,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>10,179,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2,881,000</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>51,576,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>331,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>319,000</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>12,455,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3,723,000</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>31,496,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>9,199,000</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>19,105,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>31,870,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>7,734,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>5,945,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>32,901,000</td>
<td>43,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>233,200,000</td>
<td>2,543,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>19,756,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**          | **711,625,500**  | **4,025,250**      |


b Questionnaire.

c Includes about 1,300 in East Germany.

d Includes Asian regions of the USSR and Turkey.

² Figures in the tables below are rounded to the nearest 50, except in the case of Cyprus, where the number was obtained through the 1966 inquiry. Because of differences in sources and dates, some figures given here may not agree with figures in other sections of this volume.
that this figure was too high. About 120,000 Jews were in Rumania, and some 80,000 in Hungary. According to the latest estimate, the Jewish population of the Netherlands was some 30,000, including those not identified with any type of Jewish activity. Spain had approximately 7,000 Jews including new refugees from North Africa.

**North, Central, and South America**

The Jewish population of the United States was estimated at 5,720,000. There were some 275,000 Jews in Canada, and about 705,000 in South America and the West Indies.

### TABLE 2. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN NORTH, CENTRAL, AND SOUTH AMERICA AND THE WEST INDIES, BY COUNTRIES, 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population*</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>19,919,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>44,145,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>196,842,000</td>
<td>5,720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total North America</td>
<td>260,906,000</td>
<td>6,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>244,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1,488,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>7,833,000</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curacao</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>3,750,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>3,037,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>4,438,000</td>
<td>1,500b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>4,485,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2,363,000</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>1,843,000</td>
<td>600b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1,655,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>1,287,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Central America</td>
<td>33,546,000</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and West Indies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>22,691,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>3,748,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>84,679,000</td>
<td>140,000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8,567,000</td>
<td>35,000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>18,068,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>5,084,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>2,094,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>12,012,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinam</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>2,749,000</td>
<td>50,000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>9,030,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total South America</td>
<td>169,057,000</td>
<td>705,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>463,509,000</td>
<td>6,740,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Table 1, note a.  
  b See Table 1, note b.
America. Argentine had 450,000 Jews, and Brazil 140,000 (some observers in Brazil believed this figure to be too low). There was a further decrease in the Jewish population of Cuba, from 2,400 to 2,100.

Asia and Australia-New Zealand

Of the 2,460,000 Jews in Asia, 2,344,500 lived in Israel, 80,000 in Iran, and some 16,000 in India. No other country in Asia (except for Turkey and Asian USSR) had as many as 10,000 Jews. Australia's Jewish population was 69,000, and New Zealand's, 5,000.

**TABLE 3. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN ASIA, BY COUNTRIES, 1966**

<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>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>15,352,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>25,246,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>700,000,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>603,000</td>
<td>30b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>3,836,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>498,680,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>104,500,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>23,428,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>8,262,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2,656,800</td>
<td>2,344,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>97,960,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>105,044,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>33,477,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1,914,000</td>
<td>600b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>5,399,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>4,555,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,633,972,800</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,460,480</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a See Table 1, note *.  
  b See Table 1, note b.

**TABLE 4. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND, 1966**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>11,541,000</td>
<td>69,000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2,677,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,218,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>74,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a See Table 1, note *.  
  b See Table 1, note b.
Africa

The Jewish population of Africa dwindled to some 238,000; of these about 116,000 were in the Republic of South Africa. At the end of 1966, 70,000 Jews lived in Morocco, 23,000 in Tunisia, 3,000 in Algeria, and 2,500 in Egypt.

**TABLE 5. ESTIMATED JEWISH POPULATION IN AFRICA, BY COUNTRIES, 1966**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Jewish population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>12,093,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo Republic</td>
<td>16,167,000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>29,600,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>23,000,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>9,643,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1,677,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>13,323,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>18,296,000</td>
<td>116,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>4,260,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>4,675,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia (Northern Rhodesia)</td>
<td>3,710,000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>136,444,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>238,150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Table 1, note a.  
*b See Table 1, note b.

**COMMUNITIES WITH LARGEST JEWISH POPULATIONS**

The three largest Jewish communities in 1966 were in the United States, the Soviet Union, and Israel. Together they accounted for more than 78 per cent of the world Jewish population. Only in four other countries were there Jewish communities of 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>5,720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>2,543,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2,344,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Jewish population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<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>2,300&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>1,450&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</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>Brussels</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casablanca</td>
<td>52,000</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>Guatemala City</td>
<td>1,500&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haifa</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsinki</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izmir</td>
<td>4,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>38,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
<td>187,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>57,700&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>220,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>18,000&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</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>35,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>9,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</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>600&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</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>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>13,000&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salonika</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>São Paulo</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santiago</td>
<td>30,000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarajevo</td>
<td>1,000b</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>Subotica</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>28,000b</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>1,400b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zurich</td>
<td>6,150b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For cities in the United States, see p. 237.

b See Table 1, note b.
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List of Abbreviations

AAJE American Association for Jewish Education
ACLU American Civil Liberties Union
ADL Anti-Defamation League
AC academy
ACLU American Civil Liberties Union
act. active, acting
ad academy
adv. advisory
agr. agriculture
agr. agriculturist, agricultural
AJCom- mittee American Jewish Committee
AJCongress American Jewish Congress
AJYB AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR Book
Am. America, American
amb. ambassador
apptd. appointed
assoc. associate, association, associated
asst. assistant
atty. attorney
au. author
born
bd. board
Bib. Bible
bibliog. bibliography, bibliographer
Bklyn. Brooklyn
bur. bureau
Can. Canada
CCAR Central Conference of American Rabbis
chmn. chairman
CJFWF Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds
CJMCAG Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany
coll. collector, collective, college
Colo. Colorado
cm. committee
comdr. commander
comm. commission
commr. commissioner
comp. composer, composed
cond. conductor
conf. conference
cong. congress, congregation
constr. construction, constructed
contrib. contributor
corr. correspondent
d. died
dem. democrat
depart. department
dir. director
dist. district
div. division
econ. economic, economist
ed. editor
edit. edited
editl. editorial
edn. edition
educ. education, educator
educl. educational
Eng. English, England
estab. established
exec. executive
fund
founded
founder
federation
foreign
gen. general
Ger. German
gov. governor, governing
govt. government
Heb. Hebrew
hist. historical, history
hon. honorary
hospital
HUC-JIR Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion
Hung. Hungarian
ILGWU International Ladies' Gar- ment Workers' Union
incl. including
ind. independent
inst. institute
instn. institution
instr. instructor
internat. international
Ital. Italian
JDA Joint Defense Appeal
JDC American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee
JEC Jewish Education Committee
JNF Jewish National Fund
JPA Joint Palestine Appeal
JPS Jewish Publication Society
JTA Jewish Telegraphic Agency
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JTS</td>
<td>Jewish Theological Seminary of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWB</td>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWW</td>
<td>Jewish War Veterans of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lang</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCBC</td>
<td>Large City Budgeting Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leg</td>
<td>legal, legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit</td>
<td>literature, literary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mag</td>
<td>magazine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med</td>
<td>medical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mem</td>
<td>member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metrop</td>
<td>metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mfr</td>
<td>manufacturer, manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mng</td>
<td>managing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mgmtr</td>
<td>manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ms</td>
<td>manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAACP</td>
<td>National Association for the Advancement of Colored People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nat</td>
<td>national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>National Council of Churches of Christ in U.S.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCJ</td>
<td>National Conference of Christians and Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRAC</td>
<td>National Community Relations Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYANA</td>
<td>New York Association for New Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.Y.C.</td>
<td>New York City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>off</td>
<td>office, officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>org</td>
<td>organized, organizers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orgn</td>
<td>organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORT</td>
<td>Organization for Rehabilitation through Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSE</td>
<td>Oeuvre de Secours aux Enfants Israélites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pal</td>
<td>Palestine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phar</td>
<td>pharmacist, pharmaceutical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phys</td>
<td>physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres</td>
<td>president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prin</td>
<td>principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prod</td>
<td>producer, production, producing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prof</td>
<td>professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseud</td>
<td>pseudonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pub</td>
<td>publish, publication, publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rabb</td>
<td>rabbinate, rabbinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>Rabbinical Council of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recd</td>
<td>received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel</td>
<td>religion, religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reorg</td>
<td>reorganized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rep</td>
<td>representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ret</td>
<td>retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>Rumania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RZA</td>
<td>Religious Zionists of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Synagogue Council of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sch</td>
<td>school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sci</td>
<td>scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sec</td>
<td>secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sect</td>
<td>section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sem</td>
<td>seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soc</td>
<td>society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spec</td>
<td>special, specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supt</td>
<td>superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>techr</td>
<td>teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theol</td>
<td>theological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>translator, translated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trav</td>
<td>travel, traveler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treas</td>
<td>treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAHC</td>
<td>Union of American Hebrew Congregations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAR</td>
<td>United Arab Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHS</td>
<td>United HIAS Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIA</td>
<td>United Israel Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UJA</td>
<td>United Jewish Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>univ</td>
<td>university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRWA</td>
<td>United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOJC</td>
<td>Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPA</td>
<td>United Palestine Appeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USO</td>
<td>United Service Organizations, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol</td>
<td>volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.pres</td>
<td>vice president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIZO</td>
<td>Women's International Zionist Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJC</td>
<td>World Jewish Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WZO</td>
<td>World Zionist Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yid</td>
<td>Yiddish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YIVO</td>
<td>YIVO Institute for Jewish Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMHA</td>
<td>Young Men's Hebrew Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrs</td>
<td>years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWHA</td>
<td>Young Women's Hebrew Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion</td>
<td>Zionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOA</td>
<td>Zionist Organization of America</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Jewish Organizations

UNITED STATES

Organizations are listed according to functions as follows:

Religious, Educational 479
Cultural 475
Community Relations 473
Overseas Aid 478
Social Welfare 491
Social, Mutual Benefit 489
Zionist and Pro-Israel 493

Note also cross-references under these headings:

Professional Associations 498
Women's Organizations 499
Youth Organizations 499

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. Bertram H. Gold. 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 opportunity through education and civic action; seeks to broaden understanding of the basic nature of prejudice and to improve techniques for combating it; promotes a philosophy of Jewish integration by projecting a balanced view with respect to full participation in American life and retention of Jewish identity. AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK (with Jewish Publication Society of America); Commentary; Insight; Newsletter; Proceedings of Annual Meeting.

AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE ON SOVIET JEWRY (1964). 55 W. 42 St., Suite 1530,

1 Includes national Jewish organizations in existence for at least one year prior to June 30, 1965, 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, 1966 (Vol. 67).
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, D. C. 20036. Co-Chmn. William A. Wexler (B’nai B’rith), S. Teff (Board of Deputies of British Jews), Maurice Porter (South African Jewish Board of Deputies); Secs. Gen. Jay Kaufman (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 respect to 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).** 15 Park Row, N. Y. C., 10038. Pres. Herman P. Mantell; 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. *CJO Digest.*

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; Point of View.

—, Women's Division of (1947). Atran Center for Jewish Culture, 25 E. 78 St., N. Y. C, 10021. Nat. Chmn. Eleanor Schachner. 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.


Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America (1896). 1712 New Hampshire Ave., N. W., Washington 9, D. C. Nat. Comdr. Malcolm A. Tarlov; Nat. Exec. Dir. Monroe R. Sheinberg. Seeks the maintenance of true allegiance to the United States of America; to combat bigotry and to prevent or stop defamation of Jews; to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish new ones; to foster the education of ex-servicemen, ex-servicewomen, and members in the ideals and principles of Americanism. Headquarters Newsletter; Jewish Veteran; Legislative Newsletter.


National Community Relations Advisory Council (1944). 55 West 42 St., N. Y. C, 10036. Chmn. Aaron Gold- man; Exec. V. Chmn. Isaiah M. Minkoff. Consultative, coordinating and advisory council in Jewish community relations, seeking equal status and opportunity for Jews, full expression of their values as a group and their full participation in the general society. Works with national and local cooperating agencies to reach agreement on policies, strategies, and programs; to formulate and improve techniques, and to plan the most effective utilization of collective resources for common ends. 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; Folk un Velt; Information Series; Information Sheets; Institute of Jewish Affairs Reports; World Jewry.

CULTURAL


Torah Shelemah (the Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation) and related publications; disseminates the teachings and values of the Bible.


Histadruth Ivrit of America (1916; reorg. 1922). 120 W. 16 St., N.Y.C., 10011. Pres. Judah Pilch; 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 of 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 Noar Ivri, a youth group.
on campuses and in cities throughout the United States; sponsors cultural exchange with Israel through organized tours and ulpanim. *Annual of Hebrew Academy; Hadoar; Lamishpaha; Niv; Ferakim.*

**HEBREW ARTS FOUNDATION (1939).** 120 W. 16 St., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Marcus Rottenberg; Dir. Tzipora H. Jochsberger. Promotes an understanding and appreciation of Hebrew culture in the American Jewish community through such educational projects as the Hebrew Arts School for Music and Dance, Hebrew Arts Teacher-Training School, and Hebrew Arts Music Publications.


**JEWISH LITURGICAL MUSIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA (1963).** c/o Mrs. Irene Heskes, 90-15 68 Ave., Forest Hills, N.Y. 11375. Chmn. A. W. Binder; Sec. Mrs. Irene Heskes. Seeks to advance the standards of American synagogue music; to collect, study and perform old and new synagogue music; to provide an active musicalological forum for all types of synagogue musicians of all branches of Jewish observance. *Annual Bulletin.*

**JEWISH MUSEUM (1904) (under the auspices of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America).** 1109 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10028. Dir. Sam Hunter. Collects, identifies, and exhibits Jewish ceremonial objects of all eras; encourages the design and manufacture of contemporary ceremonial objects; exhibits contemporary art; sponsors lectures and other activities related to the museum’s programs.

**JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY OF AMERICA (1888).** 222 N. 15 St., Philadelphia, Pa. 19102. Pres. Joseph M. First; Exec. Dir. Lesser Zussman. Publishes and disseminates books of Jewish interest on history, religion, and literature for the purpose of preserving the Jewish heritage and culture. *American Jewish Year Book* (with American Jewish Committee); *Annual Catalogue; JPS Bookmark.*

**LEO BAÈCK INSTITUTE, INC. (1955).** 129 E. 73 St. N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Max Gruenwald; Exec. Dir. Max Kreutzberger; Sec. Fred Grubel. Engages in 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 monographs. *Bulletin; LBI News; Year Book.*


**MEMORIAL FOUNDATION FOR JEWISH CULTURE, INC. (1965).** 215 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Nahum Goldmann; Exec. Dir. Mark Uveeler. Supports Jewish cultural and educational programs all over the world, in cooperation with universities and established scholarly organizations; conducts annual scholarship and fellowship program.

**NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR JEWISH CULTURE (1960).** 31 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10010. Pres. Label A. Katz; Exec. Dir. Harry I. Barron. 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.*


**NATIONAL INFORMATION BUREAU FOR JEWISH LIFE (1960).** 31 Lafayette Ave., Bklyn, N.Y., 11217. Pres. Chaim U. Lipschitz; Exec. Sec. J. P. Sommer. Promotes a fuller understanding of the achievements and contributions made by Jews in the fields of American government, business, the performing arts, and sciences; endeavors to depict more dramatically the patriotic roles of Jews in reciting the history of America through a more significant identification of events with personalities and places. *Legislative Newsletter; President’s Annual Report.*

**NATIONAL JEWISH MUSIC COUNCIL (1944).**
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.


**OVERSEAS AID**


American Council for Judaism Philanthropic Fund (1955). 201 E. 57 St., N. Y. C., 10022; Pres. Charles J. Tenenbaum; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Anna Walling 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.


———: National ORT League (1941).


UNITED HIAS SERVICE, INC. (1884; reorg. 1954). 200 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C, 10003. Pres. Murray I. Gurfein; Exec. Dir. Gaynor I. Jacobson. World-wide organization with offices, affiliates, committees in United States, Europe, North Africa, Latin America, Canada, Australia, Israel, and Hong Kong. Assists Jewish immigrants in pre-immigration planning, visa documentation, consular representation and intervention, transportation, reception, 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. 


**RELIGIOUS, EDUCATIONAL**

AGUDAT ISRAEL—PIRCHEI CHILDREN'S DIVISION (1925). 5 Beekman St.,

Girls' Division—Bnos Agudath Israel (1921). 5 Beekman St., N. Y. C., 10038. Chmn. Esther Oelbaum. 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. Leaders Guide; Orthodox Tribune.


Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists (1947). 84 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Seymour Glick; 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; Proceedings.


Cantors Assembly of America (1947). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10027. Pres. Saul Meisels; Exec. V. Pres. Samuel Rosenbaum. Seeks to unite all cantors who are adherents to traditional Judaism and who serve as full-time cantors in bona fide congregations; to conserve and promote the musical traditions of the Jews; to elevate the status of the cantorial profession. Annual Proceedings; Journal of Synagogue Music.


