SPIRITUAL AND INTELLECTUAL LIFE

SABBATH AND HOLIDAY OBSERVANCE.—During the past year, two countries took action of great importance in connection with Jewish religious life. In Tangier, the National Assembly voted late in 1925 to recognize the Day of Atonement as a legal holiday for all the inhabitants of the Zone. Early in 1926, the government of the Bey of Tunis decreed the Day of Atonement as a legal holiday for the inhabitants of that country. In the former country, the National Assembly voted also to permit Jewish civil servants to absent themselves from their work on Rosh Hashanah, the three festivals, and also the Feast of Purim.

Compulsory Sunday rest, which makes it difficult and sometimes impossible for Jews to observe their Sabbath, continued as in previous years, to agitate Jews in many countries. In the United States, the campaign by church organizations, headed by the Lord's Day Alliance, to introduce legislation providing for compulsory rest on Sundays was not as determined as during the previous year. As reported in the "Survey of the Year 5685" (American Jewish...
The drastic bill introduced in the United States Senate providing for compulsory Sunday rest in the District of Columbia, designed to be used as a model for similar legislation throughout the country, was not acted upon by the Sixty-Eighth Congress. Early in 1926, however, Congressman W. C. Lankford, of Georgia, introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. The bill provides that "it shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any person to labor or for any person, firm . . . to employ any person to labor . . . on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday." The bill exempts work of necessity and charity, including "labor and business in connection with the preparation of newspapers, of motor oil and gasoline, and in restaurants and cafeterias . . . and in drug stores . . . labor and business in connection with public lighting, water and heating plants and for the maintenance of street cars and railroad trains," provided the right to weekly rest and worship is not thereby denied. The bill on the other hand prohibits recreation such as keeping open a theatre and engaging in "commercialized sports or amusements on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday." Further the bill does not make provision for persons who observe the sixth day of the week as their day of rest. The bill is now in the hands of the Committee on the District of Columbia. In the State of Michigan, the Committee of the legislature failed to report a bill providing for the prohibition of the sale of groceries, dry goods, etc., on Sundays. The bill, it is interesting to note, contained the following clause: "... nothing in this act shall apply to persons who conscientiously believe the seventh day of the week should be observed as the Sabbath and who actually refrain from bus-
iness on that day, through its twenty-four hours, from midnight Friday until midnight Saturday.”

In foreign countries, the Greek government finally put into force compulsory observance of Sunday in Salonica. As related in the “Survey of the Year 5685” (American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 27, pp. 22, 23), as early as 1919, during the course of the negotiation of the peace treaties in Paris, the Jewish delegation foresaw the possibility of the introduction of compulsory Sunday rest in Salonica. They waived the demand for the insertion of a special article on this subject in the Greek minorities treaty in deference to the solemn assurance by the Greek government that no such legislation would be introduced. In 1924, however, the municipality of Salonica passed resolutions asking for the introduction locally of compulsory Sunday rest. Protracted negotiations followed in which the Joint Foreign Committee of the Jewish Board of Deputies and of the Anglo-Jewish Association of Great Britain was the moving spirit. On May 24, 1925, however, the government did put into force the law providing for compulsory Sunday observance. The Council of the Jewish Community of Salonica protested and presented its resignation to the Governor General of Salonica.

During the past year, the Central Conference of American Rabbis went on record as “opposed in principle to legislation providing for compulsory Sunday rest.” The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America at its twenty-seventh annual convention in New York late in October, 1925, demanded legislation excepting Sabbath observers from compulsory Sunday rest laws.

In the United States, as told in the “Survey of the Year 5685” (American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 27, p. 27), a
radical and thorough-going solution of the problem of Sab-
bath observance has been proposed, namely, the securing of
a five-day-labor-week. Late in 1925, the Committee for the
Promotion of the Five-Day-Working-Week was organized
in New York City. The Committee is non-sectarian in char-
acter. Previously, it developed that the employers in the
needle trades were willing to establish a five-day-labor-week
but that the unions objected on the ground that the five-
day-labor-week would imperil the eight hour principle. In
Belgium, the compulsory Sunday rest law caused difficulties
to the merchants on the Diamond Boerse. Late in 1925, the
Boerse decided to close on both Saturdays and Sundays,
thus establishing a five-day business week.

SABBATH AND HOLIDAY OBSERVANCE IN THE SCHOOLS.—
In Germany, in the province of Saxony, the Jews have failed
to secure permission from the government to have their
children excused from attending school on the days of Pesah,
Shabuot, and Sukkot. The Jewish children have a right to
absent themselves only on Rosh Ha-Shanah and Yom
Kippur. In the summer of 1925, following protests against
the selection of Friday evening and Saturday for graduation
exercises, the superintendent of schools of the city of New
York issued instructions declaring that "under no condition
in the future are graduation exercises to be planned for any
day or evening which would conflict with the religious belief
of any faith." In Roumania, the minister of education per-
sisted in fixing the entrance examinations to high schools
and colleges on days which coincided with the Jewish New
Year, despite the protest of Jewish citizens.

The problem of writing lessons on the Sabbath for Jewish
children in state schools was acute in Roumania. As told in the "Survey of the Year 5685" (The American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 27, p. 26), the minister of education ordered that public schools in which Jewish or Mohammedan children constitute the majority should be closed on the afternoons of Saturday or Friday, the forenoons of which should be devoted to religious instruction, in the course of which Jewish children were to be excused. In the fall of 1925, Senator Rabbi Zirelsohn interpellated the government, claiming that authorities disregarding the order of the minister of education were forcing Jewish children to write on the Sabbath day in schools in which the Jewish children constituted the majority.

Facilitating Sabbath and Holiday Observance.—As in previous years, incidents occurred during the year under review, indicating tendencies in a number of countries to accommodate the Jews in the matter of their observance of the Sabbath and the holidays. In the city of New York, the Board of Aldermen resolved in the fall of 1925 that the heads of the several departments of the City and Borough Governments should grant "compensation to all employees of the Jewish faith, including those on a per diem basis, who may have absented themselves from official duties on Rosh Hashanah, September 19 and 20, 1925, and on the Day of Atonement, September 28, 1925, for the purpose of observing their religious duties." The Supreme Courts of both New York and Bronx Counties postponed the date of their opening, originally set for September 28, 1925, because it coincided with the Day of Atonement.

Many governments granted furloughs during the past
year to Jews in their armed forces. In the United States, the Jewish Welfare Board, in co-operation with local communities, arranged religious services for the High Holidays at 130 posts, stations and hospitals located in continental United States and in outlying possessions. Sixteen hundred men participated in the services. In the spring, the Board held Passover celebrations at 50 points for 1,600 men from 125 posts, stations and hospitals. Previously, the Welfare Board had arranged Purim celebrations for over 1,760 Jewish men and distributed 1,850 copies of the book of Esther.

**Shehitah.**—During the past year the decline in the intensity of the campaign against Shehitah, noted in our review of the preceding year, continued. Late in 1925, representatives of the Royal Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Great Britain declared, in a statement to the Lord Mayor of Manchester, that the Society had no intention of interfering with the Jewish method of slaughtering animals and that it approved the inclusion of a proviso in the pending legislation protecting the Jewish method. About the same time, Prof. Leonard Hill published a statement in the *Spectator*, giving additional reasons for his previous statement that the Jewish method was humane, specifically that the animal cut by the Jewish method did not retain sufficient blood to insure consciousness.

Both in Lithuania and in Norway, attempts were made to legislate against Shehitah. Late in 1925, the Lithuanian Sejm rejected a bill providing for the prohibition of Shehitah; and, early in 1926, as a result of Jewish protests, the Norwegian government withdrew the bill providing for the prohibition of Shehitah in that country. In Poland, the
Minister of the Interior instructed authorities of the town of Pudala, Poznania, to lift the ban on the Shehitah imposed by them. In Soviet Russia, authorities of the Government of Podolia issued a circular declaring that every citizen had the right to kill animals for food, provided he paid a fee and observed the sanitary regulations. The decree was aimed not so much to interfere with Shehitah as to break the so-called monopoly of the Shohetim. In the District of Muranova in Ukraine, the chairmen of the Executive Committee of the Soviets of that district forbade Jews of the town of Kurilovka to have their fowl killed in accordance with the Jewish method, exception being made only in the case of Jews who were ill. This incident, however, was purely local in extent.

KASHRUT.—The New York State Kosher Law, referred to in the "Survey of the Year 5685" (The American Jewish Year Book, Vol. 27, p. 31), was declared constitutionally valid by the Supreme Court of the United States. During the year, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America urged its members to advocate the passage of similar Kosher Laws in other states. During the past year Representative Dickstein of New York introduced in Congress a bill providing for similar legislation for the District of Columbia.

The action of the Polish government in the matter of providing kosher food for Jewish men in the army was noteworthy. In December, 1925, the government issued an order providing that any Jewish soldier who desires to eat kosher food should receive from the authorities of his barracks a cash allowance in lieu of rations so that he might eat
kosher food outside of the barracks. Early in 1926, M. Elijah Kirczbrohn, Sejm deputy and member of the Sejm Military Commission, appealed to Jewish communities in localities in which troops were stationed to establish kosher kitchens for soldiers serving in the army.

During the year, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations and the Agudath Harabbanim of the United States and Canada took action with a view to preventing abuses in the matter of the administration of kashrut. The two organizations entered into an agreement providing that the Union and the Agudath Harabbanim jointly issue heksherim to be under the auspices of the Va'ad ha-Horaah to be appointed by the Aguda and an advisory committee of three to be appointed by the Union; a Finance Committee on heksherim, forty per cent of whose members are to be of representatives of the Aguda, and the remainder representatives of the Union, is to control the funds realized from this source of income for distribution among poor and indigent rabbis.

**SYNAGOGUE.**—Complete statistics of Jewish congregations in the United States and of other countries are not available. The progress of the central synagogal organizations in the United States is indicated by the fact that the United Synagogue of America has at this writing 556 affiliated organizations: 214 congregations, 235 sisterhoods and 107 young people's leagues, an increase of 85 over the number of affiliated societies of the preceding year; the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations at this writing comprises 179 congregations and 36 women's organizations, an increase of 15; the Union of American Hebrew Congregations has 279 con-
gregations with 56,140 members. In addition, the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods has 319 societies with 59,180 members, an increase of 19 groups, and the National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods has 91 societies and 15,500 members, an increase of 11 groups over the preceding year.

MISCELLANEOUS.—Late in 1925 the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States Treasury Department inaugurated far-reaching changes in the distribution of wine for ritual purposes. The order provided that withdrawal of wine for such purposes shall be limited to one gallon per year per adult member of a family living together and shall not ordinarily exceed five gallons per year for any one family. Further, the rabbi or minister authorized to receive wine, "shall personally receive, safeguard, and make delivery thereof . . . shall provide a suitable and safe storage place therefor and shall be held personally responsible for its safety and shall take care that it is used only for sacramental purposes or like religious rites."

As told in previous Surveys, anti-Semitic students in Medical colleges of Poland, Roumania and other countries tried at one time or another to deprive Jewish medical students of cadavers for dissection on the ground that the cadavers were exclusively of persons of non-Jewish faiths, and demanded that Jewish students supply corpses for their own use. Late in the year under review, it was reported that the Senate of Roumania had passed a law providing that the admission of Jewish students to medical schools be in proportion to the number of cadavers supplied by Jewish communities. The law if concurred in by Parliament will
cause great difficulties to Jewish students and might even limit their admission to the medical colleges in that country.

Early in the summer of 1925 in connection with editorial comment in the American-Jewish press that graves of American Jewish soldiers in France were marked by crosses, Cyrus Adler, Chairman of the Army and Navy Committee of the Jewish Welfare Board, denied the accusation, and declared that every assurance could be given that appropriate and distinctive Magen David markers would be erected over the Jewish soldiers dead overseas. Dr. Adler recalled that the 68th Congress in a concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 15) had instructed the American Battle Monuments Commission to erect durable markers over the graves in France, specifically providing for Star of David markers for Jewish graves, and that the Secretary of the Commission had declared that a distinctive Star of David marker would be chosen and that the Jewish Welfare Board would be consulted before the artist is selected, and it would be asked to review the design submitted. Late in the year the American Battle Monuments Commission at the suggestion of the Jewish Welfare Board adopted a special Star of David marker to indicate the graves of Jewish soldiers.

In Soviet Russia, during the past year, vandals desecrated Jewish and non-Jewish cemeteries in the Ukraine. Late in 1925 the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs of Ukraine urged local authorities to organize societies for guarding the cemeteries, and to make local religious organizations contribute their share to the expense of the maintenance of watchmen.

JEWISH COURTS.—In the United States during the past year the Jewish Court of Arbitration in New York City cele-
brated its sixth anniversary early in January, 1926, and in this connection the Court reported that during the six years of its existence, it had received 6,111 complaints and had tried and disposed of 875 cases, including 135 cases against Hebrew schools and 172 cases of domestic relations.

A rabbinic tribunal opened late in 1925 in Tangiers.

**Conversion and Apostasy.**—On May 6, 1925, the annual General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England held at London, disapproved of practices indulged in by many so-called missionary institutions. The Assembly voted that "material benefits should not be used as an inducement to bring people within the reach of religious propaganda." Further, "where ample opportunities for medical aid already exist, it is undesirable that medical work should be associated with mission activities; and where medical mission work is being carried on, the benefits of the medical mission should not be made conditional on attendance at a religious service." The General Assembly also passed the following noteworthy resolution: "Recognizing that the Jewish people have been frequently subjected to grievous persecution on the grounds of their religious belief, the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England re-affirms the right of liberty of conscience in religion, and puts on record its abhorrence of persecution."

**Heder-Yeshibah Education.**—No statistics are available concerning the number of hadarim and the number of students that they accommodated in the various countries during the past year. As reported in the "Survey of the Year 5685" (Vol. 27, p. 37), it was claimed that 3,000 hadarim accommodating 150,000 children were operating in Poland alone in the spring of 1925. In Lithuania, the Society
"Jabneh" maintained, during the year, 89 educational institutions including elementary schools, evening courses for adults and a teachers' training school, giving instruction to 7,000 pupils. The teachers' training school was located at Telzi and had an enrolment of 350.

As for institutions giving advanced instruction, the Yeshibat Keneset Israel in Slobodka, Lithuania, owing to unfavorable political conditions in Lithuania, decided in 1924 to found a department at Hebron, Palestine. The branch Yeshibah opened on November 12, 1924, with two students, but by the end of that year, the number of students had reached fifty. The Yeshibah at Hebron has since become an independent institution, and on March 31, 1926, there were 170 students from several countries, especially Poland, Lithuania, Russia, and Roumania. It is said that the Yeshibah is the largest institution of higher learning in Palestine. In Lithuania, the Yeshibat Keneset Israel in Slobodka at this writing is said to have 200 scholars, and the yeshibah at Telzi is said to accommodate a similar number. No statistics are available for the smaller yeshibot in Lithuania, Latvia, Poland and Roumania. In Poland, the Vaad ha-Yeshibot, organized during the year, and representing 50 large and smaller yeshibot, held a conference late in August, 1925, at Vilna with a view to considering the financial conditions of the seminaries, in that country. In the Union of South Africa, several Talmud Torahs joined in the establishment at Johannesburg of the Hebrew College, the yeshibah for Talmud and Jewish learning.

Tarbut Education.—Schools belonging to the system commonly known as Tarbut education, in which Hebrew
is the language of instruction operated during the past year in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Roumania, Palestine, and other countries. Complete statistics of the number of institutions and the number of scholars are not available. In Poland, the Society "Tarbut" maintains 46 kindergartens with 59 teachers and 1,491 pupils; 129 elementary schools with 855 teachers and 18,282 pupils; 12 gymnasia with 103 teachers and 3,493 pupils; 214 evening courses for adults with 612 teachers and 23,556 pupils; and 2 teachers' training schools with 23 teachers and 315 pupils and 2 pedagogic courses for teachers with 6 teachers and 100 pupils,—a total of 405 schools, with 1,558 teachers and 47,237 pupils. The Society had 306 branches in 1925. Almost every branch maintained libraries and evening courses for adults receiving education in Hebrew, Jewish history, Bible, geography of Palestine, and general educational subjects. In Lithuania, the society "Tarbut" maintained, according to reports at the end of the year 1925, 103 elementary schools with 270 teachers and 8,500 pupils; 15 gymnasia with 145 teachers and 3,850 pupils, and one teachers' seminary with 11 instructors and 60 students. In addition, the society maintained in numerous cities, courses for adults, libraries and clubs, all employing Hebrew as the language of instruction. The financial condition of the schools of the Tarbut societies here and in Poland was unsatisfactory. In Bulgaria the school year opened with 89 Jewish schools giving instruction to 2,767 pupils, 7 pro-gymnasia with 720 pupils and 10 kindergartens with 459 pupils.

In Palestine, during 5685, 13,246 pupils were enrolled in the educational institutions of the Zionist organization, all of them Tarbut schools, including 2,337 in the kindergartens,
9,030 in the elementary schools, 1,009 in the high schools, 277 in the teachers' institutes, 337 in technical schools, and 256 in the technical departments of various institutions. The enrolment was larger than in the previous year by 1,522, an increase of over 10%.

Yiddish School System.—The Jewish educational system with Yiddish as the language of instruction, operated in a number of countries during the past year, chiefly in Poland and in Soviet Russia. In Poland, the Jewish School Organization maintained 183 educational institutions with 24,000 pupils, including elementary schools, gymnasia, evening courses for adults and one teachers' seminary at Vilna. In the previous year, the Organization maintained 182 institutions with 22,375 pupils. During the year, the Organization was forced to close its teachers' seminary at Warsaw.

In Soviet Russia, there were operating in 1925–1926, 530 elementary schools with nearly 100,000 children, 8 teachers' training institutions with 800 students, 80 evening schools, all with Yiddish as the official language. Of that number, Ukraine had 342 schools attended by 56,394 children, 4 teachers' training schools with 400 students; and one Yiddish department at the Institute for Public Education with 110 students. White Russia (including the government of Witebsk) had 184 elementary schools with 36,651 children. Of the latter number, 1,026 attended 21 kindergartens, 1,671 attended 28 children's homes, and 33,954 attended 135 elementary schools. In addition, White Russia had Jewish teachers' institutes, at Minsk and at Witebsk; in both cities, there were also a number of evening schools for adults. Other parts of Russia had few schools with Yiddish as the language of instruction.
In Lithuania the government suppressed the Jewish Society "Kultur League" which controlled a number of schools and other educational institutions with Yiddish as the language of instruction. In Latvia, the central government as well as the municipalities subsidized only the elementary schools. In the United States and in Canada, the Workmen's Circle maintained in the fall of 1925, 93 after-school day schools, 2 Sunday schools, 1 kindergarten, 5 high schools and 1 music school. The schools were located in 63 towns in the United States and in Canada and they were attended by approximately 6,000 boys and girls.

**OTHER JEWISH SCHOOL SYSTEMS.**—The Alliance Israélite Universelle maintained in the school year of 1925–1926 in North Africa, the Balkans, and the Near East, 99 educational institutions, including 95 elementary schools with 41,124 pupils, 2 technical schools with 325 students, and 2 teachers' training schools with 85 students. It is interesting to note that the Central Committee of the Alliance ordered directors of schools to introduce additional religious instruction in the schools maintained by the society. In South America, the Jewish Colonization Association was maintaining at the end of 1925, in its colonies in Argentine 87 Hebrew classes with 99 masters and 3,845 pupils. Also in Brazil, special Hebrew classes operated in the Association's settlements, and religious classes were created or re-established in 13 towns in Brazil through the efforts of the representative of the ICA in that country.

