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TWENTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING

NOVEMBER 9, 1930

The Twenty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Jewish Committee was held at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on Sunday, November 9, 1930. Doctor Cyrus Adler, President of the Committee, called the meeting to order.

The following members were present:

District Members:

District

VII. Max Adler, Bernard Horwich, Chicago.
VIII. David Philipson, Cincinnati.
IX. Cyrus Adler, Justin P. Allman, B. L. Levinthal, Horace Stern, Philadelphia.
X. Edward N. Calisch, Richmond.
XI. Jacob Asher, Worcester; Edward M. Chase, Manchester; Henry Lasker, Springfield; Samuel E. Paulive, Chelsea; Archibald Silverman, Providence; Isidore Wise, Hartford.
XIII. Moses F. Aufsesser, Albany; Benjamin Stolz, Syracuse.
XIV. A. J. Dimond, East Orange; Philip Dimond, Paterson; William Newcorn, Plainfield; Oscar L. Wein­garten, Newark.

Members-at-Large:

Delegates from Organizations:

Council of Young Israel and Young Israel Organizations: Edward S. Silver.

Hadasah: Mrs. David de Sola Pool.

Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society: John L. Bernstein, Harry Fischel, Abraham Herman, Jacob Massel, Albert Rosenblatt.


Independent Order Free Sons of Israel: Solon J. Liebeskind.

Jewish Welfare Board: Joseph Rosenzweig.

Order of the United Hebrew Brothers: Meyer Greenberg.

Rabbincal Assembly of the Jewish Theological Seminary: Louis Finkelstein.

United Roumanian Jews of America: Herman Speier, Leo Wolfson.

United Synagogue of America: Nathan Levy.

Appointment of Committees

The President appointed the following Committees:

On Auditing the Accounts of the Treasurer: William Newcorn and Archibald Silverman.


Presentation of Annual Report

The Executive Committee presented its report for the past year. On motion, duly seconded, it was resolved that the report be accepted, approved and published.

The Secretary presented a report of his recent trip to various European countries. (See pp. 382–399, post.

Resolution on Palestine

Upon motion, duly made and seconded, the resolution protesting against the new policy in respect of Palestine,
announced by the British Government on October 20, 1930, submitted by the Executive Committee in its Annual Report,* was unanimously adopted.

**Amendment of the By-Laws**

Upon motion, duly made and seconded, the recommendation of the Executive Committee that Article V of the By-Laws be amended so as to increase the maximum number of Members-at-Large from 20 to 30 was unanimously agreed to.

**Elections**

The Committee on Nominations recommended the election of the following:

For Officers:
- President: Cyrus Adler.
- Vice-Presidents: Julius Rosenwald and Irving Lehman.

For Members of the Executive Committee to Serve for Three Years from January 1, 1931:
- Cyrus Adler
- David M. Bressler
- James H. Becker
- Abram I. Elkus
- Eli Frank

It was regularly moved and seconded that the Secretary be requested to cast one ballot for the nominees of the Committee on Nominations, which he did, and announced the election of the several nominees.

The Secretary was requested to cast one ballot for the nominees for memberships-at-large, suggested by the Executive Committee in its Annual Report, which he did, and announced the election of the several nominees.

**Report of Tellers**

The tellers reported that they had canvassed the ballots cast for district members, and that the candidates of the committee appointed to nominate persons to fill existing vacancies, or to succeed members whose terms had expired, had received a plurality of the votes cast, and were, therefore, elected to membership. (For the names of those members elected, see pages 339-342.)

*See pp. 368-369, *post.*
REPORT OF AUDITING COMMITTEE

The Committee on Auditing the Accounts of the Treasurer reported that it had duly audited these accounts and had found them to be correct.

REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Standing Advisory Committee on Finance, reported that this Committee had held a meeting this morning and had agreed to submit the following report and recommendations:

Analysis of the financial situation of the Committee discloses the fact that though our fiscal year ended on October 31st with a balance of $1,650, the Committee's financial prospects for the new fiscal year are anything but encouraging. Our success in coming through the past year without a deficit was due to the precautions taken in the early part of the year to secure extra contributions largely in the form of one-time donations from about eighty friends of the Committee. We actually sustained a loss in regular contributions of nearly $20,000 unquestionably due nearly entirely to the severe economic experiences of the past year. Unless general economic conditions improve during the coming year, we apprehend a further substantial loss of this kind. Our total receipts during the past year were about $60,000. This amount is $40,000 less than the amount, namely, $100,000, which Mr. Louis Marshall and his associates on the Executive Committee established as the minimum budgetary requirement of the Committee to enable us to do our work effectively.

Though we still believe that the sum of $100,000 reflects the adequate budgetary needs of the Committee, this objective must be deferred until after a resumption of normal business conditions. Continuing the strict economies of past year, we believe that the sum of $60,000 is the minimum with which we can live during the year which has just commenced. From an analysis of our membership records, and anticipating a further contraction in the number of our regular contributors and amounts of their contributions, we estimate a possible further loss of $30,000. Experience in fund-raising efforts by non-local organizations during the
past six months has indicated the futility of attempting to make up this loss by an appeal to the Jewish community at large. In the judgment of your committee, the situation is one in which we shall have to depend upon the particular interest and support of the Corporate Members of the Committee. On the assumption, therefore, that we shall require $30,000 in new money (over and above what we reasonably expect in 1931 from our regular contributors) the members of your Finance Committee who met this morning unanimously recommend that the corporate membership of the Committee assume the responsibility of securing new members or increased contributions from present sustaining members in the proportionate quotas which, in our opinion, will be equitably predicated on the basis of population and other pertinent factors.

The task divided in this way should, in our opinion, impose a trifling burden upon the members of each district. We recommend, therefore, that the secretary be instructed to communicate as soon as possible with the corporate members in their respective districts informing them of the situation and of the quota for their district and conveying the resolution of this body requesting their cooperation, and that the corporate members of each district shall jointly underwrite the amount of their respective quota and determine in their discretion how and where within the district the funds shall be raised. While it would be preferable to secure the new funds in the form of regular annual contributions, it may be more difficult to secure them than one-time contributions and it should be made clear that one-time donations, to enable the Committee to tide over the present emergency, will be most acceptable. If all the corporate members of the Committee do their share now, a critical situation will be avoided, and the efforts of the Executive Committee and the secretariat will be left free to deal with the serious problems confronting them without the distraction incident to raising the funds to carry on.

The members of your Finance Committee whose names appear below move the adoption of the foregoing recommendations:

Lewis L. Strauss, New York City, Chairman
Max Adler, Chicago
REPORT OF AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

JUSTIN P. ALLMAN, Philadelphia
Moses AufSesser, Albany
David M. Bressler, New York City
Elias A. Cohen, New York City
A. J. Dimond, Newark
Philip Dimond, Paterson
Harry Fischel, New York City
Joseph J. Klein, New York City
Henry Lasker, Springfield
Archibald Silverman, Providence
Oscar L. Weingarten, Newark
Isidore Wise, Hartford
Herbert J. Hannoich, Newark

Upon motion, duly seconded, the report and recommendations of the Finance Committee were approved and adopted.

Upon motion, the meeting adjourned.

Morris D. Waldman,
Secretary.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

To the Members of the American Jewish Committee:

Your Executive Committee begs leave to present a brief outline of the more important of the matters to which its attention has been given since your last meeting.

A. DOMESTIC MATTERS

1. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

These subjects continued during the past year to enlist the close attention of your Executive Committee. In harmony with our established policy, we have carefully watched the course of immigration legislation in Congress in order to take all proper steps to prevent the passage of laws which, in our view, may result in injustice or unreasonable hardship to immigrants into the United States, even though the pro-
portion of Jews among such immigrants has been drastically cut as a result of the operation of the immigration law of 1924. The work in this connection was ably and conscientiously supervised by Mr. Kohler, Chairman of the Standing Advisory Committee on Immigration.

Your Committee has been represented at hearings before the Committees on Immigration and Naturalization of both the House of Representatives and the Senate,

(a) in support of proposed legislation for humanizing the operation of existing immigration laws, particularly in the matter of separation of families, and
(b) in opposition to proposed legislation for the registration of aliens.

In connection with the latter, Mr. Kohler, published a pamphlet, "The Registration of Aliens, a Dangerous Project." Especially in connection with immigration legislation, your Committee has enjoyed the cooperation of other national organizations affiliated with the Committee, in all parts of the country, who recognized that the proposed registration of aliens, whether compulsory or voluntary, is bound to lead to their oppression, thus retarding their Americanization, and that, to be really effective, the scheme must eventually be extended to naturalized and native-born citizens, subjecting them to annoyance and possibly even persecution, besides infringing their natural and constitutional rights.

Although several attempts to have the Senate pass a voluntary registration bill were made, none of the many measures embodying this proposal was adopted during the past session of the Congress. In conjunction with other organizations, Jewish and non-Jewish, holding similar views on this question, the Committee will continue to watch the situation and to be ready to take such action as may appear advisable.

Early in the year, the attention of your Committee was called to the fact that the Bureau of Naturalization in the Department of Labor had issued a new form of preliminary application for applicants for naturalization and also for "Registry of Aliens," in which the innovation was introduced of requiring the latter to state not only their nationality, as required by law, but also their "race." Knowing
that much confusion would result from efforts to answer this inquiry, believing that information as to an applicant's "race" may at times be prejudicial to his rights, and convinced that such information is not required by law, your Committee appointed a sub-committee, consisting of Mr. Kohler, Judge Stern, and Mr. Lewis L. Strauss, to confer with the Secretary of Labor, with whom they left a comprehensive memorandum on the subject, which is printed as an Appendix to this report. The Secretary of Labor declared that if it were a fact that the racial classification of applicants for naturalization was not required by law, it will be discontinued. Subsequently, your Committee was informed that upon the advice of the Solicitor of the Department, the Secretary had decided to eliminate from the application form the question as to "race."

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives at the last session, by a divided vote, reported favorably a bill to increase the educational requirements for naturalization materially, including the requirement of a test in American history. This was done without any general hearing on the measure, one of the naturalization officials alone being heard. This measure, if passed, will enormously decrease the number that can be naturalized. In fact, the senior U. S. District Judge in New York City stated publicly that he believed that the requirement for a test in American history would reduce the number now capable of being naturalized by more than 80%. More serious for the time being than the citizenship matter involved is the fact that by far the largest number of wives and minor children of the "new immigrants" are now admitted to this country by reason of their relationship to such "husband" and "father" citizen, because of the very small quotas assigned to "non-Nordic" countries. Nor does the right to vote necessarily attach to citizenship, as a number of our states have a literacy test for first voters.

2. JEWS AND CRIME

Toward the end of 1929, a great deal of discussion was evoked by statements made by a judge of the District Court of Washington, D. C. The speaker, a Jew, in the course of a Hanukkah address, stated that Judaism is confronted today
with a situation requiring Maccabean courage, and went on to explain that he referred to "the crime wave—the Jewish crime wave." He then added: "Almost overnight we seem to have produced far more than our share of criminals of every class and description..." These statements, given prominence in the press of Washington, aroused indignation there and in other parts of the country. With a view to furnishing the public with actual facts, the Committee issued to the press statistics which it had gathered in 1926, covering the decade from 1917 to that year. These showed that, whereas Jews comprised over 27% of the population of New York City, but 19% of the inmates of the city's penal institutions during the decade were Jews, and that, whereas Jews constituted a little over 16% of the population of the state as a whole, not more than 10% of the inmates of state penal institutions during the period were Jews. That the judge's charge was inaccurate was shown also by evidence from other quarters. It is, of course, to be deplored that even a single Jew commits a crime against the state, for in so doing, he also sins against the Jewish Law which holds that "the law of the State is law."

3. Anti-Jewish Manifestations

The Committee's attention was called to the fact that the Bradstreet Company was using in certain regions of the country an information blank on which the "racial" extraction of applicants for credit was to be noted and on which investigators were asked to state whether this was "American, Negro, Hebrew, Greek, Italian, etc." The Committee communicated with the officers of the Bradstreet Company, who stated that these blanks are no longer official and that the company will see to it that their use is discontinued.

A sustaining member of the Committee reported that, in reply to an inquiry, he had received from the Foster Travel Service a letter stating that a certain hotel in Bermuda "reserved accommodations for Gentiles only." Replying for the Foster and Reynolds Company, to whose attention the offensive character of this statement was called, Ward G. Foster, the President, stated that this assertion was made in direct violation of the rules of the company and
that the manager responsible for this violation would be reprimanded.

The Committee protested also against the publication in a monthly periodical issued at Jacksonville, Fla., of a virulently anti-Semitic article, and has been informed that the editors have expressed their regret at the incident and have stated that the article in question does not reflect their views and that they will so state in a future issue of the periodical.