Central Yeshivah Beth Joseph Rabbinical Seminary (in Europe 1891; in
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HEBREW UNION COLLEGE MUSEUM (1913). 3101 Clifton Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio 45220. Dir. Jacob R. Marcus. Assembles, classifies, and preserves Jewish orphans to their former families and to the Jewish faith and environment.


GRATZ COLLEGE (1895). 10 St. and Tabor Rd., Philadelphia, Pa. 19141. Pres. Mitchell E. Panzer; Dean Elazar Goelman; Registrar Daniel Isaacman. Prepares 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 Bulletin; Gratz-Chass; Ner Talmid; Telem; What’s New; Yearbook.

HEBREW TEACHERS COLLEGE (1921). 43 Hawes St., Brookline, Mass. 02146. Dean Eisig Silberschlag. Educates 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. Pres. Mendel Haber; Dean Gershon Winer. 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. Bulletin; Hed-Herzliah; Yearbook.

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; Chmn. of Bd. Herman Levin; Exec. V. Pres. Emanuel S. Goldsmith. 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). 1182 Broadway, N. Y. C, 10001. Pres. Martin S. Dodell; 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. JTA Bulletin.

JEWISH TEACHERS SEMINARY AND PEOPLE’S UNIVERSITY (1918). 515 Park Ave., N. Y. C, 10022. Pres. Jacob Katzman; Dean Gershon Winer; Sec. Martin Menchel. Only Hebrew-Yiddish seminary in America training men and women for Jewish teaching profession, research and community service, conferring the degrees of Bachelor of Jewish Literature, Bachelor of Jewish Pedagogy, and Doctor of Jewish Literature; also offers courses in Jewish music, camp counselling, and trains trilingual secretaries for Jewish communal service. Seminary News.

JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA (1886; reorg. 1902). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C, 10027. Chancellor Louis Finkelstein; Chmn. Bd. of Dir. Simon H. Rifkind; Pres. Alan M. Stroock. Organized for the perpetuation of the tenets of the Jewish religion, the cultivation of Hebrew literature, the pursuit of Biblical and archeological research, the advancement of Jewish scholarship, the maintenance of a library, and the training of rabbis and teachers; maintains the Ramah camps. Seminary Progress.


——: INSTITUTE FOR RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL STUDIES (N. Y. C 1938; Chicago* Deceased.)
1944; Boston 1945). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10027. Pres. Louis Finkelstein; Dir. Jessica Feingold. Serves as a scholarly and scientific fellowship of clergymen and other religious teachers who desire authoritative information regarding some of the basic issues now confronting spiritually-minded men.


———: TEACHERS INSTITUTE-SEMINARY COLLEGE OF JEWISH STUDIES (1909). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10027. Chancellor Louis Finkelstein; Dean Seymour Fox. Offers complete college program in Judaica and teacher education for the degrees of Bachelor of Hebrew Literature or Bachelor of Religious Education.

UNIVERSITY OF ZIONISM, West Coast School of JUS (1947). 525 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. Maarav; Register; University News.


MESIVTA YESHIVA RABBI CHAIM BERLIN RABBINICAL ACADEMY (1905). 1411 Dinsmore Ave., Ft. Rockaway, N. Y. 11691. Pres. Harry Hamei; Dean Albert J. Davis. Maintains elementary division in the Hebrew and English departments, lower Hebrew division and Mesivta high school, rabbinical academy, and postgraduate school for advanced studies in Talmud and other branches of rabbinic scholarship; maintains Camp Morris, a summer study camp. Kol Torah; Merchav; Shofar.

MIRRER YESHIVA CENTRAL INSTITUTE (in Poland 1817; in U. S. 1947). 1791-5 Ocean Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11223. Dean Shrage Moshe Kalmanowitz. Maintains rabbinical college, postgraduate school for Talmudic research, accredited high school, and Kollel and Sephardic divisions; dedicated to the dissemination of Torah scholarship in the community and abroad; engages in rescue and rehabilitation of scholars overseas.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HILLEL DIRECTORS (1949). c/o Adelphi University, Garden City, N. Y. 11530. Pres. Leo Lichtenberg. Seeks to facilitate exchange of experience and opinion among Hillel directors and counselors and promote the welfare of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundations and their professional personnel.


NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR JEWISH EDUCATION (1926). 101 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Elijah Bortniker. Seeks to further the cause of Jewish education in America; to raise professional standards and practices; to promote the welfare and growth of Jewish educational workers; and to improve and strengthen Jewish life generally. Jewish Education; Sheviley Hachinuch.

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR TORAH EDUCATION OF MIZRACHI-HAPOEL HAMIZRACHI (Religious Zionists of America) (1939). 200 Park Ave., N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Bernard Bergman; Dir. Pincus B. Soller. Organizes and supervises yeshivot and Talmud Torahs; prepares and trains teachers; publishes textbooks and educational materials; conducts a placement agency for Hebrew schools; sponsors the National Association for Orthodox Educators. Bitaon Chemed; Yeshiva Education.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF BETH JACOB SCHOOLS, INC. (1943). 115 Heyward St., Bklyn. N. Y., 11206. Pres. David Ullmann; Sec.-Treas. M. Berman. 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. Nathan Saperstein; Exec. V. Pres. 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. Sponsors kosher dining clubs and fraternity houses and an Israel program. Armed Forces Viewpoint; Newsletter;
Women's League Manuals; Young Israel Viewpoint; Youth Department Manuals.

ARMED FORCES BUREAU (1939). 3 W. 16 St., R. Y. C., 10011. Chmn. Herbert Ausubel; 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.


ETERZ ISRAEL DIVISION (1926). 3 W. 16 St., N. Y. C., 10011. Chmn. Joseph Schechter. Promotes Young Israel synagogues and youth work in all synagogues in Israel; sponsors Young Israel Mogan Hayeled Home in B'nai Brak.


INTERCOLLEGIATE COUNCIL—YOUNG ADULTS (1950). 3 W. 16 St., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Stephen Bressler; 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'ELYIM-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.

RABBINICAL ALLIANCE OF AMERICA (IGUD HARABBANIM) (1944). 156 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Abraham B. Hecht; Sec. Haskel Lindenthal. Seeks to promote Conservative Judaism and the organized rabbinate that is consistently Orthodox; seeks to elevate the position of Orthodox rabbis nationally, and to defend the welfare of Jews the world over. Perspective.

RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY (1900). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10027. Pres. Eli A. Bohnen; Exec. V. Pres. Wolfe Kelman. Seeks to promote Conservative Judaism, and to foster the spirit of fellowship and cooperation among the rabbis and other Jewish scholars; cooperates with the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and the United Synagogue of America. Conservative Judaism; Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly; Rabbinical Assembly Manual.

RABBINICAL COLLEGE OF TELSHIE, INC. (1941). 28400 Euclid Ave., Wickliffe, Ohio. Pres. Mordecai Gifter; Exec. V. Pres. Aaron Paperman. College for higher Jewish learning, specializing in Talmudic studies and Rabbinics; maintains a preparatory academy including secular high school, a postgraduate department, a teachers' training school, and a teach-
ERS SEMINARY FOR WOMEN. PRI ETT CHAIM—JOURNAL FOR TALMUDIC RESEARCH; SEMIANNUAL NEWS BULLETIN.

RABBINICAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC. (1923; reorg. 1935). 84 FIFTH AVE., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Pesach Z. Lebovitz; Exec. V. Pres. Israel Klavan. Promotes Orthodox Judaism in the community; supports institutions for study of Torah; stimulates creation of new traditional agencies. HADOROM; RECORD; SERMON MANUAL; TRADITION.


SHOLEM ALEICHEM FOLK INSTITUTE, INC. (1918). 41 UNION SQUARE, N. Y. C., 10002. Pres. Edward Solomon; Exec. Dir. Saul Goodman. Aims to imbue children with Jewish values through teaching Yiddish language and literature, Hebrew and the Bible, Jewish history, significance of Jewish holidays, folk and choral singing, and about Jewish life in America and Israel; offers preparation for bar mitzvah. KINDER JOURNAL; PARENTS BULLETIN; SHOLEM ALEICHEM.

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS OF THE TOouro SYNAGOGUE, NATIONAL HISTORIC SHRINE, INC. (1948). 85 Touro ST., NEWPORT, R. I. Pres. Samuel BARNET; Sec. Theodore Lewis. Assists in the maintenance of the Touro Synagogue as a national historic site. TOURO SYNAGOGUE BROCHURE.


TORAH UMESORAH NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR HEBREW DAY SCHOOLS (1944). 156 FIFTH AVE., N. Y. C., 10010. Nat. Pres. Samuel C. Feuerstein; Nat. Dir. Joseph Kaminetsky. Establishes and services Hebrew day schools throughout U. S. and Canada; conducts teacher training institutes, teaching seminar and workshops for in-service training of teachers; publishes textbooks and supplementary reading material. Supervises Federal aid programs for Hebrew day schools throughout the U. S. HAMENAHEL; JEWISH PARENT; OLOMEINU—OUR WORLD.


UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS (1873). 838 FIFTH AVE., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Maurice N. Eisendrath; Admin. Sec. Pro Tem Albert Vorspan. Serves as the central congregational body of Reform Judaism in the western hemisphere; serves its approximately 664 affiliated temples and membership with religious, educational, cultural, and administrative programs.
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NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEMPLE ADMINISTRATORS OF (1941). 838 FIFTH AVE., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Henry Frankhauser; Admin. Sec. Milton Kulick. 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 stand-
Architectural Library consisting of photography, finance, building maintenance, design construction, and art aspects of synagogues. Assists congregations in managing materials associated with the aims of Reform Judaism; stimulates communal interest in and responsibility for Jewish religious education. NATE News.

National Association of Temple Educators (1955). 838 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C, 10021. Pres. Max Frankel; Exec. Sec. James J. Levberg. 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. William Chafets; Nat. Dir. Samuel Cook. Seeks to train Reform Jewish youth in the values of the synagogue 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. Joseph Karasick; 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 relationship to governmental and civic bodies, and the general Jewish community; conducts the national authoritative U Kashruth certification service. Jewish Action; Jewish Life; U Kosher Products Directory; Youth Study Guides.


Women's Branch of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, Inc. (Agudas Ha-
UNION OF SEPHARDIC CONGREGATIONS, INC. (1940). 235 E. Broadway, N. Y. C., 10002. Mem. of Presidium Eliezer Silver, Moshe Feinstein, Jacob Kamenetzky, 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 publishes regulations on synagogue structure and worship.


UNITED LUBAVITCHER YESHIVOTH (1940). 218 E. 70 St., N. Y. C, 10021. Chmn. Simon Greenberg; Dir. Menahem Schneerson. Promotes the religious interests of Lubavitcher Jews; prepares and distributes Lubavitcher prayer books and provides religious leaders for Lubavitch congregations.

UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA (1918). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C, 10027. Pres. Henry N. Rapaport; Exec. Dir. Bernard Segal. Association of Conservative congregations in the United States and Canada seeking 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 (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. Igeret; In Your Hands; Our Age; Synagogue School.


NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SYNAagogue Administrators of (1948). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C, 10027. Pres. Abraham Stadlen; Sec. Bernard Feinberg. Aids congregations affiliated with the United Synagogue of America to further aims of Conservative Judaism through more effective administration; advances professional standards and promotes new methods in administration; cooperates in United Synagogue placement services and administrative surveys. The Synagogue Administrator.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF JEWISH Men's Clubs, Inc. (1929). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C, 10027. Pres. Manny London; Sec. Abraham A. Silver. Maintains a national organization of synagogue-affiliated Jewish men's clubs or brotherhoods dedicated to the ideals and principles of traditional Judaism; seeks to help build a dynamic Judaism through social, cultural, and religious activities and programs. Torch.

NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF (1918). 3080 Broadway, N. Y. C, 10027. Nat. Pres. Mrs. Sol Henkind; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Baruch I. Treiger. Parent body of sisterhoods of the Conservative movement in the U. S., Canada, Puerto Rico, and Mexico; provides affiliates with a program covering religious, educational, social action, leadership training, Israel affairs and community projects, and publishes books of Jewish interest; contributes in support of Jewish Theological...
Seminary and construction of Schechter women's residence hall. *Women's League Outlook.*

---


West Coast Talmudical Seminary, Mesivta Beth Medrash Elyon, Inc. (1953). 851 No. Kings Rd., Los Angeles, Calif. 90069. Pres. Abraham Linderman; Dean S. Wasserman; Sec. H. Fried. Provides facilities for intensive Torah education as well as Orthodox rabbinical training on the West Coast; conducts an accredited college preparatory high school combined with a full program of Torah-Talmudic training and a graduate Talmudical division on a college level.


Yavneh, National Religious Jewish Students Association (1960). 84 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Ben-Zion Hochstein; Nat. V. P. Henry Horwitz. 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 Judaica; Studies in Torah Judaism; Sura; Talmi; Y. U. News.

---

tion Newsletter; Yeshiva College Alumni Bulletin; Yeshiva University Alumni Review.


Yeshivath Torah Vodaath and Mesivta Rabbinical Seminary (1918). 141 S. 3 St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 11211. Chmn. of Bd. Marvin Herskowitz; 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. Israel Lefkowitz; Chmn. of Bd. Daniel Sukenik. 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; Hamesivta Torah Periodical.


SOCIAL, MUTUAL BENEFIT


CENTRAL SEPHARDIC JEWISH COMMUNITY OF AMERICA (1940). 225 W. 34 St., N. Y. C., 10001. Seeks to maintain contact between U. S. Sephardic organizations and Sephardic communities overseas; to raise funds for scholarships for students in Israel and United States.

FARBAND—LABOR ZIONIST ORDER (1913). 575 Sixth Ave., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. Samuel Bonchek; 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. *Farbnda News.*


**Hebrew Veterans of the War with Spain** (1899). 87-71 94 St., Woodhaven, N. Y. 11421. Commander Samuel J. Semsler. 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.); Foroys (Mexico); Lebns-Fragen (Israel); Unser Gedank (Argentina); Unser Gedank (Australia); Unser Shitme (France).*


**Mu Sigma Fraternity, Inc.** (1906). 140 Nassau St., N. Y. C., 10038. Pres. Harvey Kalmeyer; Rec. Sec. Steven Haas. Sponsors 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 Gan, Israel; aids needy Jews all over the world; 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 economic rehabilitation; and to represent and further the interests of Rumanian Jews in the United States. *Record.*

**Workmen's Circle** (1900). 175 E. Broadway, N. Y. C., 10002. Pres. Israel Breslow; Exec. Sec. Benjamin A. Gebiner. Benevolent aid; cultural; educational; fraternal. *Culture and Education; Der Freind; Kinder Zeitung; Workmen's Circle Call.*

——,** Division of Jewish Labor Committee** (see p. 474)

——,** English-Speaking Division** (1927). 175 E. Broadway, N. Y. C., 10002. Pres. Israel Breslow; Exec. Sec. Benjamin A. Gebiner. Representing the second and third generation of the Workmen's Circle, it fosters social, cultural, and educational activities within the framework of a Jewish labor and fraternal organization. *Circleite; Point of View* (with Jewish Labor Committee); *Workmen's Circle Call.*


**World Sephardi Federation, American Branch** (1951). 152 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 10036; Presidium, Denzil Sebag-Montefiore, Bohor Chitrit, 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-Sepharad.*
SOCIAL WELFARE

AMERICAN JEWISH CORRECTIONAL CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION, INC. (formerly NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH PRISON CHAPLANS) (1937). 10 E. 73 St., N. Y. C., 10021. (Cooperating with the New York Board of Rabbis and Jewish Family Service.) Pres. Herbert I. Bloom; Sec. Israel Renov. 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.


CITY OF HOPE—A NATIONAL MEDICAL CENTER UNDER JEWISH AUSPICES (1913). 208 W. 8 St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90014. Pres. Emanuel H. Fineman; Exec. Dir. Ben Horowitz. As pilot medical center, seeks to influence medicine and science everywhere, affecting treatment, research, and medical education in catastrophic diseases; is responsible for 550 original findings; admits patients suffering from cancer, leukemia, heart and chest diseases, tuberculosis, and blood disorders on a completely free, nonsectarian basis, from all parts of the nation. Pilot; Torch-bearer.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL JEWISH WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS (1925). 15 E. 84 St., N. Y. C., 10028. Pres. Mrs. Henry A. Cohen; V. Pres. Mrs. Albert Wald; Sec.-Treas. Mrs. Richard M. Bleier. 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.


DEBORAH HOSPITAL (1922). Brown Mills,


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. Eula; Exec. Dir. and Chief Counsel Solomon Z. Weiss. 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.

