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TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

DECEMBER 6, 1931

The Twenty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Jewish Committee was held at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on Sunday, December 6, 1931. Doctor Cyrus Adler, President, called the meeting to order.

The following Corporate Members were present:

**District Members:**

I. Morton R. Hirschberg, Jacksonville, Fla.

VII. Julian W. Mack, Chicago; W. B. Woolner, Peoria.

IX. Cyrus Adler, B. L. Levinthal, Horace Stern, and Morris Wolf, all of Philadelphia.

X. Albert Berney, Baltimore; and Edward N. Calisch, Richmond.

XI. Isidore Wise, Hartford; Henry Lasker, Springfield; Samuel E. Paulive, Chelsea; Felix Vorenberg, Boston; and Archibald Silverman, Providence.


XIII. Moses F. Aufsesser, Albany.

XIV. A. J. Dimond, East Orange; William Newcorn, Plainfield; and Joseph B. Perskie, Atlantic City.

**Members-at-Large:**

Delegates from Organizations:

Council of Young Israel: Edward S. Silver.
Hadassah: Mrs. David de Sola Pool.
Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid Society: John L. Bernstein, Harry Fischel, Abraham Herman, Jacob Massel, and Albert Rosenblatt.
Independent Order Brith Abraham: Max L. Hollander, Nathan D. Perlman, and Adolph Stein.
Independent Order Brith Sholom: A. Sigmund Kanegieser and Martin O. Levy.
Independent Order Free Sons of Israel: Solon Liebeskind.
Jewish Welfare Board: Joseph Rosenzweig.
National Council of Jewish Women: Mrs. Estelle M. Sternberger.
Order of United Hebrew Brothers: Meyer Greenberg.
Rabbinical Assembly of the Jewish Theological Seminary: Louis Finkelstein.
United Roumanian Jews of America: Leo Wolfson.
United Synagogue of America: Louis S. Moss.
Women's League of the United Synagogue of America: Mrs. Samuel Spiegel.

Appointment of Committees

The President announced that, in pursuance of a decision of the Executive Committee, he had, in advance of this meeting, appointed the Committee to nominate successors to the officers and to those members of the Executive Committee whose terms expire on January 1, next. The Committee consists of the following: Mr. David M. Bressler, Chairman, and Messrs. Moses F. Aufsesser, Edward M. Baker, Sol Kline, Albert Berney, and A. J. Dimond.

The President announced further that, inasmuch as the books of account of the Committee are regularly audited by a certified public accountant, the appointment of a committee to audit the accounts of the Treasurer would be dispensed with. Furthermore, inasmuch as there are
no contests in any Districts for the Election of Members, no tellers will be appointed to canvass the ballots cast for District Members.

MESSAGES TO MESSRS. ROSENWALD AND SULZBERGER

The President announced that, at the suggestion of several members he had authorized the dispatch of messages expressing, on behalf of the Committee, wishes for their speedy recovery, to Mr. Julius Rosenwald, Vice-President, and Mr. Cyrus L. Sulzberger, member of the Executive Committee, who are unable to attend this meeting because of illness.

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.

AMENDMENT TO THE BY-LAWS

Upon motion, duly made and seconded, the recommendation of the Executive Committee for amendments to the By-Laws, required for putting into effect a new plan of community representation, was unanimously agreed to.

ELECTIONS

The Committee on Nominations recommended the following:

For Members of the Executive Committee to serve for three years from January 1, 1932:

Fred M. Butzel Max J. Kohler
James Davis Irving Lehman
Louis E. Kirstein Samuel D. Leidesdorf
Milton J. Rosenau

For Officers to serve for one year from January 1, 1932:

President: Cyrus Adler.
Vice-Presidents: Julius Rosenwald and Irving Lehman.
Treasurer: Samuel D. Leidesdorf.
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 membership-at-large, suggested by the Executive Committee in its Annual Report, which he did, and announced the election of the several nominees.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS ON DOCTOR ADOLPHE STERN

The President stated that it had been deemed fitting that the death on October 20, 1931, of Doctor Adolphe Stern, leader for many years of the Jews of Roumania, be appropriately noticed at this Annual Meeting, and he called upon Leo Wolfson, Esq., President of the Roumanian Jews of America, to deliver a memorial address which he had prepared for the occasion.

Upon motion, the meeting adjourned until three-thirty o'clock this afternoon.

MORRIS D. WALDMAN,
Secretary.