In many countries, in central and in eastern Europe, owing to lack of facilities, a number of children attended private schools. In Roumania, the past year finally saw the
adoption of a bill by Parliament regulating the private schools in that country. The bill provides that the language of instruction of the Jewish private schools be the Roumanian language or the language current among Jews. The last statement is understood by Jewish leaders in Roumania and by the Jewish press to mean Hebrew or Yiddish. On the other hand, the bill does not confer upon private schools the right to issue diplomas to their graduates which shall admit their holders to the high schools without special examinations. In Poland, the Minister of Education approved the program of studies of the Central Association of Jewish Schools for Social Education, a society maintaining a number of private gymnasia. The curriculum sets aside ten hours a week for the study of Jewish subjects with Hebrew as the language of instruction.

In the United States, there were established during the year under review 8 new Talmud Torahs, 4 Hebrew schools, 1 Hebrew high school, 29 other schools. Statistics bearing on the status of Jewish Sunday School Education in the United States as well as after-school day school education are not available. Early in the fall of 1925, the Jewish Education Association in New York City stated that the registration in the Jewish religious schools in New York City was more by 15,000 than in the former year. In Philadelphia, the Hebrew Sunday School Society maintained during 1924–1925, 30 schools giving instruction to 7,534 students. Bureaus of Jewish Education opened at Cincinnati, Ohio, in the fall of 1925, and at Cleveland, Ohio.

Adult Education and the Youth Movement.—According to reports at hand, 23 young people's societies were organized during the past year. Of these, 7 were young
men's, 9 were young women's, and the others were young men's and young women's together. In addition, according to records at hand, 27 Jewish community centers, were opened during the year. The Jewish Welfare Board had 244 constituent societies in November, 1925. This included 94 Young Men's, 72 Young Women's, and 37 Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Associations, and 41 Jewish Community Centers and kindred organizations. At the end of 1925, the Intercollegiate Menorah Association had 73 societies with a total of 5,000 members.

As for foreign countries, in addition to the facts enumerated above about the educational work among adults carried on by the Tarbut societies and the Yiddishists in the various countries, it is also interesting to note that in Latvia, a Jewish people's university opened at Riga; similar institutes were opened at Grodno in Poland and at Turin in Italy. In France, representatives of Jewish youth organizations at a meeting in Paris, decided to form a union of Jewish youth associations for the promotion of Jewish education and culture.

Some Problems of the Jewish School System.—As in former years, the finances of the Jewish educational systems abroad continued to be unsatisfactory during the year under review. During 1925, the Joint Distribution Committee appropriated $49,000 for educational purposes in various countries. Of that sum, $30,000 was given to the Central Relief Committee which supports for the most part educational institutions of the Heder-Yeshibah type, $4,000 to the People's Relief Committee which supports for the most part educational institutions of the Yiddish school system,
and $14,000 to the American Jewish Relief Committee, most of which went probably to the educational institutions of the type of the Tarbut system. In addition these cultural committees received money from other sources. During the first quarter of 1926, the Joint Distribution Committee allocated $4,000 to the People's Relief Committee.

In Bulgaria the government prohibited foreigners from teaching in the public schools. The decree, it was stated, menaced the existence of the Hebrew schools which employ foreign teachers, although the Premier declared to a Jewish delegation that the decree was not aimed at the Jews.

JEWS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS.—Jewish children receive their education in the public schools of the state not only in countries like the United States of America, Great Britain, France, or Germany, but also in the countries of central and eastern Europe. In the Ukraine, it was said that only one-fifth of the Jewish children attended Jewish schools. All others attended the state schools with Russian or Ukrainian as the language of instruction. In White Russia, where the Yiddish school system is developed better than in any other part of Soviet Russia, 36,651 of a total of 90,817 Jewish children of school age (40%) attended Jewish schools. In Poland it was reported that 16,000 Jewish children attended the state schools in the city of Lodz alone. A mass meeting was held at this city, at which complaint of the unfavorable conditions prevailing in the public schools attended by Jewish children in the city were voiced.

In Canada, as was told in the preceding Survey (Vol. 27, p. 45), the Premier of Quebec appointed a committee to
study the question of Jewish education in Montreal.* In
the fall of 5684, the matter came before the courts, which
rendered a decision unfavorable to the position taken by the
Jews. Later, the legislature passed special legislation permit-
ting the case to be brought before the higher courts. Early in
1926, the Supreme Court rendered a decision which is gen-
erally taken to be unfavorable to the Jews. First, the court
declared that persons of the Jewish religion could not be
appointed to the Protestant Board of School Commissioners
of the city of Montreal and that the Protestant Board was
not obliged to appoint Jewish teachers in their schools
should they be attended by children professing the Jewish
religion. On the other hand, the Protestant Board of the
city of Montreal may admit children professing the Jewish
religion to the schools as a matter of right, and in the rural
municipalities the trustees of the Protestant dissentient
schools may do so as a matter of grace. Finally, as for the
provincial legislature, that body cannot pass legislation pro-
viding that persons professing the Jewish religion be ap-
pointed to the Protestant Board of Montreal or to the Pro-
testant Committee of Public Instruction as "it is presently
constituted," or that the Protestant and the Roman Catholic
Boards of School Commissioners of Montreal appoint
teachers professing the Jewish religion in their schools should
they be attended by children professing the Jewish religion,
or that persons professing the Jewish religion be appointed
on the proposed Metropolitan Finance Commission. The
court held, however, that the provincial legislature might
pass legislation to establish separate schools for persons who

*For a detailed explanation of the problem, see THE AMERICAN
JEWISH YEAR BOOK, Vol. 27, pp. 223-229.
are neither Catholic nor Protestant; and might force Pro-
testants to accept children professing the Jewish religion in
the city of Montreal but not in the rural municipalities. The
Jews have appealed from this decision to the Privy Council.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.—It
was related in the preceding Survey (Vol. 27, p. 41) that the
country witnessed a vigorous campaign endorsed by various
churches to introduce religious instruction in our public
schools. This campaign took two forms. One was to intro-
duce the reading of the Bible in the public schools, and the
other to permit boards of education to excuse children for
a certain period once a week for the purpose of enabling
them to receive religious instruction in classes maintained
by private religious organizations. Early in the year under
review, the Commission on Jewish Education of the Union
of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Con-
ference of American Rabbis endorsed the latter plan, while
reiterating its opposition to any form of religious instruction
in "the American public school system of education or in
public school buildings, or to any form of classification of
children in the public school according to their religious af-
filiation." Similarly the United Synagogue of America at
its convention at Atlantic City, N. J., expressed its opposi-
tion to the inclusion in the curriculum of the public schools
of religious education in any form, while favoring a plan
whereby the public school curriculum may leave time for
"week-day religious instruction after school hours in places
other than the public schools and without any public school
supervision whatsoever."

Noteworthy was the resolution of the Executive Board of
the Teachers' Union of the State of New York. The Board
went on record as being opposed to teachers in the public schools in any way participating in imparting religious instruction to the pupils. Further, the Board opposed the "making of any official list of records of the religious affiliations of pupils . . . the giving of commands, directions or advice upon school premises either by school officials or by other persons concerning any sectarian act or belief . . . and the assumption by public school authorities of supervisory functions in classes or schools of religion."

In the State of California the assembly defeated a bill providing that boards of education be allowed to permit children to absent themselves a period of time once a week for the purpose of receiving instruction in religious classes maintained by private organizations. In Pennsylvania, the Committee of the Senate failed to report a bill of this nature. In the State of Wisconsin, the legislature rejected a bill providing that school boards "may provide for the free and gratuitous use of the schoolhouses or other public properties" for religious activities. On the other hand, in the State of New York, Justice Staley of the State Supreme Court declared that the Board of Education has the right to excuse children for a certain period of time of the curriculum so that they may attend during that time classes for religious education maintained by private organizations.

As for the reading of the Bible in the public schools, during the period covered by the preceding Survey, the legislatures of the states of Ohio, California, Oregon and Iowa had disapproved bills providing for the reading of the Bible in the public schools. During the year, a committee of the Senate of the State of New Jersey failed to report a bill providing for the reading of the Bible in the public schools of that
state. In Wisconsin, a committee of the Senate failed to report a bill providing for the study of the Ten Commandments in the public schools and for the opening of the morning session of each day with a recital of the Lord's Prayer. On the other hand, early in the year under review, the Governor of the State of Florida approved a bill providing that the schools of the state be required "to have once every school day readings in the presence of the pupils from the Holy Bible without sectarian comment." In Minnesota, the District Court of the Eleventh Judicial District decided in the case of a taxpayer versus the Independent School District of Virginia, Minnesota and its Board of Education, that the reading of the Bible without comment in the public schools of that district did not "constitute any infringement of the plaintiff's constitutional rights," and therefore denied the request for an injunction.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.—Statistics giving the extent of Jewish technical education in various countries are not available. The Society for the Promotion of Trade and Industry Among Jews (ORT), organized in Petrograd in 1880, maintained during the past year 29 technical institutions in Poland, 10 in Lithuania, 4 in Latvia, 11 in Roumania and 1 in Danzig,—a total of 55 schools and workshops divided into 100 departments and giving instruction to 3,200 pupils. The Russian ORT maintained 30 technical institutions giving instruction to over 2,100 children. During the past year the ORT received financial support from the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, ICA, and other organizations.

In Poland, the 29 institutions for technical education included a technical high school, the only one in that country.
As was the case in previous years the schools gave technical education to children, to adults who desired to learn a trade, and to workingmen who desired to increase their skill. About 1,920 persons received education in the institutions maintained by the ORT, and at the beginning of the school year 1925–1926, the institutions admitted 700 new pupils. In Lithuania, a society was organized for the purpose of promoting liberal and professional education among Jews.

During the year the Haifa Technical Institute opened at Haifa in Palestine.

Higher Education.—The most important event of the year was undoubtedly the opening of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem on April 1, 1925. At the instance of the Zionist Organization, Lord Balfour formally opened the university in the presence of Sir Herbert Samuel, then still High Commissioner, Lord Allenby, then Governor General of Egypt, Dr. Chaim Weizman representing the World Zionist Organization, Chief Rabbi Kook, Chief Rabbi Hertz of London and Chief Rabbi Israel Lévi of Paris, and numerous representatives of governments, universities and organizations, Jewish and non-Jewish, and many other notables. It was an event noted by the entire civilized world. The governments represented included Germany and Poland. Some of the greatest universities like the University of Oxford, Johns Hopkins University, Columbia University, and the Collège de France sent their representatives. High officials like M. Herriot, the then Premier of France, Sir Esme Howard, the British Ambassador to the United States, Hon. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada and Governor Alfred E. Smith of New York, cabled their greetings. With the exception of a small minority in Palestine and perhaps in other countries,
Jews of all shades of opinion hailed this event. On the following day a cornerstone was laid of the Balfour-Einstein Institute for Mathematics and Physics. On April 12, 1925, a board of governors was elected at a meeting at Tel Aviv. It was declared that the Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization had decided to hand over to the Board of Governors the administration of the university and the funds, endowments, donations and pledges and the grounds and buildings on Mt. Scopus registered in the name of the Jewish National Fund, the Chemical Institute, the Micro-Biological Institute and the Hebrew University Library. At this writing, the University is a post-graduate institute consisting of an Institute for Jewish Studies, a chemical Institute, a micro-biological Institute and the Balfour-Einstein Institute for Mathematics and Physics.

The most important of the institutes is that of Jewish Studies. In the summer of 1925, it was reported that during the scholastic year of 1924–1925, three professors from abroad taught at the Institute, that seven residents of Jerusalem were research associates, and that 200 students including 60 graduate students attended the Institute. During the year, it was decided that the Institute though constituting part of the university, be autonomous in administration, especially with respect to the appointment of professors and the progress of the work. Later, at a conference in September, 1925, in London, the Governing Council declared that the aim of the Institute shall be "to promote the knowledge of Judaism by the work of an élite of teachers and scholars. Its object shall not be to impart secondary education to a larger number of students, but rather to promote scholarly effort and train research workers . . . to
train younger men in the methods of higher research." It was also decided not to confer degrees upon the students. As for admission, the Council decided that it be "restricted to a select number of students, who in addition to possessing a sufficient knowledge of Hebrew and of Jewish literature must have passed at least a matriculation or an equivalent examination."

In the United States, the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia, Pa., which, exclusive of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, is the only Jewish non-theological institution for higher learning which has the authority to confer the degree of doctor of philosophy, opened this year early in October with an enrollment of 62 students. In March, 1926, Founder's Day, the College conferred degrees of doctor of philosophy upon three graduates.

During the past year a number of secular institutions of higher learning established departments or chairs for the furthering of learning in Jewish subjects. In the United States, Lucius N. Littauer, in memory of his father established in the fall of 1925, the Nathan Littauer Professorship of Jewish Literature and Philosophy at Harvard University.

In Germany, according to the press reports, the University of Greifswald established an institute for the study of the history and the topography of Palestine. In Czecho-Slovakia the Karls-University at Prague established a lectorate for modern Hebrew language and literature. In Italy, it was reported that the government had decided to establish, at the university of Florence, a chair for Semitic philology.

During the past year, the five principal Jewish seminaries in the United States had a total enrolment, at the beginning of the scholastic year, of 518 students, admitted
82 new students, and graduated a total of 43 rabbis. The seminaries in question are the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York City, the Rabbi Isaac Elchanan Theological Seminary, New York City, the Hebrew Theological College, Chicago, the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, and the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York City. The Hebrew Theological College of Chicago and the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York did not graduate rabbis during the period under review.

No complete statistics were published during the past year of the number of Jews enrolled in the secular institutions for higher learning in the various countries. In Poland, in the fall of 1925, 38.8% of the number of students attending the institutions of higher learning were Jews. 936 or 45% of a total of 2,062 Polish citizens attending universities abroad, were Jews.

The question of providing Jewish education for Jewish students attending the universities in the United States has agitated Jewish public opinion for a number of years. During the year delegates representing a number of national organizations including the Committee on Jewish Education of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the United Synagogue of America, the Rabbinical Assembly of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, the Jewish Chautauqua Society, the Intercollegiate Menorah Society, and the Independent Order B'nai B'rith met and resolved to favor the policy of cooperation among all Jewish organizations interested in work among Jewish students at universities, and to create a permanent National Commission on Jewish Work at Colleges com-
posed of representations of Jewish organizations. Late in 1925, the Council of American Jewish Student Affairs was organized in New York City to serve as an agency for expressing the views of the American Jewish student body and to stimulate Jewish consciousness among students through inter-fraternity activities and the introduction of educational programs. Abroad, the Inter-University Jewish Federation of Great Britain conducted its fiftieth annual summer course in the summer of 1925, designed to provide, for Jewish students at the universities, instruction in Jewish subjects.

In the Surveys of the years 5684 and 5685, reference was made to the Hillel Foundation which was organized at the suggestion of Dr. Edwin Chauncey Baldwin, a non-Jewish professor at the University of Illinois, for the promotion of Jewish education among Jewish students. The work proved successful at the University of Illinois, and a similar foundation was opened at the University of Wisconsin. During the past year, a third foundation was opened at the University of Ohio under the direction of Dr. L. J. Levinger.

Literature.—Complete statistics of the number of books published in Hebrew and Yiddish, and the number of books published in other languages on Jewish subjects, are not available. In Soviet Russia during 1925, 798,400 copies of Yiddish books were published, including 196,000 textbooks and 193,000 copies of periodicals. The number of titles of books published in the Yiddish language during 1925 was not to hand at this writing. In 1924, however, only 83 titles of books in the Yiddish language consisting of a total of 8,352 pages, an average of 100 pages per book, were published in the country and a total of 322,000, an average of 3,878 copies per book, were distributed.
Notable was the fund established by Professor Silvio Magrini of Ferrara in Italy. During the year under review, Professor Magrini established the "Fund for the History of Italian Judaism," to collect and to present to the University Library in Jerusalem all books published by Italian Jews, all books published by Italian non-Jews on any Jewish subjects, and all books published by persons living outside of Italy on the subject of Italian Jewry. The fund is directed by a committee composed of the donor, Professor Umberto Cassuto, and Professor Dante Lattes.

PRESS.—Complete statistics of the Jewish press in Hebrew, Yiddish, and other languages are not available. In the United States 99 Jewish newspapers and periodicals were being published in the spring of 1926. This number included 12 dailies, 61 weeklies, 14 monthlies, 3 bi-monthlies, 8 quarterlies and 1 occasional publication; this number does not take into account bulletins of organizations, of which a great number were issued. Of the dailies one was in the English language and the rest in the Yiddish language. The others were in English, Yiddish, Hebrew, and Ladino. In the previous year 105 Jewish newspapers and periodicals appeared in the country.

ART EXHIBITIONS.—As in previous years so also during the past year interest in Jewish art was displayed in many countries. Many exhibitions were held. Paintings and drawings of Marc Chagall were exhibited in New York, as were sculptures of M. Wiener-Dycar and drawings of Elias M. Grossman. In London, the Jewish Art Society "Ben Uri" opened an art gallery early in the year under review.

THE THEATRE.—Jewish theatres operated in many countries during the year under review. In the city of New York,
the theatrical season in the fall of 1925 opened with 13 Jewish theatres, the same number as were opened in the fall of 1924. Abroad, the Jewish State Theatre opened at Kharkov, a Jewish theatrical museum in memory of Esther Rachel Kaminska opened in Warsaw, and a Hebrew theatre opened at Tel Aviv, Palestine. On the other hand, the Jewish theatre at Lwow in Poland closed as a result of financial difficulties after having existed since 1886. In the fall of 1925, a society under the name of the Palestine Theatre, Limited, was organized for the purpose of carrying on business of the dramatic theatre and generally to promote the development of Hebrew drama in Palestine.

The Science of Judaism.—During the past year the associations for the promotion of Jewish learning in the various countries continued their work, notably the American Jewish Historical Society and the Jewish Publication Society in the United States, and similar societies in Great Britain, France, Germany and other countries. In Germany, the Society for the Promotion of the Science of Judaism held its convention early in 1926, and reported that it had 1,561 members in Germany and in other countries. New societies were organized in Italy and in Egypt, namely, the society for Jewish Studies, Rome, and the Society for Jewish Studies of Egypt, Cairo. The latter society aims to engage in Jewish historical, archaeological, and philological studies.

Libraries and Museums.—In 1925, the principal Jewish libraries in our country, namely those of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, in New York City, the Hebrew Union College at Cincinnati, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia, and the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York City, had a total of
186,000 books and 8,500 manuscripts. In Palestine, the Hebrew National and University Library, Jerusalem, had by the end of 1925, 90,399 books bound in 110,689 volumes. During the calendar year of 1925 the library acquired 20,855 books bound in 25,890 volumes.