International Council of Jewish Women (1912). 13435 North Park Boulevard, Cleveland, O., 44118. Pres. Mrs. Ronald Brown; Sec. Mrs. Alexander Mintz. Seeks to promote cooperation among Jewish women and to advance their status in Jewish and secular law; guides affiliates in developing Jewish education, social-welfare, and volunteer-training programs; acts as consultant to ECOSOC and UNICEF. Newsletter.


Jewish Braille Institute of America, Inc. (1931). 48 E. 74 St., N. Y. C., 10021. Pres. Emil N. Baar; Exec. Dir. Jacob Freid. Seeks to serve the religious and cultural needs of the Jewish blind by publishing prayerbooks in Hebrew and English Braille; providing Yiddish, Hebrew and English records for Jewish blind throughout the world who cannot read Braille; maintaining worldwide free Braille lending library. Jewish Braille Review.


National Council of Jewish Prison
CHAPLAINS, INC. See AMERICAN JEWISH CORRECTIONAL CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION, INC.


NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD (1917). 145 E. 32 St., N. Y. C., 10016. Pres. Louis Stern; Exec. V. Pres. Sanford Solender. Serves as national association of Jewish community centers and YM-YWHAs; 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 YMHA's and Jewish Community Centres; sponsors Jewish Book Council, National Jewish Music Council, JWB Lecture Bureau. (Represents American Jewish community in USO.) JWB Circle (of which In Jewish Book-land and Jewish Music Notes are supplements); Jewish Community Center Program Aids; WB Year Book.

PRESIDENT'S COMMUNITY IN ON JEWISH CHAPLAINCY (1940). 45 E. 32 St., N. Y. C., 10016. Chmn. Selwyn D. Ruslander; Dir. Aryeh Lev. Represents Reform, Orthodox, and Conservative rabbis on matters relating to chaplaincy; the only government recognized agency authorized to recruit, ecclesiastically endorse, and serve all Jewish military chaplains. Jewish Chaplain.


ZIONIST AND PRO-ISRAEL

AMERICA-ISRAEL CULTURAL FOUNDATION, INC. (formerly AMERICAN FUND FOR ISRAEL INSTITUTIONS, INC.) (1939). 4 East 54 St., N. Y. C., 10022. Pres. Isaac Stern; Sec. Harry J. Rubenstein. Supports projects in 50 Israeli cultural institutions, including the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, the Habimah theater, the Inbal dancers, Israel Museum, and Academies of Music; sponsors cultural exchange between the United States and Israel; awards scholarships in all the arts to young Israelis for study in Israel and abroad. Tarbut.


AMERICAN FRIENDS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN ISRAEL (formerly League for Religious Freedom in Israel) (1963). 27 North, Stoneham, Mass., 02180. Pres. Horace M. Kallen; Sec. Alex Hershft. Dedicated to the principle of full religious freedom in Israel through separation of church and state; seeks to promote public knowledge of religious coercion in Israel, to advise leaders of Israel of critical importance of separation of church and state, and to rally American Jewish support behind the forces in Israel fighting for this principle.
AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COM-
mittee (formerly American Zionist Committee
for Public Affairs) (1954). 1341 G St., N. W., Washing-
ton, D. C. 20005. Chmn. Philip S. Bernstein; Exec.
Dir. I. L. Kamen. Conducts public action bearing
upon relations with governmental
authorities with a view to maintaining
and improving friendship and good will
between the United States and Israel.

AMERICAN-ISRAELI LIGHTHOUSE, INC.
(1928; reorg. 1955). 30 E. 60 St., N. Y. C.,
10022. Pres. Mrs. Irving Lebo; Exec. Sec.
Mrs. Anne Shatz. Provides education and
rehabilitation for the blind in Israel with
the purpose of effecting their social and
vocational integration into the seeing
community. 

AMERICAN JEWISH LEAGUE FOR ISRAEL
(1957). 30 E. 42 St., N. Y. C., 10017.
Pres. Samuel H. Daroff; Secs. Louis Fish-
bein and Judah Richards. Seeks to unite
all those who, notwithstanding differing
philosophies of Jewish life, are com-
mitted to the historical ideals of Zion-
ism; works in conjunction with public or
party, for the welfare of Israel as a
whole. Bulletin of the American Jewish
League for Israel.

AMERICAN PHYSICIANS FELLOWSHIP, INC.,
FOR THE ISRAEL MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
02146. Pres. Dr. Arthur M. Master; 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 lecture-
ships in Israel by prominent American
physicians; aids the Israel Medical As-
sociation financially and also contributes
medical books, periodicals, instruments,
and drugs. APF News.

AMERICAN RED MOGEN Dovid FOR ISRAEL,
INC. (1941). 50 W. 57 St., N. Y. C.,
Emanuel Celler. Purchases medical sup-
plies and ambulances in support of the
Mogen Dovid Adom, the Israeli Red
Cross Service; helps maintain blood
banks and first-aid stations in Israel. Ac-
tion; In the Service of Mankind.

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TECHNION-ISRAEL
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, INC. (1940).
1000 Fifth Ave., N. Y. C., 10028. Pres.
Maurice M. Rosen; Exec. V. Pres. Irving
S. Schneider. Provides financial and tech-
nical assistance to Technion-Israel In-
stitute of Technology. Technion Review;
Technion Yearbook.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL (1939; reorg.
Chmn. Israel Miller; Exec. Dir. Harry
Steinberg. Coordinating and public-rela-
tions arm of the nine national organiza-
tions 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 ap-
preciation of Jewish culture within the
American Jewish community in further-
ance of the continuity of Jewish life and
the spiritual centrality of Israel as the
Jewish homeland.

AMERICAN ZIONIST YOUTH FOUNDATION,
INC. (1963). 515 Park Ave., N. Y. C.,
10022. Chmn. Charles Bick; Sec. Avra-
ham Schenker; Dir. Theodore Comet.
Sponsors programs for American youth
in Israel; Israel Summer Institute, Sum-
mer in Kibbutz, Institute for Leaders
from Abroad, Year Workshops. Mac-
cabee; Hora.

—: AMERICAN ZIONIST YOUTH COUN-
cil (1951). 515 Park Ave., N. Y. C.,
10022. Chmn. Tsui Vermont. Acts as
spokesman and representative of Zion-
iston youth in interpreting Israel to the
youth of America; represents, co-
ordinates, and implements activities of the ten
Zionist youth movements in the U. S.:
Betar, B'nai Akiva, Dror Hechalutz Hat-
zair, Ichud Habonim, Hashomer Hatzair,
Jr. Hadassah, Masada of ZOA, Mizrachi
Hatzair, Student Zionist Organization,
Young Judaeas. Maccabees.

—: STUDENT ZIONIST ORGANIZATION
Pres. Gabriel Ende; Natl. Dir. Moshe
Dworkin. Seeks to interpret Israel and
Zionism to college students on Amer-
ican and Canadian campuses; carries out
action programs in Israel and America.
Student Zionist; SZO Manual; Zionist
Collegiate.

AMERICANS FOR A MUSIC LIBRARY IN ISRAEL
(1950). 2451 N. Sacramento Ave., Chi-
cago, Ill. 60647. Pres. Max Targ; Rec.
Sec. Fannie Targ. Seeks to promote, en-
courage, and render financial and other
assistance to musical education in the
State of Israel. AMLI News.

AMAL—AMERICAN ISRAEL CORPORATION
(1942). 17 E. 71 St., N. Y. C., 10021.
Pres. Abraham Dickenstein; Sec. Mor-
is Lieberman. Seeks to develop and
maintain close ties between the United
States and Israel through investment,
shipping, and export-import business.
Annual Report.

BAR-ILAN UNIVERSITY IN ISRAEL, INC.
(1952). 641 Lexington Ave., N. Y. C.
10022. Chancellor Joseph H. Lookstein;
Pres. Moshe Jammer; Chmn. of Bd.
Phillip Stollman; Dir. of Development
Harold N. Blond. Supports growth and
development of the American-chartered
Bar-Ilan University in Israel; administers American student program and arranges exchange professorships in the U. S. and Israel. Bar-Ilan News.


HAGODUD HAIVRI LEAGUE, INC. (AMERICAN VETERANS OF THE JEWISH LEGION) (1929). 426 W. 58 St., N. Y. C., 10019. Nat. Comdr. Benjamin Goldberg; Adjutant Jacob Wald. 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 Fourth 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). Nat. Sec. Tzvi Vermont. Educates youth towards an understanding of their Jewishness and modern Israel; provides educational training for kibbutz life in Israel. Igeret Kesher; Lamadrich; Niv Haboger; Young Guard.


—: 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 mod-
ern Israel, Zionism, and general Jewish subjects.

**Histadrut** (see National Committee for Labor Israel below).

**Israel Music Foundation** (1948). 731 Broadway, N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Oscar Regev; 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—Poale Zion** (1905). 200 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003. Pres. Hyman R. Faine; Sec. 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.*


--- **Pioneer Women, the Women's Labor Zionist Organization of America** (1925). 29 E. 22 St., N. Y. C., 10010. Pres. Mrs. Rose Kaufman; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Lucette Halle. Provides, in cooperation with Moetzet Hapoalot, Working Women's Council of Israel, almost half of social services in nearly 1,000 installations in Israel where 40,000 women, youths and children are educated yearly for constructive citizenship. In America, promotes Jewish education and culture; participates actively in American civic life. *Pioneer Woman.*


**NATIONAL YOUNG JUDAES (1909).** 116 W. 14 St., N. Y. C., 10011. Pres. David Berg; Nat. Dir. Bernard Weisberg. Seeks to orient American Jewish youth to its Zionist heritage and to the service of the Jewish people in America and Israel. Judaean Leaves; Leaders' Bulletin; Senior; Young Judaean.


**POALE AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA, INC.** (1948). 147 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 10036. Presidium, Noah Chodos, Leo Jung, Samuel Schonfeld, Samuel Walkin; Exec. Dir. Shimson Heller. Aims to educate youth to become Orthodox hutzim; supports kibbutzim, trade schools and children's homes in Israel. Achdut; PAI Views; Yedioth PAI.

**—: EZZA-IRGUN HANOAR HACHAREDI** (1953). 147 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 10036. Pres. Robert Mandel; Sec. Sholom Jager. Youth organization of the Poale Agudath Israel; aims to give children a religious and agricultural education in order to prepare them to join or build kibbutzim in Israel. Aironim LaGola.

**—: LEAGUE OF RELIGIOUS SETTLEMENTS—CHEVER HAKIBBUTZIM** (1951). 147 W. 42 St., N. Y. C., 10036. Pres. Aaron Blasbalg; Sec. David Schecther. Seeks to further religious aliyah to Israel and to establish homes and kibbutzim for new immigrants.


**RELIGIOUS ZIONISTS OF AMERICA**. 200 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003.

**—: BNEI AKIVA OF NORTH AMERICA** (1934). 200 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C., 10003. Chmn. Herschel Schacter; Exec. V. Pres. Samuel Spar. Establishes and maintains schools and yeshivot in Israel and works for its economic and social development; promotes close relations between religious Jewry of the U. S. and Israel; supports all-day schools and a maximum program of religious education in the U. S. Jewish Horizon; Mizrachi Weg; Or Hamizrach.


**SOCiETY OF ISRAEL PHILATELISTS** (1948). % A. Engers, 40-67 61st St., Woodside, N. Y. 11377. Pres. David Dorfman; Sec. Treas. Arthur Engers. Promotes interest in, and knowledge of, all phases of Jewish philately through sponsorship of chapters and research groups, maintenance of a philatelic library, and support of public and private exhibitions. Israel Philatelist.

**STATE OF ISRAEL BOND ORGANIZATION** (1951). 215 Park Ave. S., N. Y. C.,
10003. Pres. Abraham Feinberg; V. Pres. Joseph J. Schwartz. Seeks to provide large-scale investment funds for the economic development of the State of Israel through the sale of State of Israel bonds in the U. S., Canada, Latin America, and Western Europe.


ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA (1897). 145 E. 32 St., N. Y. C, 10016. Pres. Jacques Torczyner; Nat. Sec. Leon 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; House News; ZOA in Review; ZOA Masada Bulletin.

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 ARMY FORCES (Religious, Educational)

ASSOCIATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITY RELATIONS WORKERS (Community Relations)

CANTORS ASSEMBLY OF AMERICA, INC. (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 Jewish Center Workers (Community Relations)
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF Synagogue Administrators, United Synagogue of America (Religious, Educational)
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF Temple Administrators, 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 TEMPLE EDUCATORS, UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS (Religious, Educational)
NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD COMMISSION ON JEWISH CHAPLAINCY (Social Welfare)

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. FALICK, 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 SISTERSHOODS, UNION OF AMERICAN HEBREW CONGREGATIONS (Religious, Educational)
NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF THE UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA (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 OF AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)
WOMEN'S LEAGUE FOR ISRAEL, INC. (Zionist and Pro-Israel)
WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION OF HAPOEI HA-MIZRACHI (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 HATZAI (Zionist and Pro-Israel)
EZRA-IRGUN HANOAR HACHAREIDI, AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)
FEDERATION OF JEWISH STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS (Religious, Educational)
HASHOMER HATZAI, ZIONIST YOUTH ORGANIZATION (Zionist and Pro-Israel)
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 HATZAI, MIZRACHI WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA AND RELIGIOUS ZIONISTS OF AMERICA (Zionist and Pro-Israel)
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SYNAGOGUE YOUTH, UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH

* For fuller listing see under categories in parentheses.
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)

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)

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. Cercle Juif; Congress Bulletin.

CANADIAN YOUNG JUDAEA (1917). 1247 Guy St. Montreal, 25. Pres. Sheldon Schloss; Nat. V. Pres. Harvey Hamburg. Seeks to imbue its membership with the necessity for the spiritual and physical perpetuation of the Jewish people, emphasizing the centrality of Israel. Hamagshem; Judaean; Machshava; Yedion.


JEWISH IMMIGRANT AID SERVICES OF CANADA (JIAS) (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. Contributes funds to Canadian Jewish Loan Cassa for loans to small businessmen and artisans.

JEWISH LABOR COMMITTEE OF CANADA (1934). 3165 Isabella Ave., Montreal, 29. Pres. Michael Rubinstein; Dir. Alan Borovy. Fights for human rights and against racial discrimination and anti-
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semitism; works for strengthening and continuation of Jewish life in Canada.


NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN OF CANADA (1893). 4700 Bathurst St., Willowdale, Ont. Pres. Mrs. A. Hollenberg; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Julia Schulz. Seeks to stimulate individuals and communities to meet human needs and to advance the democratic way of life nationally and internationally through an integrated program of education, service, and social action. Canadian Council Woman.


Jewish Federations,
Welfare Funds,
Community Councils

THIS directory is one of a series compiled annually by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. Virtually all of these community organizations are affiliated with the Council as their national association for sharing of common services, interchange of experience, and joint consultation and action.

These communities comprise at least 95 per cent of the Jewish population of the United States and about 90 per cent of the Jewish population of Canada. Listed for each community is the local central agency—federation, welfare fund, or community council—with its address and the names of the president and executive officer.

The names "federation," "welfare fund," and "Jewish community council" are not definitive and their structures and functions vary from city to city. What is called a federation in one city, for example, may be called a community council in another.

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.
1. 2 United Jewish Fund (incl. Ensley, Fairfield, Tarrant City) (1935); P. O. Box 9157 (35213); Pres. Arnold Royal; Sec. Mrs. Maurice Davis.

MOBILE
1 Jewish Welfare Federation, Inc. (reorg. 1966); P. O. Box 7295 (36607); Chmn. Melvin Stein; Sec. Mrs. H. Gandler.

MONTGOMERY
1 Jewish Federation of Montgomery, Inc. (1930); P. O. Box 1150 (36102);

Pres. Ralph Capouya; Sec. Miss Hannah J. Simon.

TRI-CITIES
1 Tri-Cities Jewish Federated Charities, Inc. (incl. Florence, Sheffield, Tuscumbia) (1933); Route 7, Florence (35632); Pres. Mrs. M. F. Shipper.

ARIZONA

PHOENIX
1 Jewish Community Council (incl. surrounding communities) (1940); 1718 W. Maryland Ave. (85015); Pres. Philip Copland; Exec. Dir. Saul Silverman.

TUCSON
1, 2 Jewish Community Council (1942); 102 N. Plumer; Pres. Fred Rosen; Exec. V. Pres. Benjamin N. Brook.
ARKANSAS

LITTLE ROCK
2 Jewish Welfare Agency (incl. North Little Rock and area surrounding Little Rock) (1911); Donaghey Bldg; Main at 7th (72205); Pres. Ben Kluglose; Exec. Sec. Miss Isabel Cooper.

CALIFORNIA

BAY CITIES
1, 2 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. Aaron L. Lucoff; Exec. Dir. Sidney Michaelson.