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY MEETING

A special public meeting to celebrate the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the foundation of the Committee took place at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on Sunday, December 6, 1931, at three o'clock. The meeting was called to order by Dr. Cyrus Adler, who read a number of messages of congratulations from individuals and from the following organizations: Alliance Israélite Universelle, Paris, France; American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, European Executive Offices, Berlin, Germany; B’nai B’rith, Cincinnati, Ohio; Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens, Berlin, Germany; Hias-ICA-Emigdirekt, Paris, France; Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden, Berlin, Germany; Israelitische Allianz zu Wien, Vienna, Austria; Jewish Colonization Association, Paris, France; Joint Foreign Committee of the Board of Jewish Deputies and the Anglo-Jewish Association, London, Eng-
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

To the Members of the American Jewish Committee:

Your Executive Committee begs leave to present for your consideration an outline of the more important of the matters to which its attention was given during the past year, the twenty-fifth in the existence of the organization.

A. DOMESTIC MATTERS

1. IMMIGRATION

Upon the opening in December, 1930, of the 3rd Session of the 71st Congress, bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate providing for the suspension of immigration for two years, with the exception of certain classes of aliens which, under the law, now possess the status of non-quota immigrants. Although the number of immigrants had already been drastically reduced by executive order to American consuls abroad, the avowed purpose of the proposed measure was to reduce "the number of newcomers into the United States who come here for the purpose of seeking employment." The Senate bill did not exempt the wives and minor children of aliens permanently residing in this country, and provided that visas be denied to intending immigrants from countries which refuse to admit their citizens who have been deported from the United States. At a public hearing on this measure before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization
of the Senate on December 15, 1930, a memorandum, presenting the objections of your Committee to these provisions was submitted.

Subsequently, the Secretary of State appeared before the Immigration Committee of the Senate which was considering the bill introduced into that body, and called attention to the fact that the proposed exemption of relatives of resident aliens from the suspension ban would have the effect of nullifying the national origins principle underlying the existing immigration laws, as in practice it would result in the admission of a very large number of Eastern Europeans and a very small number of aliens from Northern and Western Europe; the Secretary recommended as a substitute measure that all immigration be restricted horizontally to 10% of the present quotas. Inasmuch as such a horizontal cut would reduce still further the few opportunities for the reunion of families, some of whose members are here and others still abroad, your Committee joined with other organizations in opposing this suggestion and affixed its signature to a joint Memorial submitted to the Secretary of State on January 8, 1931, asking him not to favor any legislation, either suspending or limiting immigration, which raises any additional barrier to the admission of near relatives or the union of families of citizens or aliens already resident in the United States. The memorial called attention to the fact that both the Republican and the Democratic Parties had, in their 1928 platforms, recommended modifications in the law in order to facilitate the reunion of families, and that President Hoover and the Department of Labor had repeatedly favored such modifications.

Subsequently, the House Committee on Immigration reported out a substitute measure embodying the suggestions of Secretary Stimson. The new bill proposed a reduction for two years of all immigration quotas by 90%, with a minimum quota of 100 for each nationality. As did a number of other organizations, your Committee protested against the bill, which was pressed to passage in the House, but failed to come up in the Senate before the adjournment of the session.

It appears, however, that the purpose of the proposed
legislation has, in the meantime, been achieved by the Department of State, which, at the request of the President, instructed consular officers, in issuing visas to intending immigrants, to interpret strictly the provision of the immigration law which excludes persons likely to become public charges, in view of the economic depression prevailing in this country. According to the Report of the State Department, only 48,528 (32%) out of a possible total of 153,714 visas were issued to quota immigrants during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and during the same period the influx of quota-exempt immigrants totalled only 45,999 as against 107,469 for the preceding year. There was thus for the year ending June 30, 1931, a total immigration of 97,139 as compared with 241,700 for the preceding year. During the past fiscal year, however, 61,882 aliens left the country, so that the net immigration was only 35,257 as compared with a net of 191,039 for the preceding year.

In spite of this drastic reduction in immigration, certain members of Congress have already expressed their determination to perpetuate the reduction, ostensibly put into effect as an emergency measure, by endeavoring to secure the passage in the next session of Congress, which begins on Monday, December 7th, of a bill similar to the one which was passed by the House of Representatives at the last session of the preceding Congress.

A deportation bill, conferring wide powers upon the Secretary of Labor, and including a number of extremely objectionable features, was reported favorably in both Houses but did not come to a vote. In this connection, it is interesting to note that Reuben Oppenheimer, Esq., of Baltimore, prepared an able report on the deportation of aliens, criticizing many provisions of law and practice in the prevailing system, which was approved by a large majority of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement. Bills seriously to restrict naturalization were also pressed in Congress.