During the past year a number of important manuscripts, incunabula, and rare books were acquired by the principal Jewish libraries in our country, especially the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary and the library of the Hebrew Union College. The manuscripts acquired by the former library include Asher Ben Jehiel's Compendium of the Talmud, 1423; a manuscript on vellum of part of an ethical work, Spain, fifteenth century; Bomberg Bible on vellum, 1521-1525; a manuscript on vellum of two grammatical treatises by Abraham Ibn Ezra; a volume of facsimiles of Chinese Hebrew manuscripts; a collection of lists of autos da fé held in Portugal during the Inquisition; 25 vellum fragments of the Samaritan Pentateuch of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; a Persian Hebrew dictionary written in Persia in the sixteenth century; the first volume of the Lisbon Pentateuch, 1491; a copy of the Alba Bible; a copy of a ritual of the Sicilian Jews, following the expulsion from Sicily, printed in Spain before the expulsion from that country; and a copy of the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili printed by Aldus in Venice in 1499 and having 150 remarkable illustrations. The library of the Hebrew Union College acquired the museum for Jewish cultural history of S. Kirschstein of Berlin, which contains 6,174 manuscripts, pictures, books, and ceremonial objects bearing on the cultural history of the Jews of the world from the Middle Ages to the present day.
Owing to financial conditions, the Jewish Theological Teachers' Institute of Vienna was about to sell to foreign purchasers a collection of manuscripts in its possession. Early in 1926, however, the Executive Committee of the Jewish Community of Vienna acquired this collection.

As for museums, in the United States the Jewish Museum Association during the past year took steps to further the establishment in New York City of a Jewish museum for art and antiquities. In Soviet Russia, steps were taken to establish a Jewish museum at Odessa in the name of Mendele Mocher Sephorim. The Commissioner of Education of Ukraine approved the project, and instructions were issued to museums in Ukraine ordering them to transfer in due time to the projected museum at Odessa their objects and relics of Jewish religion, art, tradition, customs, food, dwellings, language, scripts, and materials of the persecution of the Jews by the Tsarist government, of the Jewish class struggle, and of the Jewish participation in the revolutionary movement.

The Communists' War on Judaism.—As told in preceding Surveys, the Jewish section of the Russian Communist party, a small body of Yiddish-speaking communists which controls communist activities among Jews has been engaged for several years in a campaign against Judaism along the lines mapped out by the Russian Communist party in their campaign against all religions in the country. The anti-religious work may be said to aim at the abolition of religious institutions for the young, suppression of the religious printed page, propaganda against religious observances, like the weekly day of rest and the holidays, and the con-
fiscation of religious institutions, specifically churches. In 1922, the campaign was intense, but, beginning with the spring of 1923, following resolutions adopted by the Eleventh Communist Congress, the intensity of the campaign diminished. The decline continued all during 1924 and during the year covered by this Survey. However, the press reported several cases where secret police uncovered religious educational institutions and arrested their officials and teachers as well as cases in which courts had sentenced to imprisonment those conducting such clandestine schools, specifically in the Ukraine. In Kiev, for instance, the court sentenced two rabbis and two workingmen to six months at hard labor for supporting a yeshibah for boys under 18 years of age. In Uman, the court, in which Yiddish is the official language, sentenced Hebrew teachers for teaching religion to children under 18 years of age. In the fall of 1925, the government issued a decree providing that libraries shall exclude books on religious education, books that confound science with religious inventions and speak of the wisdom of the Creator, and books written in the spirit of idealistic philosophy, spiritualism and theosophy. The decree ordered that libraries contain in their sections on religion only anti-religious literature. The press also reported a number of cases of confiscation of synagogues and even cemeteries. A synagogue at Stolin, for example, was confiscated and converted into barracks. At Poltava, a synagogue was confiscated and converted into a hall for meetings. At Ljadi a synagogue was converted into a workingmen's club. At two places, namely Tietiev and Shiwoti, Jewish cemeteries were confiscated and converted into gardens for the cultivation of vegetables. In the Ukraine, it
was reported that the Communist Party expelled members for attending a synagogue on the anniversary of the death of the mother of one of them, for having permitted one's son to be circumcized, and for having married according to Jewish rites. On the other hand, the spectacular campaign against the Jewish holidays, it would seem, was completely given up during the year under review. During the past high holidays, the Communists did not have the so-called "special lectures on the origin of Rosh ha-Shanah and Yom Kippur and on the Genesis of the God idea" and similar themes in the majority of Jewish cities and towns. In fact, it was said that the Central Committee of the Yiddish speaking section of the Russian Communist party issued direct orders to branch societies not to give lectures nor to stage anti-religious demonstrations during the high holidays.

In Soviet Russia, late in 1925, officials of the Joint Distribution Committee reported that a strong Jewish tendency was felt throughout all the Jewish colonies. "A new settler comes to the land to become a peasant, but a Jewish peasant. The Sabbath and all the Jewish holidays are observed. Removed as they are from the influences which are affecting the life of the cities and towns, the colonies afford an opportunity for closer family life. The strong influence exercised in the colonies by the father over his children results in a higher religious and Jewish life than in the city and town. The lack of interference on the part of the Government officials and their agencies makes it possible for them to develop their schools and institutions along Jewish lines."
THE LIFE OF THE JEW AS A CITIZEN

Physical Life.—During the past year, the government of Soviet Russia published revised statistics of the number of Jews in that country in 1920. Preliminary information gave the number as 3,380,400 for the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics and dependencies. The revised figures claim that, in round numbers, there were in 1920 only 2,800,000 Jews. Similarly, in Poland the preliminary calculations on the basis of the 1921 census were found exaggerated; there were only 2,850,000 Jews in Poland in September, 1921. On the other hand, it became known during the year that the number of Jews in Argentine was 200,000 instead of 100,000 as was estimated last year. Taking these corrections into consideration, the writer has in another place estimated the Jewish population of the world as nearly 14,600,000 Jews, including over 3,600,000 in the United States. It is noteworthy that during the year the Association Ha-Mizrah, Jerusalem, estimated the number of “Oriental Jews” to be 1,410,000 distributed according to mother-tongue as follows: Arabic, 650,000; Ladino, 589,000; Persian, 68,000; Italian, 51,000; Hebrew, 32,000; other languages, 20,000.

The world association for the preservation of Health Among Jews, OZE, was maintaining at the end of 1925, 100 medical and sanitary institutions in Soviet Russia and 81 institutions in Lithuania, in Poland, in Roumania, in Latvia, and at Berlin. Between April, 1923 and 1925, the society distributed 200,000 pieces of literature for the promotion of health among Jews.

---

hygiene among the Jewish masses. In co-operation with the Polish society Toz the society also issued a monthly under the name of Folksgesunt. By the end of 1925, OZE was composed of 12 national organizations and the Jewish Athletic association "Maccabe." In Soviet Russia, the JDC (the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee) and the OZE continued their health work. On September 1, 1925, the Commission JDC-OZE was maintaining 87 sanitary and medical institutions, which served 550,000 persons during January-August, 1925. The agencies included polyclinics, ambulatories, institutions for infants, and dispensaries for tubercular patients. In Poland, the society Toz, organized in 1921-1922 at Warsaw, had, in 1925, 37 branch societies with 8,500 members. The society maintained 53 medical and sanitary agencies, including 4 hospitals, 8 ambulatories, and 1 tubercular dispensary. It is noteworthy that its department of school hygiene and inspection had supervision over 28,533 school children in 165 schools in 27 cities. During the year a society OZE was organized in Germany, and the Permanent OZE Medical Committee of America, in New York.

**Political Life.**—Only few elections were held in the countries of the so-called Jewish Central Europe, during the period under review. In Latvia, five Jews were elected to the Sejm during the past year among 100 deputies. In Czecho-Slovakia, the delegates supported by the United Jewish Party and those supported by the Jewish Economic Party failed of election. In Canada, two out of the 245 members elected to the House of Commons in the elections held late in 1925 were Jews. It was also reported that five Jews were elected to the Constituent Assembly in Iraq.
Statistics of the numbers of Jews in the various forces for the defence of the countries are not available. But early in the year under review, in Poland, a deputy declared at one of the sessions of the military commission that proportionately more Jews than non-Jews are drafted in the army.

**Language Autonomy.**—In Soviet Russia the government continued to show its desire to retain the good will of the minorities speaking non-Russian tongues. As reported in the preceding Survey (Vol. 27, p. 72), the Central Executive Committee of the Union decided to permit localities where Jews form the majority to organize Soviets with Yiddish as the official language. During that year, some 20 Soviets were organized in small and insignificant communities of the Ukraine and White Russia. This activity was part of a policy designed to give local autonomy to minorities not inhabiting a region or a district of their own. During the year under review, activities along these lines continued in Ukraine and White Russia. It was reported that 5,000,000 persons belonging to minorities lived in the Ukraine, including over 2,500,000 Russians, 1,555,000 Jews, 658,000 Moldavians, 363,000 Germans, nearly a quarter of a million Poles, etc. Early in 1926, the Central Committee on National Minorities of the Ukraine reported that 600 Soviets employing languages other than Ukrainian were operating in the country. These Soviets served 95% of the Greek population living in the Ukraine, 75% of the Bulgarian population, 70% of the Czech population, 59% of the German population, 50% of the Polish population, 32% of the Russian population, but only 12% of the Jewish population. The report gave as the reason for the paucity of the number of Russian and Jewish Soviets the fact that these
two minorities live mostly in the cities, where they do not constitute compact groups.

At the Ninth All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets held at Kharkov in May, 1925, the President, or as he is called officially, the Chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissars, declared, according to press reports, that his government had not taken up the question of establishing a Jewish republic in the Ukraine but that "it would not be at all a bad policy if we created separate Jewish districts or even a Jewish region. It is understood that the administration of such a region would not be entrusted to the Zionists... If we establish a Jewish region or republic, we would establish it like all other Soviet republics where the administration is in the hands of workers and peasants... We ought to further the spirit of independence among all nations." The "independence" would of course be merely linguistic. This "doctrine" was clearly expressed at the same congress by M. Kameneff, speaking in the name of the government of the Union of Soviet Republics. He made the following statement, "We must all combine to give all nations that inhabit the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics the widest possibilities to satisfy their cultural, economic, and political needs in their mother-tongue. That will serve better than anything else to sovietize and to communize the masses. We have perhaps done little in this instance, but we are now taking all means so that each nation shall be able to adapt itself to the general communist culture in its mother-tongue and that it shall not meet with obstacles in administrative matters, in school matters, or in economic matters. This question must be solved once and for all."

MINORITY RIGHTS AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.—The
Sixth Assembly of the League of Nations met at Geneva in September, 1925. The matter of greatest interest to Jews taken up by the Assembly was the adoption of a definite procedure regarding charges of the infraction of the peace treaties insofar as the rights of minorities are concerned. The procedure adopted provides that the Committee of Three created by the Council in October, 1920, shall have the powers "to ascertain the full truth of alleged treaty infractions, to collect testimonies as to character on both sides, to make representations to the governments concerned with a view to friendly adjustments of the disputes under consideration, and finally to enable the Committee . . . in its own capacity, as members of the Council, to take this initiative by requesting the Secretary-General to place the questions at issue on the agenda of the Council." This means that the Assembly has bestowed upon the Committee of Three a function with regard to the minorities treaties, similar to that of the Permanent Mandates Commission with regard to the control of the mandates. It is also noteworthy that the Assembly defeated a motion by M. Galvanauskas, the Lithuanian delegate, who was supported by delegates from Poland and Roumania, which probably would have resulted in weakening the minorities treaties. Other matters of importance were the following: (1) The Assembly empowered the high commissioner for the free city of Danzig to report infractions or alleged infractions of minority rights to the Secretary-General of the League. Danzig has thus been brought definitely within the system of the protection of minorities within the League of Nations. (2) The Assembly also approved the agreements relative to Mosul, providing for the appointment of a representative to the
League of Nations charged with the supervision of the arrangements made for the benefit of minorities in that district (There are 12,000 Jews in Mosul.)

Mention may also be made of the fact that the Council of the League adopted a recommendation of the Committee and expressed the hope that the Lithuanian government "will succeed in dissipating any apprehensions which may still exist among the minorities in the country and in persuading them that the government is firmly determined to apply the provisions of the Declaration of May 12, 1922."

Public opinion continued during the past year to show interest in supporting the system of the League of Nations for the protection of minorities. The inter-Parliamentary Union at its meeting at Ottawa, Canada, October 14, 1925, went on record as advocating that the grievances of national minorities in eastern and central Europe be referred to the International Court of Justice, and that in countries where the question of national minorities is an irritating one, a mixed commission representing the majority population and the minority population be created to suggest just solutions of the problems. In the fall of 1925, it was reported that the Executive Committee of the Socialist and Labor International had appointed a commission to deal with questions relating to the rights of minority groups. In Czecho-Slovakia, the Jewish League of Nations Union was organized early in the year under review. Late in the summer, the American Jewish Congress, New York City, established a bureau at Geneva with a view to take up with officers and departments of the League of Nations, matters affecting rights of minorities.

In its report at the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the
American Jewish Committee on November 8, 1925, the Executive Committee stated that it had been the Committee's intention also "to have a permanent representative at Geneva, to act on its behalf whenever occasion should arise," but that in the course of the month spent in Geneva by Louis Marshall, the president of the Committee, he "was convinced that such a step is unnecessary." The Committee has, however, made arrangements "for the regular and systematic transmission . . . of information, reports, memorials, etc., which have any bearing on matters in which the Committee may desire to interest itself, and a mass of valuable material has been collected."

Mr. Marshall also submitted to the Secretariat of the League a memorandum suggesting reforms in the procedure in relation to alleged infractions of the provisions of the minority treaties.¹

During the period under review, two noteworthy conferences of representatives of minorities were held. The first, which took place at Geneva in the fall of 1925, was attended by delegates representing minorities chiefly in Roumania, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Czecho-Slovakia. The conference adopted two important resolutions: first, that majorities grant their minorities freedom in matters pertaining to religious belief and education, and to political and economic development; second, that the League of Nations be urged to deal with questions of the relation of the majority nationalities to their minorities from this stand-point. The

¹See The Nineteenth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee pp. 429—520 below, where will also be found two advisory opinions of the Permanent Court of International Justice (The World Court) on cases involving the minority treaties.
conference appointed a committee to make preparations for another conference of minorities in 1926 if possible. Early in 1926, delegates representing minorities living in Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia met at Riga, and protested against the persecution by the Lithuanian Government of its Polish and its Jewish minorities. In addition, the conference declared that minorities living in the Baltic States were united in demanding the solution of the question of citizenship, the abolition of discrimination in the economic fields, and the promotion of cultural autonomy.

**The Polish-Jewish "Ugoda."**—In Poland, early in the year, upon the initiative of Count Skrzynski, then minister for foreign affairs, the Polish government entered into negotiations with the Jewish Sejm Club with a view to removing misunderstandings between the Polish government and the Jews. The negotiations finally bore fruit and, on July 4, 1925, the novel procedure of exchanging declarations took place. The president of the Jewish Sejm Club handed to the Premier a written statement which was accompanied by an oral statement; a similar procedure was followed by M. Grabski, then Prime Minister of the Polish Government. These declarations, designed on the part of their makers to give assurance of their patriotism and their devotion to the welfare of all citizens of the country, were accompanied by an agreement, important specifically for the definite promises made by the government for the partial satisfaction of Jewish demands in the field of religion and education and in political and social life. Of that agreement a portion was given to the secretariat of the League of Nations and circulated by the latter among the fifty-two members of the League. This portion was brought to this country by
Mr. Louis Marshall and given out in the course of his address at the annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee in November, 1925. Other portions were unofficially reported in the Polish press. In referring to the matter at the annual meeting of the American Jewish Committee, Mr. Marshall declared that "all the fifty-four nations that are signatory to the League of Nations have copies of the Polish Jewish agreement. This means that the government of Poland has in effect concluded the agreement not only with the Jews of Poland, but with fifty-four nations that are watching the results of this agreement. The Polish government cannot afford to lose prestige in the eyes of those civilized nations of the world."

The text of that part of the Polish-Jewish agreement which was filed with the League of Nations will be found in the Nineteenth Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee on pp. 490—493 below.

In addition the Polish press declared that the government promised the following reforms to redress the grievances of the Jews: (1) To introduce a bill in the Sejm allowing persons who observe the seventh day of the week as their sabbath to trade a few hours on the first day of the week; (2) to issue an ordinance providing that Jews who close their stores on the Sabbath may keep open a few hours in the evening; (3) to try to persuade local authorities not to set Saturday as the day for public fairs; (4) to give Jews representation in the economic councils and in the labor councils proportionately, also in the council dealing with transportation; (5) to arrange with the Bank Polski and the National Economic Bank to extend credit to Jewish cooperatives, merchants, workingmen, and industrialists; (6)
to extend credit for building operations by Jews similar to those by non-Jews; (7) to disregard nationality and religion in the matter of appointments to civil service; (8) not to tax Jewish merchants and workingmen more than non-Jewish ones; (9) to give representation to Jews in the councils of assessors; (10) to extend equal rights to Jews in the matter of contracting for provisioning the army and other government institutions; (11) to solve the question of aliens in accordance with the demands of the Jews and in accordance with international agreements; (12) not to countenance the anti-Semitic agitation; (13) to recall the anti-Semitic circulars issued by the Minister of War; (14) to promote Jewish officers in the army in accordance with their personal worth; (15) not to discriminate against Jewish land-owners in the application of the agrarian reform bill; (16) to permit the establishment of a Jewish emigration bank; (17) to allow Jewish lawyers to practise in courts; (18) to organize uniformly all the Jewish communities in the country, ordering new elections in the eastern provinces, and to make possible for the elected councils to exist and to carry out their mandates; (19) to create a supreme religious council of the Jewish communities in accordance with the ordinance of 1919; (20) to give state rights to Jewish schools with the language of instruction of either Hebrew or Yiddish; (21) to extend subsidies to Jewish trade schools; (22) to introduce Jewish studies in the general public schools attended by Jewish children; (23) to appoint Jewish teachers and Jewish principals in state schools where the majority of the pupils are Jewish; (24) to annul the *numerus clausus* which exists in practice with regard to Jewish students; (25) to issue a circular providing that in the admission of students to
universities no attention should be given to the nationality and to the religion of the students; (26) to permit Jewish students who received their education in universities abroad to practise their profession in Poland; (27) to withdraw the prohibition of the use of Yiddish at public gatherings in Galicia and in the Eastern provinces.

The first result of the Polish-Jewish "Ugoda," was the promulgation of a number of ordinances. On July 11, 1925, the Department for the Affairs of National Minorities recommended 12 ordinances which were approved by the Council of Ministers on July 16, 1925. They were ordinances (1) dealing with city-wide Jewish religious organizations; (2) providing for the application of the decree issued seven years ago to the organization of the Jewish communities in the eastern provinces of the country; (3) providing for the democratization of the electoral system in the Jewish communities in Galicia; (4) dealing with the use of Hebrew or Yiddish in the sessions of the Jewish religious communities corresponding to the use of Russian and Ukrainian in the public autonomous institutions; (5) permitting the use of Hebrew or Yiddish at public meetings; (6) dealing with the closing on Saturday of certain state schools located in places having an appreciable percentage of Jews and dealing further with the instruction in Jewish subjects ten hours a week; (7) providing that children attending hadarim shall thereby comply with the provision for compulsory attendance in public schools; (8) providing for government subsidy to certain especially deserving Jewish trade schools; (9) providing for the granting of public rights to a certain number of Jewish elementary schools, secondary schools and teachers' seminaries where the language of instruction is
Hebrew or Yiddish; (10) excusing Jewish children from attending state public schools on the Sabbath day; (11) providing that Jewish pupils in schools and Jewish soldiers in the army shall be given opportunities to attend divine services; (12) providing that Jewish soldiers in the army who desire to eat kosher food shall receive money instead of rations so that they may eat kosher food outside of the barracks.