The Committee also took action in connection with an advertisement appearing in a Miami newspaper, in which, in a list of apartments advertised for rent, several were stated to be for "Gentiles only." A correspondent of the Committee received assurances from the representative of the publishers that all possible steps would be taken to prevent such advertising in the future.

In this connection, the Committee has made an investigation to determine which of the States have laws prohibiting the denial of accommodations in places of public resort on the basis of race or creed. This inquiry disclosed the fact that of the 48 States, 19 have such laws, and that in all but 3 cases, the laws are so drawn as more or less effectively to discourage this form of discrimination; 29 States, however, have no such laws. Your Committee will take under consideration the advisability of an effort to secure this kind of legislation in these States, and of having existing legislation in states other than New York follow the laws of the latter state, as amended to cover the advertising of such discrimination, and to permit penalty actions to be sued for in the district of plaintiff's residence (Laws of New York of 1913 pages 481-2; Laws of 1918 pages 812-4). The New York statute has been held to apply even to schools advertising for pupils (McKaine vs. Drake Business School, Inc., 107 Miscellaneous Reports 241), and makes discrimination a misdemeanor.

The recent action of the Philadelphia Real Estate Board is encouraging. Its attention having been drawn to the fact that a certain piece of property being advertised for sale bore a sign stating that it would be sold to Gentiles only, the Board adopted a resolution reading in part as follows:

"Whereas, such discrimination in our opinion is prejudicial to the promotion of the best American principles, which are based upon
fairness and equity as to all citizens, irrespective of their race or creed, and is therefore to be condemned and deprecated;

“Therefore be it resolved, that we, the Board of Directors of the Philadelphia Real Estate Board in monthly meeting assembled, hereby depurate such practices as un-American, prejudicial and opposed to the promotion of the best feeling among all our citizens toward each other, and counsel the discontinuance of such practice.”

Probably the most widespread and discouraging manifestation of racial and religious intolerance as against Jews is the practice of employers to deny employment to Jewish applicants, without regard to their experience, past record, or fitness for the positions they seek. Since the inception of the Committee, this phenomenon has been discussed by your Executive Committee, and, from time to time, when complaints of such discrimination were submitted to it, the Committee has taken action whenever action seemed advisable, especially when such discrimination was shown to have been practiced by a governmental, quasi-governmental, or public service agency. Because of the many subterfuges which are employed by those wishing to deny work to Jews, and the great difficulty of securing direct evidence that such discrimination is practiced, the problem of combatting it is one of extreme delicacy. Several years ago, the office of the Committee cooperated with a Christian agency in a study, on a small scale, of the practice, which brought out many interesting facts, especially as to the “reasons” for discrimination. This study appeared to indicate that a wider investigation, aimed particularly at ascertaining, if possible, the extent to which the discrimination is practiced, especially by public or quasi-public agencies, may prove of value in helping to determine the most effective method of coping with the subject. During the past year, your Committee discussed the proposal for a comprehensive study, in cooperation with other national Jewish organizations, for which preliminary steps have been taken.

While your Committee recognizes that the situation in respect of this employment discrimination is serious, it does not regard it with pessimism; it certainly does not justify the desperate conclusion that “the normal absorption of Jews within the American economic structure is practically impossible.” The facts already at hand appear to indicate
that it is a baseless generalization, and that the direct contrary is true, namely, that the Jews are not only being absorbed within the American economic structure, but have also done a great deal in the direction of strengthening and expanding that structure itself.

Though no complete study of the occupations of Jews in the United States has as yet been made, a recent study by the American Jewish Committee of occupations of Jews in New York City, where nearly one-half of all the Jews of the United States live, disclosed the following, as printed in the Committee's volume, "Jewish Communal Organizations of the Jews of the United States":

"In connection with the section on economic-philanthropic organizations, the membership of a number of trade unions in the City of New York, some belonging to the United Hebrew Trades and others not affiliated with that body, was analyzed with a view to determining the number of Jews engaged in certain industries. The unions so investigated included those of workers in the following industries: food preparation and distribution, clothing, leather, building, transportation and communication, printing, amusement, jewelry and ornament; two unions of retail salesmen workers, and 4 miscellaneous trade unions were also examined. The 50 unions investigated had, in July 1929, a total of 392,652 members, of whom 134,020 were Jews (34.13%)."

There are, of course, many Jews engaged in other forms of manual labor, including common labor, and it may not be unreasonable to assume that a study extended to Jews in other occupations would indicate similar proportions. This investigation disclosed the fact that 34.13% of all working-men engaged in the trades mentioned were Jews. Over against this, it is significant to observe that the Jewish population of the City of New York constitutes 29.56%, i.e., in these forms of manual labor the proportion of Jews exceeds the non-Jewish population by 15.5%. Incidentally, it may be of interest to refer here to the facts disclosed in the study, "The Jews in the United States," also made by the American Jewish Committee, showing that Jews are living in nearly 10,000 places, of which 4,000 are towns and villages having a population of 2,000 souls or less, and 3,000 of these places are rural districts. Indeed, there are over 75,000 Jews engaged in farming and their number is constantly increasing. It is obvious that there is no occupation in which the
Jews are not engaged and in most of which they are not proportionately represented.

This penetration into the manual trades is especially noteworthy in view of the fact that so large a proportion of these workingmen or their immigrant parents had not been engaged in industrial occupations in their native lands, having been legally and otherwise repressively prevented from engaging in many such occupations. This would certainly indicate that the very reverse is true, namely, that America's economic structure is absorbing Jews to a highly satisfactory degree.

4. Statistical Department

The Statistical Department of the Committee under the direction of Dr. H. S. Linfield, was occupied, during the past year, in gathering and classifying information of Jewish interest. It prepared for the American Jewish Year Book the directories and lists and the article on statistics of Jews, which are published in Volume 32 of that series. In connection with the statistical article, the Department prepared, on the basis of the latest official census reports, interesting and valuable supplements on the number, distribution, and social and economic condition of the Jews of Danzig, Germany, Hungary, the Irish Free State, Latvia, and Lithuania. The preparation of these supplements involved a great amount of research work. The Director of the Department also prepared for presentation before the National Conference of Jewish Social Service a paper giving an exhaustive treatment of post-war Jewish migration, with particular emphasis upon the change of policy regarding immigration and emigration in various countries.

5. The American Jewish Year Book

Volume 32 of the American Jewish Year Book, the 23rd of the series prepared in the office of, and edited for the Committee, was edited, as were the eleven preceding issues, by Mr. Harry Schneiderman, the Assistant Secretary. It contains a biographical sketch of Louis Marshall by Doctor Adler, and a comprehensive review of the events of Jewish
interest in various countries during the past year, by the editor. Besides these special features, the volume includes the usual directories of organizations, lists, and statistics of Jewish population and immigration, all carefully revised, as well as the 23rd Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee.

6. **Cooperation With Other Organizations**

During the year, the Committee has kept in close touch with other Jewish organizations, particularly those which are represented in the Committee by delegates. The aid which many of these bodies rendered in connection with immigration legislation has already been mentioned. From time to time, these societies have referred matters, outside of their special purview, to the Committee for attention.

In this connection, it will be recalled that in its preceding report, your Committee described the preliminary steps taken in pursuance of a resolution adopted in June 1929 by the American Jewish Congress, favoring a conference with representatives of that body and of your Committee, "to the end that sorely needed unity of action with respect to Jewish problems may be effected."

On January 11th last, a conference was held between a committee representing the American Jewish Committee, consisting of Judges Lehman and Stern, Doctor Adler, Mr. Bressler and the Secretary, with a special committee of the American Jewish Congress. The conferees agreed to recommend to their respective organizations that the President of the Committee and the President of the Congress, at such times as they feel cooperation may be advisable, shall call upon the other and discuss with him the appointment by both of committees to decide upon a joint policy and to make such arrangements as they can agree upon for joint action, except at such times as the Presidents, of the two bodies may find it possible to agree upon a joint policy and action without resorting to the appointment of committees. This agreement has been ratified by both organizations.

In April, without any preliminary conversation between the Presidents of the two organizations, contemplated in the agreement, your Committee received an invitation from the Congress to send representatives to a conference of Jewish
organizations to discuss the report of the British Commission of Inquiry into the ant-Jewish uprisings in Palestine in the summer of 1929. Inasmuch as your Committee has established the policy that the Jewish Agency for Palestine, representing all shades of opinion in America interested in Palestine, and being a world organization, is competent to deal with Palestinian matters, the Committee will at no time intervene in such matters unless invited to do so by the Agency, and for this reason the invitation of the Congress was declined.

Some weeks later, the Congress suggested a conference on the Jewish situation in Russia, to which your Executive Committee agreed, but in view of the inability of members of your Committee, because of absence from the country and other causes, to attend, the proposed conference has not yet been held.

B. FOREIGN MATTERS

In view of the fact that a comprehensive review of the important events of Jewish interest in all countries during the past year, written by the Assistant Secretary of the Committee, is published in the current volume of the American Jewish Year Book, we shall restrict this section of our report to those countries in connection with which your Committee has been more or less active during the past year.

In order to enable the Committee to be currently and accurately informed concerning conditions in Central and Eastern European countries, your Committee authorized the Secretary to visit these countries during the past summer. As he was on the point of departing, new disorders in Roumania were reported in the press, and the Secretary visited that country first. He will present later a brief report of his observations. The President of the Committee and Mr. Felix M. Warburg, a member of the Executive Committee, were in Europe during the past summer and also had opportunity to observe conditions there.

1. ROUMANIA

The hopes of many Jews in Roumania and well-informed observers in other countries, that with the coming into
power of the National Peasant Party, headed by Dr. Julius Maniu, better times were in store, proved baseless during the past year. In its report to the Annual Meeting in November 1928, in referring to the change of government, your Committee said: “It is believed that whatever the result may be, the machinations of anti-Semitism will be curbed and the spirit of the Minorities Treaties will be upheld.” Subsequent events, however, have not borne out this optimistic prediction.

In the preceding report, we referred to the new law for the organization of the Jewish community of Roumania, which had been introduced by the Government without consultation with Jewish religious or communal leaders, and which met with a storm of opposition, because its effect was to destroy the unified type community organization established by law during the preceding administration. On June 26, 1929, a congress of Roumanian Jewish communities adopted an energetic protest against the proposed measure. Nevertheless, the Government pressed the bill to passage, grudgingly accepting, at the last moment, an amendment providing that the communities be consulted before the regulations for enacting the law be drafted.

Although it had, on first coming into power, shown the intention to suppress student anti-Jewish agitation, the Government soon relaxed its severity. In September, 1929, it authorized a Christian students’ meeting at Putna, which was attended by anti-Jewish disorders, including attacks on Jewish travelers on the railways, and on Jewish shopkeepers in various places through which the students passed. The Government’s efforts to investigate these disorders were merely perfunctory. The Government issued a statement that reports of these disorders were exaggerated. In November, a students’ congress was again authorized to be held early in December at Craiova, on the agenda of which was the numerus clausus, and at which inflammatory anti-Jewish speeches were made. These were defended in Parliament by the Minister of Education as healthy outgrowths of the exuberance of the youth of Roumania; the Government’s support of the congress was justified by him on the ground that the money given by the Government to the students’ organizations was contributed by the people of
Roumania to their own children. "If our young people," said M. Costacescu, "in the heat of debate, overstep the limit, it is, after all, something to their honor." Neither this congress nor the celebration on December 10th of the anniversary of the congress at which the demand for a numerus clausus had been first made was approved by the university authorities. These two functions were followed by student disorders at Cluj, Timisoara, and Maresti; in Bucharest, students broke into a Masonic Temple, causing damage. Later in December, anti-Jewish disturbances occurred at the University of Jassy, when the authorities rejected the demand of a group of Christian students for a numerus clausus; Jewish students were insulted and beaten while professors stood by without attempting to intervene. At the same time, the Government felt compelled to ask Nahum Sokolow, vice-president of the World Zionist Organization, to forego an intended visit to Jassy, because it feared that his coming would intensify existing trouble. Two of the students of the university were expelled, and the right of the Christian Students' League to function was withdrawn because members of the League had participated in the disorders. When the Jassy University fracas was discussed in Parliament, the Minister of Justice explained that while the Government deeply deplores and condemns, such incidents, yet anti-Semitic activity, so long as it is confined to agitation, enjoys liberty of the press and of assembly like other movements.

Anti-Jewish outbreaks were not confined to the universities, although students were often the instigators of such disorders. The maltreatment of Jewish passengers on railway trains, a favorite sport of the Christian students, has already been referred to. In one case, a Jew who pulled the train emergency cord when attacked was fined for doing so. In December, students invaded the National Theatre in Bucharest and interrupted the performance of a French play because the leading part was taken by a Jewish actress.