2. **Alien Registration**

While none of the bills for the compulsory registration of aliens was reported out of Committee in either House
of the Congress, such a measure was passed by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, and introduced in California and, according to press reports, in thirteen other states. After loosely and erroneously defining “aliens legally resident in the State of Michigan” and requiring such “aliens to establish proof of the legality of their entrance to the United States,” whereupon they are to be given a “certificate of legal residence,” the Michigan act forbids all persons and corporations to employ aliens who do not produce such certificates, and requires the reporting of every case of persons not holding such certificates; violators of the act are to be arrested and fined or imprisoned, and alien violators, after paying a fine or serving a term of imprisonment, are to be turned over to the officers of the United States Bureau of Immigration.

When informed of the passage of this act by Michigan members of the Committee, Mr. Max J. Kohler, chairman of the Standing Advisory Committee on Immigration, communicated with the Governor of Michigan, urging him to veto the bill on both the grounds of unconstitutionality and public policy. Many other organizations, national and local, also protested, but the Governor signed the measure on May 29, 1931. On June 1, several Detroit attorneys applied on behalf of clients to the United States District Court for temporary injunction against the enforcement of the act, which was granted and a date set for a hearing before the same court on the motion for a permanent injunction. This hearing was held July 1, 1931, when the attorneys for the plaintiffs filed an exhaustive brief, in the preparation of which Mr. Kohler and Mr. Fred M. Butzel of this Committee rendered valuable assistance. The Court announced at the conclusion of the argument that the temporary injunction would be continued, but has not yet made known its decision.

3. THE FREIBURG PASSION PLAY

During the past year, a company of actors continued to tour the country and produce the so-called Freiburg Passion Play. Convinced that such plays tend to intensify prejudice, efforts were made by Jewish communities in
a number of cities to prevent the production of the Freiburg Play. In some cities, Christian leaders joined with Jewish representatives in the effort to have the play banned. This was the case in Savannah, Ga., in September. In Rochester, N. Y., where a motion picture version of the play was shown, the protest of the Jewish rabbis and laymen was endorsed by Christian clergymen, and the Committee on International Friendship of the Federation of Churches issued a statement to the effect that "any such presentation which attaches blame to the Jews of today for a crime committed centuries ago is most reprehensible." A similar attitude was adopted in May, by a pastor in Syracuse, whose Church cancelled arrangements for the presentation of the Passion Play. Your Committee cooperated in many of these efforts by supplying community leaders with literary material to aid them in formulating their protests, and, in the case of the cinema production, by registering direct protests with the producers and distributors. Your Committee suggests that members be on the alert for announcements of the coming of this play to their cities and endeavor to take all proper steps to forestall the conclusion of definite arrangements for the production.

4. Discrimination in Colleges and Professional Schools

Last December the attention of your Committee was called to the fact that, in connection with public discussion on the alleged discrimination as against Jews in admissions to medical schools, the proposal had been made in several quarters that Jewish medical schools be established. Your Committee endeavored to determine the facts, and consider whether the acceptance of discrimination and the development of a Jewish institution to meet the situation would not, in the long run, encourage discrimination in this and other fields. In an article published in August 1930 in The Jewish Tribune, New York City, by Dr. A. I. Rongy, who had conducted a nation-wide investigation for the National Conference of Jews and Christians, Dr. Rongy admitted that his inquiry indicated that only one of every three Jewish applicants is admitted to the
medical schools; but he pointed out that the enrollment of Jews is $3\frac{1}{2}$ times their proportion of the population, and as the Jewish physician's clientele is chiefly Jewish, he insisted that the restriction on the admission of Jews is for their own benefit, as otherwise excessive competition would result to the detriment of Jewish medical practitioners; he recommended that the Jewish population should itself take steps to curtail the number of its young men entering the medical profession. Some interesting figures were given in an article on the same subject by Dr. Harold Rypins, Secretary of the New York State Board of Medical Examiners, himself a Jew, published in December, in *The American Hebrew*. He pointed out that 17% of all the students in medical schools are Jews, and insisted that the apparent discrimination as against Jews is explained by the paucity of accommodations and by geographical factors; he agreed, however, that there is nevertheless "a very large number of ambitious and capable Jewish students, who, ... are banned from the study of medicine," and that these students present a special problem which must, and undoubtedly will, find a special solution.