Later, however, the Jewish Sejm Club at its session on October 6, 1925, criticized the administration for not living up to the provision of the Polish-Jewish agreement, and decided in the future to vote with the opposition. The statement issued declared that the Polish government in spite of these promises not only did not fulfil the just demands of the Jews but it supported new measures which violated the constitution and oppressed Jewish masses. Specifically it was charged that, under the cloak of the autonomous administration of universities and in violation of the provisions of the constitution and the statutes concerning higher institutions of learning, the government introduced limitations of the admission of Jewish students. Further, the statement declared that by its economic policy and its heavy taxation, the government was ruining the Jews of the country and undermining the economic foundation of the Republic. In spite of this declaration, M. Grabski, the then prime minister, declared, according to press reports, that the government's attitude towards the Polish-Jewish agreement would not change. Later in the fall, the Grabski ministry fell, but M. Skrzynski, the head of the new ministry, declared in his address in the Sejm that his ministry would stand by the Polish-Jewish Agreement.
As was told in the "Survey of the Year 5684" (See Vol. 26, pp. 58-61), the treaties concluded with Turkey provided for the protection of minorities in the Turkish State along the lines of the treaties with the countries of Central Europe. In the fall of 1925, the Chief Rabbi of Constantinople formally notified the government of the decision of the Jews in the country not to claim the status and the rights of a minority, and of their desire to be regarded as a part of the Turkish population. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Armenians also adopted the same position.

**MINORITIES AND CITIZENSHIP, FREEDOM OF RELIGION, ETC.**—In the preceding Survey (See Vol. 27, p. 75f.), we told how the Jewish population of Roumania and Poland was being confronted with difficulties in the matter of acquisition of citizenship. Poland promulgated a law of nationality in 1920 which was entirely unsatisfactory to the minorities living in that country and which was said to be violative of the minorities treaties. This was also the opinion of the eminent French jurist M. de Lapradelle. On April 30, 1925, the Executive Committee of the League of Nations Union, at its meeting in Brussels, passed a resolution that "the Polish and Roumanian Nationality Laws and the Nationality Bill now before the Latvian Parliament are apparently in contradiction to the minorities treaties, and are furthermore calculated to cause serious hardship by creating a large class of *Heimatslose* (people without a home)." The Executive Committee determined to ask the British government to take the necessary steps to bring the matter before the Permanent Court of International Justice. Early in 1926, the political committee of the Council of Ministers of Poland recommended that the government introduce laws with a
view to facilitating the acquisition of citizenship by certain categories of persons now living in the eastern provinces. The measures taken by the government have solved to a large degree the difficulties of the so-called heimatslose people including many Jews living in those districts.

The acquisition of Spanish nationality by Sephardic Jews not living in Spanish territory was referred to in the preceding Survey (See Vol. 27, pp. 76, 77). During the review period, the *Daily Express*, London, published an item to the effect that the Prime Minister, Gen. Primo de Rivera, had declared to its representative at Madrid, that Jews could not become citizens of Spain unless they adopted the Catholic faith. The Spanish ambassador at Berlin denied this statement, the falsity of which was later confirmed by M. Lucien Wolf of the (Anglo-Jewish) Joint Foreign Committee.

In the United States, a bill is pending in Congress providing for the registration of aliens. In this connection, a statement made by Justice A. N. Hand is noteworthy. In an address before the Conference on Charities and Corrections held early in December, 1925, in New York City, the judge declared that the proposed legislation providing for the registration of aliens would be a step backward. "There is no reason to suppose," he stated, "that aliens in this country do not behave as well as the citizens. . . And let me say in this connection that the greatest criticism of the spirit of the hour is the prevalence of race prejudice. It is our pride that we have assimilated foreign races into a homogeneous citizenship with marvellous adaptability and skill. That has been in a large measure true, but it will not continue to be so if we have so little confidence in America that we fear and distrust those who come to our shores. A real fairness to-
wards the alien and the new citizen born of understanding and toleration is worth thousands of flags and reception committees and condescending speeches. This is a thing of the spirit and not a passing mechanism of slight value.”

Late in 1925, the American Federation of Labor at its convention at Atlantic City, adopted a resolution recommending to the Executive Committee to maintain a policy of watchful vigilance with a view to defeating any measures that may be presented at the Sixty-ninth Congress providing for the registration of aliens.

The matter of the language of instruction in schools attended by children of minorities caused friction in several countries. In Poland for instance, the Director of Education of the District of Vilna ordered all schools to teach history and geography in the Polish tongue only. The White Russian School Society, the Lithuanian Education Society “Ritas,” the society “Tarbut,” and the Jewish Education Committee protested. Late in 1925 attempts were made to organize a society for the protection of minorities’ schools. In Lithuania, early in 1925, the Education Commission of the Sejm recommended legislation providing for the introduction of Lithuanian as the language of instruction in state schools maintained for minorities. This evoked a great deal of opposition on the part of the liberal elements of the country. The central office of the Federation of Lithuanian Teachers opposed it. Finally the Sejm rejected the proposed legislation.

Mention was made above of the important ordinance issued by the Polish government permitting the public use of Hebrew or Yiddish. The order was of particular significance to the Jewish communities in Galicia where authori-
ties had prohibited the use of Hebrew or Yiddish at meetings on the basis of an old Austrian law. In Roumania, in the Province of Bessarabia, the military commander according to the press, ruled that the public use of Yiddish must be restricted to intimate informal gatherings which have a cultural or religious character. It was also reported that, authorities at Harbin, China, prohibited rabbis from delivering their sermons in Yiddish, and societies from arranging celebrations in the Yiddish language.

The question of the language of instruction in private schools was especially acute in two countries, namely Roumania and Turkey. In Roumania, the question aroused a great deal of agitation among Jews. At first, one section demanded that the language of instruction be Hebrew, while another section demanded Yiddish. There were also those who wanted Russian, especially in Bessarabia, German in Bukowina, and Hungarian in Transylvania. Threatened with defeat as a result of internal dissension, Jewish leaders at the last moment united in demanding that the Jews be permitted to have in their private schools either Hebrew or Yiddish. After a great deal of urging, the government acceded to the demand of the Jews. The law as passed contains a clause providing that Jewish private schools shall have as their language of instruction either Roumanian or the language current among Jews, the last clause being understood to mean Hebrew or Yiddish. In Turkey, early in 1926, it was reported that the department of public instruction issued an order which provided that, beginning with the school year of 1927-1928, Turkish should be the only language taught in the first two classes of the schools and that Turkish was to be the only language taught in the third and
fourth class beginning with the school years 1928–1929 and 1929–1930 respectively. The school maintained by the Alliance Israélite Universelle has since become a communal school with Turkish as the language of instruction but the study of French continues to occupy a prominent place.

During the past year, the Soviet authorities continued to establish courts with the language of the minorities as the official language. Early in the summer, it was reported that the Commissariat of Justice of Ukraine issued an order providing that civil lawsuits in which both the defendant and the plaintiff were Jews, and criminal cases in which the defendants were Jews even though the plaintiffs were non-Jews, should be brought before courts with Yiddish as the official language. Later in the fall, it was reported that the authorities had decided to establish 92 courts in the Ukraine with the languages of the minorities as the official languages, including 33 courts with Yiddish as the official language. It was also decided to establish mixed courts where the population contains two or more nationalities. Early in 1926, 31 courts with the languages of minorities as the official language were in existence in the Ukraine. In Poland, early in 1926, the government finally decided to permit the use of all European languages, including Hebrew and Yiddish, in the mails and in telegrams.

During the past year several governments voted subsidies for the maintenance of Jewish religious and educational institutions. Noteworthy was the case of the Prussian Diet which voted 500,000 marks for the maintenance of Jewish religious and educational institutions. The bill provided that the money was to be given to the National Association of Jewish Communities of Prussia and to the National Association of
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the Orthodox Congregations of Prussia, in proportion to the number of their members, and that these national associations are to distribute the money to poor congregations. It is interesting to note that there were only two parties who voted against the bill, namely the deutschnationale (monarchists and anti-Semites) and the communists.

In Poland the Budget Commission of the Sejm recommended early in 1926 a subsidy of only 115,000 zlotys for Jewish religious institutions, whereas the bill which the Jewish deputies sponsored called for a subsidy of 800,000 zlotys. In Poland, as in previous years, the various city councils voted small subsidies to Jewish schools with Yiddish or Hebrew as the language of instruction. This was especially the case in Warsaw. The Latvian government extended subsidies to the Jewish elementary schools. Early in 1926, the Budget Commission of the Sejm recommended that the government extend a subsidy of 36,000 lat to Jewish technical schools.

COMMUNAL ORGANIZATION.—During the year under review important developments took place in the communal organization of several European countries. In Poland, the Jewish communal organization was perfected. As was stated above, in the fall of 1925 the government issued a bill providing for the organization of the Jewish kehilloth in the eastern districts, namely, the districts of Volhynia, Polesia, Bialystok, and Vilna, along the lines of the statute regulating the Polish-Jewish kehilloth in Congress Poland. In Esthonia, the Jewish communal organization is being perfected. The National Assembly passed a bill providing for the cultural autonomous organization, in the true sense of the word, of the Germans, Swedes, Russians, and other minorities having
3,000 or more members. Early in 1926, after it was ascertained that the number of Jews in the country exceeded that minimum, the government of Esthonia issued regulations for elections to the Jewish National Council which shall be the supreme organ of cultural self-government of the Jewish community in that country.

In Lithuania, the government continued ruthlessly to break up the organization of the Jews in that country as a national minority. As was told in the two preceding Surveys (See Vol. 26 p. 71, and Vol. 27 p. 82), the government started by cancelling the budget of the Minister for Jewish Affairs. This led to the abolition of the ministry and the creation of strained relations with the Jews in the country. Later, the government refused to recognize the Jewish National Council, thus giving another blow to the Jewish organization in that country. During the year now under review the Minister of the Interior completely abolished the so-called national autonomous organization of the Jews, substituting for it an organization similar to the one prevailing in Germany and other countries of Western Europe. The ordinance providing for the new Jewish communal organization abolishes the existing city-wide kehillot, and, instead, permits any group of fifty Jews or more to form a community. Forty or more communities may form an association of communities which shall annually hold a conference of delegates and elect a central council. The constitution and the system of taxation of the central councils as well as the budget and system of taxation of the communities that are not members of the association of communities are subject to approval by the Minister of the Interior. This ordinance called forth a great deal of opposition among Jews. Early
in December, a national Jewish conference decided to advise Jews not to participate in the new elections to the communities which the government ordered early in January, 1926. It appears, however, that some Jewish elements, specifically those led by the Agudath Israel, were satisfied with the new communal organization.

In Turkey, it appears that during the year, the chief rabbi and the rabbi of the Ashkenazic community as well as the leaders of the Jewish community of Constantinople favored a separation of state from the church, a question agitating greatly the citizens of Turkey of all denominations. At a meeting in Constantinople called by the B'nai B'rith, the two rabbis openly declared their stand in favor of separation insofar as it affects the reorganization of the Jewish communal life in Constantinople.

**Economic Life.**—During the past year, Soviet authorities published instructive data on the economic conditions of the Jews in that country. Authorities declared that of the 2,800,000 Jews in the country, 905,000 persons gained a livelihood as kustari, i.e. doing small manufacturing in their own homes; 850,000 persons were clerks and workers and members of trade unions; 130,000 were farmers; and the remaining 915,000 were tradesmen and persons without a definite occupation. Very instructive was also the distribution of the Jewish union men. In the needle trades union, as high as 84% of the membership was Jewish; in the leather trades, 39% of the union's members were Jews, and the percentage was the same in the art trades union. The percentage of Jews was also high in the food trades, namely, 35%, and in civil service, 28%.

According to the official statement given above, practically
one-third of the Jews in the Soviet Republics are engaged in trade, which is ostensibly illegal, or are without occupation. In Poland, and in the Ukraine, unemployment was prevalent among Jews more than among the general population owing to specific causes. In Poland, unemployment was accentuated by the government's discharge of Jewish employees, especially in the tobacco factories, with a view to making place for workingmen who are Polish by race. In that country, both the central administration and the local administrations, it was claimed, discriminated against Jews also in the matter of public works. Late in 1925, the Union of Jewish Coöperatives in Poland declared that more than half of the Jewish workers in the country were without employment. According to a statement by the Jewish Artisans Association of Warsaw early in 1926, of the 2,800 shoe-making establishments in the city, 2,060 were closed; of the 3,000 men's tailoring shops, 2,550 were closed; of the 180 embroidery shops, 108 were closed; and of the 100 brush factories, 50 were closed. In that city, numerous Jewish associations of workers requested the Jewish Kehillot as well as the city authorities to establish soup kitchens and cut-price trading places.

In the Ukraine, it was claimed that the substitution of the Ukrainian language in place of the Russian language in the administrative offices of the country caused the discharge of numerous Jewish civil employees. In White Russia in the summer of 1925, 100,000 Jews were said to have been without means of a livelihood.

The Russian government took steps to improve the lot of the so-called kustari, persons who engaged in manufacture in their own homes. Late in 1925, the govern-
ment permitted such manufacturers to engage two apprentices instead of one as was the case hitherto. It is claimed that this regulation relieved unemployment among Jewish youth in the small towns and improved Jewish life in the small towns generally.

JEWS IN AGRICULTURE AND THE BACK TO THE LAND MOVEMENT.—During the year it became known that 130,000 Jews were living by farming in Soviet Russia in July, 1925. Government authorities in Russia claimed that the number of Jewish farmers had been steadily increasing since 1917. In that year, there were 50,000 Jewish farmers in the country and at the beginning of 1925, 100,000. In Bessarabia 8,000 Jewish families were engaged in farming.

As was told in the preceding Survey (See Vol. 27, p. 59f.), the Russian authorities had decided to further the Jewish back-to-the-land movement. Late in 1924, the various governments issued charters to societies for the promotion of Jewish land-settlement in the Union of Soviet Republics and a Committee for the Settling of the Jews on the Land KOMZET, headed by M. Peter Sfnidowitch, who is secretary to the chairman of the Central Executive Committee, was organized in connection with the government's Commission on Minority Nationalities. At the same time, various laws regulating settlement on the land were changed with a view to facilitating Jewish settlement, and 71,000 desiatins (191,700 acres) of land were allotted for Jewish settlement during that year by the government. It was estimated that between 4,000 and 5,000 Jews settled on the land during 1924. During the past year this movement continued and even gained momentum.

Late in September, 1925, M. Kalinin, Chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Re-
publics, declared to a representative of the Russian Telegraphic Agency the government's position on this policy for improving the economic status of the formerly oppressed nationalities in Russia. The Soviet government, M. Kalinin declared, had inherited tens of millions of persons who formerly belonged to the oppressed nationalities. Tsarism had inflicted upon them deep wounds not only by depriving them of political rights but also economically by thwarting agricultural and industrial development. "The October revolution, founded on the principle that there can be no political equality where there is no economic equality, set out to apply this principle to the formerly oppressed nationalities. Approaching from this point of view the so-called Jewish question," Mr. Kalinin continued, "we have of course during a short time done a great deal in the matter of giving equal rights to Jews, but, in economic fields, we not only did not improve the condition of the Jewish masses but to a certain degree, we made it worse." The Jews, he continued, did not receive land when the government distributed the land formerly belonging to the great landowners, and the nationalization of the industries has deprived hundreds of thousands of Jews of their means of a livelihood; the Jewish population in the Ukraine, White Russia, and the western governments lived in appalling poverty; because of the slow development of the Russian industry, there was no hope of establishing Jews in that field; the only hope lay in settling considerable masses of Jews on the land. At about the same time, M. Smidowitch, chairman of the Komzet declared that the Soviet government never doubted the soundness of the plan to transfer a considerable part of the Jewish population to agricultural work, and that full freedom of action was to
be given to all foreign organizations who were willing to help, and that the work of the American Jewish Joint Agricultural Corporation, usually referred to as the Agro-Joint, was gratifying. In White Russia, the Central Committee of the Communist Party adopted a resolution declaring that the "work of improving the economic condition of the Jewish population must henceforth be an important task of the party. . . . the settling of Jews on the land must be continued energetically."

Previously, in the United States, on May 14, 1925, the executive committee of the Joint Distribution Committee decided to launch in the fall of 1925 a campaign for the collection of an adequate fund to be regarded as an overseas chest for the relief of Jews in foreign countries, especially in Soviet Russia. It was later decided that the campaign be for $15,000,000 to be raised in three years. In the fall the Joint Distribution Committee and its constituent organizations issued a call for a conference to which one thousand delegates of organizations and representative Jews responded. The national conference on relief was held in Philadelphia September 12–13, 1925, and it adopted a resolution authorizing the campaign to gather fifteen million dollars, "to be expended by the Joint Distribution Committee along the lines of relief and reconstruction pursued by it heretofore and up to this time," and favoring the continuance and extension of "the work initiated by the Joint Distribution Committee, four years ago in the field of industrial and agricultural settlement," and "its fruitful work of relief and service in the fields of war orphan care, medical sanitation and prevention of disease, in the care of our unhappy refugee brothers, especially those stranded in the ports of
Europe, in the field of industrial aid to artisans and tradespeople, and in cultural work." The resolution concluded with a paragraph declaring that the conference regarded it as self-evident that "American Jewry whenever called upon is prepared generously to support the work of Jewish resettlement in Palestine." (For full text of resolution see the Report of the American Jewish Committee, p. 496 below.)

Late in November the Joint Distribution Committee announced the following tentative plan of distribution of the $15,000,000 to be collected during the coming three years: (1) $2,500,000 annually for agricultural and constructive work, of which $1,500,000 is to be used in Russia; $500,000 in Poland, Roumania, and other European countries; and $500,000 in Palestine, to be invested in the shares of the stock of the Palestine Economic Corporation, provided the corporation receives the assets of the Palestine Development Council and of the American Palestine Company, and the payments of individual stock subscribers so as to provide the full amount of its capital of $3,000,000; (2) $600,000 annually for agricultural and cultural work; half to be used in Russia and half in Poland, Roumania, Palestine, and other countries; (3) $400,000 annually for credit institutions, co-operative, and business reconstruction: $250,000 for Russia and $150,000 for other countries, specifically Poland; (4) $600,000 annually for the relief of refugees; and (5) $900,000 for the relief of orphans, institutional work, etc.

During 1925, it was reported, the Russian government allotted 103,050 desiatins of land for Jewish colonization: 62,139 desiatins in the Ukraine, 28,500 desiatins in Crimea, and 12,411 desiatins in White Russia. 5,465 Jewish families were settled during that period. In the previous year the
government allotted 270,000 acres for Jewish colonization; 160,000 in Southern Ukraine, 81,000 in Crimea and 27,000 in White Russia.

During 1925, the settlement in Russia was carried on through the Agro-Joint, the Society for the Setting of Jews on the Land GEZERD, and the smaller organizations OTR and ICOR. Late in the summer of 1925 ICA assigned $100,000 for Jewish colonization work in Soviet Russia for 1926. The Committee for the Settlement of Jews on the Land, KOMZET, met in conference with the GEZERD in Moscow late in October 1925. It was decided to complete the settlement of 5,468 Jewish families which had moved on the land during 1924, and in addition to settle 10,400 new families, if feasible. It was estimated that between 800 and 900 rubles (between $400 and $500) per family or a total of 3,124,000 rubles would be necessary for the first project, and a minimum of 1,250 rubles per family or a total of 12,935,000 rubles for the second. Adding to these amounts the sum of 950,000 rubles estimated as necessary for improvements, maintenance of a staff of instructors, introduction of machinery, etc., brought the total budget for 1926 up to 17,000,000 rubles or about $8,500,000. The leaders of the movement for the settlement, however, estimated that only about 11,736,000 rubles would be available, 9,286,000 of which would come from philanthropic organizations and 2,450,000 from the settlers themselves. The amount expected from the philanthropic organizations comprised the following: 4,900,000 from the Agro-Joint, 4,000,000 from the GEZERD, 200,000 from the ICA and 186,000 from the ORT and ICOR. The GEZERD and the KOMZET also decided to divide the prospective settlers into classes according to their financial means.
The poor family will be required to contribute only 10 rubles; other families, 150 rubles; still others, 300 rubles; and finally there would be families that would require to pay between 500 and 1,250 rubles.