LONG BEACH
1 Jewish Community Federation (1946); (sponsors the United Jewish Welfare Fund); 2601 Grand Ave. (90815); Pres. Gilbert G. Lapid; Exec. Dir. Sol Frankel.

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. Albert H. Kessler; Exec. Dir. Oscar A. Mintzer.

ORANGE COUNTY
1 Jewish Community Council of Orange County (1964); (sponsors United Jewish Welfare Fund); P. O. Box 682, Garden Grove (92642); Pres. Harry Gartler.

SACRAMENTO
1 Jewish Federation of Sacramento (1935; reorg. 1961); 930 Alhambra Blvd. Suite 230 (95816); Pres. Irwin Frankel; Exec. Dir. Nathan Rothberg.

SAN BERNARDINO
1 San Bernardino United Jewish Welfare Funds, Inc. (incl. Colton, Redlands) (1936); P. O. Box 2945 (92406).

SAN DIEGO
1 United Jewish Federation (incl. San Diego County) (1935); 4079-54 St. (92105); Pres. Herbert J. Solomon; 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 except Palo Alto and Los Altos) (1930; reorg. 1950); 1024 Emory St. (95126); Pres. Ben Ginden; Exec. Dir. Sidney Stein.

STOCKTON
Jewish Community Council (incl. Lodi, Sonora, Tracy) (1948); P. O. Box 4145 (95204); Pres. Gerald Sapper; Sec. Mrs. Barton Warshauer.

VENTURA
1 Ventura County Jewish Council—Temple Beth Torah (1938); 7620 Foot hill Rd. (93003); Pres. Samuel Potts; Exec. Sec. Neil Brief.

COLORADO

DENVER
1 Allied Jewish Community Council (1936); (sponsors Allied Jewish Campaign); 400 Kittredge Bldg. (80202); Pres. Norman Davis; Exec. Dir. Nathan Rosenberg.

CONNECTICUT

BRIDGEPORT
1 United Jewish Council of Greater Bridgeport, Inc. (1936); (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); 4200 Park Ave. (06604); Pres. Norman Hewitt; Exec. Dir. Nathan Skolnick.

DANBURY
1 Jewish Federation of Danbury (1945); P. O. Box 446 (06810); Pres. Albert Hornig; V. Pres. Leroy Paltrowitz.

HARTFORD
1 Jewish Federation (1945); 333 Bloomfield Ave., W. Hartford (06117); Pres. Harry Gampel; Exec. Dir. Bernard L. Gottlieb.

MERIDEN
1 Meriden Jewish Welfare Fund, Inc. (1944); 127 E. Main St.; Pres. Joseph Barker; Sec. Harold Rosen.

NEW BRITAIN
1 New Britain Jewish Federation (1936); 33 Court St.; Pres. Lester Udit sky; Exec. Dir. Ben Stark.

NEW HAVEN
1 Jewish Community Council (incl. Hamden, W. Haven) (1928); (sponsors Jewish Welfare Fund) (1939); 152 Temple St. (06610); Pres. Stuart Grodd; Exec. Dir. Benjamin N. Levy.

NORWALK
1 Jewish Community Council of Norwalk; (1946; reorg. 1964); Shorehaven Rd., East Norwalk (06855); Pres. Jack Waltuch; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Beatrice Nemzer.
STAMFORD
1 United Jewish Appeal; 132 Prospect St. (06902); Admn. Chmn. Harry Rosenbaum; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Leon Kahn.

WATERBURY
1, 2 Jewish Federation of Waterbury, Inc. (1938); 34 Murray St. (06710); Pres. Leonard A. Garston.

DELAWARE
1, 2 Jewish Federation of Delaware (statewide) (1935); 701 Shipley St. (19801); Exec. Dir. Nathan Barnett.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
WASHINGTON
Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington (1938); 1330 Massachusetts Ave., N. W. (20005); Pres. Louis C. Grossberg; Exec. Dir. Isaac Franck.


FLORIDA
CLEARWATER
1 Jewish Welfare Fund of Clearwater (1963); P. O. Box 998 (33757); Pres. H. Gordon Brown; Sec. Mrs. Maxwell Stockheim.

HOLLYWOOD
1, 2 Jewish Welfare Federation of Greater Hollywood (1943); 1720 Harrison St., Home Tower Bldg., Suite 4A (30201); Pres. William D. Horvitz; Exec. Dir. Myron J. Brodie.

JACKSONVILLE
1 Jewish Community Council (incl. Jacksonville Beach) (1935); 3731 Hendricks Ave.; Pres. George Richter; Exec. Dir. Barney Gorenstein.

MIAMI
1, 2 Greater Miami Jewish Federation (incl. Dade County) (1938); 1317 Biscaeyne Blvd., Miami Beach (33132); Pres. Joseph M. Lipton; Exec. Dir. Arthur S. Rosichan.

ORLANDO
Central Florida Jewish Community Council, Inc. (1949); 1117 Lake Weldon Rd. (32801); Pres. Irving Slott.

Palm Beach
1, 2 Jewish Federation of Palm Beach County (1938); 502 Citizens Building, W. Palm Beach (33401); Pres. Robert S. Levy; Exec. Dir. I. Edward Adler.

PENSACOLA
1 Pensacola Federated Jewish Charities (1942); 1320 East Lee St. (32503); Pres. George Wagenheim; Sec. Mrs. Harry Saffer.

ST. PETERSBURG
Jewish Community Council (1950); 8167 Elbow Lane North, P. O. Box 12868 (33733); Pres. Edward Rogali; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Irving Sohon.

SARASOTA

TAMPA
1 Jewish Welfare Federation of Tampa (1941); 2808 Horatio (33609); Pres. Maril Jacobs.

GEORGIA
ATLANTA
ATLANTA JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1945); 41 Exchange Pl. S. E. (30303); Pres. Bernard Howard; Exec. Dir. Max C. Gettinger.

1 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. (30303); Pres. Herman Heyman; Exec. Dir. Max C. Gettinger.

AUGUSTA
1 Federation of Jewish Charities (1937); P. O. Box 3251, Hill Station (30904); Pres. Ira Goldberg; Exec. Dir. Abraham Mintz.

COLUMBUS
1 Jewish Welfare Federation of Columbus, Inc. (1941); P. O. Box 1303 (31902); Pres. Melvin G. Satlof; Sec. Herbert Kohn.

SAVANNAH
1 Savannah Jewish Council (1943); (sponsors UJA-Federation Campaign); P. O. Box 6546, 5111 Abercorn St. (31405); Pres. Erwin Friedman; Exec. Dir. Irwin B. Giffen.

IDAHO
BOISE
1 Southern Idaho Jewish Welfare Fund (1947); 922 Front (83706); Pres. Kal Sarlat; Treas. Martin Heuman.

ILLINOIS
CHAMPAIGN-URBANA
1 Federated Jewish Charities (1929);
1911 Bellamy Dr., Champaign, Ill. (61822); Pres. Edward Blum; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Bernard Singer.

CHICAGO
- 1, 2 Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago (1900); 1 S. Franklin St. (60606); Pres. A. D. Davis; Exec. Dir. James P. Rice.
- 1 Jewish Welfare Fund of Metropolitan Chicago (1936); 1 S. Franklin St. (60606); Pres. Morris Glasser; Exec. Dir. James P. Rice.
- 1 Sub-Federation of Northwest Suburbs of the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago; 4017 West Church St., Skokie; Pres. Sidney S. Silverstein; Dir. Eugene J. Bender.

DECATUR
- 1 Jewish Federation (1942); 469 Delmar (62522); Pres. Abe Burstein; Sec. Mrs. Ben Miller.

ELGIN

JOLIET
- 1 Joliet Jewish Welfare Chest (incl. Coal City, Dwight, Lockport, Morris, Plainfield) (1938); 226 E. Clinton St. (60432); Pres. Seymour Brown; Exec. Dir. Morris M. Hershman.

PEORIA
- 1 Jewish Community Council, Inc. (1933); 613 Citizen Bldg., 225 Main St. (61602); Pres. Zangwill H. Freed; Exec. Dir. Adolph W. Szold.

ROCK ISLAND—MOLINE
- 1 United Jewish Charities of Rock Island County (1938); 2713 32 Ave. Court (61201); Pres. Leonard Weinrich; Sec. Benjamin Goldstein.

ROCKFORD
- 1, 2 Rockford Jewish Community Council (1937); 1502 Parkview Ave. (61107); Pres. Eugene Arfin; Exec. Dir. Leon Goldberg.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS
- 1 Jewish Federation of Southern Illinois (incl. all of Illinois south of Carlinville and Cape Girardeau, Missouri) (1942); 435 Missouri Ave., Rm. 208, East St. Louis (62201); Pres. Leo Schermer; Exec. Dir. Hyman H. Ruffman.

SPRINGFIELD
- 1, 2 Jewish Federation (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); 111 E. Washington Blvd. (46502); Pres. Earl Brenn; Exec. Dir. Joseph Levine.

GARY
- 1, 2 Northwest Indiana Jewish Welfare Federation (1940; reorg. 1959); 708 Broadway, Room 220 (46402); Pres. Lloyd Hurst; Exec. Dir. Alvin S. Levinson.

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 (1924); Pres. Jack Pearlman; Fin. Sec. Louis Pearlman, Jr., P. O. Box 676.

MUNCIE

SOUTH BEND
- 1 United Jewish Welfare Fund; 2800 Franklin St. (46361); Pres. Burton B. Ruby; Sec. Mrs. Morris Kohn.

TERRE HAUTE
- 1 United Jewish Welfare Fund of Terre Haute (1922); Pres. Werner Loewenstein; Sec. Mrs. Mitchell Thomas, 1460 So. 8th St. (47808).

IOWA

CEDAR RAPIDS
- 1 Jewish Welfare Fund (1941); 415 Granby Bldg. (52401); Pres. Abbott Lipsky; Sec. Allen T. Yarowsky.

DAVENPORT
- 1 Davenport United Jewish Welfare Fund (1921); 1115 Mississippi Ave. (52803); Pres. Isadore Katz.

DES MOINES
- 1 Jewish Welfare Federation (1914); 315 Securities Bldg. (50309); Chmn. Abe D. Clayman.

SIOUX CITY
- 1, 2 Jewish Federation (1923); 525–14 St. (51102); Pres. Lawrence S. Slotsky; Exec. Dir. Oscar Littlefield.
WATERLOO
1. WATERLOO JEWISH FEDERATION (1941); Pres. Elmer L. Cohn % Congregation Sons of Jacob, 411 Mitchel Ave., Waterloo (50702).

KANSAS

TOPEKA
1. TOPEKA-LAWRENCE JEWISH FEDERATION (incl. Emporia, Lawrence, St. Marys) (1939); Pres. Louis Pozez, 911 Adams (66607).

WICHITA
1. MID-KANSAS JEWISH WELFARE FEDERATION, INC. (1935); 505 Union National Bldg. (67202); Pres. Stanley O. Beren; Exec. Sec. Edward Weil.

LOUISIANA

ALEXANDRIA
1. THE JEWISH WELFARE FEDERATION AND COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1938); 111 Main St.; Pres. Nathan Kaplan; Sec.-Treas. Mrs. George Kuplesky.

BANGOR
2. JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (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. Julius Wise; Exec. Sec. Leonard Nemeth.

PORTLAND
1. JEWISH FEDERATION OF PORTLAND, MAINE (1942); (sponsors UNITED JEWISH APPEAL); 341 Cumberland Ave. (04111); Pres. Melvin L. Stone.

MARYLAND

ANNAPOLES
ANNAPOLES 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 J. Fox; Exec. Dir. Robert I. Hiller.

1. JEWISH WELFARE FUND OF BALTIMORE, INC. (1941); 319 W. Monument St. (21201); Pres. Calman J. Zamoiski, Jr.; Exec. Dir. Robert I. Hiller.

MASSACHUSETTS

BOSTON
1. COMBINED JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES OF GREATER BOSTON, INC. (merger of Associated Jewish Philanthropies and Combined Jewish Appeal of Greater Boston) (1895; reorg. 1961); 72 Franklin St. (02110); Pres. Bernard D. Mintz; Exec. Dir. Benjamin B. Rosenberg.

1. JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN BOSTON (1944); 72 Franklin St. (02110); Pres. Hirsh Sharf; Exec. Dir. Robert E. Segal.

BROCKTON
1. COMBINED JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES OF THE BROCKTON AREA (1939); 71 Legion Pkway. (02401); Pres. Alfred Pagell.

FALL RIVER
1. FALL RIVER JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL; 154 So. Main St. (02726); Pres. Thomas Ellison.

FITCHBURG
JEWISH FEDERATION OF FITCHBURG (1939); 66 Day St. (01420); Pres. Felix Heimberg; Exec. Dir. Lester Nelson.

HAVERHILL
HAVERHILL UNITED JEWISH APPEAL; 514 Main St. (01830); Pres. Louis Kleven; Exec. Sec. Milton Lincoln.

HOLYOKE
1. COMBINED JEWISH APPEAL OF HOLYOKE (1939); 378 Maple St. (01040); Pres. Herbert Goldberg.

LAWRENCE
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1947); 309 Appleton St. (01840); Pres. Sam Minsky; Exec. Sec. Julius Wise.
BAY CITY
Northeastern Michigan Jewish Welfare Federation (incl. East Tawas, West Branch) (1940); 411 Phoenix Bldg. (48706); Pres. Dr. Milton J. Miller; Exec. Sec. Dorothy B. Sternberg.

DETROIT
1. Jewish Welfare Federation of Detroit (1926); (sponsors Allied Jewish Campaign); Fred M. Butzel Memorial Bldg., 163 Madison (48226); Pres. Hyman Safran; Exec. Dir. William Avrunin.

FLINT
1 Jewish Community Council (1936); 912 Sill Bldg. (48502); Pres. Jack Shaprow; Exec. Dir. Irving Geisser.

GRAND RAPIDS
1 Jewish Community Fund of Grand Rapids (1930); Pres. Edward Silverman; Sec. Mrs. William Deutsch, 1121 Kenebey Way, S. E. (49506).

LANSING
1 Jewish Welfare Federation of Lansing (1939); Pres. Maurice Tanenbaum; Sec. Alan Ginsburg, 3939 Capitol City Blvd. (48906).

SAGINAW
Saginaw Jewish Welfare Federation (1939); 1424 S. Washington (48607); Pres. Carl Stander; Fin. Sec. Mrs. Henry Feldman.
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 (08406); Pres. Arthur Peskoe; Exec. Dir. Irving T. Spivack.

BAYONNE
2 Jewish Community Council (1938) (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); 1050 Boulevard (07002); Pres. Leonard Rogoff; Exec. Dir. Barry Shandler.

BERGEN COUNTY
1 Jewish Welfare Council of Bergen County, Inc. (inclus. most of Bergen County) (1953); 24 Salem 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. Harold D. Sarshik; Exec. Dir. Bernard Dubin.

ELIZABETH
1 Eastern Union County Jewish Council (1940); (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); Green Lane, Union, N. J. (07083); Pres. Paul Shapiro; Exec. Dir. Samuel J. Rosenthal.

ESSEX COUNTY (NEWARK)
1, 2 Jewish Community Council of Essex County (1923); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal of Essex County [1926]); 32 Central Ave., Newark (07102); Pres. Sidney M. Weinstein; Exec. Dir. Abe L. Sudran.

JERSEY CITY
1 United Jewish Appeal (1939); 604 Bergen Ave. (07304); Chmn. Samuel A. Parness; Sec. Mrs. Jeanne Schleider.

NEW BRUNSWICK
1 Jewish Federation of Raritan Valley (1948); 2 S. Adelaide Ave., Highland Park (08904); Pres. Samuel M. Adler; Exec. Dir. Dan B. Asher.

PASSAIC

PATERSON
1 Jewish Community Council (1933); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal Drive); 390 Broadway (07501); Pres. Gerrard Berman; Exec. Dir. Sam A. Hatow.

PERTH AMBOY
1 Jewish Community Council (1938); (sponsors United Jewish Appeal); 316 Madison Ave. (08861); Pres. Robert N. Wilentz; Exec. Dir. Israel Silver.

PLAINFIELD
1 Jewish Community Council of the Plainfields (1937) (sponsors United Jewish Appeal); 403 W. 7th St. (07060); Pres. Herzl Rosenbaum; Exec. Dir. Samuel J. Rosenthal.

SOMERVILLE
1, 2 Jewish Federation of Somerset County; 11 Park Ave. (08876); Pres. Charles E. Camins; Exec. Dir. Arnold Gross.

TRENTON
1 Jewish Federation of Trenton (1929); 999 Lower Ferry Rd. (08628); Pres. Philip J. Albert; Exec. Dir. Milton A. Feinberg.

NEW MEXICO

ALBUQUERQUE
1 Jewish Welfare Fund (1938); Korber Bldg., Rm. 256, 200 Block 2nd St., N. W. (87101); Pres. Yale Weinstein; 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. Harold Segal; Exec. Dir. Morton Adell.