Information secured by your Committee from various reliable sources indicated that the failure of the schools to accept Jewish students in the same ratio as that of their number to all applicants is not altogether traceable to anti-Jewish discrimination, as other factors are also taken into account. It is also true that the facilities of existing medical schools are far below the point where they can care for all the applicants who seek admission, but those who suggest increasing these facilities overlook the fact that, compared with many other countries, the United States is over-supplied with medical practitioners especially in the large cities of the East, and that, because of the resulting keen competition, many abuses obtain. In the light of these and other facts your Committee reached the conclusion that while it may be true, that "a very large number of ambitious and capable Jewish students, ... are banned from the study of medicine," yet the establishment of a medical school for the accommodation of Jewish students is not the solution of the problem this situation presents. It would lead to the further over-
crowding of an already over-crowded profession, with an increase of the difficulties and abuses resulting from heightened competition; moreover, such a step would be tantamount to an acceptance and a tacit endorsement of discrimination in this particular field, leading to further discrimination therein and also encouraging such practice in other scholastic circles. Your Committee feels that the solution lies rather in the direction of better vocational guidance for Jewish students about to choose professions. This must not be understood to mean, however, that the Committee accepts existing discrimination. We maintain, as we always have and shall, that institutions of learning, which, in enrolling candidates for admission, are guided by considerations of race or creed, violate the fundamental ideals which such institutions are universally expected to foster and promote, and we shall not abate our efforts to combat racial and religious prejudice in admission to schools, wherever it may be practiced.

A complaint of such prejudice affecting three students in a medical school of an eastern university was received by your Committee at the close of the spring semester of 1931. The local representative of the Committee thoroughly investigated the complaint and the evidence he secured convinced him that the charge of racial bias was without foundation.

In the autumn of 1930, the cooperation of your Committee was requested in connection with the charge that the authorities of another college in the East were limiting the enrollment of Jews. Your Committee was represented on a joint committee of various interested bodies which decided, as a first step, to present an authenticated complaint to the Board of Regents of the State in which the college was situated. This complaint was forwarded to the Board of Trustees of the institution whose reply constructively admitted that the race and religion of applicants is considered in weighing their qualifications for admission, but they defended this procedure on the ground that the student body should constitute a fairly representative cross-section of the state, and a composite and harmonious whole. When this reply was submitted to the joint committee which had made the complaint, the
latter requested and was granted a hearing before the Board of Regents. Representatives of the committee presented an oral argument, and submitted a brief. The matter is still pending.

5. DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

In the report submitted to you at the last meeting, in November 1930, your Committee, referring to the problem of anti-Jewish discrimination in employment, stressed the desirability of a comprehensive study of the subject to be undertaken cooperatively by a group of national Jewish organizations. The subject was discussed at conferences held in New York in December 1930, and January 1931, called by the B’nai B’rith, which resulted in the formation of a National Conference on Jewish Employment. The participating organizations, besides the B’nai B’rith, and your Committee, are: The American Jewish Congress, the Jewish Welfare Board, the National Council of Jewish Women, the Independent Order B’rith Abraham, and the United Hebrew Trades. A program and a procedure were agreed upon, and your Committee voted an appropriation as its share of a fund for a preliminary study, but inasmuch as this fund has not yet been completed, the actual initiation of the study has been temporarily deferred.

6. CALENDAR REFORM

It will be recalled that in the report submitted to the Annual Meeting in November 1929, your Executive Committee stated that it was closely following the progress of the movement to bring about the reform or simplification of the existing Gregorian Calendar and that the Committee had joined other organizations in establishing the League for Safeguarding the Fixity of the Sabbath Against Possible Encroachment by Calendar Reform. This League has been engaged in opposing all schemes for Calendar Reform which involve the device of a blank day or days, which would have the effect of destroying the existing and immemorially fixed periodicity of the seventh day Sabbath, thus confronting observers of such a Sabbath with the dilemma either of keeping the Sabbath on different
days of the week from year to year, thereby suffering material losses, or of refraining from keeping the Sabbath, thereby violating their conscience—a situation which, it was feared, would eventually result in the virtual destruction of the Sabbath.

During the past year the League, with the active cooperation of the Committee's office, prepared a memorandum on the Jewish attitude toward Calendar Reform, which was submitted to the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit of the League of Nations, which has been discussing the reform of the calendar. Along with representatives of European bodies also interested in the matter, the president of the League attended the meeting in June of the Preparatory Committee on Calendar Reform which met in Geneva, for the purpose of preparing for a conference on the subject to be held in October, under the auspices of the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communications and Transit of the League of Nations. At this meeting the Jewish representatives laid before the Preparatory Committee the objections to the blank day device from the Jewish point of view.