Your Committee was deeply disappointed by the reports of these incidents, and your President accepted the opportunity to discuss the conditions in Roumania in general with Mr. Charles A. Davila, Roumanian Minister to the United States, when the latter, accompanied by the Counsellor of
the Legation, called upon Doctor Adler in New York City on December 18th last. Mr. David M. Bressler was also present.

Mr. Davila said that his predecessor at Washington on a number of occasions had useful conferences with the late President of the American Jewish Committee, Louis Marshall, and that it was his desire, on behalf of the Legation, to renew and continue this useful contact with the Committee. Various matters relating to the situation of the Jews in Roumania were discussed. Dr. Adler pointed out that the Jewish Community Law had brought to this country (and also to other countries) reverberations indicating that the large majority of Jewish people in Roumania were opposed to it and had not been consulted prior to the adoption of the law. Dr. Adler expressed the hope that the Minister would be in position in the near future to give assurance that a Congress of Jewish Communities in Roumania would be called for the purpose of giving them an opportunity to express their views on the subject.

Further matters relating to the economic situation of the Jews and possibilities for credit were discussed and Mr. Davila said that he would make inquiries on the subject.

With regard to the recent reports of disorders, Mr. Davila declared that according to advices he had received from his government, the students' congress in Craiova had passed without any disturbances whatever. He also stated that the incidents at Cluj and Timisoara had not been provoked by the students' organization. Strong measures have been taken by the government to suppress anti-Semitic riots. Armed forces had been used in Cluj to re-establish order. The students who had forced entrance into the Free Mason Temple of the Grand Orient in Bucharest had been expelled from the University. He also stated that he would be glad to inform his government of the feeling which exists in America, that the Jewish community in Roumania should be given opportunity of freely managing its own religious, charitable, and cultural affairs.

During the early months of 1930, the situation showed signs of improvement, but in May, new reports of excesses again caused anxiety. The anti-Semitic party in Roumania intensified their propaganda activities. Agitators toured the
rural sections promising the peasants that an anti-Semitic government would confiscate the property of all Jews and divide it among the farmers. These and other inflammatory speeches could not but result in violence, and the Jews in the villages began to suffer from attacks by the peasants with whom they had been living amicably; several cases of incendiariism were reported. In one of these villages something out of the ordinary occurred. A party of students returning from Roman after a by-election, at which Professor Alexander Cuza, the notorious anti-Semitic leader, had been elected to Parliament, while passing through Targu Frumos, attempted to organize an anti-Jewish riot, but were severely cudgelled by some Jewish young men. The latter were arrested and given such scandalous treatment at the hands of the local police, that the Government felt compelled to suspend the prefect of police.

After reports of these and a number of similar incidents had been received here, your President considered it advisable to communicate with the Roumanian Legation, and on May 23, 1930, the following telegram was dispatched:

"For some time past we have received disturbing reports of attacks upon the Jewish population in various sections of Roumania. Within the past few days we have received reports of serious outbreaks in Transylvania resulting in physical violence aggravated by reports of failure of authorities to prevent repression of these occurrences. Our Committee would greatly appreciate your informing us whether you have information on this subject and if not whether in accordance with the personal and official assurances to us of His Excellency, Mr. Davila, you will be good enough to communicate by cable immediately with your Government for reliable information. Our Committee and constituencies are greatly disturbed over these reports, we are filled with anxiety as to the state of insecurity prevailing among our brethren in your country and would appreciate receiving reliable information of recent occurrences and present situation."

In the absence of Mr. Davila, the Minister, a charge d'affaires replied to the effect that the reports were exaggerated and the Government was vigorously suppressing all disorders. But reports of anti-Jewish incidents continued; and your Committee thereupon requested the Secretary, who, as has already been mentioned, had been authorized to make a survey of European conditions, to proceed first to Roumania.
Hope for improvement was reawakened with the return of Prince Carol, and his accession to the throne. Pronouncements by him and by M. Maniu, who, after a brief retirement returned to the post of Premier, indicated a sincere desire to suppress anti-Jewish violence. But, almost simultaneously with these benevolent declarations, a violent agitation was going on in the southern districts of Bukovina, attacks occurred at many places, and for a long time a state of terror existed among the Jews of this district.

Later there was much dissatisfaction with the Government’s tardiness in the matter of indemnifying the victims of a fire at Borsha, and subsequently with the pitifully inadequate appropriation voted.

Jewish leaders in Roumania complain against the Government on other grounds. They charge that it has failed to keep its promise to establish a Jewish teachers' seminary, urgently needed to train teachers for Jewish schools closed by previous cabinets; that the Ministry of Education has reduced the number of hours devoted to Hebrew or Yiddish in Jewish schools; that the full amount of subventions voted for Jewish religious institutions has not been paid; that the government has established the requirement that no persons may teach in Jewish schools who have not successfully completed a course in normal school—a requirement which is tantamount to the dismissal of practically all the teachers in these schools; that Jews are discriminated against in civil service employment; that Jewish officials, particularly in Bukovina and Transylvania, where, under Austro-Hungarian rules, not a few Jews held government posts, are dismissed on the flimsiest pretexts; that the War Ministry has forbidden the employment of Jews in military offices; that the law providing for religious instruction for Jewish pupils in state schools is not being enforced; that the Government is delaying the settlement of the political status of thousands of Jews who are not yet citizens of Roumania and, at the same time, are not citizens of any other country, although this condition is a violation of the treaty between Roumania and the Allies in the World War; and that Jewish cooperatives have been unjustly dealt with in a new law.
2. Poland

While anti-Jewish propaganda is not absent in Poland, it is the economic condition of the Jews of that country that gives cause for the gravest concern. In October last, when Mr. Tytus Filipowicz, then the newly-appointed Minister (later Ambassador) of Poland, arrived in the United States, he stated in an interview that the wretched economic situation of the Jews in Poland is the unfortunate but inevitable result of the reorganization of the economic life of the country, which is having the effect of eliminating, to a large extent, middlemen, a great many of whom are Jews. The Government of Poland, however, stated Mr. Filipowicz, is doing its utmost to relieve this situation. But Jews in Poland and their relatives in this country insist that the Government could do much more. They say that while it is true that the spread of the cooperative movement is resulting in the displacement of many thousands of Jewish middlemen from commerce, the Jews suffer in addition from racial discrimination and boycotting, and from the fact that the taxation system is so designed as to cause the fiscal burden to fall most heavily on the urban population, of which the Jews form so great a part. Furthermore, certain Tsaristic restrictions against Jews are still in force, and charges that Jews are discriminated against in government employment and that there exists a spirit of non-cooperation on the part of various government organs with the Jewish representatives in the Sejm, have been frequently made. Besides, the conversion of many industries to government monopolies has had the effect of excluding many Jews from employment; Jews are also discriminated against in the matter of bank credits and are not admitted to administrative positions; in spite of the fact that the Jews, who constitute only 11% of the population, contribute 40% of the taxes, they are forced to maintain institutions of learning at their own cost because of the failure of the government to provide adequate facilities at public expense. The situation is further complicated by the existence of internal dissension within the Jewish population itself.

Your Committee gave earnest study to this state of affairs. Following Mr. Filipowicz's interview, the Secretary, who had made a survey of conditions in Poland in 1927 for
the Joint Distribution Committee, sent the Minister a private communication expressing confidence in the desire of the Polish Government to promote a unified Poland in which equal rights would be granted to all elements of the population, and while substantially agreeing that the existing economic troubles of the Jews should be ascribed, in the main, to general political and economic conditions, yet maintained that the position of the Government, insofar as fair treatment to the Jews is concerned, could be strengthened by a more liberal policy in the matter of employing persons of the Jewish faith in various departments of the Government and allied public services. In January last, representatives of your Committee had a conference on the Jewish situation in Poland with Mr. Charles S. Dewey, financial advisor to the Polish Government, with whom they interchanged information and views. A similar conference was had with Honorable John N. Willys, United States Ambassador to Poland, on the eve of the latter's departure for Warsaw.

Conditions in Poland are still in a state of flux, owing to frequent governmental crises, and it appears that so long as political instability lasts, the material situation of the whole population, and particularly the Jews, is bound to remain deplorable.

3. Russia

The world-wide protest against the persecution of religion in Soviet Russia during the past year served to bring the religious phase of the life of the Jews to the foreground. Along with the adherents of other religions, the Jews were the victims of the intensified campaign of atheism. As in former years, the anti-religious campaign took various forms,—the confiscation of synagogues, the conversion of cemeteries into public grounds, the punishment of teachers of religion, discouragement of ritual practices, and the degradation of ministers of religion and other functionaries; insofar as the Jews were concerned, there were also acts against their cultural institutions and the persecution of Zionism.

Ever since the establishment of the present régime in Russia, your Committee has watched with deep concern
the anti-religious movement in that country, especially, of course, insofar as it affected Judaism. The subject was discussed at practically every meeting of the Executive Committee. In the various reports submitted to you from year to year, your Committee described the progress of that movement, in which Communists of Jewish birth among others took so active and ignoble a part.

When, following the declaration of the Vatican, in February last, appealing to all creeds to raise their voices in protest against the intensified religious persecution, various denominations organized demonstrations, your Committee took the position that Jewish organizations which concerned themselves especially with religious matters should perform that function for the American Jewish community, and encouraged the Synagogue Council of America, representing the three national synagogue federations and the three national associations of rabbis, to take action to organize a dignified protest. On February 19th, the Council adopted a resolution expressing the solidarity of Jews with the worldwide protest and calling upon their “brethren of the House of Israel in this land of freedom to repair to their synagogues on the Sabbath, March 7th, to offer up public prayer that the campaign against religion in Soviet Russia may come to a speedy end, giving way to that brotherhood which is the flowering of God’s spirit on earth.” This appeal was widely heeded.

In March, following the world-wide protest, the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party issued a public announcement demanding moderation in the matter of the confiscation of church edifices.

The lot of rabbis and other religious functionaries of Russia was a hard one during the past year. In October, eleven elderly Jews of Leningrad, the Administrative Committee of the Kehillah, were sentenced to imprisonment at hard labor for conducting communal activities, when all that they did was to appeal for funds for remodelling the synagogue, and to sublet to an artisans' cooperative, some of the rooms in a building housing a mikveh.

In February 1930, a new rule was announced in the Kiev region forbidding the telegraph offices and the postal authorities to deliver telegrams or letters to religious organizations
and functionaries. In the same month, reports reached Riga that rabbis in White Russia were being persecuted with unusual severity, being driven from their homes, or imprisoned for failure to pay the heavy taxes imposed upon all clericals. In April, a court in Minsk decided that the children of religious functionaries need not obey the law requiring all children who work and live with their parents to contribute toward the support of the latter.

The most notorious case of persecution of religious functionaries was the arrest, in February, of fourteen leaders of the Minsk community, including several rabbis; in some manner the report reached Warsaw that these persons were to be executed, and appeals were made to Jewish leaders in various western countries for intervention to prevent the threatened executions. Immediately after the arrest of the Minsk rabbis, a leading European rabbi sent urgent telegrams to Jewish leaders in various countries, asking them to intervene against the threatened executions. One of these messages reached your Committee, which communicated at once with correspondents in London, Paris and Berlin. Later, your Committee learned that action taken in these places had proved successful. Eleven of the fourteen persons arrested were soon released, while the others were freed sometime later. The communist press published the charges upon which these persons were arrested; one was "an important ex-trader, the organizer of religious societies and rabbinical seminaries"; another was "the president of a society of rabbinical students which is an outspoken counter-revolutionary organization"; one rabbi was charged with having been "a speculator who established loan societies that saved Nep-men from ruin"; others were charged with having maintained illegal correspondence with counter-revolutionary individuals abroad. It should be said, however, that for the time being the persecution of religion has abated, although the position of rabbis and Jewish teachers is one of abject misery and degradation, and the religious education of children remains illegal.

4. Germany

At the present moment, the situation of the more than one half million Jews of Germany is cause for the gravest
anxiety, owing to the fact that, mainly because of economic conditions, the National Socialist Party, which makes the Jews the scapegoat for these conditions, has recently shown that it has a large following.

The history of German Jewry during the past year is virtually a repetition of dismal recitals of several preceding years. The depressing economic conditions of the masses render their minds fertile soil for the seed of all kinds of hatred, especially hatred of the Jew, for which generations of propaganda had already prepared him.