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); (sponsors United Jewish Fund Campaign); 501 Sidway Bldg., 775 Main St. (14203); Pres. Louis M. Bunis; Exec. Dir. Sydney S. Abzug.

ELMIRA
1 Elmira Jewish Welfare Fund, Inc. (1942); Federation Bldg., 115 E. Church St. (14901); Pres. Irving Etkind; Exec. Dir. Ronald H. Miller.

GLENS FALLS
1 Glens Falls Jewish Welfare Fund (1939); 90 Broad St. (12801); Chmn. Charles Garlen.

HUDSON
1 Jewish Welfare Fund of Hudson,
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INC. (1947); 414 Warren St. (12534); Pres. Joseph Bellamy.

KINGSTON
1. JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL, INC. (1951); 96 Maiden Lane (12402); Pres. Robert A. Ronder; Exec. Dir. Sidney Silver.

MIDDLETOWN
1. UNITED JEWISH APPEAL OF MIDDLETOWN, N. Y. (1939); c/o Middletown Hebrew Assn., 13 Linden Ave. (10940); Chmn. Owen Falk; Sec. Joseph Herman.

NEW YORK CITY
1, 2. FEDERATION OF JEWISH PHILANTHROPIES OF NEW YORK (incl. Greater New York, Nassau, Queens, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties) (1917); 130 E. 59th St. (10022); Pres. Samuel J. Silberman; Exec. V. Pres. David G. Salten.

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
1, 2. UNITED JEWISH CHARITIES OF NEWBURGH (1925); 360 Powell Ave. (12553); Pres. Bernard Brickman; Exec. Dir. Morris Kronenfeld.

NIAGARA FALLS
1. JEWISH FEDERATION OF NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y., INC. (1935); 685 Chilton Ave. (14301); Pres. Bernard Brickman; Exec. Dir. Morris Kronenfeld.

PORT CHESTER
1. JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL (1941); (sponsors UNITED JEWISH CAMPAIGN); 258 Willett Ave. (10573); Pres. Morton H. Abramowitz; Exec. Dir. Mrs. May Chinkers.

POUGHKEEPSIE
JEWISH WELFARE FUND (1941); 110 Grand Ave. (12603); Pres. James W. Efpron. Exec. Dir. Julius Dorfman.

ROCHESTER
JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF ROCHESTER, N. Y., INC.; 129 East Ave. (14604); Pres. Harry D. Goldman; Exec. Dir. Elmer Louis.

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. Robert J. Ludwig; Exec. Dir. Samuel Soifer.

SYRACUSE
1. JEWISH WELFARE FEDERATION, INC. (1918); (sponsors JEWISH WELFARE FUND (1933)); 201 E. Jefferson St. (13202); Pres. Herman Dubhoff; Exec. Dir. Norman Edell.

TROY
1. TROY JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL, INC. (1936); 2500–21 St. (12180); Pres. Irving H. Myers.

UTICA
1. JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF UTICA, N. Y., INC. (1933); (sponsors UNITED JEWISH APPEAL OF UTICA); 1703 Genesee St. (13501); Pres. Sidney J. Friedlander; Exec. Dir. James M. Senor.

NORTH CAROLINA

ASHEVILLE
JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER; 236 Charlotte St. (28801).

CHARLOTTE
1. FEDERATION OF JEWISH CHARITIES (1940); P. O. Box 2612 (28201); Pres. Paul S. Stewart.

GREENSBORO
1. GREENSBORO JEWISH UNITED CHARITIES, INC. (1940); Pres. Herman Cone, Jr.; Chmn. Albert Jacobson, Plaza P. O. Box 9233 (27408).

HIGH POINT
UNITED JEWISH CHARITIES; % High Point Hebrew Congregation, Kensington Drive (27260).

OHIO

AKRON
1. JEWISH WELFARE FUND OF AKRON, (1935); 73 E. Mill St. (44308); Pres. Seymour J. Kaplan; Exec. Dir. Nathan Pinsky.

CANTON
1. CANTON JEWISH COMMUNITY FEDERATION, INC. (1935; reorg. 1955); 2631 Harvard Ave., N. W. (44709); Pres. Isadore Freed; Exec. Dir. Leonard Sebrans.

CINCINNATI
1, 2. ASSOCIATED JEWISH AGENCIES (1896; reorg. 1956); 2905 Vernon Pl. (45219); Pres. A. Marcus Levy; Exec. Dir. Clifford Josephson.

1. JEWISH WELFARE FUND (1930); 2905 Vernon Pl. (45219); Pres. Marvin L. Warner; Exec. Dir. Clifford Josephson.

CLEVELAND
1, 2. JEWISH COMMUNITY FEDERATION OF CLEVELAND (1903); 1750 Euclid Ave. (44115); Pres. David N. Myers; Exec. V. P. Henry L. Zucker; Exec. Dir. Sidney Z. Vincent.

COLUMBUS
1. UNITED JEWISH FUND AND COUNCIL (1925; merged 1959); 40 S. Third St., Rm. 330 (43215); Pres. Herman Katz; Exec. Dir. Ben M. Mandelkorn.
DAYTON
1, 2 Jewish Community Council of Dayton (1943); Community Services Bldg., 184 Salem Ave., Rm. 240 (45406); Pres. Robert Shapiro; Exec. Dir. Robert Fitterman.

LIMA
1 Federated Jewish Charities of Lima District (1935); 321 W. High St. (45801); Pres. Norman Mervis; Fin. Sec. Samuel Stambor.

STEUBENVILLE
1 Jewish Community Council (1938); P. O. Box 472 (43952); Pres. Maurice Katz; Exec. Sec. Mrs. Joseph Freedman.

TOLEDO
1 Jewish Welfare Federation of Toledo, Inc. (1907; reorg. 1960); 2247 Collingwood Blvd. (43620); Pres. Sydney Mostov; Exec. Dir. Marvin G. Lerner.

YOUNGSTOWN
1, 2 Jewish Federation of Youngstown, Ohio, Inc. (1935); P. O. Box 449 (44501); Pres. Samuel D. Goldberg; Exec. Dir. Stanley Engel.

OKLAHOMA

ARDMORE
Jewish Federation (1934); Co-Chmn. Ike Fishman, Box 1764 (73401), Louis Fishel, "A" St., N. W. (73401).

OKLAHOMA CITY
1 Jewish Community Council (1941); 618 Sooner Bldg., Sheridan and Harvey (73102); Pres. Raymond Friedlander; Exec. Dir. Leonard Lieberman.

TULSA
1 Tulsa Jewish Community Council (1938); (sponsors Tulsa United Jewish Campaign); 200 McBinney Bldg., 8 E. 3rd St. (74103); Pres. Irvin Frank; Exec. Dir. Irving Antell.

OREGON

PORTLAND
1, 2 Jewish Welfare Federation of Portland (incl. State of Oregon and adjacent Washington communities) (1920; reorg. 1956); 1643 S. W. 12th Ave. (97201); Pres. Hershal M. Tanzer.

PENNSYLVANIA

ALLENTOWN
1 Jewish Federation of Allentown (1948); 22nd and Tilghman Sts. (18104); Pres. Bernard Kobrowsky; Exec. Dir. George Feldman.

HARRISBURG
1 United Jewish Community (1933); 100 Vaughn St. (17110); Pres. Morris Schwab; Exec. Dir. Albert Hursh.

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. Frank L. Newburger, Jr.; Exec. Dir. Donald B. Hurwitz.

PITTSBURGH
1, 2 United Jewish Federation of Pittsburgh (1912; reorg. 1955); 234 McKee Pl. (15213); Pres. Alvin Rogal; Exec. Dir. Gerald S. Soroker.

POTTSTOWN
1, 2 United Jewish Charities (1935); 23rd and Mahantongo Sts. (17901); Chmn. Saul Anton; Exec. Sec. Gordon Berkowitz.
READING
1. Jewish Community Council (1935); (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); 1700 City Line St. (19604); Pres. Norman B. Dunitz; Exec. Sec. Harry S. Sack.

SCRANTON
1. Scranton-Lackawanna Jewish Council (incl. Lackawanna County) (1945); 601 Jefferson Ave. (18510); Pres. Sydney M. Katz; Exec. Sec. George Joel.

SHARON
1. Shenango Valley Jewish Federation (1940); Pres. Harold Rosenblum; Sec. Francis Miller, 450 Fairfield Rd. (16147).

UNIONTOWN
United Jewish Federation (1939); Pres. Herbert C. Gottfried; Sec. Morris H. Samuels, % 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. (18701); Pres. Morton B. Weiss; Exec. Dir. Louis Smith.

YORK
Jewish Organized Charities (1928); 120 E. Market St.; Pres. Mose Leibowitz; Exec. Sec. Joseph Sperling.

RHODE ISLAND
PROVIDENCE
1. General Jewish Committee of Providence, Inc. (1945); 203 Strand Bldg. (02906); Pres. Merrill L. Hassenfeld; Exec. Dir. Joseph Galkin.

SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON
1. Jewish Welfare Fund (1949); 1645 Millbrook Dr. (29407); Pres. Harold Sherman; 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); 81 Madison Bldg., Suite 1200 (38103); Pres. Herbert Kohn; 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. Abe Pilsk; Exec. Dir. Nisson Pearl.

TEXAS
AUSTIN
1. Jewish Community Council of Austin (1939; reorg. 1956); P. O. Box 351 (78767); 206 Western Republic Bldg. (78762); Pres. Earl Podolnick; Sec. Mrs. Robert Lantos.

CORPUS CHRISTI
1. Corpus Christi Jewish Community Council (1953); 750 Everhart Rd. (78411); Pres. Jules H. Pels; Exec. Dir. Mrs. Lillian Racusin.

DALLAS
1. Jewish Welfare Federation (1911); 209 Browder Bldg., Rm. 403 (75201); Pres. Sol Levine; Exec. V. Pres. Jacob H. Kravitz.

EL PASO

FORT WORTH
1. Jewish Federation of Fort Worth (1936); 6801 Granbury Rd. (76133); Pres. Louis H. Barnett; Exec. Dir. Daniel Rosenthal.

GALVESTON
1. Galveston County Jewish Welfare Association (1936); P. O. Box 146 (77550); Pres. Neil N. Nathan; Sec. Mrs. Arthur M. Alpert.

HOUSTON
1. Jewish Community Council of Metropolitan Houston (incl. neigh-
boring communities) (1937); (sponsors United Jewish Campaign); 2020 Hermann Drive (77004); Pres. Milton H. Levi; Exec. Dir. Albert Goldstein.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); Pres. Myron Blankfield; 3949 Lakeshore Dr. (77642).

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Mrs. Harold Vexler; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); Pres. Myron Blankfield, 3949 Lakeshore Dr. (77642).

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Mrs. Harold Vexler; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); Pres. Myron Blankfield, 3949 Lakeshore Dr. (77642).

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Mrs. Harold Vexler; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); Pres. Myron Blankfield, 3949 Lakeshore Dr. (77642).

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Mrs. Harold Vexler; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); Pres. Myron Blankfield, 3949 Lakeshore Dr. (77642).

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Mrs. Harold Vexler; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); Pres. Myron Blankfield, 3949 Lakeshore Dr. (77642).

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Mrs. Harold Vexler; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); Pres. Myron Blankfield, 3949 Lakeshore Dr. (77642).

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Mrs. Harold Vexler; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); Pres. Myron Blankfield, 3949 Lakeshore Dr. (77642).

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Mrs. Harold Vexler; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.

PORT ARTHUR
Federated Jewish Charities and Welfare Funds (1936); Pres. Myron Blankfield, 3949 Lakeshore Dr. (77642).

SAN ANTONIO
1. Jewish Social Service Federation (incl. Bexar County) (1924); 307 Aztec Bldg. (78205); Pres. Mrs. Harold Vexler; Exec. Dir. Paul Kulick.
ALBERTA

CALGARY
1 Calgary Jewish Community Council (1962); 18th Ave. and Center St. S.; Pres. Joe Busheikin; Exec. Dir. Harry S. Shatz.

EDMONTON
1 Edmonton Jewish Community Council, Inc. (1954); 305 Mercantile Bldg., 102nd Ave., and 103 St.; Pres. Tevie H. Miller; Exec. Dir. Morris A. Stein.

BRITISH COLUMBIA

VANCOUVER
Jewish Community Council of Vancouver (1932); 950 W. 41 (13); Pres. William Gelmon.

MANITOBA

WINNIPEG
1 Jewish Welfare Fund (1938); 370 Hargrave St., Rm. 200 (2); Pres. A. L. Simkin; 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.

LONDON

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; Jewish Community Centre, Church St.; Pres. B. I. Cooperman; Sec. Dan Monson.

TORONTO
1 United Jewish Welfare Fund of Toronto (1937); 150 Beverley St. (2B); Exec. Dir. Benjamin Schneider.

WINDSOR
1, 2 Jewish Community Council (1938); 1641 Ouellette Ave.; Pres. Morton M. Bernholtz; Exec. Dir. Joseph Eisenberg.

QUEBEC

MONTREAL
1 Allied Jewish Community Services (merger of Federation of Jewish Community Services and Combined Jewish Appeal) (1965); 493 Sherbrooke St. W. (2); Pres. Jacob M. Lowy; Exec. Dir. Alvin Bronstein.
Jewish Periodicals

UNITED STATES

ALABAMA


ARIZONA


CALIFORNIA


COLORADO


CONNECTICUT


HERITAGE — SOUTHWEST JEWISH PRESS (1914). 5322 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, 90036. (Also San Diego; Central Valley, Fresno; Orange County, Garden Grove.) Herb Brin. Weekly.


DELAWARE


DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA


1 Periodicals which have been in existence at least one year prior to June 30, 1966, 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, 1966 (Vol. 67). For organizational bulletins, consult organizational listings.


FLORIDA


GEORGIA


ILLINOIS


INDIANA


KENTUCKY


MARYLAND


MASSACHUSETTS


MICHIGAN


MINNESOTA


MISSOURI


NEBRASKA


NEW JERSEY


NEW YORK


NEW YORK CITY


IN JEWISH BOOKLAND (supplement of the JWB CIRCLE) (1945). 145 E. 32 St,
10016. Alexander Alan Steinbach. 7 times a year. Jewish Book Council of America.
KINDER JOURNAL (1920). 41 Union Sq., 10003. S. Goodman, I. Goichberg. 6 times a year; Yiddish. Farlag Matones Assoc., Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute, Inc.
KINDER ZEITUNG (1930). 175 E. Broadway, 10002. Joseph Mlotek. 5 times a year; Yiddish. Education Dept., Workmen's Circle.
KULTUR UN DERZTUNG—CULTURE AND EDUCATION (1930). 175 E. Broadway,
10002. Joseph Mlotek. 7 times a year; Yiddish. Education Dept., Workmen's Circle.


SEVEN ARTS FEATURE SYNDICATE. See News Syndicates, p. 520.


United Labor Zionist Party, Achdut Ha-avoda, Poale Zion.


WESTCHESTER JEWISH TRIBUNE. See New York State.


YIDDISHER KOL KUF (1934). 1048 Fifth Ave., 10028. Yudel 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

AMERICAN ISRAELITE (1854). 906 Main St. (Room 404), Cincinnati, 2. Henry C. Segal. Weekly.


OHIO JEWISH CHRONICLE (1921). 87 N. Sixth St, Columbus, 43215. Milton J. Pinsky. Weekly.


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  


DAILY HEBREW JOURNAL (1911). 409 College St., Toronto, 2b, Ont. S. B. Rose. Weekly; Yiddish.


JEWISH EAGLE (1907). 4075 St. Lawrence Blvd., Montreal 1, P.Q. Joseph Gallay. 3 times a week; Yiddish.


Necrology: United States


ALEXANDER, BERNARD, bus. exec, civic leader; b. Trenton, N. J., Jan. 1, 1899; d. Trenton, N. J., Mar. 1, 1966; pres.: Jewish Fed. of Trenton, 1943-47; Middle Atlantic Region, JDC, since 1947; Central Atlantic region, CFWF, 1946-50; mem.: bd. of overseers JTS, since 1949; bd. of dir. UPA, 1949; natl. quota chmn. UJA, 1949; honors: JTA Eternal Light award; UJA 25th anniversary medallion.


Berg, Gertrude, actress; b. N. Y. C, Oct. 3, 1899; d. N. Y. C, Sept. 14, 1966; writer, producer, actress, radio-TV show "The Goldbergs"; appeared in many plays, motion pictures, incl. Me and Molly (1948–49); From Main St. to Broadway (1953); Morning Star (1954); Majority of One (1959); Dear Me the Sky Is Falling (1962–63); au. The Rise of the Goldbergs (1931); recd. Interfaith award, B'nai B'rith, 1949; Radio and TV Mother citation, Girls Clubs of Am, 1950; distinguished merit citation, NCTC, 1950; commendation award, Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1950; Natl. Acad. of Television Arts and Science award, 1950; Antoinette Perry award, 1958; Sarah Siddon award, 1960.