Subsequently, the League for Safeguarding the Fixity of the Sabbath was invited by the Advisory and Technical Committee for Communication and Transit of the League of Nations, to send representatives to a conference on October 12th. The president of your Committee secured the consent of Messrs. Philip S. Henry and Elkan N. Adler to serve as representatives along with Mr. Arthur I. Le Vine of New York City. In the meantime, your Committee took steps to suggest that in the appointment of representatives of the United States Government to attend this conference, account be taken of the fact that a large part of the citizens of the country are opposed to schemes for Calendar Reform involving the blank day device. Similar action was taken, at the suggestion of the Committee, by the League for Safeguarding the Fixity of the Sabbath, through the Chairman of its Executive Board, Mr. William Liebermann, a member of the American Jewish Committee. Following this action, it was learned that the representatives of the United States Government were not given authority to commit the Government on
the question but were only "representatives in the capacity of experts for the purpose of following all discussions at the conference."

At this conference, a petition protesting against the blank day device, bearing the signatures of distinguished Jewish laymen of various countries, was submitted in order to demonstrate that the opposition to this device among Jews was not restricted to the rabbinate, as had been alleged. This petition was the outcome of a conference held at Basle, Switzerland, during the past summer, called jointly by the chairman of the Joint Foreign Committee and the president of your Committee. Among the signatories of the laymen's petition were Baron Edmond de Rothschild; Professor Sylvain Lévi, President of the Alliance Israélite; Lionel de Rothschild, President of the United Synagogue of England; Nahum Sokolow, President of the World Zionist Organization and of the Jewish Agency; O. E. d'Avigdor Goldsmid, President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews; Dr. J. L. Magnes, Chancellor of the Hebrew University; Chaim N. Bialik, Hebrew poet; Oscar Wassermann, Vice President of the Deutsche Bank; Felix M. Warburg; Herbert H. Lehman; and Dr. Adler. According to press reports, the general conference decided that, in view of present unsettled conditions in many countries, it would not, in its report to the League of Nations, propose any further steps in the direction of the reform of the calendar, but would merely suggest further study and efforts to secure the endorsement of public opinion for the proposed reform.

7. The Statistical Department

The Statistical Department of the Committee, continued during the past year, to gather, classify, and disseminate information concerning Jewish matters. It prepared for the American Jewish Year Book the directories and lists and the article on Statistics of Jews which are to be found in Volume 33 of that series. In addition to the general statistics of population and immigration, the Department prepared interesting and valuable supplements on the Jews of Luxembourg, Venezuela, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, Turkey, and the Union of Socialist Soviet
Republics. These statistics were abstracted with considerable effort from voluminous reports of official censuses taken in these countries in recent years.

A great deal of the time and effort of the Director and his staff during the first half of the past year was devoted to the compilation from official sources of statistics of inmates of State Prisons in the United States for the ten years from 1920 to 1929, with a view to determining the percentage of Jewish inmates in these penal institutions. The data brought together showed that during this period a total of 394,080 prisoners were received by these prisons, and that 6,846, or 1.74% of this number were Jews. During the same decade, the average percentage of Jews to the total population of the United States was 3.43%. Hence, the number of Jews in the state prisons was 49.27% smaller than the percentage of Jews to the total population of the country. Prison statistics for Poland, Roumania, and Latvia gathered by the Department showed a similar situation. These facts support the statistics gathered by the Department in 1926 of the inmates of the prisons of New York State and of New York City, which were cited in the report submitted by your Committee at your last Annual Meeting.

In this connection the article "Jews War on Crime" by Ernest K. Coulter in a recent issue of the Outlook Independent Magazine, is of great interest, because the author presents facts and figures which demonstrate not only that the number of Jews in penal institutions in New York State are less than their proportion to the total population, but also that the percentage of Jews has been steadily and rapidly decreasing during the past quarter century. It is also gratifying to note that the author of the article, who has been for many years an active worker in various efforts to reduce juvenile delinquency, gives the credit for this improvement to agencies established by the Jewish community of New York City.

8. THE AMERICAN JEWISH YEAR BOOK

In September last, the Jewish Publication Society of America issued Volume 33 of the American Jewish Year
Book. This was the 24th volume of the series prepared in the office of the Committee; it was edited, as were the twelve preceding issues, by the Assistant Secretary. This number contains, besides the usual directories, lists and statistics, and the article on the Inmates of State Prisons already referred to, biographical sketches of the late Nathan Straus of New York, and of the late Ben Selling of Portland, Ore., who was a member of the Committee since its inception; the first article was contributed by the Rev. Dr. David de Sola Pool of New York City, and the second by Rabbi Henry J. Berkowitz of Portland. The volume also contains an article on Jewish Women's Organizations in the United States by Mrs. Rebekah Kohut, describing the genesis, and enumerating the principal services here and abroad of the leading national Jewish Women's Organizations in the United States. The editor also contributed a detailed review of the important events of Jewish interest in various countries during the past year. Finally, the volume includes the 24th Annual Report of the American Jewish Committee.