At a conference of the Central Verein Deutscher Staatsbuerger Juedischen Glaubens, last spring, the growing danger of the Jews of Germany because of the increasing influence of the Nationalist parties, was enlarged upon. The National Socialists, led by Hitler, are acquiring a controlling voice in many cities, it was said, where small Jewish communities were being boycotted, terrorized, and economically ruined. In a number of small towns, Jews fear to venture on the streets after dark. This sinister influence is spreading to larger cities. An article in an April issue of the Vossische Zeitung, Berlin, described how the anti-Semites, taking a leaf out of the book of the Russian Communists, were organizing “cells” of their Party in factories, offices, schools and universities; in Berlin no less than 1,200 such “cells” exist in various sections, their members raiding meetings of opposition parties and engaging in anti-Semitic agitation. It is from the membership of these “cells” that cemetery vandals and synagogue defilers are recruited. The number of Jewish cemeteries desecrated since this form of vandalism was begun, seven years ago, was increased from seventy-six to eighty-five during the past year. Tombstones were overthrown, destroyed, or defaced with ribald inscriptions. Attacks on synagogues usually followed rallies or meetings addressed by Hitlerist agitators. The synagogue building is defaced during the night, or its premises are invaded and damaged, or services are interrupted by loud noises, such as pistol shots or reports of fire works. In one case, during the past year, a synagogue in Berlin was stormed by hundreds of Hitlerites who were dispersed by a large force of police. Acts of personal violence were also perpetrated.

An alarming symptom of the spread of reaction in Ger-
many was the coming into power in the provincial government of Thuringia of a coalition of nationalist parties, in which the post of Minister of Education and Public Worship was assigned to Dr. Wilhelm Frick, a rabid anti-Semite, who, at the same time, became chief of the provincial police. One of his first official acts was the introduction in the schools of prayers asking Divine protection against "people of alien race", and containing some of the favorite expressions of the National Socialist creed. When charged by Socialists in the Landtag with incitement to anti-Semitism, Frick admitted that the "alien race" referred to "the Jews who demoralized the German people." The Frankfurter Zeitung appealed to the German people not to permit this blasphemy, reminding them that "the children in their very first religious lesson are taught that God gave the Holy Scriptures to the Jewish people and that the Savior's mother was a Jewess; then they are immediately made to utter prayers filled with anti-Jewish hatred. This discord is poisoning the souls of our children." Later, Dr. Joseph Wirth, Minister of the Interior of the Reich, forwarded a protest against the Frick innovation to Premier Baum of Thuringia. Despite a second warning from the Reich Government, the Thuringian cabinet declined to abolish the anti-Jewish prayers, and on May 26th, the Reich brought suit in the Supreme Court at Leipzig, charging that the prayers are contrary to the constitution of the Reich. Subsequently, these prayers were discontinued.

In their efforts to harass and humiliate the Jews, the reactionary elements seized upon the device of making Shehitah, the method of slaughtering animals according to Jewish ritual, illegal. Their real motive was revealed by a speaker in the Thuringian Landtag, who said: "We are not interested in the protection of animals, but we hope that anti-Semitism will keep Jewish visitors away from the summer resorts of Thuringia." Attempts to secure anti-Shehitah legislation were made by National Socialists in several provinces and municipalities. These efforts failed in the Landtag of Baden, and in the cities of Cologne and Berlin, but succeeded in the Landtag of Bavaria, where, on January 29th, a bill requiring stunning before slaughter was passed.

After the passing of this law, your Committee received an
appeal to take whatever steps it deemed proper in the premises. Recalling that in a similar case, the United States Department of State had advised bringing the matter to the attention of the representative in America of the foreign government then in question, your Committee addressed the following communication to his Excellency, Baron von Prittwitz, Ambassador of Germany in the United States:

February 28, 1930.

YOUR EXCELLENCY:

Mr. Felix M. Warburg, a member of this Committee, has informed me of his recent conversation with you and, upon the basis of it, I venture to send you the following communication:

Information has reached us that recently the Bavarian Diet passed a law providing that animals slaughtered for meat shall first be rendered unconscious. This provision would prohibit the slaughtering of animals in accordance with Jewish ritual requirements. The observance of a religious practice which has been conscientiously pursued by a large proportion of Jews for twenty-five centuries is involved.

This is not a matter of mere form or ceremony. It relates to a basic principle in the religious life of the Jews. Their Bible forbids the eating of blood, and they have been taught from their earliest days that meat may not be eaten from which the blood has not been thoroughly drained. In order to bring about that result, careful regulations have been prescribed defining the person who is to slaughter the animal, the instrument with which the killing is consummated, and the method which is to be followed. The slaughterer is required to possess expert knowledge of the anatomical and pathological condition of the organs of the animal which is slaughtered, and to examine the carcass in order to determine whether or not the animal was in such a state of health as to render its flesh wholesome for human consumption. The observant Jew regards it as sinful to eat meat of an animal which has not been slaughtered in strict conformity with these requirements.

The legislation recently enacted in Bavaria would, in effect, forbid this age-long procedure. The result of the adoption of such a policy would be to prevent the Jews who adhere to their religious doctrines from eating meat altogether, under pain of violating their conscientious belief.

That the Jewish method of slaughtering animals is in every way humane and hygienically desirable is established by the opinions of hundreds of competent non-Jewish experts who have scientifically investigated this subject in all parts of the world. Among them may be named Lord Lister, the famous British authority on asepsis; Sir Michael Foster, Professor of Physiology and the successor of Huxley at Cambridge; Professors Virchow and Reymond, eminent German physiologists.

In 1922, this subject was considered at the Forty-Sixth Annual Convention of the American Humane Association, held at St. Paul,
Minn., where, after considering a paper written by Rev. Dr. Moses Hyamson, a reprint of which I enclose, it was concluded that the Jewish method of slaughtering animals was free from objection.

It is a well-known fact that many of the leading meat packers in the United States have found it desirable to adopt this form of slaughtering, not only for their Jewish but also for their non-Jewish customers, since it tends to promote the better preservation of the meat.

Our fears have been somewhat allayed by an informal report to the effect that the Commission on Legal Terminology of the Reichstag has agreed to add to the paragraph on animal slaughter in the new book on legal terms a clause to the effect that the Jewish method does not constitute cruelty to animals. We are informed that, should this clause be adopted by the Reichstag, laws prohibiting the Jewish method on the ground of cruelty would become inoperative. In the meantime, however, we respectfully ask you, if you deem such a course proper and helpful, to indicate to the Bavarian government and also to that of the Reich that legislation of this character has wounded the sensibilities and has offended the consciences of a large body of American citizens in every way friendly to the people of Germany, and to express the hope that the taking effect of such legislation (according to the statute it is to go into effect on October 1, 1930) be withheld in view of the consideration stated above.

Enclosed herewith I am sending you several documents bearing upon this question which throw further light upon it.

Respectfully yours,

(Signed) Cyrus Adler,
President.

Subsequently the Ambassador referred the matter to his Government, and the German Foreign Office requested the Ministry of the Interior “to draw the attention of the German States to the fact that there is unfavorable feeling of a great part of the population of the United States which may have a very unfavorable political effect.” The contents of this letter became known in some manner to the Voelkische Beobachter of Munich, chief organ of the Hitler party, which immediately raised the cry that American Jews were attempting to interfere in matters of internal concern in Germany.

The action of the Reich Government in the Bavarian Shehitah matter, as well as in that of the prayers of hate in Thuringia, indicates that the Federal Government has no sympathy with the anti-Semitic movement and that, whenever possible, it takes steps to combat their activities. The entire German press, with the exception of the large number
of organs of the Hugenberg and Hitler parties, also vehemently oppose the anti-Semitic campaign, and the counter attack is effectively led by the Central Verein Deutscher Staatsbuerger Juedischen Glaubens.

On several occasions your Committee has given indications of its sympathy with the Central Verein and other Jewish organizations in their struggle against the anti-Semitic movement in Germany.

5. PALESTINE

In view of the organization of the enlarged Jewish Agency, your Committee has taken the position that inasmuch as this body represents all Jewish elements interested in promoting the Jewish settlement in Palestine, matters concerning that settlement should be left entirely in the hands of the Agency, for, if this policy is not adhered to there may be conflict of counsel which is bound to be detrimental to this cause. Nevertheless, mindful of the fact that in April 1918, the American Jewish Committee, at a special meeting, adopted a resolution pledging its cooperation with those who "attracted by religious or historic associations, shall seek to establish in Palestine a center for Judaism", your Committee deems it proper to express at this time its profound disappointment with the new construction lately placed by the British Government upon the Balfour Declaration,—a construction which, we are convinced, is not warranted by the terms of that Declaration or of the Mandate based upon it, and is bound to make increasingly difficult, if not impossible, the project to the achievement of which the British Government pledged "their best endeavors." Feeling that the policy recently enunciated will prove detrimental not only to the progress of the Jewish settlement, but also to the welfare of the non-Jewish population of Palestine, your Committee has prepared for submission to you today, the following resolution:

WHEREAS, at a special meeting held on April 28, 1918, the American Jewish Committee adopted a resolution expressing profound appreciation of the Balfour Declaration regarding Palestine, pledging cooperation to those who, "attracted by religious or historic associations, shall seek to establish in Palestine a center for Judaism, for the stimulation of our faith, for the pursuit and
development of literature, science and art in a Jewish environment, and for the rehabilitation of the land," and,

WHEREAS, on March 1, 1919, the American Jewish Committee joined with other bodies in submitting to Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, a Memorial asking "that the Peace Conference recognize the aspirations and historic claims of the Jewish people in regard to Palestine," and "that such action be taken by the (Peace) Conference as shall vest the sovereign possession of Palestine in such League of Nations as may be formed and that the government thereof be entrusted to Great Britain as the Mandatory or trustee of the League"; and,

WHEREAS, on April 24, 1920, the Supreme Allied Council, meeting at San Remo, did indeed agree to entrust the mandate for Palestine to Great Britain, and on July 22, 1922, the Council of the League of Nations defined the terms of the mandate, stipulating that, in recognition of the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine, the Mandatory was to be responsible for placing that country under such "political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home," and providing that "an appropriate Jewish Agency shall be recognized as a public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the administration of Palestine in such economic social and other matters as may affect the establishment of the Jewish national home and the interests of the Jewish population in Palestine"; and,

WHEREAS, in August 1929, an extended Jewish Agency representative of all elements of the Jewish people interested in the development of a Jewish home in Palestine was organized; and

WHEREAS, officers of the Jewish Agency have recently resigned in protest against the new policy in respect of Palestine announced by the British Government on October 20, 1930, which these officers unite in regarding as an unjustified attack on Jewish work in Palestine, and a land and immigration policy calculated to arrest the further development of the Jewish National Home; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the American Jewish Committee in Annual Meeting assembled, joins with these officers of the Jewish Agency in expressing its profound disappointment with the new policy of the British Government as enunciated in the White Paper of October 20, 1930; a policy which the Committee deems to have no basis in either the Balfour Declaration or the Mandate and to be a fallacious interpretation of these two charters underlying the trusteeship of Great Britain on behalf of the League of Nations; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the American Jewish Committee express its confidence in the sense of justice and fairness of the people of Great Britain, and its hope that the British Government will revise its present policy as respects Palestine so as to bring it into full harmony with the spirit of the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the American Jewish Committee offer its wholehearted cooperation to the Jewish Agency in any efforts it may take to bring about such a change of policy.
6. OTHER COUNTRIES

Your Committee has kept in close touch with conditions not only in the countries already mentioned, but also in other lands, including Hungary, Italy, Turkey, and the Yemen, in each of which special problems confront the Jews which require watching.

7. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

In its efforts to ameliorate the conditions of Jewish communities in foreign lands, your Committee enjoyed the friendly and energetic cooperation of kindred organizations, at home and abroad, especially the Joint Distribution Committee in this country, and the Joint Foreign Committee in England, the Alliance Israélite Universelle in France, and the Central Verein Deutscher Staatsbuerger Juedischen Glaubens in Germany. Your Committee wishes to acknowledge with thanks the aid given to us in our work, and the courtesies extended to the President and the Secretary during their recent visits abroad.

The President of the Committee spent some time during the summer in Geneva and utilized the opportunity to discuss the situation in various Eastern European countries with the officials of the Minorities Section in the Secretariat of the League of Nations. There is no question but that these officials give deep sympathy to the matters submitted to their charge.