COHEN, FRANK J., dentist, educ., social worker; b. N. Y. C., Oct. 16, 1894; d. N. Y. C., Sept. 19, 1966; exec. dir. Lavanburg Corner House Fund since 1962; exec. dir. Youth House, 1944-54, Lavanburg Corner House, 1934-44; child-guidance worker, Jewish Bd. of
Guardians in early 1930s; in 1953, helped establish a graduate program in social service education, assoct. dean Graduate School of Public Administration and Social Service, NYU; au.: *Children in Trouble: An Experiment in Institutional Child Care* (1952); *Youth and Crime* (1957); recd. Marshall Field award, 1957.


sculpture for Am. military cemetery, Hamm, Luxembourg; designed large-scale sculptures for Oregon State Capitol; Columbia Terrace, Providence, R. I.; State Coll. of Women, Denton, Tex.; sculptured clock in House of Rep., Washington, D. C.; two works exhibited in Metropolitan Museum of Art.


GREENBERG, NOAH, cond., musicologist; b. N. Y. C, Apr. 9, 1919; d. N. Y. C, Jan. 9, 1966; on faculty Mannes Coll. of Music, 1955-63; scholar, performer...


HABER, JULIUS, Zion. leader, communal worker; b. Boiberke, Galicia, Dec. 24, 1887; d. N. Y. C., Sept. 22, 1966; in U. S. since 1902; mem. exec. bd. ZOA, 1922-28; au.: The Unpaid Debt of American Jewry to Its Brethren (1945); The Odyssey of an American Zionist (1956); contrib. to Herzl Year Book, Anglo-Jewish pubs.

HADAS, MOSES, educ., scholar; b. Atlanta, Ga., June 25, 1900; d. Aspen, Colo., Aug. 17, 1966; world renowned classicist; Jay prof. of Greek, chmn. dept. Greek and Latin, Columbia U., 1956-66; on faculty since 1925; instr., asst. prof., 1937, assoc. prof., 1953-56; on faculty U. of Cincinnati, 1928-30; au.: History of Greek Literature (1950); Aristeas to Philocrates (1950); A History of Latin Literature (1952); Ancilla to Classical Reading (1954); Hellenistic Culture (1959); Humanism (1960); Old Wine in New Bottles (1962); ed. Complete Works of Tacitus (1942); Basic Works of Cicero (1951); The Greek Poets (1952); tr. Constantine the Great (1948); Goethe the Poet (1949); The Homicidal God (1954); Three Greek Romances (1954); mem. Am. Philological Assoc., Archaeological Inst. of Am.


HEISLER, KALMAN, union off., Yid. au.; b. Komarno, Poland, Mar. 11, 1899; d. N. Y. C., Jan. 6, 1966; in U. S. since 1921; educ. dir. cloak pressers union local, ILGWU; mem.: Yid. Writers' Union, Yid. PEN Club, Jewish Natl. Workers' Alliance; au.: Mentshn...
HELLER, Florence G., communal leader, 528 / American Jewish Year Book, 1967


Service award for professional achievement; annual lectureship estab. in his honor by N. Y. Acad. of Med.


KINZLER, JACOB, mfr., communal leader; b. Lemberg, Austria, Mar. 15, 1883; d. N. Y. C., Dec. 21, 1966; in U. S. since 1897; pres.: Heb. Home for the Aged, Riverdale; Yeshiva and Mesira Rabbi Israel Bolanter, Bronx; West Side Institutional Synagogue; Olam Hadash; a trustee Herzliah Heb. Techrs. Inst.; v. pres. Mid-Town Lodge B'nai B'rith; active in Fed. of Jewish Philanthropies, UJA.


KLEIN, WILLIAM, atty., civic worker; b. N. Y. C., 1876 (?); d. Yonkers, N. Y., Jan. 16, 1966; a fdr., UJA; Am. Friends of the Alliance Israelite Universelle; est. Adolph and Rosa Klein scholarship fdn.

KOUSSEVITZKY, MOSHE, concert artist; b. Smorgonie (near Vilna) Poland, June 9, 1899; d. Great Neck, N. Y., Aug. 23, 1966; in U. S. since 1948; can- tor Temple Beth El, Bklyn., since 1952; chief cantor Tlomacka Synagogue, Wars- saw; gave many concerts in USSR, Israel, and USA; bd. mem. Jewish Min- isters Cantors Assoc. of Am. and Can- ada; dir. Yeshiva Eit Zehaim, Bklyn.

LEVINE, ABRAHAM, realtor, communal worker; b. Polonne, Ukraine, May 15, 1891; d. Miami Beach, Fla., March 27, 1966; in U. S. since 1905; a fdr. Albert Einstein Coll. of Med.; trustee State of Israel bonds; recd. honor award, State of Israel; Albert Einstein Coll. of Med. award.


LEVY, NEWMAN, atty., au.; b. N. Y. C., Nov. 30, 1888; d. N. Y. C., Mar. 22, 1966; counsel Am. Jewish Com., 1938–50; au.: Opera Guyed (1923); Saturday to Monday (1930); Theatre Guyed (1935); Gay But Wistful (1935); The Nan Patterson Case (1959); contrib. many articles on law as well as verse to numerous pubs.


MENDELSON, MORRIS J., Zion.; b. 1880 (?) d. Bklyn., N. Y., Aug. 29, 1966; a


PAT, JACOB, orgn. exec., Yid. au.; b. Bialystok, Poland, July 19, 1890; d. N. Y. C., Apr. 25, 1966; in U. S. since 1938; exec. sec. Jewish Labor Com., 1939-62; co-ed. Zukunft: former gen. sec. Central Yid. Sch. Orgn. (Poland); mem. Central com. Jewish Labor Bund; councilman, Warsaw Jewish Community; a fdr., chmn. World Cong. of Jewish Culture; mem. exec. com. CJMCA; Fdn. for Jewish Culture; Yivo; au.: Bundistn (1928-29); Ofy kidush hashem (1930); Ofy di vegg fun baginen (1933); Rayze in Rusland (1937); Ash un fayer (1947); Henach (Buenos Aires, 1948); Talks with Jewish writers (1954); Hankah (Buenos Aires, 1965); Di leiterin Ester (Buenos Aires); awards: for best Yid. short stories, The Day, 1931; Zukunft, 1942.


POLEYEFF, MOSES A., rabbi, educ.; b. Timkovitz, Russia, 1888; d. Jersey City, N. J., Nov. 14, 1966; in U. S. since 1920; assoc. prof. of Talmud, Yeshiva U., 1920-66; au.: Mahaneh Yisrael (1930); Beter Avraham (1940); Orah Mishot (1949); Or Ha'shemesh (1959); recd. honor of doctor of divinity, Yeshiva U., 1959.


RASKIN, SAUL, artist, au., lecturer; b. Noginsk, Russia, Aug. 15, 1878; d. N. Y. C., Sept. 22, 1966; in U. S. since 1904; painter of Jewish life and rel. subjects; faculty mem. Jewish Teachers Sem.; former art dir. YMHA; works exhibited at Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bklyn.
Museum, Jewish Museum, and many others; au.: Pirke Aboth (1940); Hadgadah (1941); Tehillim (1942); Braishes (1944); Siddur (1945); Land of Israel (1947); 5 Megiloth (1949); Kabbalah in Word and Image (1952); Aron Hakedesh (1955); Hebrew Rhapsody (1959); Go Back and Tell (1957); recd. four prizes and hon. mentions for works in graphic art.

RATNER, LILLIAN B., civic leader, philanthropist; b. Cleveland, 1901; d. Cleveland, Jan. 1966; chmn. nat. exec. com. women's div. UJA; bd. mem. Park Synagogue, Cleveland, frd. of its day nursery and camp; estab. Lillian Ratner Montessori Sch.; benefactor of many local civic and philanthropic orgns.


RUDOY, Pincus E., Yid. writer; b. Ukraine, 1885 (?); d. San Jose, Calif., Aug. 2, 1966; in U. S. since 1921; wrote Elteren...


SIEGEL, WILLIAM, Yid. playwright; b. Lithuania, 1893; d. N. Y. C., May 23, 1966; in U. S. since 1906; wrote more than 150 Yid. plays performed in N. Y. Yid. theaters and elsewhere, incl. The Great Moment; The Drunkard; Bublit-chiki; The Jewish Cowboy (1960).

SILVER, MAXWELL, financier, rabbi, au.; b. Neustadt, Lithuania, Jan. 1, 1891; d. N. Y. C., Oct. 9, 1966; in U. S. since 1900; rabbi Free Synagogue, Flushing, N. Y., 1920-22; Temple Israel, Lafayette, Ind., 1916-18; mem. admin. bd. UPA, 1946-49; a fdr. and first pres. Dr. Herzl Zion Club, forerunner of ZOA; au.: Justice and Judaism (1928); Ethics of Judaism (1938); The Way to God (1951); Retirement as a New Career (1964); There Was a Man (1965).

SILVERMAN, ARCHIBALD, bus. exec.; b. Zinkoff, Russia, Mar. 5, 1880; d. Providence, R. I., Sept., 1966; in U. S. since 1890; mem. bd. of dirs. UJA; Jewish Orphanage, Providence; chmn. Jewish War Relief, R. I., 1919-21; mem. exec.


TUCKER, SOPHIE, entertainer; b. Russia, 1884; d. Silver Springs, Md., Dec. 26, 1966; in U. S. since 1923; prof. of Heb., Bklyn. Coll., 1939–64; au.: numerous works incl. Pathways in Modern American Literature (in Heb., 1930); John Dewey, Educateur (in French, 1932); Dusk in the Catskills (in Heb., 1946, Eng. ed. 1957); The Lost Generation (in Heb., 1953); The Literature of Modern Israel (1957); American Noveltists (in Heb., 1958); contrib. to various Heb. and Am. pubs.; awards: Guggenheim fellowship; Louis LaMed prize; Prize for Literature, ZOA; Neuman prize, Heb. Acad.


YUD, NACHUM (YERUSALIMCHIK), journalist, poet; b. Mogilev, Russia, Aug. 1, 1888; d. N. Y. C., Feb. 19, 1966; in U. S. since 1898; mem. edtl. staff Jewish Daily Forward; mem. exec. bd. Yiddish Writers Union; au.: Fabln (1918); A mayse veng a fisher un a fishele (1920); ed. Fabln (1924); Lider (1924).

Calendars
### SUMMARY JEWISH CALENDAR, 5727–5728 (Sept. 1966–Sept. 1968)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLIDAY</th>
<th>5727</th>
<th>5728</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosh Ha-shanah, 1st day</td>
<td>Th Sept. 15</td>
<td>Th Oct. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosh Ha-shanah, 2nd day</td>
<td>F  Sept. 16</td>
<td>F  Oct. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of Gedaliah</td>
<td>S  Sept. 18</td>
<td>S  Oct. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yom Kippur</td>
<td>Sa Sept. 24</td>
<td>Sa Oct. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukkot, 1st day</td>
<td>Th Sept. 29</td>
<td>Th Oct. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukkot, 2nd day</td>
<td>F  Sept. 30</td>
<td>F  Oct. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosh'na Rabbah</td>
<td>W  Oct. 5</td>
<td>W  Oct. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shemini 'Azeret</td>
<td>Th Oct. 6</td>
<td>Th Oct. 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simhat Torah</td>
<td>F  Oct. 7</td>
<td>F  Oct. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Heshwan, 1st day</td>
<td>F  Oct. 14</td>
<td>F  Nov. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Heshwan, 2nd day</td>
<td>Sa Oct. 15</td>
<td>Sa Nov. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Kislev</td>
<td>S  Nov. 13</td>
<td>S  Dec. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanukkah, 1st day</td>
<td>Th Dec. 8</td>
<td>W  Dec. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Tevet, 1st day</td>
<td>T  Dec. 13</td>
<td>M  Jan. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Tevet, 2nd day</td>
<td>W  Dec. 14</td>
<td>T  Jan. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of the 10th of Tevet</td>
<td>F  Dec. 23</td>
<td>Th Jan. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Shevat</td>
<td>Th Jan. 12</td>
<td>W  Jan. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamishshah-'asar bi-Shevat</td>
<td>Th Jan. 26</td>
<td>W  Feb. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Adar I, 1st day</td>
<td>F  Feb. 10</td>
<td>Th Feb. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Adar I, 2nd day</td>
<td>Sa Feb. 11</td>
<td>F  Mar. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Adar II, 1st day</td>
<td>S  Mar. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Adar II, 2nd day</td>
<td>M  Mar. 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of Esther</td>
<td>Th Mar. 23</td>
<td>W  Mar. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purim</td>
<td>S  Mar. 26</td>
<td>Th Mar. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shushan Purim</td>
<td>M  Mar. 27</td>
<td>F  Mar. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Nisan</td>
<td>T  Apr. 11</td>
<td>Sa Mar. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover, 1st day</td>
<td>T  Apr. 25</td>
<td>Sa Apr. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover, 2nd day</td>
<td>W  Apr. 26</td>
<td>S  Apr. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover, 7th day</td>
<td>M  May 1</td>
<td>F  Apr. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passover, 8th day</td>
<td>T  May 2</td>
<td>Sa Apr. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Iyar, 1st day</td>
<td>W  May 10</td>
<td>S  Apr. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Iyar, 2nd day</td>
<td>Th May 11</td>
<td>M  Apr. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lag Ba-'omer</td>
<td>S  May 28</td>
<td>Th May 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Siwan</td>
<td>F  June 9</td>
<td>T  May 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shavu'ot, 1st day</td>
<td>W  June 14</td>
<td>S  June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shavu'ot, 2nd day</td>
<td>Th June 15</td>
<td>M  June 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Tammuz, 1st day</td>
<td>Sa July 8</td>
<td>W  June 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Tammuz, 2nd day</td>
<td>S  July 9</td>
<td>Th June 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of the 17th of Tammuz</td>
<td>T  July 25</td>
<td>S  July 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Av</td>
<td>M  Aug. 7</td>
<td>F  July 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast of the 9th of Av</td>
<td>T  Aug. 15</td>
<td>S  Aug. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Elul, 1st day</td>
<td>T  Sept. 5</td>
<td>Sa Aug. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Moon, Elul, 2nd day</td>
<td>W  Sept. 6</td>
<td>S  Aug. 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONDENSED MONTHLY CALENDAR

**1966, Dec. 14—1967, Jan. 11**  
**TEVET 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>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></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>Ezekiel 37: 15-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wa-yehi</td>
<td>Gen. 47: 28-50: 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Shemot</td>
<td>Exod. 1: 1-6: 1</td>
<td>I Kings 2: 1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 7</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wa-era'</td>
<td>Exod. 6: 2-9: 35</td>
<td>Ezekiel 28: 25-29: 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1967, Jan. 12—Feb. 10**  
**SHEVAᵀ 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>14</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bo'</td>
<td>Exod. 10: 1-13: 16</td>
<td>Judges 4: 4-5: 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Be-shallah (Shabbat Shirah)</td>
<td>Exod. 13: 17-17: 16</td>
<td>Judges 5: 1-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hamishshah-asar bi-Shevav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yitro</td>
<td>Exod. 18: 1-20: 23</td>
<td>Isaiah 6: 1-7: 6; 9: 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mishpatim</td>
<td>Exod. 21: 1-24: 18</td>
<td>Jeremiah 34: 8-22; 33: 25,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italicics are for Sephardi Minhag.*
### 1967, Feb. 11—Mar. 12 [5727]

<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>Terumah</td>
<td>(Num. 28: 9-15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tezavveh</td>
<td>Exod. 27: 20-30: 10</td>
<td>Ezekiel 43: 10-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ki tissa’</td>
<td>Exod. 30: 11-34: 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wa-yakhel</td>
<td>Exod. 35: 1-38: 20</td>
<td>I Kings 7: 40-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I Kings 7: 13-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Peḳude; Sheḳalim</td>
<td>Exod. 38: 21-40: 38</td>
<td>II Kings 12: 1-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30: 11-16</td>
<td>I Kings 12: 17-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td>I Samuel 20: 18,42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1967, Mar. 13—Apr. 10 [5727]

<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>18</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wa-yikra’</td>
<td>Levit. 1: 1-5: 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fast of Esther</td>
<td>Exod. 32: 11-14; 34: 1-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Purim</td>
<td>Exod. 17: 8-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Shushan Purim</td>
<td>(Book of Esther is read the night before.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezekiel 36: 16-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezekiel 45: 18-46: 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardi Minhag.*
### 1967, Apr. 11—May 10