9. Louis Marshall Memorial Volume

In memory of Louis Marshall, our late president, your Committee has had reprinted in book form the biography of Mr. Marshall written by the president of the Committee, together with addresses delivered by officers of your Committee at memorial meetings.

B. FOREIGN MATTERS

During the past summer, as in that of 1930, the Secretary of the Committee spent a number of months on the European continent in order to confer with Jewish leaders and other persons regarding the most recent events affecting the Jews of those countries to which your Committee has been devoting attention during recent years. The President of the Committee and the Chairman of the Executive Committee were also abroad, in connection with the meeting of the Jewish Agency Council for Palestine.

A comprehensive review of conditions in so far as they affect our people in various lands, is, as has already been
pointed out, included in the current issue of the American Jewish Year Book. We shall, therefore, briefly sketch the situation only in those countries in which special problems exist which have had the attention of your Committee.

Before doing so, however, it seems fitting, in view of the close historic connection of the Jewish people with that country's past, to refer in this place to the proclamation, on April 14, 1931, of the Republic of Spain. It was the expulsion of the Jews from that country, four hundred and forty years ago, which led to the establishment of many of the present Jewish settlements on the shores of the Mediterranean, and to the beginnings of Jewish colonization in North and South America.

Since the proclamation of the republic several members of the provisional government have expressed their benevolent intentions toward the descendants of the exiles of 1492, and their eagerness to expunge from the laws of the land the edict of expulsion which plunged so many thousands of human beings, guilty only of adhering to their ancestral faith, into the abyss of misery, and had such a profound and far-reaching effect upon the course of Jewish history.

We are happy to preface what is in large measure a gloomy review with this cheerful reference.

It is appropriate also to note here that December 9, next, will be the 100th anniversary of the birth of the great philanthropist Baron Maurice de Hirsch, who devoted his entire fortune to the cause of alleviating the economic sufferings of the congested Jewish communities of Eastern Europe by helping a large number of Jews to emigrate to South America, and in other ways.

Poland

The attention of the Committee has been confined, insofar as Poland is concerned, to the economic condition of the Jewish people and to legislative questions which had a bearing upon the civil and religious rights of the Jewish citizenry and then, only with a view to supporting the legitimate demands of the Jewish population itself as reflected in the utterances and activities of the leaders
of the Jewish organizations and parties in that country. Under the present government no question had arisen with regard to the security of life and limb. Sporadic attempts to do violence to Jews were promptly and effectually suppressed by the authorities and the malefactors were always dealt with sternly. The recent outbreaks came as a shocking and profoundly distressing surprise. When reports of the student disorders first reached us they were accompanied by the news that the university authorities had as a precaution closed the universities, had denounced the disorderly students and threatened to punish them by expulsion. And as news came of the riots spreading against the Jewish population at large, it was uniformly reported that the police were taking the necessary measures to protect them and to apprehend the rioters. When, however, the disturbances assumed proportions in Vilna resulting in injury to many Jews and the death of a rioting non-Jewish student, your Committee entertained fears that the authorities either were failing to act with vigor, or were unable adequately to cope with the situation. Your President thereupon wrote to the Polish Ambassador, as follows:

November 18, 1931.

YOUR EXCELLENCY:

We have been profoundly distressed by the reports appearing in the press during the past few weeks of the disturbances which began in the University of Cracow over two weeks ago, spreading rapidly to other universities, and, during the past few days, have extended to the Jewish population at large, in a number of cities and towns of your country. It appears from the most recent reports that those outbreaks have involved loss and damage to property, bodily injury to many persons, and even loss of life. We were, in a measure, relieved by the consistent reports of efforts that were being made by the authorities to suppress the disturbances and to arrest the malefactors. Knowing that the present government of Poland had succeeded in effectually dealing with violent anti-Jewish manifestations, we were confident that in these instances the authorities would be equally effective. But the reports during the past few days would seem to indicate the inability of the authorities to cope with the situation in such a way as to fully relieve the fears of the Jewish people of Poland and the anxiety of their brethren in other parts of the world.