Coöperatives.—In Poland the Association of Jewish Coöperatives had on the 31st of December, 1925, 287 coöperatives with 81,528 members. Of the former number, 252 were small credit coöperatives with 76,166 members, 24 were merchants' coöperatives with 4,757 members, and 10 were miscellaneous coöperatives with 545 members; 189 coöperatives were people's banks. On June 30, 1925, there were 60,883 members and a combined capital (shares and reserves) of 1,314,000 zlotys, deposits of 2,500,000 and a balance of 10,000,000 zlotys. On that date, the banks had loans of 1,500,000 zlotys. In Lithuania there operated 93 peoples' banks. A new people's bank opened at Memel and a coöperative for the promotion of industry and agriculture among Jews ("Roimasz") at Kovno. In Czecho-Slovakia, there operated 14 Jewish loan and savings banks with a combined capital of 5,500,000 czech crowns. It is interesting to note that one-third of the members of the Jewish coöperatives in that province were non-Jews, according to press reports in the fall of 1925. In Bessarabia, the Jewish coöperative movement continued to thrive. On January 1, 1925, 33 coöperative institutions connected with the ICA had jointly 25,000 members and a capital of 73,533,000 lei. The institutions are combined in a union with headquarters at Kishineff. In Soviet Russia, the loan and savings associations supported by the ICA had on June 30, 1925, 46,764 members with a combined capital of 3,237,313 rubles. The property of the coöperatives was valued at 496,000 rubles.
In addition, Jewish coöperatives operated in Latvia and in other countries.

During 1925, the American Joint Reconstruction Foundation disbursed $337,176 to credit institutions: in Poland, $99,500; Roumania, $99,050; Lithuania, $50,000; Latvia, $25,000; Czecho-Slovakia, $25,000; Turkey, $22,500; Greece, $10,000 and Austria, $6,126. In November, 1925, the Foundation, which controlled the stock of the Jewish Bank for Coöperatives in Poland, the central clearing and financial agency for Jewish coöperatives in the country, transferred a majority interest to the Union of Jewish Coöperatives. It was stipulated that the bank was to be used for the benefit of all Jewish coöperatives in the country, including those which are not affiliated with the Union. Early in 1926 the American Joint Reconstruction Foundation appropriated $300,000 for the establishment of loan and credit societies in Poland; $200,000 for about 100 new loan and credit societies for artisans, and $100,000 for 20 loan and credit societies for small merchants.

Immigration.—As was the case in previous years, complete statistics of Jewish emigration and immigration for the year covered by this survey are not available. During 1925, 33,800 Jews entered Palestine and 2,150 Jews left the country. Only 10,282 Jews entered the United States of America during the year ended June 30, 1925; 4,459 entered Canada, 6,920 entered Argentine, and about 2,500 Jews entered Brazil. The most important fact about Jewish migration during the past year is the paucity of Jewish immigration to the United States. Probably for the first time since 1881, as a result of the operation of the Immigration Law of 1924, fewer Jews entered the United States than other
oversea countries. As a result of the new law the Jewish immigration was one-fifth of the magnitude of that of the previous year, namely 48,000, and less than one-tenth of the number of Jews who entered during 1914 just before the war, 113,000. As in previous years, so also during the past year the number who left the country was insignificant, namely 291 Jews.¹

In his message to Congress upon the State of the Union in December, 1925, President Coolidge declared, relative to the operation of the immigration act, that "the situation should . . . be carefully surveyed in order to ascertain whether it is working a needless hardship upon our own inhabitants. If it deprives them of the comfort and society of those bound to them by close family ties, such modifications should be adopted as will afford relief, always in accordance with the principle that our Government owes its first duty to our own people and that no alien, inhabitant of another country, has any legal rights whatever under our constitution and laws . . . But we should not, however, be forgetful of the obligations of a common humanity. The standard which we apply to our inhabitants is that of manhood, not place of birth." Later in the year numerous bills were introduced in the House and in the Senate providing for amendments to the immigration law of 1924, for the purpose of facilitating the union of families, some of whose members are in the United States and others still abroad, but none of these bills were acted upon by Congress.

¹For an analysis of the Jewish immigration to the United States as well as the Jewish immigration to Canada and Argentine, see "Statistics of Jews" pages 379—427 below.
The Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), New York, rendered assistance to Jewish emigrants in this country and to Jewish emigrants in the following foreign countries, during 1925: Poland, Roumania, Latvia, Lithuania, Danzig, France, China (Harbin) and Cuba (Havana). During 1925, the HIAS Immigration Bank transmitted abroad 53,175 remittances aggregating $2,173,137. In Poland the Jewish Central Immigration Society continued its work; between January, 1924 and June, 1925, the Society served 24,883 families of emigrants, a total of 87,744 persons. The United Jewish Emigrant Society "Emigdirect," with headquarters in Berlin, operated during the past year in all the countries of Eastern Europe and issued a journal, the Yiddishe Emigration. Its budget was covered for the most part by HIAS.

The International Conference of Private Organizations for the Protection and Welfare of Migrants, designed chiefly to promote international cooperation in the matter of the protection and the welfare of migrants, was organized at Geneva in September, 1925, at a conference of delegates representing forty-nine organizations. Jewish delegations at the conference represented the ICA in Paris, Ezra in Antwerp, the Jewish Association for the Protection of Girls and Women in London, the National Council of Jewish Women in New York, the Committee of Jewish Delegations in Paris, and the United Jewish Emigration Committee in Berlin.

Distress and Relief.—During the past year information continued to be spread concerning the disastrous economic conditions prevailing among Jews in Soviet Russia, in Poland, and in other countries. Famine conditions developed among the Jewish colonists in Bessarabia, and the anti-
French uprisings in Syria affected the Jews at Damascus. In addition, the problem of Jewish war refugees and stranded immigrants and of war-orphans occupied the attention of Jewish relief organizations. Mention was made above of the wretched economic conditions of the Jews in Soviet Russia and in Poland and of the action taken by American Jewry and other agencies to relieve the situation. In Roumania, in the province of Bessarabia, famine conditions developed late in the summer in the Jewish colonies of the districts of Belz, Orhejew, and Benderi. The Provisional Committee for the Relief of Jewish colonists in Bessarabia Suffering from the Famine was organized during the year. In the fall of 1925 it reported that it spent 407,540 lei (about $1,800) for relief during October-December, 1925. It also reported that no less than 20,000 colonists were in need of relief. In the fall it was reported that the American Joint Reconstruction Foundation and ICA had jointly voted special credits for the relief of Jewish farmers in Bessarabia and that seven colonies had already received credits of 1,200,000 lei (about $5,500). As for Syria, early in 1926, the delegate for the International Committee of the Red Cross informed the Joint Foreign Committee, London, that the Jewish Relief Committee in Damascus was extending relief to 200 families, 1,800 persons, in the city and that the relief was inadequate and would have to be discontinued.

In the preceding Survey (Vol. 27, p. 84) we recorded the facts that the High Commissariat for Refugees of the League of Nations had been transferred to the Bureau Internationale du Travail, that adequate measures had been taken by the League of Nations to solve the Greek refugee problem, but that arrangements for methodical solution of the question
of Russian war refugees numbering 700,000 persons in Europe and 100,000 in Eastern Asia had not been satisfactory. A large number of these refugees are Jews. In the fall of 1925 the Assembly of the League of Nations voted to create two agencies under the supervision of the International Labor Office, one to be located at Buenos Aires and the other at Rio de Janeiro at a cost of £4,000 annually, for the purpose of settling Russian refugees in Argentine and in Brazil. It was also decided to request the Council of the League of Nations to refer to an inter-governmental conference the question of creating a revolving fund to defray the cost of the transport and the settlement. As for Jewish emigrants stranded in various ports as a result of the passage of the United States Immigration Law of 1924, we reported in the preceding Survey (Vol. 27, p. 86) that a commission sent by HIAS estimated that there were about 8,000 of these stranded immigrants. In June, 1924, an Emergency Committee for Jewish Refugees was organized which issued an appeal for $500,000. The Emergency Committee coöperated with the Jewish organizations in Canada in caring for some of the refugees admitted there by special arrangement, organized systematic relief activity for about 5,000 Jews stranded in Cuba, and sent a commission to investigate immigration conditions in Mexico. In July, 1925, this Committee, ICA, and the United Jewish Emigration Committee in Berlin decided to create a United Evacuation Committee for the purpose of dealing with the emigrants stranded at various ports, and decided to assign for this purpose $500,000. Of that sum, $340,000 was to be contributed by the Emergency Committee, $100,000 by ICA, and $60,000 by the United Emigration Committee. The Committee began
to operate in August 1925 caring for 5,489 Jews; 2,159 stranded immigrants and 3,330 Russian Jewish refugees in Russia and at Constantinople.

According to estimates there were on August 1, 1925, 45,200 Jewish war-orphans in the countries of Eastern Europe. Of that number 18,449 received support from the JDC and 3,409 received technical education. The greatest number of Jewish war orphans, 30,742, were found in Poland; of this number 13,529 were subsidized and 2,456 were receiving technical education. The small Jewish community of Lithuania had 4,000 war orphans, of which number only 420 were subsidized and 236 were receiving technical education. The remaining orphans were in Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, Latvia, Roumania, and Turkey. In Poland, the Association of Central Societies for the Care of Orphans cared for 13,529 children, the largest number of Jewish orphans in that country. By July 1, 1925, 2,456 orphans were receiving technical and professional education, especially tailoring, shoe-making, carpentry, or locksmithing. The budget was covered by moneys received from the JDC, from Jewish Communities, and from municipalities and the central government.

As in previous years, the extent of Jewish relief abroad during the past year can be to some extent measured by the work of the Joint Distribution Committee. In 1925, the Joint Distribution Committee disbursed $1,846,722 for relief abroad, bringing the total amount of the money disbursed since the inception of the Committee to $58,886,806. Of the former sum, $1,051,648 was allocated for countries and $795,074 to organizations. As for countries, $238,201 was allocated for Russia, $283,827 for Poland, and $270,735
for Palestine. Of the amount given to organizations, $492,601 was appropriated for the activities of the Agro-Joint in Soviet Russia.

III

JEWISH COMMUNAL LIFE

PARTIES. — Complete statistics of the strength of the Agudath Israel in the various countries are not available, but during the year, the central office of the Agudath Israel at Frankfort on the Main reported that there were in Poland 530 branch societies and 300 societies of Poale Agudath Israel, groups of Orthodox workers. Later in the year under review, a delegation of the world organization came to the United States and opened an American office of the Keren ha-Yishub, a fund for settling Jews in Palestine. It was reported that the office planned to launch a campaign for the collection of $3,000,000 for the colonization work of the Agudath Israel in Palestine. During the year there were Agudath Israel conventions in Poland, Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Netherlands, and Switzerland.

For the Zionists, the year under review was a congress year. The 14th biennial world Congress met at Vienna, August 18–27, 1925, attended by delegates from all over the world. Later, in accordance with the decisions of the Congress, the Actions Committee of the World Zionist Organization, meeting at Berlin in October, 1925, resolved “to prolong the period of office of the Executive elected at the Thirteenth Congress and of the Financial and Executive Council with the rights then accorded to this body, until the Fifteenth Congress.” The Executive Committee of the World Zionist Organization elected at the Thirteenth Con-
gress included Dr. Ch. Weizmann as chairman. The Committee further approved the budget for the Central Office in London amounting to £38,760. The Zionist factions like the Mizrachi, the Hitahduth, the Zionist Socialist Party "Zeire Zion," and the Jewish Workers' Alliance Poale Zion, held their world conferences at Vienna in connection with the Congress. The Mizrachi world organization reported that it maintained about 40 educational institutions in Palestine. Among the Zionist Socialist groups the movement for amalgamation continued. In the summer of 1925, it was reported that the Poale Zion organization, the Left Zeire Zion, the Society Deror in Poland and the Ha-Shomer ha-Zair in Russia merged to form a world socialist Zionist organization. As for the national organizations, the customary conventions were held in numerous countries. Notable was the 28th annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America held at Washington, late in June, 1925, at which convention it was declared that on May 31, 1925, the organization had 38,375 members. During the year the Zionists held a national conference at Baltimore, where it endorsed the United Palestine Appeal for $5,000,000 during 1925. Later it was decided that the funds shall be allocated as follows on the basis of the collection of $5,000,000 during the year: $3,000,000 for the Keren Hayesod, $1,000,000 to the Jewish National Fund, $500,000 to the Hadassah Medical Organization, $250,000 to the Hebrew University Fund, $90,000 to Mizrachi institutions in Palestine, $43,000 to Junior Hadassah, and $11,700 for a contingent fund. In Poland, the past year witnessed the first all-Polish Zionist convention. The steps referred to in the preceding Survey (Vol. 27, p. 88), designed to unify the various regional or-
ganizations into one Polish Zionist organization, proved successful.

Coming to other groups, we find that in Soviet Russia, the central bureau of the Jewish sections of the Russian Communist Party in the Ukraine declared that only 11,438 Jews were members of the Russian Communist party. Of that number, 8,750 lived in the interior of Russia where they could not effectively engage in Jewish work. The Bureau further reported that there were Jews in 1,500 localities, only 400 of which were being regularly reached by the central bureau of the Jewish sections.

As in previous years, the various parties and groups cooperated also during the period under review. For example, negotiations were carried on between the Agudath Israel and the Zionist Organization with a view to affecting cooperation in matters pertaining to Palestine work. Early in the summer, it was reported that representatives of the Zionist organization and of the Agudath Israel had come to an understanding on the question of the purchase of land in Palestine. The question of woman franchise continued to be a bone of contention between the parties. This was especially the case in Palestine in connection with the elections to the Representative Assembly. The Agudath Israel uncompromisingly opposed female suffrage. In this connection, we note that in the fall of 1925, the Jewish community of Berlin decided to grant franchise to women, who up to that time, had had the right to vote in the national elections to the Jewish communities but not in the local elections. Another subject of controversy was the question of the language of instruction in the Jewish schools. The case was especially acute in Roumania. The Jews of Old
Roumania favored Roumanian. On the other hand, in Bessarabia, both the Agudath Israel and the so-called Yiddishists (the Jewish labor element) demanded Yiddish; in Bukowina, where the Jews speak German in their homes, some Jewish leaders favored German; in Transylvania some wanted Hungarian, while the Zionist section demanded Hebrew. Late in the year, however, the groups compromised in demanding Hebrew and Yiddish.

Little was published during the year to show the comparative strength of the various parties and groups in specific countries. In Czecho-Slovakia, in the elections held in the fall of 1925, the Agudath Israel and the Autonomous Jewish Orthodox Congregations of Slovakia refused to join the Zionists organized under the name of the United Jewish Party and put forward their own ticket under the name of the Jewish Economic Party. On November 15, 1925, the elections were held and the United Jewish Party polled 99,520 votes, including 18,000 votes in the District of Uzhord in Slovakia, while the Jewish Economic Party polled 16,813 votes, including 15,175 votes in Uzhord. On the other hand in Latvia, judging by the number of deputies the various parties managed to elect to the Sejm in the fall of 1925, the Agudath Israel was the strongest party and the general Zionist, the weakest. Of the five deputies elected, 2 were Agudists, 1 Mizrahit, 1 Bundist, and 1 Zeire Zionist.

Organizations.—Under the various headings in the chapters "Spiritual and Intellectual Life," "The Jew as a Citizen," "Palestine and Zionism," and "Anti-Semitism," we tell of the work of Jewish religious, educational and cultural associations; of health organizations, economic societies, immigration societies, and relief societies; of organizations
for the protection of Jewish rights; of organizations for the
reconstruction of Palestine; and of societies engaged in coun-
teracting anti-Semitism. In this place we may properly
mention religious societies. In the United States, a notable
event of the past year was the organization of the Synagogue
Council of America, composed of representatives of national
Jewish religious organizations, for the purpose of furthering
such interests as the constituent organizations have in com-
mon. The organizations constituting the Council are the
Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Rabbinical
Assembly of the Jewish Theological Seminary, the Rabbinic-
cal Council of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations
of America, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations,
the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America,
and the United Synagogue of America.

In connection with educational societies, not dealt with
elsewhere, we may add here that the Jewish Education As-
sociation of New York was instrumental in placing 15,000
Jewish children in Jewish schools during the past year. The
Association also gathered a testimonial fund of $500,000 in
honor of the fiftieth birthday anniversary of Judge Otto A.
Rosalsky, for the purpose of advancing Jewish religious
education in the city of New York. Abroad, the various
students' societies held their conferences during the year.
Noteworthy was the meeting of the Association of Jewish
Academic Youth in Poland, held in Warsaw late in January,
1926, which is said to have 6,000 members. In Great Britain,
the fifth annual summer school of the Inter-University Jew-
ish Federation was attended by about one hundred students.

Of national and central organizations in the United States
the American Jewish Committee held its nineteenth annual
meeting in New York City on November 8, 1925. It is noteworthy that the Committee decided to conduct a survey of existing Jewish educational facilities in the United States. President Louis Marshall in his annual report reviewed the activities of the Committee and the situation of the Jews in various countries. In addition, he made public for the first time the text of that version of the Polish-Jewish Agreement which was filed by the Polish Government with the Secretariat of the League of Nations. The American Jewish Congress held its fifth biennial meeting in Philadelphia, Pa., in October, 1925. In the preceding Survey (Vol. 27, p. 95) we reported how, during the year then under review, elections of the Union of Jewish Communities of Prussia were held for the first time on the basis of a liberal franchise, and a stronger organization than existed before was effected. During the past year, steps were taken to further the perfection of the organization of the Jews in the country. Delegates representing the Union of German Jewish Communities, the National Association of Jewish Communities of Prussia, the Association of Jewish Communities of Bavaria, the Association of Jewish Communities of Baden, the National Association of Jewish Communities of Anhalt, and the Jewish Community of Hamburg, held a conference at Munich, early in 1926. The conference went on record as favoring the organization of a nation-wide Association of German Jews (Reichsverband der deutschen Juden).

In connection with the Zionist congress at Vienna, delegates representing organizations and communities of Sephardic Jews and Oriental Jews in many countries held a convention on August 16 chiefly for the purpose of furthering Zionist interests among Oriental Jews.
A National Council of Jewish Women was organized in Jugo-Slavia with thirty branches. In many countries the national women's societies held their conventions. Notable was the convention of the Union of Jewish Women of Great Britain and the Union of the Jewish Women's Societies in Czecho-Slovakia. Late in the summer of 1925, the Women's International Zionist Organization held its third biennial conference in Vienna in connection with the Zionist Congress. In Bulgaria, the Zionist Women's Societies held their first national conference in 1926.