In view of the gravity of the situation in Germany, Roumania and other countries, your Executive Committee has taken the unusual step of arranging for a special session beginning at three o'clock this afternoon, to which it has invited, in addition to the Corporate Members of the Committee, many of the contributing members and leading persons of various parts of the country; where, after a discussion of the situation, it is hoped that plans may be reached in order to determine what can usefully be done to ameliorate the present distressing situation.
C. ORGANIZATION MATTERS

1. NECROLOGY

It is with deep sorrow that your Committee must report the death, during the past year, of the following Corporate Members:

DAVID A. LOURIE of Boston, on January 18, 1930
ISAAC M. ULLMAN of New Haven, January 28, 1930
LOUIS TOPKIS of Wilmington, March 24, 1930
SAMUEL DINKELSPIEL of San Francisco, May 14, 1930
MAURICE H. HARRIS of New York, June 23, 1930
NATHAN BIJUR of New York, July 8, 1930
JOSEPH SILVERMAN of New York, July 27, 1930
SIMON FLEISCHMANN of Buffalo, September 2, 1930
LOUIS M. COLE of Los Angeles, October 1, 1930

The following minutes, expressive of the Committee's sense of loss, were adopted by your Executive Committee:

DAVID A. LOURIE OF BOSTON

The Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee has learned with profound sorrow of the death, on January 18th, 1930, of DAVID A. LOURIE of Boston, a member of the Committee since 1920. Judge Lourie held an honored place in the public life of his city and state for many years, as well as a leading position in all the Jewish activities of his community to which he devoted much thought and energy. His advice and cooperation, always readily available and cheerfully given, were highly valued by his colleagues on the American Jewish Committee. We extend to his widow and children our heartfelt sympathy in their bereavement.

ISAAC M. ULLMAN OF NEW HAVEN

The Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee learned with deep sorrow of the sudden death on January 28th, 1930, of their colleague and friend, Colonel ISAAC M. ULLMAN of New Haven, who was a member of the General Committee since its inception, and Treasurer since 1922. By sheer force of ability and unflagging devotion to the city of his birth, he achieved a wide influence, which he used unselfishly in the interests of the city and its residents.
Every cause for civic betterment and social service were sure to enlist his cooperation.

As a Jew, he participated in both local and national communal movements. As the outstanding leader in the Jewish community of his state, he could always be relied upon to influence his community to take a worthy place in the work of the Jews of America in all nation-wide efforts toward self-improvement and toward the amelioration of the less fortunate condition of their brethren in foreign lands. As a member of the Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee he maintained a keen and unabated interest in its activities. As Treasurer he gave up much of his time and effort for the advancement of the Committee's welfare.

With his bereaved kindred, his many friends, and his fellow-citizens, we mourn the great loss which all have suffered in the death of this civic worker and communal leader.

**Louis Topkis of Wilmington**

The Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee has learned with deep sorrow of the death on March 24, 1930 of Louis Topkis of Wilmington, Delaware, elected to membership in the General Committee at the 23rd Annual Meeting on November 10, 1929. Mr. Topkis, who was a highly respected manufacturer and honored for his active participation in, and generous support of, public movements, both local and national, manifested particular interest in Jewish life and rendered active service in efforts for the improvement of the conditions of the Jewish people here and abroad and for the preservation of Judaism. The interest which he showed in the work of the American Jewish Committee during the short time between his election and his untimely death, at the age of fifty-eight, gave promise of his being a valuable addition to its membership, and his passing was therefore a grievous blow to the Committee as to the many other organizations with which he was affiliated. The Committee extends to his widow and his children its profound sympathy in their bereavement.

**Samuel Dinkelspiel of San Francisco**

The Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee has learned with deep sorrow of the death on May
14, 1930 of Samuel Dinkelspiel of San Francisco, who was a member of the General Committee for only a brief time. In his passing, the community in which he lived and of which he was an outstanding citizen, has suffered a severe loss. The Committee extends to his family its profound sympathy.

Maurice H. Harris of New York City
The Executive Committee has learned with deep sorrow of the death on June 23, 1930, of Maurice H. Harris, a member of the Committee since 1909. Doctor Harris was for almost half a century a leading member of the American Rabbinate. Though recognized by his colleagues and his congregation as a master of homiletics he did not wholly confine himself to his study and pulpit but was active in many efforts for social improvement. He was intensely interested in the education of the Jewish youth, and was the author of a number of excellent textbooks for Jewish religious schools. The problem presented by the delinquent child absorbed much of his attention and he took the initiative or cooperated actively in the creation of agencies devoted to its solution. He maintained a deep interest in the work of this Committee. We extend to his widow and children our profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Nathan Bijur of New York City
The Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee has learned with deep sorrow of the death, on July 8, 1930, of Nathan Bijur of New York City.

Before accepting a place on the Supreme Court Bench, of which he was an honored member for the last twenty years of his life, Judge Bijur was a noted leader in Jewish communal affairs. As Vice-President and the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the United Hebrew Charities of New York City, he stimulated many constructive local philanthropic undertakings. He was among the first to realize the importance of community-wide effort and was a pioneer in the attempt to establish a Federation of Philanthropies. His community-mindedness was so broad as to comprehend the needs of his fellow Jews throughout the world. This was especially reflected in his active interest in the work of the American Jewish Committee, of which he
was a founder and Corporate Member since its inception. Before that, he had already rendered great service as a director of the Baron de Hirsch Fund and as a member of the committee which raised funds for the relief of sufferers in the Russian Massacres of 1905. He was instrumental in the formation of the Industrial Removal Office and very active in its management. His activities were not circumscribed by Jewish interests; he cooperated freely and vigorously with non-Jewish groups in works of social and civic improvement in which his wise counsel and resourceful suggestions were eagerly welcomed. Though he was obliged in later years, because of his judicial duties, to diminish his activity in communal affairs, his interest therein never abated.

He will be greatly missed at the meetings of the American Jewish Committee, which he attended regularly and whose work he followed with closest interest. The Committee extends to his widow and son its sincere condolence in their bereavement.

JOSEPH SILVERMAN OF NEW YORK CITY

The Executive Committee has learned with deep sorrow of the death on July 27, 1930, of JOSEPH SILVERMAN, a member of the Committee since 1909. Doctor SILVERMAN was a prominent member of the American Rabbinate, having been for thirty-four years rabbi and for eight years rabbi-emeritus of Congregation Emanu-El of New York City. He was an outstanding member of the American Rabbinate, at one time President of the Central Conference of American Rabbis. He lent the full measure of his talents as an eloquent and forceful speaker to numerous social and civic organizations in whose work he took an active part. He was especially energetic in the Jewish communal activities, both local and national, and responded cheerfully to the many demands for his services in connection with the work of raising funds for the relief and reconstruction of Jewish communities abroad. As a member of the American Jewish Committee, he was loyal and helpful. The Committee extends to his family its heartfelt sympathy.

SIMON FLEISCHMANN OF BUFFALO

The Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee has learned with deep sorrow of the death on Sep-
tember 2, 1930 of Simon Fleischmann of Buffalo, a member of the Committee since 1914. Mr. Fleischmann was a distinguished member of the bar, an ardent advocate of good government, and an active supporter of every worthy public cause. He was entrusted by his fellow citizens with high office in the city administration, and by the bar associations of which he was a member with positions of responsibility. He took an active interest also in the affairs of the Jewish community, locally and nationally, and was an earnest and loyal member of this Committee, helpful in its councils and wholehearted in the cooperation he gave to its work. His death was a grievous loss to his city and to the Jewish community. The Committee extends to his family its profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Louis M. Cole of Los Angeles

The Executive Committee of the American Jewish Committee has learned with deep sorrow of the death, on October 1, 1930, of Louis M. Cole of Los Angeles, Cal., who was a member of the General Committee since 1920. In his passing, the community in which he lived and of which he was an outstanding citizen, has suffered a severe loss. The Committee extends to his family its profound sympathy.

2. Membership

Your Committee is pleased to report that all the gentlemen who were elected to membership at the last Annual Meeting, and whose names are listed in the Twenty-Third Annual Report on pages 72 and 73, have agreed to serve.

Your Committee elected the following members to fill vacancies:

James N. Solomont, Boston, to fill vacancy caused by death of Judge David A. Lourie.

Ralph Schwartz of New Orleans to fill vacancy caused by death of Rabbi Max Heller.

Morton R. Hirschberg, Jacksonville, to succeed Simon Benjamin, resigned.

You will recall that at your last Annual Meeting, your Executive Committee recommended and gave notice that it would propose an amendment to the by-laws increasing the maximum memberships-at-large from 20 to 30. You will be
asked to vote on this amendment today. After the amendment is voted upon, your Committee will submit a recommendation for members-at-large, as follows:

- Louis Bamberger, Newark
- James H. Becker, Chicago
- Jacob Billikopf, Philadelphia
- David A. Brown, New York
- Leo M. Brown, Mobile
- Abel Davis, Chicago
- Jacob Epstein, Baltimore
- Eli Frank, Baltimore
- Herbert Friedenwald, Washington, D. C.
- Albert M. Greenfield, Philadelphia
- Herbert J. Hannoch, Newark
- Henry S. Hendricks, New York
- Stanley M. Isaacs, New York
- Alexander Kahn, New York
- J. J. Kaplan, Boston
- Louis E. Kirstein, Boston
- Sol Kline, Chicago
- Edward Lazansky, Brooklyn
- Fred Lazarus, Jr., Columbus
- A. C. Lehman, Pittsburgh
- Samuel D. Leidesdorf, New York
- Jacob M. Loeb, Chicago
- Isidore D. Morrison, New York
- Milton J. Rosenau, Cambridge
- Victor Rosewater, Philadelphia
- Morris Rothenberg, New York
- B. C. Vladeck, New York
- Frederic W. Wile, Washington, D. C.

In accordance with the provisions of the by-laws, the following Nominating Committee, empowered to nominate candidates to succeed those members whose terms expire today and to fill vacancies wherever they exist, was appointed:

District
- I. Lionel Weil, Goldsboro
- II. Nathan Cohn, Nashville
- III. Barnett E. Marks, Phoenix
- IV. Aaron Waldheim, St. Louis
V. Daniel Alexander, Salt Lake
VI. Henry M. Butzel, Detroit
VII. Sol Kline, Chicago
VIII. Murray Seasongood, Cincinnati
IX. Morris Wolf, Philadelphia
X. Albert Berney, Baltimore
XI. Felix Vorenberg, Boston
XII. David M. Bressler, New York
XIII. Henry M. Stern, Rochester
XIV. Louis Bamberger, Newark

Following is a list of the nominees of the Nominating Committee to succeed members whose terms expire, or to fill existing vacancies:

I. Leonard Haas, Atlanta, to be reelected.
II. Ben H. Stein, Vicksburg, to be reelected.
III. S. K. Bernstein, Oklahoma City, to be reelected.
IV. Harry Block, St. Joseph, to be reelected; J. A. Harzfeld, Kansas City, to be reelected.

V. Leo J. Falk, Boise, to be reelected; Samuel Platt, Reno, to be reelected; Ben Selling, Portland, to be reelected; Henry G. W. Dinkelspiel, San Francisco, to fill vacancy caused by the death of Samuel Dinkelspiel.

VI. Eugene Mannheimer, Des Moines, to be reelected; Joseph H. Schanfeld, Minneapolis, to be reelected; Isaac Summerfield, St. Paul, to be reelected; Joseph Weinberg, Butte, to be reelected; Nat Stone, Milwaukee, to be reelected; Morris Haytin, Casper, to be reelected.

VII. B. Horwich, Chicago, to be reelected; Julius Rosenwald, Chicago, to be reelected.

VIII. Samuel E. Rauh, Indianapolis, to be reelected; Benjamin S. Washer, Louisville, to succeed Isaac W. Bernheim; E. S. Halle, Cleveland, to succeed Paul L. Feiss; Louis Horkheimer, Wheeling, to be reelected.

IX. B. L. Levinthal, Philadelphia, to be reelected; Morris Rosenbaum, Philadelphia, to be reelected.

X. Simon Lyon, Washington, D. C., to succeed Fulton Brylawski; Jacob H. Hollander, Baltimore, to be reelected; Siegmund B. Sonneborn, Baltimore, to be reelected; Edward N. Calisch, Richmond, to be reelected; Aaron Finger, Wilmington, to fill vacancy caused by death of Louis Topkis.

XI. Philip N. Bernstein, Waterbury, to be reelected; Jacob B. Klein, Bridgeport, to be reelected; Isidore Wise, Hartford, to be reelected; A. Hartman, Haverhill, to be reelected; Henry Lasker, Springfield, to be reelected; George Newman, Pittsfield, to be reelected; A. C. Ratthesky, Boston, to be reelected; Chas. Wineapple, Salem, to be reelected; Archibald Silverman, Providence, to be reelected; Alexander Cahn, New Haven, to fill vacancy caused by death of Colonel Isaac M. Ullman.
XII. Joseph M. Proskauer, to succeed Elias A. Cohen; Abram I. Elkus, to be reelected; H. G. Enelow, to be reelected; William Fischman, to be reelected; Irving Lehman, to be reelected; Adolph Lewisohn, to be reelected; James N. Rosenberg, to succeed Judah L. Magnes; Carl H. Pforzheimer, to fill vacancy caused by death of Joseph Silverman; L. M. Stettenheim, to be reelected; Lewis L. Strauss, to be reelected.