#### 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>Apr. 11</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Nisan 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mezora'</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Kings 7: 3-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ahare (Shabbat Ha-gadol)</td>
<td>Levit. 16: 1-18: 30</td>
<td>Malachi 3: 4-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fast of Firstborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Passover, First Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Kings 23: 1-9; 21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Passover, Second Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hol Ha-mo'ed Third Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezekiel 37: 1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hol Ha-mo'ed Fourth Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Passover, Seventh Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>II Samuel 22: 1-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Passover, Eighth Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaiah 10: 32-12: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Kedoshim</td>
<td>Levit. 19: 1-20: 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</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 Sephardi Minhag.*
### 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>May 11</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Emor</td>
<td>Levit. 21: 1-24: 23</td>
<td>Ezekiel 44: 15-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Be-har</td>
<td>Levit. 25: 1-26: 2</td>
<td>Jeremiah 32: 6-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pesah Sheni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Be-hukkotai</td>
<td>Levit. 26: 3-27: 34</td>
<td>Jeremiah 16:19-17:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lag Ba-omer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>10</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Naso'</td>
<td>Num. 4: 21-7: 89</td>
<td>Ezekiel 1: 1-28; 3: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Num. 28: 26-31}</td>
<td>Habakkuk 2: 20-3: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shavu’ot, Second Day</td>
<td>{Deut. 15: 19-16: 17}</td>
<td>Zechariah 2: 14-4: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Num. 28: 26-31}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Be-ha ‘alotekha</td>
<td>Num. 8: 1-12: 16</td>
<td>Joshua 2: 1-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shelah lekha</td>
<td>Num. 13: 1-15: 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Korah</td>
<td>Num. 16: 1-18: 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Num. 28: 9-15}</td>
<td>I Samuel 66: 1-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardi 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</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tammuz</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Balaq</td>
<td>Num. 22: 2-25: 9</td>
<td>Micah 5: 6-6: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pen'has</td>
<td>Num. 25: 10-30: 1</td>
<td>I Kings 18: 46-19: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fast of the 17th of Tammuz</td>
<td>Exod. 32: 11-14;</td>
<td>Isaiah 55: 6-56: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mas'ê</td>
<td>Num. 33: 1-36: 13</td>
<td>Jeremiah 2: 4-2: 28;</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>Aug.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Av</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dewarim (Shabbat Hazon)</td>
<td>Deut. 1: 1-3: 22</td>
<td>Isaiah 1: 1-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fast of the 9th of Av</td>
<td>Morning: Deut. 4: 25-40 Afternoon: Exod. 32: 11-14 34: 1-10</td>
<td>(Book of Lamentations is read the night before.) Jeremiah 8: 13-9: 23 Isaiah 55: 6-56: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wa-ethannan (Shabbat Naḥamu)</td>
<td>Deut. 3: 23-7: 11</td>
<td>Isaiah 40: 1-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>'Egev</td>
<td>Deut. 7: 12-11: 25</td>
<td>Isaiah 49: 14-51: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Re'eh</td>
<td>Deut. 11: 26-16: 17</td>
<td>Isaiah 54: 11-55: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Sephardi 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>Sept. 6</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>9</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>16</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ki tese</td>
<td>Deut. 21: 10-25: 19</td>
<td>Isaiah 54: 1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</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>30</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>
<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>Oct. 5</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>7</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ha'azinu (Shabbat Shuvah)</td>
<td>Deut. 32: 1-52</td>
<td>Hosea 14: 2-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fast of Gedalia</td>
<td>Exod. 32: 11-14; 34: 1-10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55: 6-56: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yom Kippur</td>
<td>Levit. 16: 1-34; Levit. 29: 7-11</td>
<td>Isaiah 57: 14-58: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</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>21</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>22-24</td>
<td>S-T</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>Hol Ha-mo'ed</td>
<td>Num. 29: 20-28; Num. 29: 23-31; Num. 29: 26-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hoshana Rabbah</td>
<td>Num. 29: 26-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Shemini 'Azeret</td>
<td>Deut. 14: 22-16: 17; Num. 29: 35-30: 1</td>
<td>I Kings 8: 54-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Be-reeshit</td>
<td>Gen. 1: 1-6: 8</td>
<td>Isaiah 42: 5-43: 10; Isaiah 42: 5-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 3</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 Sephardi Minhag.
### 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>Nov. 4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noah; New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Gen. 6: 9-11; 32</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>11</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lekh lekha</td>
<td>Gen. 12: 1-17: 27</td>
<td>II Kings 4: 1-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>Dec. 3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td>Hosea 12: 13-14: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hosea 11: 7-12: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wa-yese'</td>
<td>Gen. 28: 10-32: 3</td>
<td>Obadiah 1: 1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wa-yishlah</td>
<td>Gen. 32: 4-36: 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>W-F</td>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>Hanukkah, First to Third Day</td>
<td>W Num. 7: 1-17 Th Num. 7: 18-29 F Num. 7: 24-35</td>
<td>Zechariah 2: 14-4: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mi-kez; Hanukkah, Fourth Day</td>
<td>[Gen. 41: 1-4: 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Num. 7: 30-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Hanukkah, Fifth Day</td>
<td>Num. 7: 36-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hanukkah, Sixth Day; New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>[Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Num. 7: 42-47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardi Minhag.*
### 1968, Jan. 2—Jan. 30  

#### TEVET 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>Jan. 2</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tevet 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day; Hanukkah, Seventh Day</td>
<td><a href="#">Num. 28: 1-15</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Num. 7: 48-54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hanukkah, Eighth Day</td>
<td>Num. 7: 54-8: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wa-yiggash</td>
<td>Gen. 44: 18-47: 27</td>
<td>Ezekiel 37: 15-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Th</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>27</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Wa-era'</td>
<td>Exod. 6: 2-9: 35</td>
<td>Ezekiel 28: 25-29: 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1968, Jan. 31—Feb. 29  

#### SHEVAT 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>Jan. 31</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Shevat 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hamishshah-'asar bi-Shevat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yitro</td>
<td>Exod. 18: 1-20: 23</td>
<td>Isaiah 6: 1-7; 6: 9: 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardi 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>Mar. 1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Adar 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tezawweh, Zakhor</td>
<td></td>
<td>I Samuel 15: 2-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</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>14</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Purim</td>
<td>Exod. 17: 8-16</td>
<td>(Book of Esther is read the night before.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Shushan Purim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ki tissa'</td>
<td>Exod. 30: 11-34: 35</td>
<td>I Kings 18: 1-39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardi 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>Apr. 6</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Zaw (Shabbat Ha-gadol)</td>
<td>Levit. 6:1-8:36</td>
<td>Malachi 3:4-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fast of Firstborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Hol Ha-mo'ed</td>
<td>Exod. 34:1-26 Num. 28:19-25</td>
<td>II Kings 23:1-9; 21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hol Ha-mo'ed</td>
<td>Num. 9:1-14 Num. 28:19-25</td>
<td>II Kings 23:1-9; 21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</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 Sephardi 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>Apr. 29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Iyar 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tazria', Mezora'</td>
<td>Levit. 12: 1-15: 33</td>
<td>II Kings 7: 3-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ahare Mot, Kedoshim</td>
<td>Levit. 16: 1-20: 27</td>
<td>Amos 9: 7-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lag Ba-omer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezekiel 20: 2-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Emor</td>
<td>Levit. 21: 1-24: 23</td>
<td>Ezekiel 44: 15-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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 28</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Siwan 1</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Be-midbar</td>
<td>Num. 1: 1-4: 20</td>
<td>Hosea 2: 1-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Num. 28: 26-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shavu'ot, Second Day</td>
<td>{Deut. 15: 19-16: 17</td>
<td>Habbakuk 3: 1-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Num. 28: 26-31</td>
<td>Habbakuk 2: 20-3: 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</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>15</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>26</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 Sephardi Minhag.*
### 1968, June 27—July 25: Tammuz 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>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Tammuz 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Koraḥ</td>
<td>Num. 16: 1-18: 32</td>
<td>I Samuel 11: 14-12: 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Balak</td>
<td>Num. 22: 2-25: 9</td>
<td>Micah 5: 6-6: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S</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>20</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pinehas</td>
<td>Num. 25: 10-30: 1</td>
<td>Jeremiah 1: 1-2: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1968, July 26—Aug. 24: Av 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>July</td>
<td></td>
<td>Av</td>
<td>New Moon</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td>Jeremiah 2: 4-28: 3: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremiah 2: 4-28: 4: 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mattot, Mas'e</td>
<td>Num. 30: 2-36: 13</td>
<td>Isaiah 1: 1-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fast of the 9th of Av</td>
<td>Morning: Deut. 4: 25-40</td>
<td>Isaiah 55: 6-56: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deut. 32: 1-14; 34: 1-10</td>
<td>(Book of Lamenta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tions is read the night before.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeremiah 8: 13-9: 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wa-ethannan (Shabbat Naḥamu)</td>
<td>Deut. 3: 23-7: 11</td>
<td>Isaiah 40: 1-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</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>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Re'eh; New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>{Deut. 11: 26-16: 17</td>
<td>Isaiah 66: 1-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{Num. 28: 9-15</td>
<td>Isaiah 66: 1-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I Samuel 20: 18, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardi 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>Aug. 25</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Elul 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</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>14</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>
### TISHRI 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>Sept. 23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tishri 1</td>
<td><strong>Rosh Ha-shanah, First Day</strong></td>
<td>Gen. 21: 1-34, Num. 29: 1-6</td>
<td>I Samuel 1: 1-2: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Fast of Gedaliah</strong></td>
<td>Exod. 32: 11-14, 34: 1-10</td>
<td>Isaiah 55: 6-56: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Wa-yelekh (Shabbat Shuvah)</strong></td>
<td>Deut. 31: 1-30</td>
<td>Hosea 14: 2-10, Micah 7: 18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 2</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Yom Kippur</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isaiah 57: 14-58: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td><strong>Ha'azinu</strong></td>
<td>Deut. 32: 1-52</td>
<td>Jonah 1: 1-4: 11, Micah 7: 18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Sukkot, First Day</strong></td>
<td>Levit. 22: 26-23: 44, Num. 29: 12-16</td>
<td>Zechariah 14: 1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Sukkot, Second Day</strong></td>
<td>Levit. 22: 26-23: 44, Num. 29: 12-16</td>
<td>I Kings 8: 2-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Hol Ha-mo'ed</strong></td>
<td>Exod. 33: 12-34: 26, Num. 29: 26-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Hosha'na Rabbah</strong></td>
<td>Num. 29: 26-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>Shemini 'Azeret</strong></td>
<td>Deut. 14: 22-16: 17, Num. 29: 35-30: 1</td>
<td>I Kings 8: 54-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>27</td>
<td><strong>Be-re'shit</strong></td>
<td>Gen. 1: 1-6: 8</td>
<td>Isaiah 42: 5-43: 10, Isaiah 42: 5-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>30</td>
<td><strong>New Moon, First Day</strong></td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardi Minhag.*
### 1968, Oct. 23—Nov. 21 | HESHWAN 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>Oct. 23</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Heshwan 1</td>
<td>New Moon, Second Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lekh lekha</td>
<td>Gen. 12: 1-17: 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New Moon, First Day</td>
<td>Num. 28: 1-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1968, Nov. 22—Dec. 21 | 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>30</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wa-yeze'</td>
<td>Gen. 28: 10-32: 3</td>
<td>Hosea 11: 7-12: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 7</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wa-yishlah</td>
<td>Gen. 32: 4-36: 43</td>
<td>Obadiah 1: 1-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mi-kez; New Moon, First Day; Hanukkah, Sixth Day</td>
<td>{Gen. 41: 1-44: 17, Num. 28: 9-15, Num. 7: 42-47}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Italics are for Sephardi Minhag.*
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Harry Starr 2 .......................................................... New York
Roger W. Straus, Jr. 2 ............................................. New York
Lewis L. Strauss 1 ................................................... Washington
Saul Viener 3 .......................................................... Richmond
Morton H. Wilner 1 .................................................... Washington
Ben D. Zevin 2 ........................................................ Cleveland
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Trustees

Publication Committee

Edwin Wolf, 2nd ....................................................... Chairman

1 Term expires in 1967. 2 Term expires in 1968. 3 Term expires in 1969.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chaim Potok</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert D. Abrahams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Howard L. Adelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert Alter</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Max Arzt</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Bernard J. Bamberger</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Salo W. Baron</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Samuel Belkin</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Stanley F. Chyet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur A. Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gerson D. Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Moshe Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Samuel Dinin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Azriel Eisenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. H. W. EtTELson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Abraham J. Feldman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hartford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Louis Finkelstein</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph M. First</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard L. Frankel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. H. Louis Ginsberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Eli Ginzberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nahum N. Glatzer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waltham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Nelson Glueck</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Judah I. Goldin</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Solomon Grayzel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Moshe Greenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Abraham Halkin</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Abraham J. Heschel</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Oscar I. Janowsky</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Louis L. Kaplan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Milton Konvitz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Bertram W. Korn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A. Leo Levin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Louis E. Levinthal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Dr. Joseph H. Lookstein</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jacob R. Marcus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Abraham A. Neuman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jacob Neusner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Harry M. Orlinsky</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Oskar K. Rabinowicz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scarsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ellis Rivkin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Abram L. Sachar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waltham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Seymour Siegel</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Solis-Cohen, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Shalom Spiegel</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Starr</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Isadore Twersky</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell Whiteman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The seventy-eighth annual meeting of The Jewish Publication Society of America was convened at three o'clock in the afternoon on Sunday, April 24, 1966, in the Warwick Hotel, Philadelphia, with approximately 150 members in attendance. The invocation was delivered by Dr. Jacob R. Marcus.

Mr. Sol Satinsky, President of the Society, extended greetings on behalf of the officers and trustees, then proceeded with the business of the Annual Meeting.

Treasurer's Report

Mr. David C. Melnicoff, Treasurer, reported as follows:

The scale of financial operations during 1965 was on the same order as in recent years. The Society's deficit, after donations, was small, and the reserve funds of the Society produced a satisfactory flow of income.

Income from the distribution of books in 1965 remained about even with the previous year. Sales of Bibles and Torahs declined, but this loss was made up by gains in sales of other publications so that total revenues, including those from royalties, were about $322,000.

Publication expenses rose during the year, increasing the publishing deficit from $185,000 to $204,000. Some increase in dues (from $138,000 to $156,000) and other donations held the net operating deficit at about last year's level—a modest $4,800. The control of overhead and administrative expenses (which did not increase) contributed to this result.

During the year the various Funds available to the Society were consolidated for management purposes, but special purpose funds continue to be segregated on the books until their purpose is accomplished. Combined income and capital gain from these funds exceeded 6% for 1965. The ratio of equities to the total portfolio was 45%—well within the limit set by the Board of Directors.

The budget for 1966 envisions operations on approximately the same scale as 1965.

Executive Director's Report

Mr. Lesser Zussman, Executive Director, presented an informal report on the Society's promotional activities during the past year. Primarily, these activities were aimed at membership enrollment, although the distribution of books through jobbers and bookstores was not neglected.

Purchase of space on a test basis in Commentary, National Jewish Monthly, Hadassah Magazine and Reporter produced satisfactory results, so that the program will be continued in 1966. Also, direct mail efforts will be expanded—all in an attempt to make the work of the Society better known to prospective members.

Report of the Publication Committee

Mr. Edwin Wolf, 2nd, Chairman, reported as follows:

I find on looking back over the printed record of past years that the report of the Chairman of the Publication Committee has been a custom adhered to rather than a purpose accomplished. Each year we tell you that after overcoming insuperable difficulties in obtaining worthwhile manuscripts, we have put out a list of distinguished books. Each year we assure you that those difficulties seem as great for the future, but that we have confidence we shall once more achieve success. The amazing thing is that we do so year after year.
I am afraid that the JPS is being taken for granted, as I am afraid that Jewish books are being taken for granted. The Society was founded because there was a paucity of books on Jewish subjects available to English readers. If today there seems to be a plethora of them, I can assure you that there is not a plethora of good ones, and that your Society is publishing a good percentage of the quality works. This means that your Editors and your Publication Committee are doing the task which you expect them to do.

I am concerned that the availability of books is taken so lightly. As a librarian, I am conscious of a general feeling that it is up to someone to see that books are written, printed and kept, so that they may be made available to the right person at the right time. But, that someone always seems to be someone else. The recent tragic fire at the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary should teach us a lesson. Money was raised for the Seminary for many purposes, all worthy, but somehow the library never became a priority. The availability of books was taken for granted. It is only when they are no longer available that their prime importance is recognized.

Books are the heart of a university, we are told, but almost generally libraries are the second-class citizens of the university communities. Book funds are grudgingly given, and given with a tight fist. Yet, every department, particularly those enjoying the rich grants now so easily to be obtained, expects to find exactly what it wants when it wants it.