We shall greatly appreciate your informing our Committee whether you have information of those occurrences, and if not, whether you will not communicate with your Government for
reliable information. As you know, from conversations we have had with your Excellency and other high and responsible representatives of your Government, we have been deeply concerned for a long time over the sad economic plight of the Jewish people of Poland. During the existence of the present Government, we had thus far entertained no fears with regard to the security of the life and limb of our brethren, and we shall be very happy to learn that vigorous measures are being taken by the national and local authorities of your country successfully to put an end to the excesses.

I have the honor to be,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Cyrus Adler,

President.

In the meantime, continued reports of excesses were received and feeling began to run high. After consulting the President and the Chairman of the Executive Committee, the Secretary placed himself in personal touch with the representatives of the Polish Government to inform them of the Committee's growing distress and the importance of their conveying this feeling to their Government. A few days later the following communication was received from the Ambassador:

November 21, 1931.

My dear Mr. Adler:

I beg to answer your letter of the 18th inst., in which you expressed the desire to be informed about the last riots between the Polish and Jewish students in some of the Polish universities. It seems to me quite natural that you should be anxious to have this information from me personally, because as one can easily guess, the newspaper reports are, as usual in such cases, not without exaggeration and not without a bias towards sensation.

The trouble between the Polish and Jewish students started on the university grounds from a minor reason, which since years forms a perpetual cause of misunderstandings between Christian and Jewish medical students in Poland as well as in other European countries.

According to Polish legislation, our universities enjoy the privilege of autonomy and the police has no authority to interfere on the university grounds. So, when in the Warsaw University the riot occurred, the Rector ordered immediately closing of the University to prevent the abuse of the University's privileges,—by this means not only condemning the riots, but at the same time creating the possibility for police to exercise their duties. When the disturbances started outside of the Colleges, vigorous measures were taken by the authorities and many arrests were made. At the same time the Minister of the Interior issued a declaration
in which, condemning those who provoked these regrettable incidents, expressed the strong decision on behalf of the Government, that all excesses started by irresponsible elements will be very energetically suppressed by the authorities.

This attitude of condemning the instigators was not only taken by the Polish Government, but by the immense majority of the Polish nation. The Bishop of Cracow, Prince Sapieha, after having been informed that one of the churches has been sacrileged, issued an appeal warning the population against the provokers and asking the people to remain calm and dignified. A similar stand was taken by the Polish press.

As you know, Mr. Adler, every nation nowadays is blessed by the existence of a group of her own extreme nationalists, who sometimes without much scruple avail themselves of the hot-headed university youth, instigating them to extravagant and even criminal manifestations. Poland is not an exception to this rule, as proved by some events in the year 1922, and as far as I know, the same elements are today responsible for instigating university students against their Jewish colleagues. I presume that in this fact the Polish authorities had an additional reason to be very energetic, and you may be sure that all possible measures for pacification are employed by my Government.

I, myself, as a representative of the Polish Government and as a Polish citizen, feel very sorry that the recent regrettable riots occurred between two unreliable factions of my co-citizens. At the same time, I feel quite sure that the attacks against the Jews cannot be considered as a result of anti-Semitic feelings of the Polish population, but simply as an unpatriotic and un-humanitarian exploitation by irresponsible elements of an antagonism between those Jewish and Polish students who are not mature enough to understand the advantages of peaceful relations between all the citizens of my country.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) T. FILIPOWICZ,
Ambassador of Poland.

It is with great relief also that we learned from direct reports that order had been restored. On November 27th, further word was received from the Embassy conveying the text of the following telegram it had received from the Polish Government:

Connection recent anti-Jewish disturbances understand from official sources police detained altogether 425 university and high school students. 96 including several Jews were arrested and prosecuted. One Christian killed, 35 Christians and 58 Jews injured among them three Christians and three Jews seriously. No pillaging of property had taken place. Measures taken by school authorities included closing of universities and prohibition for high school students to appear in streets after 6:30 P.M. Police
acted energetically throughout dispersing crowds with aid of rubber sticks, fire hose and tear gas. Criminal prosecutions are pending against twenty students. University authorities investigate about fifty cases. Several students have already been expelled from their colleges. Connection with charges of laxity on part of Wilno police government suspended government commissioner and assistant police chief. Complete order has now been restored.

Subsequently there was received from the Polish Embassy the following dispatches of the Polish Telegraphic Agency:

WARSAW (PAT). November 27. The Jewish Parliamentary Club publishes an appeal to the Jews in Poland expressing appreciation for the standpoint taken by the Jews in Poland during the recent disturbances and stressing the fact that the Poles separated themselves entirely from the anti-Semitic disturbers and condemned severely the excesses. The appeal underlines also the fact that the Government acted in a full understanding of its duties and proceeded with utmost energy against the perpetrators of anti-Semitic riots. The appeal closes with the request that the Jews should continue trusting their Parliamentary Club which will not fail them. The Warsaw Jewish Daily Nash Przeglad—commenting on the above declares that it does justice to the Government. Public opinion the world over will rely solely upon the declarations of the Club. Any attempt to weaken the meaning of the above enunciation either by political impostors or by writers lacking political orientation or by self-appointed defenders trying to exploit anti-Semitic excesses for purposes having nothing in common with real interests of the Jews in Poland—will have no importance whatever.