XIII. Eugene Warner, Buffalo, to be reelected.

XIV. Isaac Alpern, Perth Amboy, to be reelected; Philip Dimond, Paterson, to be reelected; Michael Hollander, Newark, to be reelected; David Holzner, Trenton, to be reelected; Isaac W. Frank,* Pittsburgh, to be reelected; William Harris, Allentown, to be reelected; Irwin F. Lehman, Pittsburgh, to be reelected.

Ballots were prepared and distributed, which will be canvassed at today's meeting and the results reported by the tellers appointed by the President, in accordance with the provisions of the by-laws.

3. **The Executive Committee**

At its meeting in December 1929, your Committee elected Judge Horace Stern, Chairman of the Executive Committee. At the following meeting, in January, it elected Morris Wolf, Esq., of Philadelphia a member of the Executive Committee.

In March 1929, upon his appointment as United States Minister to Czecho-Slovakia, Mr. A. C. Ratshesky of Boston presented his resignation as a member of the Executive Committee. It was decided to accept Mr. Ratshesky's resignation with the proviso, however, that his place be left vacant until after his return to this country from his official duties, when, it is hoped, he would find it possible to resume membership.

During the past year, your Committee came to the conclusion that inasmuch as the General Committee had been somewhat enlarged since 1911, when the Committee was incorporated, the Executive Committee should also be increased. Accordingly, steps were taken to secure the passage by the Legislature of the State of New York of an act to amend the charter of the Committee to increase the maximum membership of the Executive Committee from 21 to 30. Such an act was passed by both Houses and was signed by the Governor in March 1930. Subsequently,

*Deceased.*
your Committee elected the following to membership in the Executive Committee: Fred M. Butzel, Detroit; James Davis, Chicago; Henry Ittleson, New York; and Louis E. Kirstein, Boston.

In February, your Committee elected Sol M. Stroock, Esq. of New York, Treasurer for the remainder of the term of Colonel Isaac M. Ullman, deceased.

4. STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Since the last Annual Meeting, your Committee has deemed it advisable to create a number of standing advisory committees to study such matters as are referred to them, with a view to advising the Executive Committee what action, if any, to take. These Standing Advisory Committees are composed of Corporate Members. There are Committees on Federal Legislation, State Legislation, Immigration and Naturalization, Anti-Jewish Manifestations, Foreign Affairs (with sub-committees on Poland, Central Europe, Russia, Balkan Countries, Baltic Countries), Finance, and Office. Several of these Standing Advisory Committees have already been called upon for their opinion on subjects within their purview, and the results indicate that this system is likely to facilitate the work of the Committee.

5. FINANCE

The report of the auditor of the Committee’s accounts is appended to this report. It shows that there were received from Sustaining and Contributing Members $48,250.86, from community funds and foundations $12,180.00, and contributions for special purposes $5,000.00 balance in Emergency Trust Fund covered into General Fund, $2,153.51, and from other sources, such as interest on bank balances, $202.52, a grand total of $67,786.89. Of this sum $42,431.62 was expended for the general maintenance of the Committee’s office. Expenditures for other purposes include $14,899.54 for the maintenance of the Statistical Department, $500.00 for a contribution to the work of the Foreign Language Information Service, $1,625.16 for editorial and other expenses in connection with the American Jewish Year Book, $648.19 for books and pamphlets printed or
purchased for distribution, and $7,500.00 special expendi-
tures. The total expenses paid and accrued were $67,604.51,
being in excess of the receipts of the year by $182.38.

Following is a list of the States showing the amount
received from each during the fiscal year just closed, com-
pared with the total contributed during the preceding year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Contributions received for fiscal year ended Oct. 31, 1929</th>
<th>Contributions received for fiscal year ended Oct. 31, 1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$592.00</td>
<td>$405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>348.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>807.50</td>
<td>1,473.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>307.00</td>
<td>167.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1,153.00</td>
<td>1,063.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>465.00</td>
<td>543.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10,877.00</td>
<td>6,930.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>905.00</td>
<td>570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>489.00</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>530.00</td>
<td>1,224.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2,672.50</td>
<td>2,192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>1,941.34</td>
<td>3,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>443.00</td>
<td>340.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3,148.50</td>
<td>2,493.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>231.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>68.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2,147.00</td>
<td>1,155.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>16,793.84</td>
<td>18,751.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>3,217.50</td>
<td>2,819.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>407.00</td>
<td>437.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5,583.20</td>
<td>3,268.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>289.50</td>
<td>188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>260.00</td>
<td>220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1,504.00</td>
<td>1,890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>2,122.00</td>
<td>4,905.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of the general depression, your Committee sensed that there would be a considerable decrease in income from our regular contributors, and we took steps in time to provide against an expected deficit. Thanks to the interest of about 80 good friends of the Committee, we succeeded in securing one-time donations. Through the efforts of several members of your Committee, notably Doctor Adler, Judge Stern, Messrs. Isaac Gerstley and Morris Wolf in Philadelphia, Mr. Rosenwald and Mr. James Davis in Chicago, Judge Frank and Mr. Albert Berney in Baltimore, Messrs. Simon Lyon in Washington, and Lewis L. Strauss in New York, we succeeded in securing a considerable enrollment of new contributors. These, together with a generous contribution of $2,500 from the Hofheimer Foundation toward the cost of our research department, enabled us to meet all our obligations. Nevertheless, we still fell far short of what we regard as a reasonable minimum for carrying on our work adequately, and at present we are confronted with the disturbing fact that, should present conditions continue, our total expected income from regular contributors for the new fiscal year just begun will fall short by from $25,000 to $30,000 of even the restricted budget upon which we are now operating. We feel that the Corporate Members of the Committee should cheerfully share with the members of the Executive Committee the burden of raising this amount. This task, divided among us all, does not appear insuperable or even difficult. All that is required is the hearty cooperation of each member, and this your Committee is confident will be forthcoming.

Respectfully submitted,

The Executive Committee.
REPORT OF THE SECRETARY ON EUROPEAN CONDITIONS

To the Members of the American Jewish Committee:

Upon the authorization of the Executive Committee, I spent four months, the period between May 22d and September 22d, abroad, the major part of the time in Central European countries, for the purpose of familiarizing myself more thoroughly with the problems with which we are dealing and to establish contacts with persons abroad who are also identified in one way or another with those problems. It is not necessary for me to review the events of the past year affecting our fellow-Jews in these countries. The record of these events, formulated by our able assistant secretary, Mr. Harry Schneiderman, appears in the American Jewish Year Book for 1930. My task will be confined rather to an analysis of the currents and under-currents of Jewish life in eastern and southeastern European countries, particularly as they affect the civil and religious rights of Jews in those countries, based both on direct observation and on conversations with many Jewish leaders and other well-informed persons as well as government officials. Naturally, consideration is here given to the steps that can be taken on this side of the ocean looking toward an amelioration of the difficult and distressing conditions under which the vast majority of these people dwell.

Viewed as a whole, the situation discloses the striking fact that the territory of our interest, which in past years was virtually confined to the countries which constituted pre-war Russia, Roumania and Turkey, has become extended to lands further west, such as Germany and Austria, in spite of the high level of civilization attained by these countries. Indeed, for the time being, the problems in these countries being acute, as distinguished from their more chronic character in the countries to the east, are even more disturbing. In Russia, the particular situation of the Jews has not grown worse, though of course they too suffer with the rest of the population in the difficulties of securing ample food and other necessities of life. It is true that they have been subjected, like other elements in the population, to heavy
restrictions in their religious life, and the Jewish colonists have borne the burden of agricultural collectivization in fellowship with the peasantry at large. On the other hand, the nearly fatal restraints upon the economic life of the Jews in the towns and cities has been to a considerable extent removed; so for the first time in the history of the Soviet Republics this formerly declassed population has now been afforded an opportunity, even though still somewhat limited, to enter into the economic life of the country. The condition of the Jews in Poland continues grave; restrictions under which the Jewish population still labor by failure on the part of the government to abolish the old Tsarist laws still obtain and increase the burden already made intolerable by the economic repression to which they have been peculiarly subjected. In Lithuania there has been no improvement either in the direction of economic existence or in the long time efforts toward the suppression of Jewish culture. In Hungary, though there has been no manifest discrimination, the quiet operation of administrative acts on the part of the government has continued to deny to Jews vacant positions in public and quasi-public service which they freely enjoyed before the War and the Jewish population, engaged largely in mercantile pursuits, have suffered from the general business depression to a disastrous degree. Apart from the humiliating discriminations in the universities and the anxiety occasioned by the growing strength of the anti-Semitic political parties in Austria, the problems affecting the Jews of that country, most of whom live in Vienna, have been economic. And here, as in Hungary, the Jewish population has been to a large extent transformed from a prosperous community into an impoverished community. Nevertheless, it must be observed that the anti-Semitic elements have made headway very recently. The Schober government has been succeeded by the Vaugoin ministry which has welcomed into its midst two leading anti-Semites, and through them has materially increased the influence of the anti-Semitic elements in the government of Austria. The situation in these countries, depressing and nearly hopeless as it appears to many of its inhabitants, has not, however, presented problems of so acute a character as to evoke intervention on the part of our Committee and similar
organizations operating in Europe. This was not the case, however, in Roumania.

From its very inception, the American Jewish Committee has been obliged to register its dissatisfaction with the flagrant abuses to which the Jewish population of that country has been subjected, and to continue to do so even after the adoption of the minorities treaty under which Roumania agreed to afford equal, civil, religious and linguistic rights to all persons belonging to minority groups including its Jewish inhabitants. These protests were invariably met by denials of the accuracy of the press reports and by repeated utterances that the government of Roumania was fully alive to its obligations and was sincerely desirous of protecting the rights of all of its minorities. It will be recalled that the Executive Committee under the leadership of Louis Marshall, then president of the Committee, had numerous conversations and communications with the ministers of Roumania to this country, all of which were dilated upon in its special and annual reports.

When the National Peasants Party came into power, our Committee hailed its advent with feelings of satisfaction because we believed that the democratic character of this party, as reflected in its platform and program, and the absence of anti-Semites from the Parliament insured the long-awaited liberation of our much tried people from the administrative discriminations from which they had suffered and the recurring terrors of unbridled violence of the anti-Semitic elements which, under the previous so-called Liberal government, had culminated in the shocking outbreaks in Oradea Mare and Cluj. The disappointment and distress of the Committee can be pictured when we began to receive disturbing reports, in private communications as well as in the press, of a resumption of excesses in various parts of the country, which even under the last Liberal government had, to a considerable extent, been suppressed after the unhappy events in Oradea Mare. News of the reestablishment of anti-Semitic organizations combined with legislative and administrative acts by the new government, which evoked even the protests of Jewish members of the Roumanian parliament affiliated with the government party, shook our confidence in the good faith of the government and caused
us renewed anxiety. Again we took occasion, as was referred to in the report of the Executive Committee this morning, to express our dissatisfaction with the situation to the Roumanian minister to the United States and to urge that his government observe its international obligations. And again we received the customary reply that the reports were exaggerated and distorted, that the government was endeavoring earnestly to conduct its affairs in conformity not only with its treaty obligations but with all the accepted principles of enlightened democratic government, and once more assurances were given that all necessary steps would be taken to remedy existing abuses and to suppress attempts to terrorize the Jewish population and to punish perpetrators of outrages. In spite of these assurances, reports of attacks upon Jews and infractions of rights and legal evasions, prejudicial to Roumania's Jewish citizens, continued and about the time of my departure became more frequent.

It was decided therefore that Roumania should be my first objective. I arrived in Bucharest on the very day on which Prince Carol's accession to the throne had been approved by the Parliament, and remained in that country for ten days, which were busily occupied from early morning to late at night with conversations with countless persons directly or indirectly concerned with Jewish affairs, including Jewish leaders, bankers, business men, newspaper men, members of Parliament and cabinet officers.