We come now to Rabbinical Associations, teachers' societies and social workers' organizations. In the United States, late in April, the Rabbinical Assembly of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America met in New York City; in May, the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada met at Lakewood, N. J., and, in October, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations held its convention at Cincinnati, O. In foreign countries, we note the conventions of the Rabbis of Great Britain, of the Association of French Rabbis at Paris early in June, and of the Association of German Rabbis at Cologne in June, 1925. Noteworthy was also the second convention of the Polish rabbis held at Warsaw. Numerous teachers' conferences were held during the past year. Noteworthy was the so-called world conference of teachers held at Vienna in connection with the Zionist Organization in the latter part of August, 1925. The convention was attended by teachers of Hebrew schools in the United States, Palestine, Poland, Lithuania, Czecho-Slovakia, Austria, Bulgaria, Greece, and other countries. The National Conference of Jewish Social Service in the United States held its twenty-sixth annual convention at Denver,
Colo., early in June, 1925, and the National Association of Jewish Community Center Secretaries held its seventh annual conference in Philadelphia, Pa., on May 31-June 3, 1925.

**Federations.**—During 1925, the Jewish federations of charities in this country had a combined budget of over $14,000,000. In the previous year the combined budget amounted to $11,065,000. Abroad, the Society for the Promotion of Agriculture and Industry among Jews, ORT, continued its work in many countries. The shareholders of the $1,000,000 Jewish Reconstruction Fund held their first meeting and elected a temporary board of directors. Later, the provisional Board of Directors met for the first time in London and reported that $120,000 had been received out of the amounts promised for the fund of $1,000,000.

**IV**

**Anti-Semitism**

**Public Opinion.**—During the year under review, weighty opinion was expressed in opposition to intolerance and anti-Semitism. In the United States, President Coolidge made a notable statement at the Convention of the American Legion at Omaha, Nebraska, October 7, 1925. The President said in part as follows: "Among some of the varying racial, religious and social groups of our people there have been manifestations of an intolerance of opinion . . .against which we may well be warned . . .The war brought a great test . . .None was excepted from the obligation to serve . . .Well nigh all the races, religions and nationalities of the world were represented in the armed forces of this na-
tion, as they were in the body of our population. No man's patriotism was impugned or service questioned because of his racial origin, his political opinion, or his religious convictions... We must all realize that there are true Americans who did not happen to be born in our section of the country, who do not attend our place of religious worship, who are not of our racial stock, or who are not proficient in our language. If we are to create on this continent a free republic... it will be necessary to regard these differences as accidental and unessential... Divine Providence has not bestowed upon any race a monopoly of patriotism or character... Let us cast off our hatreds.” In Germany, Herr Ulrich, the Premier and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the State of Hesse, publicly declared that anti-Semitism was a disgrace to the German people. In Roumania, M. Duca, the then Minister for Foreign Affairs, and also the chairman of the Roumanian Delegation to the Assembly of the League of Nations, declared, while at Geneva in the fall of 1925, “Anti-Semitism and its disgusting excesses are a product of certain university circles, and the Government will do all that is possible to combat it.” M. Stefan Ugron, the leader of the Hungarian party in Transylvania declared, “I consider anti-Semitism as an anachronism and I believe that it has no foundation at all. The Hungarian party is opposed to any movement that stirs the passions.” In Hungary, the Mayor of the City of Budapest, declared in the fall of 1925, in an address, that “the talk about a Jewish peril is untrue. There is no necessity for the creation of a union of Christian Hungarians against the Jews.”

Of church leaders in the United States, Mr. Herring, Chairman of the committee on good will of the Federal
Council of the Churches, declared in the fall of 1925 that American Christendom needs more information about American Jewry. "American Judaism and Jewry is to a very large extent a sealed book to American Christendom. In my experience with my fellow men in America, I have hardly found one from the Gentile group that has stepped into the inner circle of Jewish culture."

**Organized Anti-Semitism.**—During 5685 (See Vol. 27, p. 100–101) attempts were made by anti-Semitic organizations to create an international organization, and late in the summer (1925), the Austrian National Socialist Party, an anti-Semitic organization, at its convention at Salzburg, instructed its executive committee to take steps to convene a world parliament of anti-Semites in Vienna in 1926. During the past year, a so-called world convention took place at Budapest in October, 1925, and proved a complete fiasco. At first, the anti-Semitic leaders in Hungary decided to convene a public international congress of anti-Semites at Budapest, but later they changed their minds and decided to hold the sessions of the congress in secret. After great effort, the secret congress finally met at Budapest on October 3, 1925, but it consisted of no more than the leaders of the Hungarian anti-Semites joined by only nine others from Roumania, Austria and Germany (Bavaria). In spite of efforts to keep the proceedings of the congress secret, the press soon published reports about the meeting. According to these, the so-called international secret congress resolved that the Jews in the various countries must be deprived of their citizenship and be considered undesirable aliens; that Jewish possessions in the various countries be nationalized
with a view to confiscating them and distributing them among non-Jews; that the Jewish students and Jewish professors at universities should be immediately expelled. The publication of the reports was followed by disturbances in the National Assembly of Hungary and a good deal of dissatisfaction in that country. The conference having been participated in by Deputy Eckhardt, a notorious reactionary, and anti-Semitic leader in Hungary, and Prof. Alexander Cuza, the notorious reactionary in Roumania, deputies in the national assembly of Hungary accused M. Eckhardt of lack of patriotism. The same accusation was brought by the press of Roumania against Professor Cuza. The newspaper *Facla* published reports of the addresses delivered at the congress. Cuza, for instance, had declared that it was evident that it was necessary to expel the Jews from Europe and that "only guns and revolution can expel the Jews." Expulsion, he claimed, should take place first in Roumania and if proved successful there, Roumania would be followed by other countries.

Few national organizations of anti-Semites came into existence during the year. In Switzerland, there was organized an anti-Semitic society by the name of the People's Union for Freedom and Justice of Switzerland with headquarters at Zurich. It is interesting to note that the Catholic International press agency "Kipa" warned the Catholics against this new anti-Semitic society, declaring that "It is desirable that Swiss Catholics take an unfriendly stand against the Union and its press organ . . . The work of the People's Union for Freedom and Justice reminds one strongly of the Hakenkreuzler, whose extreme views cannot go together with Catholic principles." In Roumania, a united
anti-Semitic party called Actiunoa Nationale Crestina was organized in the spring of 1925.

Like previous years the past year was not distinguished for the part played by government and high officials in promoting anti-Semitism, the contrary being true on the whole. In Roumania, it is painful to report that M. Bratianu, the then prime minister, declared in an interview that he recognized "the anti-Semitic party's right of existence," though he did not approve of anti-Semitic outbreaks. The liberal press protested on the ground that such statements encouraged the anti-Semitic movement in that country. A report on conditions in Roumania which appeared in The New York Times in October, 1925, was unusually interesting. A correspondent writing from Vienna claimed that the liberal party which was then in power controlled 90% of the banks, and thereby the economic life of the country, and directed legislation according to its own needs. Being corrupt, the Liberal Party tries to drug the people by "policies of extreme chauvinism. The oppression of the non-Roumanian minorities, such as the Magyars, Jews and Transylvanian Germans, chiefly serves as a camouflage for the Liberal régime's economic transactions. The wave of violent anti-Semitism now sweeping Roumania also is artificially nurtured by the Government in order to make the people forget their wrongs and shove the blame on the Jews."

The content of the propaganda of the anti-Semites during the past year did not differ materially from that of the preceding years. The character of the demands of the anti-Semites may be judged from the proclamations distributed among the Roumanian peasants, which demanded that the government dismiss all Jews from the army and from civil
service, remove all Jews from the villages, and expel all Jews who entered the country after 1914, confiscate the land of the Jewish farmers and timberlands owned or leased by Jews, and the dwellings of Jewish merchants, and dismiss all Jewish children attending schools where the language of instruction is Roumanian. In Poland, the Association of Polish Youth resolved at its third congress held at Warsaw that "the Polish policy with regard to the Jews" shall be directed towards the "political, cultural and economic isolation as well as the far-reaching decrease of their numbers in the state." In the preceding Survey (See Vol. 27, p. 103) we referred to complaints of anti-Semitic agitation in schools, and told how the German Democratic Women's Society had adopted a resolution condemning this propaganda, and that in Lithuania, Jewish teachers had protested against anti-Semitic tendencies in school text-books. During the past year, deputies in the Polish Sejm had occasion to criticize the government for permitting teachers in the public schools to engage in anti-Jewish propaganda among the school children.

The actual extent, during the year under review, of what we may call organized anti-Semitism is difficult to gauge. Judging by the notoriety given to anti-Semitism in the press, it may be said that during the year under review Roumania, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Austria, and Germany were centers of anti-Semitic agitation. Relative to Roumania, it was declared by M. Guernut, the secretary general of the Ligue des Droits de l'Homme, Paris, upon his return from Roumania that "the Jewish question still bears an acute aspect. Theoretically the equality of all citizens is admitted, but there exists in fact a noisy anti-Semitic movement which
the government seems to be unable to suppress."

**ANTI-JEWISH FEELING.**—As in previous years, the outcome of popular elections during the review period did not show that anti-Semitism had a popular appeal. In Roumania, it was declared that the political party headed by Prof. Cuza, notorious anti-Semite, was defeated in the municipal elections, none of its candidates having been elected. In the city of Budapest, a hot-bed of anti-Semitic agitation, the anti-Semitic parties were not successful in electing more than ninety-one candidates to the City Council out of a total of two hundred and fifty councilmen.

In Soviet Russia, the government continued its uncompromising opposition to anti-Semitism, but ill-feeling among the peasants seems to have come to the surface in some places in the latter’s relation to the new Jewish farmers. Thus the colonists of Tshervoni Zar near Berdichev published an appeal in the Jewish communist paper *Der Stern*, published at Kharkow, stating that the neighboring peasants were threatening violence and pastured their cattle on Jewish fields and committed similar unlawful acts. As for Austria, Herr Johann Schrober, the chief of police of the city of Vienna, and a former Premier, declared upon his visit to this country as the Austrian delegate to the International Police Conference that “were it not for the noise made by certain sections of the press concerning the Hakenkreuzler (anti-Semites), Austria would not have known of their existence.”

**ANTI-JEWISH DISCRIMINATION.**—As in previous years, cases were not lacking during the year under review in which “social” organizations discriminated against Jews. One
incident of importance was the action of the Society for the Promotion of German Language and Culture Abroad. At its national convention held at Dresden, it was moved that the society consider "that in the future only those German men and women be admitted to membership who are in a position to establish their German origin; applicants must be of pure German blood and they must not be related to Jews."

ANTI-SEMITISM IN COLLEGES.—In previous Surveys (See Vol. 25, p. 89, Vol. 26, p. 95, and Vol. 27, p. 105) we told how a wave of anti-Semitism and disorders at the institutions of higher learning started at the University of Prague in June, 1922, and spread to Austria, Hungary, Poland, Latvia and other countries. The year 5684 witnessed a vigorous defense by the liberal forces of the world, and the wave began to recede. The recession continued during 5685 and 5686, but the affair was not brought to a close, especially in Roumania and Hungary; besides, the opposition of the liberal forces slackened during 5685. The year under review brought no change in the situation as a whole.

One thing deserves special mention, namely the decision of the Council of the League of Nations in the matter of the Hungarian *numerus clausus* law. In November, 1920, shortly after its passage, the attention of the League of Nations was called to this law, which limits the admission of Jewish students to the schools of higher learning, when the Joint Foreign Committee of the British Board of Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association filed a formal complaint, charging that the law in question constituted a breach of the minority clauses of the Treaty of Trianon. Later, the
Committee was assured by legal counsel that this was the case, and it asked the Council of the League of Nations to submit the question to the Permanent Court of International Justice for an *avis consultatif*. In the fall, the Joint Foreign Committee and its associated societies succeeded in placing on the agenda of the Council of the League of Nations the complaint against Hungary. The matter caused a stir in Hungarian circles. Owing, it was said, to pressure from the Government, the Jewish community of Budapest requested the League of Nations to remove from the agenda the question of the *numerus clausus* in Hungary, declaring that no organization had authority to speak for it on this subject. The Joint Foreign Committee, however, declared that it was not speaking in the name of the Hungarian community, but desired to press the question because of the existence of the *numerus clausus* in other countries besides Hungary, and because of its effect upon the Jewish communities in other countries. The Committee had information showing that 12,000 Jewish students were suffering as a result of the application of the *numerus clausus* in certain countries. The victims of the *numerus clausus*, declared the Committee, become a charge on the Jewish communities of other countries. It insisted also that its action was strictly in accordance with Article 60 of the Treaty of Trianon. The Council refused to take the matter off the agenda and the complaint was assigned to M. Mello Franco, the Brazilian delegate, as *rapporteur*, and at the session of the Council of the League of Nations on December 12, 1925, M. Franco reported as follows:

"In Article 58 of the Treaty of Peace with Hungary, it is laid down that Hungarian nationals shall be equal before the
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Hungarian nationals who belong to racial, religious or linguistic minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as other Hungarian nationals. The Hungarian law XXV of 1920 lays down as regards admission to the Universities care shall be taken that the number of students of different races and nationalities shall be in proportion to the number of inhabitants of such races and nationalities in the country. The question which the Council has to decide is whether the above provision is compatible with the principle of equal treatment for all Hungarian nationals. In view of the fact that the Hungarian representative has stated that his government regards the *numerus clausus* as an exceptional and temporary measure necessitated by an abnormal social situation, and that it has decided to amend the *numerus clausus* law directly that the situation changes, I would recommend my colleagues on the Council not to touch the question of law and to take no action in the matter at the moment, but simply to take note of these statements of the Hungarian Government, and await the amendment of the law in the near future."

The Council of the League of Nations adopted the report of Franco. It is noteworthy that Count Klebelsberg, the Hungarian Minister of Education and the delegate at the meeting of the Council of the League of Nations, completely abandoned the defense of the *numerus clausus* law on the basis of justice or right, but maintained the advisability of the retention of the law as a temporary expedient. The decision of the League of Nations did not bring relief to the suffering Jewish students of Hungary, but may prove a moral factor for liberalism and justice, and a deterrent
against the adoption of similar legislation by other countries. The extent of the suffering to the Jewish community caused by the operation of the Hungarian Education Act of 1920 during the past year is not known, but it has been estimated that during the school year of 1924–1925, Jewish citizens were forced to send abroad over 200,000,000 crowns (about $300,000), for the support of students compelled to complete their education at universities in foreign countries.

In Poland, the Jews had occasion to complain of the action of the government in the matter of limiting the admission of Jews to the universities. A good example of the tactics of the government was the episode at the university of Lwow (Lemberg). The senate of that institution notified the minister of education that it could admit only 600 new students, and suggested that 360 seats (60%) be reserved for Catholic Poles and the remaining 240 (40%) for Ukrainians (Greek Catholics) and Jews. The minister went further and ordered the Senate to limit the admission of Jews and Ukrainians to 40% of the number of Catholic Poles actually admitted to the university. At registration time, only 260 Catholic Poles applied for admission, and the senate of the university, in accordance with government orders, admitted only 104 Jews and Ukrainians in spite of the fact that 364 seats were available and there were many additional applicants. Other institutions also limited the admission of Jews. The government was severely criticized, and M. Stanislau Grabski, the then minister of education, declared that he could not rescind the order but that he would issue a circular to the universities, requesting them to disregard, in the future, nationality and religion in the matter of admission of students. He further declared that the students
who remained outside of the walls of the universities as a result of the government’s order would be granted passports for the continuation of their studies at universities abroad.

No legislation for the limitation of the admission of Jews to universities was enacted in Roumania, but the year passed without seeing the disturbances in the universities brought to an end. In the fall of 1925, anti-Semitic students celebrated the so-called anniversary of the *numerus clausus* agitation, and a small but noisy section of students rioted and committed excesses against Jewish students on that day, at Bucharest and at other places. Similar disturbances occurred during the year, especially at the universities of Jassy and of Bucharest. That these disorders were tantamount to an actual *numerus clausus* was generally admitted.

At the meeting of the League of Nations Union of Roumania at Bucharest, late in 1925, the general secretary, in referring to the statement made by Professor Aulard of Paris at an international congress of the League of Nations Union "that in Roumania ‘numerus clausus’ does not exist legally, but in practice it exists in the form of acts of violence committed by students against their Jewish colleagues and even against some professors," stated: "These facts in the form they were presented, the Roumanian delegation cannot categorically deny."

In other countries, also, there were disturbances in the universities. At the university of Vienna disturbances occurred in the spring of 1925, and also in the fall of the same year. On one occasion an investigation disclosed that anti-Semitic students had removed a cross from one of the lecture halls with a view to creating ill feeling against Jewish students. In Germany, as in the preceding year, unsuccessful attempts
were made during the year under review, to introduce legislation providing for the limitation of admission of Jewish students to the universities. In Thuringia, anti-Semites introduced a bill in the Diet providing that the university of Jena refuse admittance to "every foreigner who is unable to produce an affidavit from a notary public that both his parents and all his grandparents were Christians."

**Economic Discrimination.**—As in the previous years so also during the year under review, few cases of economic discrimination were reported. In Poland, it appears that government authorities were making definite efforts to displace Jewish labor in the nationalized industry of tobacco. In Grodno, for instance, the director of the government tobacco factory discharged 600 Jews and 100 non-Jews in one department and a number of Jewish workingmen in another department, and then re-employed a number of the discharged Polish workingmen to take the place of the discharged Jewish workingmen of the second department, in this way accomplishing the so-called Polonization of the factory. In other fields of labor, Jews had occasion to complain of discrimination. In Lodz, Jewish workers complained that officials discriminated against them in the matters of unemployment insurance and of filing requests for work. The Jewish Emigrant Aid Society in Warsaw submitted a memorandum to the French ambassador, complaining of difficulties encountered in securing visas by Jewish workers who have contracts of employment in France.

In Roumania, it was declared that banks and other credit institutions were discriminating against Jews in the matter of extending credit.
POLITICAL MATTERS.—Few cases of political discrimination were reported during the year. In England, the Home Secretary challenged persons "to give one single instance in which there has been any anti-Jewish bias shown by the Home Office or its officials," in the matter of domicile. It was charged that the office of the Home Secretary discriminated against aliens of the Jewish faith who desire to become citizens. The Fifth Congress of Jewish Artisans of Lithuania protested against the government's interference in economic matters and against extortion in the form of taxation. It is interesting to note that the court of the district of Husi in Roumania denied a motion to impose upon a Jewish litigant the oath *more judaico*, on the ground that the new act of civil procedure in the country had abrogated all former laws of this nature. Dr. Leon Reich, president of the Club of Jewish Deputies in the Polish Sejm, and the Polish delegate to the conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, openly declared at the session at Ottawa that the Polish government limited the employment of Jews in civil service. Early in the summer, the Reichstag in Germany defeated a motion introduced by the leader of the anti-Semitic *Deutschvoelkische Partei*, providing for the dismissal of domestics of the Jewish faith.

Also in Soviet Russia it appears that during the year, the autonomous republics were discriminating against Jews in the matter of representation in the legislative and administrative bodies. Very noteworthy were the charges brought by M. Larin at the third congress of the national minorities held at Moscow in the spring of 1925. The speaker declared that the autonomous republics limited the rights of the national minorities living among them. Thus, for instance,
in White Russia, the Soviets in the villages have only .04% Jews, while the Jews in White Russian villages form as many as 7.5% of the population. In the Ukraine, the Jewish population is represented in the Soviets only to the extent of .03%. Further, the Crimean government prohibited the Jewish colonists to bring over their families if they did not do so before March 4, 1925. Such abnormalities, the speaker said, must be abolished.