Such, too, is the attitude of the Jewish community. Because the Society runs a fiscally tight ship, and because its publishing program has been successful, we are taken for granted. The new translation of the Bible has aroused enthusiasm and created excitement, but many of those who have heard the call of the Bible are deaf to the less dramatic, stone-by-stone building which we do year after year. Those stones make quite an edifice. I suggest that those of you who have not visited the headquarters of the Society on 15th Street do so. Look at the wall of books which constitutes the past publications; read the titles; take a volume from the shelves and leaf through pages. It is quite a bookish edifice we have built. And the important thing is that we have not stopped building.

A great deal of knowledge has been made available through our efforts. We have one further problem: getting people to make use of that knowledge. Yes, we are taken for granted. Because we exist, the American Jewish community salves its conscience and assumes Jewish books are being printed and Jewish books are being read, this in the face of every study of contemporary American Jewish life which shows that one of the major eroding forces of Jewishness is lack of knowledge. We know how many books we distribute, but we do not know how many of the books we distribute are read.

I want to end on an optimistic note, because I would not have you think that we publish books solely for the greater glory of the Publication Committee. First, our membership has increased, and while there is no guarantee that we have acquired many readers, it is fair to assume that we have gained some more. Secondly, our paperback reprint sales are increasing, and with our new arrangement with Harper and Row's Torchbook series, they should increase even more. While hard-back books are bought, sometimes merely to have, frequently for potential future reference, and occasionally to fill empty shelves, paperbacks are almost invariably bought for immediate reading. I look upon the success of our paperbacks as our brightest hope for the future, but you must remember that most successful paperbacks began life as a hard-back which achieved recognition. That brings us back to the work of the Publication Committee. We must create tomorrow's paperbacks by bringing out good books today. Our past year has been a good one. The seemingly effortless flow of books into your homes is the result of the effort of
individual members of the Committee, our editors and our executive director. Do not take them for granted. Give them the kind of encouragement and support that all good men need to make good better.

Report of the Committee on Nominations

Mr. Bernard G. Segal, Chairman, reported as follows:

I rise to report in behalf of the Committee on Nominations and By-Laws, consisting of Samuel H. Daroff, Louis E. Levinthal, David C. Melnicoff, Jerome J. Shestack, Edwin Wolf, 2nd, with Lesser Zussman as Secretary and your speaker as Chairman.

You will, of course, recall that upon motion of this Committee, the members of the Society at the last Annual Meeting adopted substantial changes in the By-Laws, particularly insofar as the election of officers and limitations upon the number of permissible successive terms of officers and trustees are concerned.

Under our new By-Laws, some of our stalwarts with many years of service become ineligible for another full three-year term until after the lapse of one year. Fortunately, we are able to renominate some of these for one or two year terms. Thus, we shall provide our new President with the benefit of the experience and talents of at least some of our veterans during the transitional period.

All eligible Trustees must be renominated if they are to continue to serve on the Board, and under the By-Laws, there must be staggered terms. Accordingly, our Committee is today nominating the following incumbent Trustees for respective terms of one, two and three years, as follows:

For one-year terms:


For two-year terms:


For three-year terms:

Robert J. Block, Justice H. B. Cohen, Judge A. L. Freedman, Leo Guzik, Dr. J. R. Marcus, Dr. Paul Sloane, Saul Viener.

I have the pleasure, for the Committee, to nominate as new Trustees a very distinguished group of men whom I shall describe only by their city of residence and their principal activity.

For one-year terms:

For a two-year term:

Samuel Katzin, Chicago, President of the Midwest Chevrolet Co., and longtime President of the Board of Jewish Education of Chicago.

For three-year terms:

Philip Werner Amram, of Washington, D.C., Senior partner in the Washington law firm of Amram, Hahn & Sundlun; Isaac Auerbach, Philadelphia, President of the Auerbach Corporation; Meyer Feldman, Washington, D.C., formerly Deputy Special Counsel to President John F. Kennedy and formerly Counsel to President Lyndon B. Johnson, now a member of the law firm of Ginsburg and Feldman; Harry Elson, Atlanta, Georgia, President of a large news distributing service and a moving force in the publication of the magazine “Commentary”; John J. Goldberg, San Francisco, a senior partner in the law firm of Steinhart, Goldberg, Feigenbaum & Ladar; Dr. A. Leo Levin, Philadelphia, Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania and Professor of Law at the Law School of that institution; Dr. Paul Mishkin, Philadelphia, Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Mitchell Panzer, Philadelphia, partner in the law firm of Wolf, Block, Schorr & Solis-Cohen, and President of Gratz College.

Mr. President, I have the pleasure, in behalf of a unanimous Committee, to move the election of the gentlemen I have named, as Trustees of the Society for the respective terms specified.

The motion was seconded and passed.

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Sol Satinsky, President, made his annual report as printed on page 557. The Annual Meeting was then adjourned and reconvened as an open meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Bernard G. Segal reported as follows:

Under the By-Laws as amended last year, officers will now be elected by the Trustees. However, our Committee is so proud of the slate of officers we are presenting, that we are making our nominations at this open meeting of the Board of Trustees in the presence of our General Membership. The By-Laws now provide that no person, other than the Executive Director, and the Editor, shall hold the same office for more than three consecutive years. This renders ineligible for election today, our esteemed and effective President, who has served for six successive terms, and all of our Vice Presidents.

I think it is appropriate to review very briefly a few of the advances made by the Society during Sol Satinsky's tenure as President. They are very considerable indeed.

One outstanding event was the publication of The Torah at the end of 1962. By now, there are approximately 180,000 volumes of this notable work in print and more than $300,000 has been raised for the Bible Fund to achieve this result and make possible continuance of the distinguished work on the Bible being carried on under the Society's auspices.

Another significant attainment during Sol Satinsky's Presidency was the conception and completion in 1964 of the Society's splendid new building. This was made possible by a grant from the Jacob R. Schiff Fund, of which our President
and the respective Presidents of Columbia University and the College of the City of New York are the trustees. In addition to the $100,000 for the building renovation, the Fund, during Sol's concurrent service as President of the Society and as Trustee of the Fund, made a grant of $150,000 to the Society to be used to publish books on Jewish contributions to American democracy.

Too many statistics are a terrible bore; a few meaningful ones can be an inspiration. Here are just three categories which provide some measure of the Society's advances during the six years of our President's incumbency.

Publications—66 new books and 150 reprints.
Distribution—1,300,000 hard-back volumes and one-quarter million paperbacks.
Memberships—rose from 11,300 to 13,400, with annual dues going from $110,000 to $156,000.

Similar impressive gains are reflected in the statistics of all of the Society's activities.

These represent the quantitative, the measurable results, achieved, during Sol Satinsky's administrations.

There are, too, the qualitative values. Having been Vice-President of the Society during all of the six years of Sol's Presidency, I can personally attest to the inspiration of Sol's leadership, as can every other officer and trustee. I cannot remember anyone's ever refusing an assignment Sol asked him to assume in behalf of the Society. In his quiet and modest, yet persistent and effective way, he has inspired all who have worked with him. He has effectually carried forward the work and the objectives of his distinguished predecessors, and he has broken significant new ground on his own. He turns over to his successor a smoothly functioning and highly regarded operation.

Last year, the members of this Society wisely voted that upon completion of his term, a President shall become a life member of the Board of Trustees as well. Mr. Satinsky, therefore, now assumes the more leisurely, though still influential, role he has so long sought—a still young senior elder of the Society.

Mr. Satinsky knows that he will have our esteem, our affection, and our deep appreciation always. We look forward to working with him for many more years in the service of the Society he has served so well.

Mr. Chairman, it is, I think an attribute of worthwhile organizations with lofty purposes that as the chief actor leaves the stage, there is always in the wings, a new star ready to assume the leader's role. That is our happy situation today.

From the start, your Nominating Committee had only one choice for the Presidency. For eleven years, he has been one of the wisest and most useful members of our Board of Trustees. He has held high posts of honor in the Jewish community as well as in the community at large.

As the first President, now Honorary President, of the Albert Einstein Medical Center, he demonstrated his immense administrative ability as he launched that new project so effectively that it has become a recognized leader among the private hospitals of the country.

As editor of the Pennsylvania Bar Association Quarterly, a position he has held with distinction for the past quarter of a century, he continues to serve his own profession of the law.

In the field of education, he has been President of the alumni of his Alma Mater, the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania; he has been honored by being the recipient of the University Alumni's Award of Merit; and he serves currently as a member of the Joint Committee of the Trustees of the Annenberg School of Communications and the Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania. In recent days, he was elected to the Board of Trustees of Temple University.

Although by now you may doubt it, he also has a job and he earns a living at it.
For he is, as he has been since 1940, Vice-President, Secretary, and General Counsel of Triangle Publications, which besides operating a chain of television and radio stations, publishes The Philadelphia Inquirer and many of the country's leading magazines and other publications.

There is no one I know whose election as President of the Jewish Publication Society would give greater promise for the future of the Society.

It is, therefore, with pride and gratification that, in behalf of the Nominating Committee, I nominate as President of the Society for the coming year, one of my oldest and most cherished friends, Joseph M. First.

We are most enthusiastic, too, about the other officers we are nominating today. I wish time allowed my telling you something about each of them. They are:

Vice Presidents—David C. Melnicoff, Philadelphia
Leo Guzik, New York
Maxwell M. Rabb, New York
Philip D. Sang, Chicago
Jerome J. Shestack, Philadelphia

Secretary—Dr. Paul Sloane, Philadelphia

Treasurer—William S. Fishman

As Life Trustees, we nominate:
Jack Solis-Cohen, Jr.
Judge Louis E. Levinthal
Justice Horace Stern
Sol Satinsky
Edwin Wolf, 2nd

And, of course, we shall renominate for his 17th term, our Executive Director, Lesser Zussman, who continues to administer the affairs of the Society with the outstanding effectiveness to which we have all become accustomed. He is an invaluable asset to the Society.

At our Annual Meeting last year, we honored our distinguished and beloved Editor of 27 years, Dr. Solomon Grayzel. As we take official note of his retirement, we wish him God-speed, and many years of satisfying and productive work in the field of scholarship he will now be able more leisurely to pursue.

As you all know, we are nominating as Dr. Grayzel's successor as Editor, Dr. Chaim Potok, whom you will be hearing more about later in the program, and who is our speaker today.

Mr. Chairman, I move the election of the foregoing officers and Life Trustees. The motion was seconded and passed.

Mr. First accepted the presidency and, as his first official act, presented awards of appreciation to Sol Satinsky, Bernard L. Frankel, Dr. Solomon Grayzel, Dr. Jacob R. Marcus and Bernard G. Segal.

Program

Dr. Solomon Grayzel, Editor Emeritus, introduced Dr. Chaim Potok, newly-elected Editor, who read a paper titled "New Frontiers in Jewish Publishing." The presentation was followed by questions and discussion. A reception in honor of the outgoing officers ended the afternoon's activities.

Respectfully submitted,
PAUL SLOANE, M.D., Secretary
Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is an open secret that I am but minutes away from being relieved of the responsibilities which I have carried during the past six years as President of the JPS. These have been eventful years and I shall always look back on them with gratitude and a feeling of accomplishment, but I shall not dwell on them. Our work is in the future, in which it is my hope that I may have a part, so permit me to confine myself to the year just passed and let the earlier years remain as they have already gone into the record.

Actually, the work of the JPS falls into a pattern each year—a pattern intended to fulfill our reason for existence. On the surface, our task is a very simple one. We publish and distribute books which help to enhance and strengthen our Jewish culture and religion. However, this apparently simple task becomes highly complicated when we get into the specifics of what is published and for whom our books are intended. Let's look at the record and see what we accomplished during the past year.

**1965 Publication Program**

During the year, we published eleven hardbound titles and one paperback reprint. The titles, with the statistical record of month published, quantity printed and number distributed during the calendar year follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Printed</th>
<th>Distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Short Friday and Other Stories,</em> by Isaac Bashevis Singer</td>
<td>(Co-published with Farrar, Straus &amp; Giroux)</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>4,961</td>
<td>4,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>This People Israel,</em> by Leo Baeck.</td>
<td>(Co-published with Holt, Rinehart and Winston)</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Autobiographies of American Jews,</em> by Harold Ribalow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>2,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Education in Israel,</em> by Joseph Bentwich.</td>
<td>(Co-published with Routledge &amp; Kegan Paul, Ltd.)</td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>2,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Usque's Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel,</em> by Martin A. Cohen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr.</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>2,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Jewish Marriage Anthology,</em> by Phillip and Hanna Goodman</td>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>7,246</td>
<td>4,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Captive Rabbi: The Life of Rabbi Meir of Rothenburg,</em> by Lillian Freehof.</td>
<td>(No. 18 in the Covenant Series.)</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>And the Crooked Shall Be Made Straight,</em> by Jacob Robinson.</td>
<td>(Co-published with The Macmillan Co.)</td>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>4,058</td>
<td>2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>American Jewish Year Book,</em> Vol. 66, edited by Morris Fine and Milton Himmelfarb.</td>
<td>(Co-published with the American Jewish Committee.)</td>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yossel of Rosheim,</em> by Selma Stern</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paperback (Co-published with Harper & Row in the Torchbook Series.)

Jews in the Renaissance, by Cecil Roth Nov. 6,000 2,870

1965 Reprints

We reprinted fourteen titles during the year, with the statistical record of volumes reprinted and total in print as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reprints</th>
<th>Total in Print</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Torah: A New Translation</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Holy Scriptures (1917 Translation)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1,088,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American Jew: A Reappraisal, by Oscar I. Janowsky</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>7,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakthrough, by Irwin Stark and Irving Malin</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>7,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Einstein, by William Wise (A Covenant Book)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanukkah, by Emily Solis-Cohen, Jr.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A History of the Jews, by Solomon Grayzel</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>76,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A History of the Jews in Christian Spain, Vol. I, by Yitzhak Baer</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let Laughter Ring, by S. Felix Mendelsohn</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways Through the Bible, by Mortimer C. Cohen</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>182,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathways, Workbooks, Compiled by Miriam Levitin</td>
<td>1,667 sets</td>
<td>27,089 sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pharisees, 2 Vols., by Louis Finkelstein</td>
<td>2,000 sets</td>
<td>12,325 sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophies of Judaism, by Julius Guttman</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath, by Abraham E. Millgram</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>17,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publication Distribution

In 1965, we distributed 192,000 volumes, of which 52,000 were selected by members, 136,000 distributed through jobbers, bookstores and other customers, and 4,000 distributed as free books.

Membership Statistics

Our membership enrollment in 1965 showed an encouraging increase. We ended the year with 13,394 members compared with 12,145 in 1964, so that we gained 1,249 for an increase of 10% during the year. It is gratifying to know that nearly 90% of the annual members on our rolls at the end of 1964 renewed in 1965. It is our hope that sustained effort in this important area of our work will continue to produce good results.

Bible Translation

The Bible Translation Committee and the Bible Fund which is making possible this monumental achievement merit special attention. You have read in the Bookmark and the press that we recently expanded the Translation Committee to include a group of young scholars and rabbis who have accepted responsibility for translating the Ketubim. The new members are Dr. Moshe Greenberg of the Uni-
versity of Pennsylvania, Dr. Jonas C. Greenfield of the University of California (Berkeley), Dr. Nahum M. Sarna of Brandeis University, Rabbi Saul Leeman of Cranston, R. I., Rabbi Martin Rozenberg of Fort Washington, N. Y., and Rabbi David S. Shapiro of Milwaukee.

The original committee will continue with the translation and preparation of *The Torah, Haftarot* and *Megillot* (which we hope to publish in 1968) and then turn their attention to completion of *Nebiim*. Thus, with both groups working side by side, it is our hope that the work of translation will be accelerated and that the entire work will be completed in five or six years.

The response from the community to our appeal for gifts to the Second Bible Fund continues to be a source of deep satisfaction. Our goal of $500,000.00, estimated as the amount needed for completion and publication of The *Tanach*, has been more than half met by contributions from some 1,700 individuals and institutions in an amount of $264,845.00. Outstanding in their efforts during the past year were Trustees Philip D. Sang and Samuel N. Katzin in Chicago, and Trustee Saul Viener in Richmond and Norfolk.

We shall continue our efforts until the goal is reached.

**Necrology**

During the past year, we lost three valued colleagues who are irreplaceable in the work of the JPS: Martin Buber, aged 87, wrote *For the Sake of Heaven*, which we published in 1945 in an English translation by Ludwig Lewisohn; Ephraim A. Speiser, aged 63, was a member of the Publication Committee for 13 years and also served as a member of the Bible Translation Committee; Myer Feinstein, aged 69, was an officer and trustee for 14 years, during 12 of which years he served outstandingly as treasurer.

May their memories serve as an inspiration and a blessing for all of us.

In closing, I would like to express my thanks to you, our members, for your sustained interest and support. Let's all look to the future and hope that the value and effectiveness of the JPS will continue to grow—in a world at peace.
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