In spite of my general familiarity with the situation it presented such a welter of confusion and contradictions that I felt the need for further observation and therefore resolved to pay a second visit to that country before returning home. I planned on doing so at the very end of my sojourn so as to allow as much time as possible to elapse in order to afford an opportunity of testing out the assurances I received from Premier Maniu and other Roumanian ministers, especially as it was generally hoped that the advent of Carol would spell an improvement in the treatment of the Jewish population. To my dismay, however, I learned, within a few weeks of my departure from that country, of new excesses in a number of places, culminating rapidly in a widespread uprising of the peasantry in Bukowina and Transylvania against their Jewish neighbors, instigated and led by notori-
ous anti-Semitic agitators, attaining its climax in a conflagration in the large village of Borsa which rendered fifteen hundred Jews homeless. With the concurrence of Dr. Adler, with whom I was in cable communication, I hurried to Roumania a second time and visited the scenes of the most recent outrages. Upon my exit ten days later and after consulting Dr. Adler in Geneva, where he had in the meantime arrived, I issued the following statement to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency and within the following few days gave interviews in greater detail to the European representatives of other international news agencies as well as to the particular correspondents of important newspapers in America and Europe, which were circulated to all parts of the world:

"The press reports of the anti-Semitic excesses have not been exaggerated or distorted. They were unquestionably instigated and organized by anti-Semitic agitators, who found the peasantry, though normally friendly to their Jewish neighbors, fertile soil for their propaganda because of their agrarian depression. I am convinced that these excesses, which seriously impair Roumania's prestige and credit, would not have occurred had it not been for the government's support of students' organizations and so-called patriotic congresses, and the government's reluctance to suppress illegal anti-Semitic propaganda out of a mistaken emphasis upon the liberty of the press and assembly. The ministry of the Interior, which controls the police, and the ministry of Cults and Education, which controls students, teachers and priests were especially responsible. Indications reflect that the king is distressed by the recent events. Order is at present restored and the government's latest energetic measures indicate that the government finally realizes that the numerous anti-Jewish manifestations during the past year, which it professed to regard as sporadic, trifling and harmless, were rapidly generating widespread anarchy. Borsa is tragic testimony of the danger of this propaganda of hate among the normally kindly-disposed peasantry, which terrorized the whole Jewish population of Bukowina, Transylvania and Bessarabia for months. Despite the local government officials' first report that the Borsa fire was an accident, overwhelming circumstantial evidence reflects carefully planned incendiarism. Though four weeks have elapsed no relief has been afforded except 2,500 dollars originally granted by the government and a few hundred dollars by the Transylvanian Jewish Emergency Committee, in the face of $300,000 damages and suspension of industry. No steps have been taken to shelter the homeless or to rebuild the burnt area. Hundreds are virtually starving. The congestion is terrible. Many are living in cellars of the destroyed homes under conditions beggaring description. Unless steps are taken immediately I fear a pestilence which will not only affect the Borsa population, Jewish and Gentile,
but is likely to spread. The situation warrants the imperative action of the Roumanian government and the Red Cross."

Shortly thereafter, I had a long interview in Berlin with the Roumanian minister to Germany, who promised to convey our views to his government. The accuracy of my observations was confirmed not only by representatives of other Jewish organizations who visited the country shortly after my departure, but by the published confessions of the Minister of the Interior who has since been replaced in the new Mironescu government. Some measures have been taken to relieve the acute distress in Borsa in which the Reconstruction Foundation (composed of the Joint Distribution Committee and the Jewish Colonization Association) have taken a substantial part. The government has contributed something as well, but in so trifling a degree as to be little more than a gesture.

As indicated, the Borsa fire was the climax of anti-Jewish disorders. After this sad and startling event, order was restored by the government. Many peasants were arrested as well as several of the leaders, but so far as we know the chief instigators are still at large, little or no punishment has been meted out to the malefactors, and nothing material has been disclosed by the government's inquiry with respect to the incendiary character of the fire. The restoration of law and order was evidence however of the ability of the government to suppress outbreaks. To what extent the government's embarrassment in the face of public opinion or its fear of a peasant uprising was the motivating element in its vigorous actions, is hard to say. I believe it was motivated by both considerations.

It must not be imagined from these occurrences of the past year that the government as a whole consciously encouraged anti-Semitic propaganda and the excesses. Nor should it be thought that the Roumanian people as a whole have been in sympathy with them. On the contrary the general Roumanian press had continuously decried them and urged the government to take severe measures against them. The trouble was that the government regarded them for a long time as merely sporadic and unimportant occurrences and was averse to strong measures because, in contradistinction to the more despotic preceding government,
it was averse to doing anything which might appear as subversive of the freedom of speech and assembly. The sincerity of this attitude was open to question, however, because it did not pursue this so-called democratic policy with regard to the activities of the communists.

The voluminous news reports in the Jewish press and our particular concern with the Jewish situation in Roumania should not give us the impression that the Jewish question is the chief problem with which the government is dealing. To the government it is a minor, even though a vexatious, problem. Roumania has the larger task of welding together its various populations into a united, if not homogeneous, Roumanian citizenry, particularly those added by the acquisition of new territory, the Bulgarians in the Dobrudja, the Russians in Bessarabia, the Ruthenians in Bukowina and Hungarians in Transylvania, the smaller groups of German Saxons in Transylvania and Hungarians and Jugo Slavs in the Banat, as well as the Jews scattered all over the country. Moreover it has the task of developing the remarkably rich resources of the country for its own economic independence and for the prosperity of its people. In the first task it encounters the nationalist sentiments of alien peoples most of whom, for many years identified with the more occidental civilization of Austria and Hungary, regard Roumanians as inferior and bitterly resent their own forcible separation from their native states. In the second task the present government has met with determined opposition from the still very active Liberal party. The two parties are widely at variance with respect to political theories as well as policies and programs. An objective appraisal of the views of both parties sees logic and sincerity on both sides. The chief distinction lies between the desire on the part of the present government to open the country to foreign investments in the form of loans and concessions, and the policy of the previous government to discourage foreign loans and concessions but to attempt to remain self-sustaining in its development of the country's resources. The present government is taking great pride in the success which it has already achieved in the direction of enlisting foreign financial interests, obtaining substantial though not yet adequate foreign loans and credits, in farming out some of its public
utilities, in opening up, on attractive terms, to outside interests the shipping facilities of its splendid harbors on the Black Sea. The Liberal or bourgeois government, on the other hand, in its desire to work out the country's destiny unaided from the outside, discouraged parceling out of large landholdings in order to insure the maximum production for export and encouraged the establishment of large industries by high protective tariffs. It was accused of pursuing this policy for the personal interest of its leaders who are the most powerful bankers and industrialists of the country, but there is as much evidence on the other side to show that their motive was patriotic rather than selfish. They were opposed to the invasion of foreign investment which they regard as exploitation at an excessively usurious cost to the people. The conditions surrounding the loan of one hundred and two million dollars secured in 1929 from the combination headed by the Bank of France and the Swedish match interests, of which amount only eighty-seven million dollars was to be the net proceeds to Roumania,—and this, guaranteed by the receipts of certain large monopolies entirely controlled by the banking interests and carrying substantial interest charges furnish some basis for the apprehensions of the Bratianus, whose personal integrity is as strenuously defended by their many friends as it is assailed by their many enemies. An unfortunate element in the political situation in Roumania is the personal bitterness which obtains between the leaders of the political parties and the undue emphasis laid upon party differences rather than upon the means of united action for the common good. These phenomena obtain of course in other countries as well, especially in eastern and southeastern countries which have comparatively short experience in government administration. As a member of the Roumanian parliament said, "don't compare our government with that of the United States or England; we won't reach your level for hundreds of years." But I carried away the impression that Roumania, though suffering a serious economic setback together with the rest of the world, is earnestly endeavoring to set its house in order and enjoys the prospect of becoming one of the most prosperous, if not best governed, countries of Europe. The Jews of the world desire to see it prosperous
because the prosperity of all of its elements including the Jewish population is predicated on the general prosperity of the country. And it is fatuous to believe that the Jews of Roumania are not eager for Roumania's prosperity, because apart from the traditional loyalty of Jews to the particular country in which they dwell, they realize that economic depression always works a particular hardship to them as the scapegoat for the country's ills. And the country does no suffer from over population. Roumania's one million Jews, constituting a little over five per cent of the population, can readily be absorbed into the economic life of the country without disadvantage to the non-Jewish population; on the contrary, to their great advantage.

There is no need here of entering into details with respect to the particular complaints of the Jewish population; these have been described in the report of the Executive Committee. That they are justified is demonstrated by the fact that all Jewish elements including those affiliated with the present government are united in pressing them. To what extent the causes of these complaints will be removed only the future will tell. Though at present anti-Jewish organizations have been suppressed the causes for your Committee's continuing its interest have not been entirely removed. Full citizenship has not yet been accorded to all of the Jewish population. A satisfactory community organization law has not yet been enacted. Adequate support of Jewish communities and schools has not been forthcoming. Nor has complete justice been done with regard to Jewish teachers and the curricula in the schools. Discrimination in the field of financial credits has not yet been removed. In short, the rights of the Jewish population under the minorities treaties and guarantee of the League of Nations are still in a measure only paper rights. And the Committee should not be diverted from its task by the specious argument of government officials or other individuals that this constitutes an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of their country.

The task of securing the desired amelioration is complicated by the internal differences which obtain among the Jews themselves. And those differences, which also obtain in other countries are especially flagrant in Roumania and
Poland. Though they are split up into many factions the essential or fundamental difference consists in their weltanschauung, i.e., Jewish nationalism versus anti-nationalism. These differences not only affect the relation of the Jews to one another and of the Jews to their neighbors, but constitute a vital factor in their political life. Though the subject is too complex to be dealt with here, it should be observed that the anti-nationalists regard the nationalists as the greatest danger to their security, because they believe that Jewish nationalism gives ground for the charge that the Jews are an alien and unassimilable element in the population. The nationalist Jews on the other hand, fear that the rights of Jewish citizens will be completely ignored if they should permit themselves as individuals to be absorbed into and scattered among the prevailing political parties. Moreover, they are confronted with the fact that other minorities within their country operate as distinct parties. Thus they are impaled on the horns of a dilemma. Should they affiliate with these minorities, or should they affiliate with the parties of the majority? They fear they will be damned either way. This particularly affects the Jews who live in the newly acquired territories, for example in Ukrainian East Galicia and in the Lithuanian Vilna district in Poland, or with the Hungarian minority in Transylvania and the Ruthenians in Bukowina. The Jews of old Roumania, the Regat, are not confronted with this difficulty because in old Roumania there are few persons apart from Jews who belong to minority groups. The internal differences among the Jews govern their forms of organization, their communal policies and their methods of operation. The situation is complicated, moreover, by personal rivalries and antipathies which frequently degenerate into amazingly bitter rancour and abuse. It is doubtful whether these differences can be reconciled. Even in the gravest emergencies it has proven impossible, with rare exceptions, to unite these factions on critical issues. The enemies of the Jews, and the government, have not failed to take advantage of these antagonisms to weaken the Jewish forces still further. This is especially patent in Roumania, where factionalism has resulted in a scandalous checkmate to all efforts to protect Jewish interests. The differences among the Jewish organ-
izations in the occident, who are occupied in these fields, which are quite analogous, if not identical, with those in Eastern European countries, are known to the governments and have resulted in a diminishing respect for Jewish solidarity of which in the past they entertained a wholesome opinion.

What can be done? If the government, let us say like the Czarist government in Russia before the War, were the instigators of anti-Jewish outrages or defiantly flaunted infractions of the rights of its minorities, two steps would be open,—one, an appeal to the decent sentiment of the world, the other, a formal arraignment before the League of Nations. But the government as a whole is not only not the instigator of excesses, but recognizing the embarrassment and danger to the country's prestige, would be glad to consign Cuza and his associates to oblivion. The fault of the government lies in its leniency, in its indulgence of these vicious elements, in its persistent policy of underestimating the dangerous effects of anti-Semitic agitation and propaganda which by its own laws it could have and should have effectually suppressed, in its failure to punish the malefactors, in its wholly mistaken interpretation of democratic principles and procedure, and not the least, in continuing a policy of legislative evasions and administrative acts of discrimination against its Jewish citizens which only tend to emphasize the traditional feeling of the population at large that the Jews are still to be regarded as aliens and of inferior civic status. The fault of the government rests also in its persistent policy to minimize the complaints, sometimes even to extenuate or deny the facts, and worse than this, to accuse its Jewish population of disloyalty because they appeal for intervention or assistance from their fellow-Jews in other parts of the world. Because of the instability of Roumanian governments they have been sensitive to every current of dissatisfaction within as well as outside the country. So long as anti-Jewish outbreaks were sporadic and of comparatively mild effect and so long as discriminations remain subtle and difficult of indictment before the League of Nations, the government avoided taking strict measures with the student bodies, the thoughtless and exuberant instruments of the anti-Semitic agitators, because
the students are, so to speak, the darlings of the people. The government feared to generate a widespread unpopularity which would only have added strength to the political opposition which kept growing both inside and outside its party ranks. Only when the situation began to assume the aspect of an international scandal, to threaten countrywide anarchy, and to evoke the dissatisfaction of its new King; did it finally take necessary measures.

Protests on the part of our Committee and other similar organizations have not been without some effect, especially during the administration of the present government whose great desire for foreign financial help makes it especially sensitive to the world's opinion.