VIOLENCE AND PERSECUTION.—In Soviet Russia authorities had occasion to deal with acts of administrative violence by subordinate authorities. This was especially the case in the government of Podolia. In the summer of 1925, the district court of Podolia brought to trial the chairman of the district committee, M. Savtschik, and his associates, including a judge and a chief of police, who were all accused of having exacted fines from the Jewish population of Stanislavtschick without court judgments, of having insulted the religious feelings of the population, of having ordered the closing of the synagogue before the high holidays and before Passover for the purpose of exacting money from the Jewish population, and of having compelled Jews to subscribe to a local paper in the Ukrainian language. In the spring of 1926, the court sentenced the president of the Soviet of the district of Luhin, the secretary of the Soviet, the judge, and other officials to imprisonment for from six months to nine years for bribery, corruption and terrorization of the population. It was established at the trial that the secretary of the district Soviet had caused the arrest of the president of the Jewish religious community of the town of Luhin and a Russian priest without cause, that the judge had conducted a
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sham trial of these men and that the chairman of the Soviet had caused the closing of the Jewish cemetery and had imposed heavy taxes upon the poor. Also in other parts of Russia, especially in Northern Caucasus, Soviet authorities were charged with having discriminated against Jewish inhabitants, according to statements made by Emes, Moscow. In Ukrainia it was stated that local authorities neglected communal and sanitary needs of the Jewish population in smaller towns.

In last year's Survey (Vol. 27, p. 106) we told, by way of illustrating the abandon and the criminal enormities of the anti-Semitic movement in the Roumanian Universities, of the deliberate murder of the Police Prefect of Jassy by one Zelea Codreanu. It will be recalled that during disturbances at the university of Jassy the chief of police of the city arrested a few students. The latter brought suit against the chief of police alleging false arrest, and on October 26, 1924, as the plaintiff and the defendants and their counsel were leaving the court room, Zelea Codreanu, one of the counsel for the plaintiff, deliberately shot to death the chief of police. The assassin was arrested, but the anti-Semitic students demanded his release, and the government displayed little energy in the prosecution of the criminal and his accomplices. After delays, due to the threat of disorders, the Government transferred the trial of Codreanu from Jassy to Focsani, and from there to the little town of Turn-Severin, where a jury brought in a verdict of not guilty, and the government set the murderer free.

The trial of Lieutenant Morarescu also deserves notice. It was charged that while stationed to guard a Russo-Roumanian frontier post on the river Dniester, the lieutenant
and nineteen soldiers murdered Jews who tried to cross the river, in some cases upon the invitation of the lieutenant who moreover received a bribe. More than that, Morarescu was accused of having entered into a conspiracy with smugglers to bring persons from the Ukraine into Roumania, whom he robbed and murdered. In spite of the fact that the evidence against Morarescu was of the most flagrant character, the military court of the second army corps at Bucharest acquitted the lieutenant and his accomplices on the ground that they acted under the orders of general Popovici, military commander of Bessarabia, who had been removed several years before. The acquittal was denounced by the liberal public opinion in many countries. In Galicia, Jan Taskalica, a youth engaged in anti-Semitic work, charged with having set fire to the local synagogue, was to be tried at Belz. Anti-Semites from other places came to the town to intimidate the court, which postponed the trial at the request of the prosecutor, whereupon the visiting anti-Semites committed excesses against the Jews in that town.

In Hungary, the Court of Appeals at Budapest set aside the death sentence imposed by a lower court upon Karl Marosi, sentencing him instead to six years' imprisonment, and in acquitting four others who had been his accomplices. Mr. Marosi was charged with having installed an infernal machine in the Elizabethstadt democratic club in April, 1922, resulting in the killing of nine members of the club (Jews) and wounding twenty-three others. It was also charged that he threw a bomb at the residence of Deputy Rassy (liberal leader) on February 20, 1923; another bomb at the courthouse at Budapest on August 22, 1923; a bomb at the Czecho-Slovakian Embassy in October, 1923; a hand
grenade at the office of the liberal newspaper Az Est; a bomb at the French Embassy on November 16, 1923; and a bomb at the Jewish synagogue in Neupest on November 24, 1923. The press charged that the acquittal was due to political influence.

In preceding Surveys (See Vol. 26, p. 109, Vol. 27, p. 120) we referred to the revolutionary committees in Bulgaria which terrorized Jews in Macedonia, and reported that President Zankov had admitted that certain secret societies were extorting money from the inhabitants of Macedonia, and had promised to take vigorous measures. During the year unknown persons continued to terrorize the Jews in Macedonia. In the summer, the minister of war ordered all commanders of garrisons to "take energetic measures to crush the (anti-Semitic) movement whoever may be the leader." In Germany, the year witnessed the desecration by unknown persons of a number of Jewish cemeteries and synagogues. In Karlsruhe, unknown persons broke into the synagogue and painted anti-Semitic emblems on the floor and on the walls.

Excesses.—The year under review, like the preceding year, passed without serious waves of excesses. Late in the summer, excesses against Jews were committed by students and hooligans at Jassy, Ungheni, Vasilelupu, Focshani and Bucharest, which forced the government to declare martial law at Bucharest, Dimienta and the District of Pulna, including the city of Focshani. These excesses were the result of an incident involving a driver and the notorious Professor Cuza. The driver, Lerman, while on his way to deliver a wagonful of flour to an orphan asylum in Jassy, requested
a passerby for directions to the orphan asylum. The passerby happened to be Professor Cuza, who insulted and attacked the driver. The latter not knowing the identity of his assailant, returned the blows and was arrested by the police. The evening of the same day students rioted in Jassy. The riots continued on the following day and later the disturbances spread to the places named above. Previously anti-Jewish excesses had been committed in connection with the trial of Codreanu, referred to above. At Focshani, counsel for the defendant moved that the court release Codreanu on bail. This the court refused to do, and numbers of visiting anti-Semites from all over the country held a demonstration. Later, anti-Semites and bands of thieves attacked Jews and persons looking like Jews, wounding several persons, including one, Judge Dorin, who was not a Jew. A great deal of Jewish property was also destroyed. The excesses in Focshani came up for consideration at the Parliament where Senator Sanilevici interpellated the Minister of the Interior. Excesses were also reported from places in Moldavia and in Bukowina in the fall of 1925. With regard to the excesses in Roumania, it may be noted that the United Roumanian Jews of America at their annual convention, late in 1925, declared that the Roumanian government was conniving at the excesses, and that many persons of high standing in the educational and official world in Roumania are directly or indirectly encouraging, and in many instances participating in, the excesses.

In Lithuania, anti-Semitic students attacked Jewish students at the University of Kovno. In Latvia, anti-Semites terrorized the Jewish community of Waraklaini. Outside of Europe, the press reported the case of a mob attack-
ing Jews at Oran, Algeria, killing two Jews and wounding fifty.

**FORCES OPPOSING ANTI-SEMITISM.**—In Soviet Russia the government seems to have come to an end with its trials of pogrom leaders. The press, however, reported early in 1926 that a court at Zhitomir sentenced to death M. Jur'chenko, leader of the pogrom bands, who had terrorized and massacred Jews in the district of Zhitomir. The Polish government dissolved the monarchist organization led by General Raszewski. In Roumania, the government prohibited anti-Semitic organizations from holding an international congress at Oradea Mare in the fall of 1925. Previously, the Minister of the Interior had prohibited other anti-Jewish manifestations. In Austria authorities refused to permit the anti-Semitic *Voelkische Partei* to hold a national conference at Vienna at the same time as the Zionist Congress was meeting there.

No international intervention was reported during the past year. Deputies MM. Kallay and Lukacs, the Hungarian delegates to the Inter-parliamentary conference held at Washington, D. C., in the fall of 1925, are said to have reported to their government that "As long as the *numerus clausus* is in existence in Hungary, it is impossible for representatives of Hungary to raise, at international gatherings, the question of the suppression of Hungarian minorities in the new states." In the United States, at the meeting of the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities, held in New York City late in 1925, Mr. Louis Marshall, President of the American Jewish Committee, protested against the anti-Semitic movement in Roumania. M. Nich-
olas Titulescu, the Roumanian Minister to Great Britain and Chairman of the Roumanian Debt Funding Commission was present at the meeting. Mr. Marshall stated that the grievances of the Jews in Roumania were serious. "Mere protestations of good will on the part of the Roumanian government will not suffice . . . You are here for the sake of obtaining credit for Roumania. You cannot get moral credit if you trample under foot the religious minorities of your country and those great moral principles for which America stands."

V

PALESTINE AND ZIONISM

PUBLIC OPINION.—As in the previous years, the idea of a Jewish National Home in Palestine was indorsed during the past year by important public men. Early in the summer, Hon. David Lloyd George, former prime minister of Great Britain, declared in an address, according to press reports, that "whatever political party will be in power in England,—Liberals, Labor, or Conservatives—Great Britain will stand by the Balfour Declaration . . . England appealed through the Balfour Declaration to the Jewish people for assistance in the cause of their allies because England is a Biblical nation . . . and because the Allies wanted the sympathy of one of the noblest races which stood so many persecutions . . . when the Balfour Declaration was submitted to the British Cabinet, it was unanimously accepted." In the fall, Sir Herbert Samuel, upon his return to England after having served as the first high commissioner for Palestine for five years, declared that "the Balfour Declaration is now firmly and permanently established as a part of the
public law of the world. It has been confirmed by Labor, Liberal and Conservative governments. British tradition is continuity of policy.” Noteworthy were also statements made by Lord Balfour in the course of his visit to Palestine for the purpose of opening the university. The Lord stated that “the document which expressed the sanction of the British Government for the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine has not been produced by myself, but it is the deliberate decision of the American and European powers. The declaration which is called the Balfour Declaration is the declared policy of all the civilized nations and cannot ever be reversed . . . It commits not only Great Britain but the whole body of international opinion.”

In France, there was organized a French Committee of Friends of Zionism, “France-Palestine.” The Committee, consists mostly of non-Jews with M. Gaston Doumergue, the president of the republic, as its honorary president. The chief purpose of the Committee is to promote the establishment of a Jewish National Home through the work of the Keren Hayesod and the Jewish National Fund. The committee includes former Premier Edouard Herriot, Paul Painlevé, A. De Monzie, Charles Gide, non-Jews, and Léon Blum and Ferdinand Corcos, Jews. Also in Portugal, there was organized during the year a pro-Palestine society consisting of non-Jews and Jews with headquarters at Lisbon. The purpose of the society is to further the interest of the national home in Palestine.

As in the previous years so also during the past year, only two governments remained opposed to the Zionist movement among Jews, namely Hungary and Soviet Russia; perhaps we may add here a third government, the govern-
ment of Persia. In Hungary, the ban on Zionist work was not lifted during the year. As for Soviet Russia, we explained in the preceding Survey (Vol. 27, p. 125) that the Communist International had taken a definite stand with regard to the movement for a national home in Palestine, and that its Eastern Bureau had issued a statement denouncing Zionism, the British occupation of Palestine, the British administration, and the Jewish Labor Party Ahduth ha-Abodah. During the year under review, the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of White Russia at Minsk adopted a resolution on Zionism which according to press reports read as follows: "The appalling economic position of the Jewish population prepares a favorable ground for Zionism, which now has the strongest influence upon the middle class and the Jewish youth. Considering the anti-revolutionary part which Zionism is playing in Russia, as well as abroad, the Central Committee proposes, besides weakening Zionism by improving the economic condition of the Jewish population, to reinforce its direct fight against Zionism . . . The Communist Party and the Communist youth organization are to be acquainted with the character of Zionism. Anti-Zionist literature is to be widely spread among the youth." All through the year, the Jewish press reported cases of arrests and seizures of Zionists, especially in the Ukraine and in White Russia.

League of Nations.—In the preceding Survey (See Vol. 27, p. 125) we reported that the administration of Palestine had come up for consideration before the Permanent Mandates Commission for the first time and that the Commission had dealt with the question of Jewish immigration
and had presented its report to the Council of the League of Nations together with its special observations. On September 15, 1925, the Council adopted the report and approved the recommendations of the Commission.

Later in the year the administration of Palestine came up for the second time before the Permanent Mandates Commission at the latter's seventh session. As at the previous session, a large part of the deliberations of the Commission centered around the question as to whether or not the British government had done all that was possible to further self-government in Palestine. The opinion of M. Rappard is very noteworthy. The latter stated, according to the minutes:

"With regard to the fears expressed by M. Palacios that the mandatory Power was paying more attention to that part of the mandate concerning the Jewish National Home than it was to the provisions for the granting of local self-government to the Arab population, M. Rappard desired to emphasize the fact that the Jews developed more quickly than the Arabs, quite independently of the action of the Administration. The Jewish National Home was developing because the Zionist organizations all over the world were assisting it and because the Zionist settlers were fired by a truly idealistic zeal. In actual fact, the Administration, far from paying exclusive attention to the Jewish National Home, was adopting a very prudent and, he thought, a very wise attitude. Despite the terms of the mandate, it had severely regulated and not promoted immigration and had so far refused to grant immigrant Jews free land. He had no doubt as to the wisdom of a cautious policy. From a sociological point of view, the Jews progressed far more
rapidly than the Arabs, who had remained in practically
the same state of civilization for the last two thousand years. The progress of the Jews was not due, therefore, to the Administration but to their own initiative. In point of fact, it would seem that the Administration was rather more concerned with the Arab population, which developed far more slowly than their more active neighbors, and were less able to look after themselves."

For its consideration the Commission had before it, in addition to the reports by the British government, memoranda by the Zionist organization, the Arabs and others. The Zionist Organization submitted a document entitled "Memorandum on the Development of the Jewish National Home, 1924–1925." It was addressed to the Secretary General of the League of Nations for the information of the Permanent Mandates Commission and was dated October, 1925. The memorandum followed in arrangement the one submitted the previous year, a summary of which was given in the preceding Survey (Vol. 27, pp. 132–134), and it gave information on immigration, agricultural colonization, urban development, industry, public health, and education. Note-worthy was a covering letter addressed to the High Commissioner of Palestine, dated September 1, 1925. In that letter the Zionist Organization declares that certain observations made in the last report of the Commission "did less than justice to the Jewish immigrants who had settled in Palestine during the period under review. These observations suggested that the Commission . . . was not fully aware of the scale on which the Jews had actually contributed to the reconstruction of Palestine". Further, the letter complained of two grievances: first, the paucity of the grant-
in-aid received by the Zionist organization from the government for Jewish education, and secondly, failure to receive government land for Jewish settlement. The memorandum drew attention to the fact that the Jewish schools in Palestine received from the Government "nothing beyond a trivial grant-in-aid, amounting in 1924-1925 to £3,065, or about 3 per centum of the sum appropriated to education from public funds. The Jews at present constitute about 13 per cent of the population, and they have repeatedly urged that in this allocation of funds for educational purposes they should receive a share proportionate to their numbers." Further, the Executive "feel bound to point out that although the Mandate has now been in force for some considerable time, Article VI still remains substantially inoperative." Article VI of the Mandate provides that the Administration "shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions, and shall encourage . . . close settlement by Jews on the land, including State lands and waste lands."

Concerning the two memoranda submitted by the Executive Committee of the Palestine Arab Congress, M. Palacios summed up the contents before the Permanent Mandates Commission, saying that the first document attacks and repudiates in principle the basis of the Palestine Mandate, while the second claims to prove that the Mandatory Power was not complying with the provisions of the Mandate and is therefore injuring the interests of the non-Jewish population. The Committee contended that the Balfour Declaration issued in 1917 was in violation of the pledge to the Sherif of Mecca in 1915 by Sir Henry MacMahon that "Great Britain is prepared to recognize and support the
independence of the Arabs,” and therefore, the memorandum states, “the League of Nations should have asked Great Britain to abolish the Balfour Declaration.” In its comments, the British government states that the petition dealing with Sir Henry MacMahon’s letter omits the introductory sentence which governs the whole letter and that the reservation contained in this sentence “has always been regarded by His Majesty’s Government as covering the Vilayet of Beirut and the Independent Sanjak of Jerusalem. The whole of Palestine west of the Jordan was thus excluded from Sir Henry MacMahon’s pledge.” The introductory sentence reads as follows:

“The districts of Mersina and Alexandretta, and portions of Syria lying to the west of the districts of Damascus, Homs Hama and Aleppo, cannot be said to be purely Arab, and should be excluded from the proposed limits and boundaries.”

Relative to the other complaints of the Committee, the British government called attention to numerous misstatements, and M. Palacios, the reporter, suggested “that the Commission should consider the suggestion of a visit to Palestine.” This remark caused a great deal of discussion. It was strenuously opposed by M. F. Lugard, M. Van Rees, and thoughtful exception was also taken to it by M. Rappard. Finally, M. Palacios suggested that the petitions and the British comments be published, and that is all the Mandate Commission did.

In this connection the policy adopted by the Mandates Commission on the admissibility of petitions is interesting. It was decided that “the Chairman will be expected to accept, as worthy of the attention of the Commission, all petitions which concern the execution or interpretation of
the provisions of the Covenant or the Mandates. Such petitions or parts thereof will not, however, be accepted: (a) If they contain complaints which are incompatible with the provisions of the Covenant or of the Mandates; (b) if they emanate from an anonymous source; (c) if they cover the same ground as a petition which has recently been communicated to the Mandatory Power, and do not contain any new information of importance."

In December, 1925, the League of Nations at its session in Geneva, adopted the report on Palestine submitted by the Permanent Mandates Commission. The report reads in part as follows:

The Commission "regrets that certain elements of the population do not appear to recognize that the essential principles embodied in the mandate . . . provide the only substantial basis for the economic and political development of the country." The Commission "notes with satisfaction that the population, both Jewish and Arab, is increasing and that there is no unemployment of any account in the country . . . that the mandatory power is . . . ready to give its very special attention to any requests which may be made by or on behalf of such settlers for the acquisition of any state or waste lands . . . that . . . in connection with complaints of the Ashkenazic community (of Jerusalem) the mandatory power has no intention of depriving any community of complete religious freedom and complete liberty of conscience." The Commission "hopes that greater progress in the field of legislative and administrative action for the protection of the workers and particularly for the regulation and control of child labor may be evident (in the further reports submitted to the Commission) . . . that, when the
financial situation improves, the government will be able to provide larger funds both for continuing its policy of creating village schools in the Arab communities and also that more substantial assistance may be given to Jewish schools in view of the constantly increasing number of school children.” The Commission “desires to express its appreciation of the important contribution made by the Hadassah Medical Organization not only professionally, but socially and politically, by reason of the services which it renders to all sections of the population”, and to express its desire to be fully informed in the future concerning “the progress made in carrying out the survey of the country” and the “methods used or contemplated by the government for the disposition of any of these lands . . . the delimitation of various frontiers of Transjordan,” the administration of Transjordan, details concerning the immigrants admitted to the country, the abolition of “the legal status of slavery in Transjordan,” the conditions of labor in Palestine, “the prospects for opening an agricultural school for Arabs,” and the “financial operation of a public character.”

BRITISH POLICY.—Early in the year under review, Colonel Leopold Amery, the British Secretary for the Colonies, visited Palestine and declared to delegates of Arabs and of Jews that “the Jewish National Homeland has to live and develop hand in hand with the Arab National Home, both cooperating in the interests of a common Palestinian nationalism and patriotism.” He added also that in his opinion “the Arabs will always remain the majority in Palestine.”