This brings me to an important point in my recital. Fundamentally, as I have indicated before, it is the unfavorable economic situation of the Roumanian masses which has made the anti-Jewish propaganda effective. The agrarian depression which made it difficult, if not impossible, for the peasants to meet their obligations to the banks, furnished fertile soil for anti-Jewish agitation. The peasants were told that the Jews were responsible for their plight because the latter had depressed the prices of farm products, on the one hand, and had, on the other hand, increased the prices of manufactured commodities needed by the peasants. Moreover, it was alleged that it was the Jewish bankers who held their mortgages and who were not only charging the peasants extortionate rates of interest, but were foreclosing on their mortgages. Though there is no doubt that the rates of interest are excessive, my inquiry disclosed that the banks who hold farm paper were nearly exclusively non-Jewish institutions. For example, in Suceava, Bukowina, the center of the peasant uprising, there are twelve banks. Of these, only two are in Jewish hands. And neither of these held farm mortgages. They were in the possession of the non-Jewish banks. Should the government, which has been negotiating for a foreign agricultural loan, succeed in obtaining it, it is confidently expected that the agrarian situation will be saved. In consequence, the peasants, the prospective beneficiaries of this loan, who have been traditionally friendly to the Jews, will no longer prove credulous material for anti-Semitic propaganda.
It follows that all who have at heart the welfare of the Jews of Roumania must at the same time be eager to see Roumania obtain the financial aid she desires. But, as Roumania has already learned, all symptoms of internal instability, whether political crises or civil disorders such as anti-Jewish riots, make it difficult to obtain such aid on favorable terms. In the face of such symptoms of instability, even the warmest friends of Roumania cannot espouse her cause, except in a lukewarm and unconvincing manner. It is clear, therefore, that sound statesmanship dictates that the vicious circle must be broken by Roumania herself, that she must maintain public order, protect the life and property of all her population, and remove all cause for unrest and disorder, by granting the minorities in fact the equality of rights to which they are entitled by law. These indications of stability and strength will not fail to win for her the respect of the world and the credit to which the industry of her people and her natural wealth entitle her. The financial aid she will thus obtain will, by improving the general economic conditions, sterilize the soil on which at present the seeds of anti-Semitism fall, take root, and flourish.

Does recourse to the League of Nations offer hope of early and measurable improvement?

In a more detailed report to our Executive Committee, I pointed out that the League has met with only very limited success. I stated, "The nature of discriminations and infractions of the rights of those belonging to minorities is such that an appeal to the League of Nations is likely to prove unavailing. The evasions of treaty obligations are usually too subtle to allow of clear-cut indictment on the part of the League against the offending nation, especially as the League, in its desire not to humiliate its member bodies and not to appear as infringing upon their national sovereignty, has surrounded the reception and consideration of complaints with a cumbersome procedure which has discouraged the minorities of late from submitting protests. As reported in the official Journal of the League of Nations, there were, between June 13, 1929 and May 31, 1930, 57 petitions, 26 rejected as unreceivable, 14 considered by the Committee of Three in 19 meetings, 29 disposed of, 3 still being examined—not one submitted to the Council."
Efforts have been made to simplify and facilitate the procedure affecting complaints. In this our Committee, under Louis Marshall, took an active though unofficial and indirect part because as an American committee we were restrained from taking direct action since the United States of America is not a member of the League of Nations. But our views were conveyed, in the form of definite recommendations, to several of the leading personages engaged in the consideration of the revision of the procedure, among them the late Herr Gustav Stresemann of Germany, and Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, England, who received them sympathetically and incorporated them in their proposals.

Until radical changes in the procedure are effected, those interested in protecting the rights of minorities will be greatly handicapped and will very largely have to depend, so far as action by the League of Nations is concerned, upon the informal and tactful intervention of the Secretariat or the officials of the Minorities Section, which, it must be recognized, has been of considerable value and is likely to continue to be helpful in the future.

In this and other connections, I desire to point out that publicity though sometimes a powerful instrument is a double-edged sword and when indulged in to excess is likely to work great injury. I cannot escape the conviction that publicity, especially in relation to the troubles of the Jews of Eastern Europe, has frequently been thoughtlessly resorted to and, may I say it brutally, that it sometimes appears as if it has been exploited for personal ambitions, or for the prestige of certain organizations. This excessive and ill-advised publicity has itself become a problem with which our Committee should deal. The situation of our fellow-Jews in these countries is precarious; they are surrounded by many enemies who are ready to take unscrupulous advantage of any words which can be distorted for their own malicious ends. This should make us all careful to weigh our words meticulously and be prepared very often even to refrain from expressing ourselves in public. During our Committee’s experience of nearly a quarter century many of its most effective efforts have frequently been those of which the public, and in some cases not even the General Committee, has been made aware. Moreover, constant
allusions to anti-Jewish discriminations promote callousness on the part of those against whom the complaints are uttered as well as in the public at large, and they gradually lose their effect. The impression gains ground that it is in the very nature of things that the Jews are an oppressed people—an inevitable condition like epidemics of measles or diphtheria, before the recent discoveries of medical science. I interviewed many persons high in the public life of Roumania. Not one of them failed to point to the existence of anti-Semitism in other countries, even in the United States, in extenuation, if not in justification, of its existence in Roumania. Even King Carol in his first pronouncement on the Jewish situation incorporated this allusion.

May I here revert to a statement made in the beginning of my remarks, namely, the striking fact that during the past year the territory of our interest has been extended to countries further west? Even in Switzerland, a country which has been the traditional refuge of oppressed peoples from all parts of the world, there is evidence of an attempt to organize anti-Jewish sentiment in the form of a church newspaper published in the city of Berne.

It is in Germany, however, where the situation is basis for genuine consternation. Let me quote the following from my memorandum to the Executive Committee:

"Finally, I desire to say a word with regard to the anti-Semitic movement in Germany, which, in my opinion, is cause for greater anxiety than the anti-Jewish manifestations in Eastern European countries. The phenomenal gains of the National Socialist Party in the recent elections, far in excess of what was even anticipated at the end of August, when I left Berlin, has threatened to throw the balance of political power in the hands of a group whose ruthlessness is matched only by its organizing ability."

That statement was supported by data too voluminous to be presented in this report. The situation in Germany differs in character from that in countries further east. First, unlike the other countries, Germany has entered into no treaties dealing with minorities rights, although at the Peace Conference, the delegates gave written assurances that they would treat minorities in Germany at least as well as the minority treaties would provide; secondly, the present federal government has in no way abetted or encouraged anti-Jewish agitation. On the contrary, it has taken
severe measures to repress all such demonstrations and has taken all steps legally possible to restrain anti-Jewish propaganda. In spite of this, anti-Semitic agitation assumed alarming proportions within the past year, and in most brutal and offensive forms. Though the economic burdens under which the German people have been suffering have fertilized the soil for this propaganda and a return of prosperity is likely to diminish its effect substantially, the situation is fraught with great danger not only to the Jewish people in Germany, but to the Jews of the whole world.

Again we must be careful to avoid an unbalanced perspective. Hitlerism comprehends much more than anti-Semitism. Not every member of the National Socialist party is an anti-Semite. Nevertheless, anti-Semitism is an essential and important element in its philosophy. Moreover, there are many enemies of the Jews in other parties especially in the Hugenberg National Party. The danger of Hitlerist and Hugenberg nationalism rests in the fact that while raising national issues involving the repudiation of the Versailles treaty and reparation payments, which evoke the sympathy and support of great numbers of Germans outside of these two parties, it insidiously identifies the Jewish people in general and Jewish citizens of Germany in particular with Germany's enemies. Jews are being accused by the Hitlerites of being responsible for the War, for the defeat of Germany, for the Treaty of Versailles as well as for the Young plan. The Jew is the scapegoat. Hitlerism without anti-Semitism would not be our concern as Jews. Under such circumstances, it would be a matter for the German people to deal with, and for those other nations whose interests are involved in the effect upon them of Germany's failure to meet its war obligations. But when a political party with prospects of holding the balance of power, threatens to deprive the Jews of their property and of their rights of citizenship, to subject them to all manner of economic repression, to eliminate them from public service and public honors, in short, degrade them to an inferior economic and political status, the world is confronted with the boldest and most ruthless manifestation of anti-Semitism ever shown in any country. Even Roumania before the War felt obliged to hide its discriminations behind the subterfuge
that the Jews were not citizens. And today there are no legislative discriminations against Jews in Roumania, virtually only evasions of the law, and there is no political party which professes anti-Semitism except the Christian National Party which has one representative, Cuza. Nor are there parties in any other country which openly profess anti-Semitism. In other words, it has been left to this highly civilized country of Germany to make a political issue of what Painleve recently characterized as barbarism, and Gorky has called "this disgusting filth of anti-Semitism."

Social ostracism is humiliating, but can be tolerated by a people who are conscious of their own worth. That exists in other so-called enlightened countries. But the incorporation of medieval measures of persecution in the program of a political party is a shocking defiance of the decencies of modern civilization and a black shadow upon democracy. Albert Einstein who raised the curtain upon the unknown wonders of the universe, or, to use Bernard Shaw's words, has actually created a new universe; Heinrich Heine whose immortal poetry has become part of the folk music of the Germanic race; Albert Ballin whose genius helped his country to build a merchant marine that enabled it to conquer many of the markets of the world; Walter Rathenau, who not only established the huge organization which alone made it possible for Germany to hold out with raw materials to the end of the War, but whose various efforts for a self-respecting yet reasonable solution of the reparations problem strengthened Germany's position before the world—these men who brought undying glory to Germany and the countless others who have in more modest ways contributed to German civilization in every direction, have been branded as unassimilable aliens, and it is sought to legislate them out of German life and memory, and out of the German territory for the protection of which many thousands of its Jewish citizens, far in excess of their proportion in the population, readily gave up their lives. And we cannot overlook the dangerous augury for the future in the impregnation of the seeds of anti-Semitism upon a receptive and impressionable youth. The situation furnishes cause for anxiety to all Jews, even those who have seen no reason for identification with Jewish affairs. Even baptized Jews are not exempt from the
Hakenkreuzler objective of hate. As I stated to our Executive Committee, our interest has ceased to be only a matter of altruism; it has become one of self-defense.

The history of the decade since the end of the Great War reflects the amazing fact that democracies may be just as illiberal as monarchies. Where, before, a despotic sovereign, Ahasauerus, was influenced by a Haman to destroy the Jews, today the sovereign people are exposed to the demagoguery of the reactionaries. And where, in ancient days a Mordecai and an Esther were necessary to protect the Jews, today we must employ the democratic instrumentality of arousing the conscience of humanity to the end that their legal rights, now accorded in virtually every land of the globe shall be secured in fact as well as on paper, in spirit as well as in letter. And that is the task to which the American Jewish Committee is dedicated. It is a task on which all Jews, regardless of their particular views and interests can and should unite.

Respectfully submitted,

MORRIS D. WALDMAN,
Secretary.

CORPORATE MEMBERSHIP

I. District Members


DIST. II: Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee. 3 members: Milton H. Fies, Birmingham, Ala.; Ben H. Stein, Vicksburg, Miss.; Nathan Cohn, Nashville, Tenn.


DIST. V: CALIFORNIA, IDAHO, NEVADA, OREGON, UTAH, WASHINGTON.


DIST. XII: NEW YORK CITY. 36 members: Benjamin Altheimer, Herman Bernstein, David M. Bressler, Benjamin N. Cardozo, Abram I.

*Deceased.


II. MEMBERS-AT-LARGE
(Elected for one year.)


III. DELEGATES FROM NATIONAL JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY, A. S. W. Rosenbach; CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS, David Lefkowitz; COUNCIL OF YOUNG ISRAEL AND YOUNG ISRAEL ORGANIZATIONS, Edward S. Silver; HADASSAH, Mrs. David de Sola Pool; HEBREW SHELTERING AND IMMIGRANT AID SOCIETY OF AMERICA, John L. Bernstein, Harry Fischel, Abraham Herman, Jacob Massel and Albert Rosenblatt; INDEPENDENT ORDER BRITH ABRAHAM, Gustave Hartman, Max L. Hollander, Nathan D. Perlman and Adolph Stern; INDEPENDENT ORDER BRITH SHOLOM, Martin O. Levy, William M. Lewis; INDEPENDENT ORDER FREE SONS
OF ISRAEL, Solon J. Liebeskind; INDEPENDENT WESTERN STAR ORDER, H. Waiss; JEWISH WELFARE BOARD, Joseph Rosenzweig; NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF JEWISH SOCIAL SERVICE, Fred M. Butzel; NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, Mrs. Estelle M. Sternberger; ORDER OF THE UNITED HEBREW BROTHERS, Meyer Greenberg; PROGRESSIVE ORDER OF THE WEST, Joseph Schiller; RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY OF THE JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Louis Finkelstein; UNITED ROUMANIAN JEWS OF AMERICA, Herman Speier and Leo Wolfson; UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA, Nathan Levy; WOMAN'S LEAGUE OF THE UNITED SYNAGOGUE OF AMERICA, Mrs. Samuel Spiegel.

*Deceased.