The statement made by Mr. Ormsby-Gore, Under-Secretary of State and British representative at the Seventh Ses-
sion of the Permanent Mandates Commission, was highly important. As reported in the minutes of the Permanent Mandates Commission, Mr. Ormsby-Gore stated that he was confident that “within ten years, self-governing institutions in which Jews and Arabs could cooperate would have grown up in Palestine. The racial and religious divisions were becoming less acute every year. When the Arabs realized that no British Government would abandon the Balfour Declaration, they would change their attitude, and the British Government would be ready to consider any proposals they might make. What was wanted was a sense of Palestinian nationality to supersede the different racial consciousnesses. Palestine must always be a country of mixed races, and it was likely that the direction of an outside Power would continue to be needed in order to safeguard not merely the interests of the Jews and Arabs but the interests of the whole world in Palestine.”

PALESTINE ADMINISTRATION.—During the year under review, the term of service of the first commissioner for Palestine ended, and on May 21, 1925, Field Marshall Lord Plumer succeeded Sir Herbert Samuel as High Commissioner of Palestine and Commander-in-Chief. In this connection, it is noteworthy that the Zionist organization was not consulted in the appointment of the High Commissioner.

In the fall of 1925 the Government promulgated the order providing for the division of Palestine into two districts for the purpose of administration: the northern district with headquarters at Haifa, and the (Jerusalem)—southern district with headquarters at Jerusalem. With regard to boundaries, the statement made by the British representative,
Mr. Ormsby-Gore, is interesting. He declared that the frontier commission had concluded its work on the frontier between Palestine and Syria, west of the Jordan. East of the Jordan, there was an understanding between the governments of the two mandatory powers which became fairly definite owing to the presence of British troops. As for the boundaries to the east and south, they have not been exactly defined but the right of Transjordania has been asserted during the year over Maan and Akaba in order to make it clear to the Sultan of Negd that he would not be allowed to occupy Maan and Akaba because such occupation would affect the mandated territory of Transjordania.

During the year under review, as during the one that preceded it, Palestine enjoyed perfect tranquillity. Not even the political disturbances of the north affected the peace in Palestine. Law and order were so firmly established that it was possible without the slightest difficulty to withdraw some of the garrison troops. During the deliberations of the seventh meeting of the Permanent Mandates Commission, one member observed that it was particularly notable that at a time when the entire Moslem world was in a state of upheaval, the number of armed attacks had decreased and the courts of law had been re-organized.

With regard to finances, revised estimates of the governments' revenues and expenditures for the year ending March 31, 1925, gave £2,012,000 for the former and £1,781,000 for the latter. In the preceding Survey (See, Vol. 27, p. 130) we noted that the Allied Debt Commission had allotted some $22,500,000 to Palestine as its share of the Ottoman national debt, and that the Palestine government had taken exception to this allotment. In the summer, Prof. Borel,
the arbitrator appointed by the League of Nations, rendered a decision in accordance with which Palestine must pay 2.4% of the Turkish public debt.

During the past year the government finally promulgated the Palestine Citizenship Ordinance of 1925, which came into force August 1, 1925. The ordinance provides that any "Turkish subject" habitually resident in the territory of Palestine upon the first day of August, 1925, shall become a Palestinian citizen unless he opts within two years for Turkish nationality or for the nationality of any other state," and that the "High Commissioner may grant a certificate of naturalization as a Palestinian citizen to any person who makes application therefor and who satisfies him . . . that he has resided in Palestine for a period not less than two years out of the three years immediately preceding the date of his application." The ordinance further states that "the grant of a certificate of naturalization shall be in the absolute discretion of the High Commissioner . . . and no appeal shall lie from his decision."

JEWISH AGENCY AND ZIONIST ORGANIZATION.—In preceding Surveys (See Vol. 26, p. 120 and Vol. 27, p. 130) we outlined the efforts which had been made by the Zionist Organization to secure the coöperation of non-Zionist bodies in the organization of the Jewish Agency, and recorded that in the United States a conference of representative Jews had been held in January, 1924, in New York City, and that later, on March 1, 1925, the so-called Non-Partisan Conference for Palestine met in New York City and adopted important resolutions. In the fall of 1925, Mr. Louis Marshall declared that the American non-Zionists were ready
to carry out their promises given to Dr. Weizmann on his last visit to the United States when the two had discussed the entry of non-Zionist elements in the Agency. Later, the British representative at the sessions of the Permanent Mandates Commission declared that the coöperation between the Jewish Agency and the Palestine administration was making satisfactory progress on both sides.

The two important institutions of the Zionist Organization, namely the Keren Hayesod and the Jewish National Fund, maintained their high record of preceding years. During 1925, the Head Office of the Keren Hayesod received £513,253, of which £266,689 or 52% came from the United States. During the previous year the total collections had amounted to £473,046, including £285,573 or 60% from the United States. The total collected for the Keren Hayesod, since its organization in 1921, is £2,144,371, of which £1,291,092 or 60% came from the United States. As for the Jewish National Fund, statistics for the year 5686 are not yet available. During 5685, the Head Office of the Jewish National Fund, Jerusalem, received £260,336, of which £54,960 or 21% of the total came from the United States, and £60,126 or 23% from Poland, the receipts in that year exceeding those of any other year since the organization of the National Fund.

Colonization, Commerce, and Industry.—The question of State lands for settlement of Jews occupied the attention of the Jews and of the British Government. As in former years, no land was set aside by the government for Jewish settlement during the year under review. On May 20, 1925, the British Government's spokesman in the House
of Lords made the following interesting statement:

"The government estimates that the total area of Palestine was approximately 27,000,000 dunams of land (4.4 dunams equal one acre). Of that number of dunams 14,500,000 are accounted for by towns, villages, railways, roads, the desert in the south and uncultivable lands in other places. Of the 12,500,000 of cultivable land, 9,000,000 dunams were cultivated by Arabs, 850,000 by Jews, and 150,000 by others. Of the 2,500,000 remaining dunams of land probably not more than a million and a half would in any case be available for Jewish settlement, the remainder being made up of small and unsuitable plots of land."

It is interesting to note that of the 9,000,000 dunams of land held by the Arabs, one-third lies fallow each year.

During the fiscal year 1924–1925, over £500,000 were invested by Jews in agricultural undertakings,—£144,000 by the Zionist organization, £172,000 by the Jewish National Fund on the purchase and amelioration of agricultural land, £100,000 for similar purposes by the American Zion Commonwealth, and £150,000 by individual settlers. During the year under review numerous societies were registered with the government for the purpose of promoting agricultural development. We may mention the following: the Haifa Bay Development Company for participation in the development and economic rehabilitation of Haifa, with a capital of £30,000; the Hityashvuth Company for the purpose of assisting the settlement of the Jews on the land and to promote immigration, with a capital of £10,000; the Palestine Mining Syndicate with a capital of £100,000.

Trade continued to develop all through 1925, owing
largely to the new capital brought to the country by Jewish immigrants, according to official statements. In 1925, the volume of trade, it was said, exceeded by almost 50% that of 1923 and by 20% that of 1924. During 1925, imports reached the high figure of £7,532,148, the enormous sum of £2,265,799 more than in the preceding year. Up to this year the highest figure had been £5,471,667 in 1922. Also exports of Palestine products increased, but by comparatively a smaller amount. The value of Palestinian products exported during 1925 was £1,399,524 as against £1,200,812 in the preceding year. On the other hand, re-exports continued to decline and were valued only at £139,713; in 1924, £141,842, and in 1923, £233,973. On the other hand, the export of specie also declined. In 1925 it amounted to £102,145 and in 1924 to £717,275. The imports in transit to Syria were valued for the year 1925 at £71,776, and the exports in transit from Syria at £51,122. This small volume must be explained by the disorders prevailing in Syria. In this connection we note that the Government abolished the duty upon goods exported from the country except on the export of tobacco and of antiquities. Also shipping increased during the year under review. During 1925, 754 steam vessels with a combined tonnage of 1,831,619 tons and 1,718 sailing vessels with a combined tonnage of 27,423 tons entered the ports of Jaffa, Haifa, Acre and Gaza in foreign trade. The number of ships and the tonnage thus exceeded those of 1924, as the latter had exceeded those of 1923. During 1924, only 605 steamers with a combined tonnage of 1,329,575 tons and 1,521 sailing vessels with a combined tonnage of 24,266 tons entered the ports of Palestine.
Complete statistics of the amount of money invested in Palestine by Jews were not available, but in July, 1925, it was estimated that £2,000,000 had been invested by Jews in Palestine industries as compared with £1,000,000, the total estimated in November, 1923. Of that amount, £482,980 had been invested in the industry of building materials, £337,440 in the chemical industry, £383,705 in food-stuff manufacture, £138,000 in textiles, £91,485 in printing and paper, and £73,155 in metal works. It was estimated that £500,000 had been brought by the immigrants to the country during 1924–1925.

During the past year, several new banks were registered with the government, notably the Salonica Palestine Society, a Greek Company with a capital of 1,000,000 drachmae, the Bulgaro-Palestine Bank, with a capital of 5,000,000 levas, and the Erez-Israel-Poland Bank with a capital of £10,000. It was also reported that 19 loan and savings societies were operating in the country having jointly 9,500 members and a combined capital of £145,000.

LABOR.—During the year under review Jewish labor in Palestine continued to develop. In the month of Nissan (April) 5685, there were 16,000 Jewish working men in the country. Of that number 6,000 were engaged in agriculture, 4,783 were employed on public works and in building construction, 4,070 were engaged in transportation, 1,040 were workers in factories at Tel Aviv and at Haifa, and between 2,500 and 3,000 men were laborers at Jewish colonies. This compares well with the previous census taken at the end of 5684 which showed only 11,000 workingmen; and is double the number reported at the end of 5683. On December 31,
1924, the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Erez Israel had 14,835 members.

There was very little unemployment among Jews between October, 1924, and March, 1925, the daily average being only 400 persons. During the two corresponding previous periods, it was 1,600 and 1,000 respectively.

We note the convention held by delegates representing the Zionist Labor Party "Hitahduth," the Zionist Socialist Party "Zeire Zion," the Jewish Socialist Alliance "Poale Zion," the society "Hehaluz," the Alliance of Jewish Youth, and the Executive Committee of the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Palestine which was held at Vienna, September 1, 1925. The convention constituted the second world meeting for the purpose of furthering the interests of labor in Palestine.

Immigration.—The most notable feature of the period under review was the marked increase in the volume of Jewish immigration accompanied by a fall in the number of departures. The number entering the country was 7,421 in 1923, 12,856 in 1924, and 33,801 in 1925, while only 2,141 Jews permanently left the country. During 1925, 17,731 Jews left for Palestine through the Zionist Palestine Offices located in Poland. It was reported that from 1920 to November 30, 1925, the Office at Warsaw had assisted 38,588 emigrants to Palestine: 2,081 in 1920, 4,636 in 1921, 3,053 in 1922, 3,100 in 1923, 7,987 in 1924, and 17,731 in 1925.

The pioneer effort known as the Hehaluz movement continued its work. It was reported that the World Association of the Hehaluz had societies in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Russia, Roumania, Czecho-Slovakia, Austria and
Germany. The central office was located during the past year at Warsaw and it issued a weekly in Hebrew Heatid. Very interesting were the figures reported for the Hehaluz organization in Germany, where on June 1, 1925, the society had 1,003 members, comprising 739 men and 264 women, whereas on February 1, 1923, the society had only 420 members and on March 1, 1924, only 604 members. Of the 1,003 members, 486 were preparing for farming and gardening, 310 for work as locksmiths, smiths, builders, etc., and 207 for mechanics, goldsmiths, bookbinders, compositors, printers, etc. During the first half year of 1925, 263 persons completed their preparation for work in Palestine: 201 boys and 62 girls; during 1924, 276 boys and girls received preparation, and during 1923, 105 boys and girls received preparation.

Early in the fall of 1925 the Palestine Government promulgated the Immigration Ordinance of 1925 which took effect September 1, 1925. The regulations do not, however, differ materially from those in force before.

**EDUCATION.**—Complete statistics of the status of education in Palestine for the year 5686 are not available. In 5685, the number of pupils of educational institutions in the country was 58,074, comprising 21,635 Moslems, 21,454 Jews, and 14,985 Christians. Of the 58,074 pupils, 38,910 attended non-government schools and 19,164 attended government schools. The latter schools, it is noteworthy, were attended by only 19 Jews and 2,151 Christians, the bulk of the pupils, 16,994, being Moslems. Thus practically all the Jewish children and most of the Christian children received their education at private schools; while only 4,641
Moslems received their education in such schools. Noteworthy was also the sex distribution of the pupils,—37,315 of the total being boys and 20,759 girls. Of the latter 10,127 were Jews, 6,476 were Christians, while only 4,156 were Moslems; 17,419 of the total of 21,435 Moslem children were thus boys, 11,327 were Jewish boys and 8,590 were Christian boys, the percentages being 53% boys and 47% girls for the Jews, 57% boys and 43% girls for the Christians, and 81% boys and 19% girls for the Moslems.

Mention was made above of the complaint by the Zionist Organization of the lack of state subsidies for Jewish schools. We add here that the British representative stated at the session of the Mandates Commission that if strong representations were made, the government would consider the question of establishing schools in which instruction would be given in Hebrew, but that at present, both Jews and Christians prefer to pay for their own schools. The representative felt urged to conclude his remarks by stating that the first and most important point was to educate the very large population of illiterate Moslems. He also declared that the government was spending £103,000 per annum for education, which was the maximum at the present time for the budget of a country like Palestine.

Public Health.—Complete statistics bearing on public health work during 1925 are not available. In 1924 the government spent £91,000 for promoting public health. Of the two Jewish health agencies in the country, namely the Hadassah and the Kuppath Holim, the Hadassah Medical Organization during 1925 maintained 5 hospitals, one each at Jaffa, Safed, Jerusalem, Tiberias and Haifa.
The Kuppath Holim of the Jewish Federation of Labor, which is the Jewish workingmen's sick benefit fund, had 13,077 members on September 30, 1925, an increase of 4,926 over the preceding year.

During the past year the two health organizations mentioned above rendered medical aid to refugees from Syria through their offices at the Jewish colonies Metullah and Kephar Gileadi on the border of Syria. The work of the Hadassah was lauded by the Mandates Commission.

COMMUNAL ORGANIZATION.—The past year witnessed a great deal of agitation in the matter of organization of the communities. The Mandates Commission also showed its interest in this subject. At the sessions of the Commission, the British representative stated that the chief object was to grant communities civil government within the strict limitation of their own personal law, that is to say, the communities could regulate such matters as marriage, divorce, disputes about wills, etc. He explained at the sessions of the Permanent Mandates Commission that there was a large number of religious communities in Palestine. It was, therefore, considered desirable to adopt a system to apply to all religious communities in question. The measures contemplated would not affect the political rights of the population but would merely aim at organizing the various religious communities in a manner which would leave them free to settle such questions as marriage, divorce, inheritance etc., according to the tenets of their own faith. As for the Jews, he declared that it was the British idea that their community should also be organized sufficiently to be able to regulate the cultural developments of the Jews, and it should
be sufficiently representative of the Jewish population to enable it to constitute a Vaad Leumi or representative body, to deal with many questions, including certain aspects of education. The British government met with difficulties owing to the fact that the Jewish population is not homogeneous in regard to religious practices.

In the report of the Mandates Commission to the Council of the League of Nations, as mentioned above, the Commission expressed the hope that the British administration would not interfere with the freedom of conscience of the Ashkenazic Community. The latter's petition to the Commission had declared that orthodox Jewry in Palestine had met difficulties in organizing its communal life. The orthodox Jewry in Jerusalem organized itself, upon the occupation of Palestine by the British forces, into a separate community and it declined to unite in the organization of the community with another section of Jews, which at that time had organized a Jewish community together with irreleigious Jews on secular and national principles alone. This Ashkenazic community numbers 1,600 heads of families. The proposed statute for the organization of Jewish communities in Palestine, their petition averred, threatens the existence of the orthodox community and deprives them of "freedom of religion and conscience and endangers the possibility of observing religion in communal life in Palestine in the future. The said statute already contains clauses which are against Jewish morals and religion, such as giving women active and passive right of election, which is not practised in any existing Jewish community." The memorandum calls attention to the fact that the community had previously submitted a draft of a statute prepared by the "Center of the
World Agudath Israel Organization," and requests that if the League of Nations cannot further the adoption of this draft, it should at least further the organization of a Jewish community in Palestine, so that the orthodox element may be given the right to organize separate communities "in a manner entirely independent of other communities." In addition, the memorandum mentioned four specific grievances, namely, (1) that the Jewish community in Jerusalem has prohibited the Ashkenazic community to establish its own abattoir; (2) that their members were forced to pay a Mazzah tax which the members of the Ashkenazic communities have not approved; (3) that the Ashkenazic community was forced to be subjected to the other community in all matters of certificates; and finally (4) that the Ashkenazic community was forbidden the practice of using the name of "'the Council of the Ashkenazic community' for the reason that the government cannot recognize more than one community in a town."

The recommendation in the report of the Mandates Commission was generally regarded by the Jewish press as a complete victory for the Ashkenazic community over the majority community headed by the Chief Rabbinate and possessing the institution of the Representative Assembly. It is however instructive to note the explanations given by the British representative and to read in their light the recommendation of the Commission. The British representative stated that it was impossible to have two completely separate Jewish communities in one country, for this would lead to chaos. There should be one community with a sub-community set up within, if desired. He declared further that his government had approved an ordinance empowering the
High Commissioner for Palestine to make regulations providing for the religious communities in Palestine. Hence, if after the enactment of this ordinance, the Jewish community in Palestine would apply for recognition by the government of Palestine, the government would draw up regulations suitable for that community, and the representations made by the Ashkenazic Jewish community would be borne in mind. The following statement is especially noteworthy. "The British representative stated that he would convey to the British government the observations made by M. Rappard to the effect that it was necessary for a community to be established with power to deal with civil matters bearing on religious questions, and that, in the establishment of that community, the views of the majority should prevail over those of the minority. A provision might, however, be inserted in the ordinance that if in a community a certain section of Jews feel it to be against their conscience to submit to the control of the majority in such matters as ritual slaughtering of animals, it should be free to slaughter its own animals in its own way at its own cost."

Late in the fall the second Assembly of Delegates was convened in Palestine. The Jerusalem Ashkenazic Community protested to Baron Plumer against this Asephath ha-Nibharim, claiming that the Assembly did not represent the Jews in Palestine inasmuch as members in sympathy with the Jerusalem Ashkenazic Community did not participate in the elections.

Early in 1926, the draft of the Religious Communities Organization Ordinance of 1926, was published. The order reads in part as follows:

"If any Religious Community in Palestine makes applica-
tion under this Ordinance, the High Commissioner and Executive Council may, with the approval of one of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, make, and, when made, vary or revoke regulations for its organization as a religious community and its recognition as such by the Government of Palestine." Further, "Separate regulations shall be made in each case, suited to the special circumstances and organization of the Community concerned." The order provided that the "Regulations may provide for the constitution of religious and cultural Councils or Boards of the Community which shall have the capacity to acquire and hold property . . . may bestow upon the Councils or Boards power to impose upon the members of the community contributions or fees for communal purposes which shall be recoverable in the same way as municipal taxes and fees . . . [and] may provide that any Ottoman decree or regulation relating to matters falling under this Ordinance shall cease to have effect in Palestine."