WARSAW (PAT). November 27. The Central Committee of the Orthodox Jews of Poland (Agudas Israel) publishes a declaration with regard to false rumors spread abroad and especially in the United States about the recent excesses in Poland. The declaration stresses the fact that those excesses were provoked solely by chauvinistic elements and that the Government as well as the Poles in general emphatically condemned and suppressed them in their very origin. The enunciation declares that the Polish Government applies no race or creed differentiation to any citizen of Poland.

Though the Committee feels greatly relieved that order has been restored in Poland, we labor under no illusions with respect to the danger of continued and more intense propaganda on the part of the anti-Jewish elements in that country. The old weapon of boycott which was wielded by the cooperative anti-Jewish organization Rozvoj for several years after the War, whose activities soon became attenuated and were virtually destroyed under the present
Polish Government, threatens now again to be taken up with new vigor by the National Democrats through the boisterous anti-Jewish student groups.

The recent excesses are attributable mainly to internal politics. The government authorities regard them as resulting from the machinations of the chauvinistic elements in the National Democratic Party, which hostile to the government, is represented in the Sejm by 64 deputies out of a total of 444. It has been the policy of fascists and anti-Jewish elements in eastern European countries to use student groups as the instruments for their propaganda. Students have proven to be most effective agents in this direction because of their youthful exuberance, and because they are the darlings of the people. They hold a position in the minds of the people of being outside and above the general laws of the land. The traditional autonomy of the universities has probably reinforced this position. The revolutionary changes which have taken place in the economic life of the people of eastern European countries since the War have to a great extent broken down class distinctions. This, combined with the increased struggle for existence, in which the virtual shutting off of emigration is no negligible factor, has stimulated the desire for education and all the material benefits accompanied by education on the part of strata of the population which, before the War, had been satisfied to remain within their economic and social environment. Children of the working classes and of the peasantry now desire a place in the sun, and for the first time have the opportunity to satisfy that desire.

That Jews constitute so large a proportion of university population is not only due to the traditional love of learning of the People of the Book, but it is the effect, in a measure, of the circumscribed life of the Jews during the long dark periods preceding the final and complete political emancipation following the Great War, their virtual imprisonment within the borders of the Russian Pale and the limitations placed upon their occupational life. They were not permitted to live on the land; they were shut out of public service; military life offered no opportunities beyond the lowest compulsory ranks; large industry discriminated against their employment. Even today in Poland because
of the paucity of agricultural land no encouragement is given to Jews to engage in agriculture. But even assuming that the proletarization of the Jewish people is desirable, the means to encourage them to turn to agriculture and common labor are not the *numerus clausus* and personal violence.

For some time before the recent outbreaks, your Committee had studied with great anxiety the economic situation of our Polish brethren. The results of the elections in December 1930 which gave Marshal Pilsudski and his party a working majority in the Sejm aroused hope for better times. These hopes have not, however, been realized. On the contrary, the condition of the Jews in Poland has grown worse, not merely in common with that of the general population, but in disproportion, because they constitute an excessively large element among the commercial and artisan classes who have been obliged to carry the heavier burdens of the economic depression.

Keenly aware of the extremely wretched situation of our Polish brethren, your Committee was glad to avail itself of the opportunity to discuss it with the Ambassador of Poland to the United States, last December, when he expressed the desire to confer with representatives of your Committee in the persons of the President, the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and the Secretary; the Ambassador was accompanied by the Consul General of Poland in New York City. The subject matter of this conference was published in the press during the following few days and later appeared in some detail in the current American Jewish Year Book.

Subsequently, further conversations were had with the Polish representatives in the United States and with Polish statesmen upon whom the Secretary called during his European trip, at the request of the Polish Embassy. In these conversations the Committee’s representatives took the position that the Jewish problem in Poland is not merely a problem of the Jews, but also an internal problem of Poland itself, which can be solved only in Poland and through the cooperation of the Polish Government; furthermore, that it is the Government’s particular task to undo as far as it can the tragic effects of the abnormal occupa-
tional structure of Jewish life for which Tsarist Russia, and not the Jews, are responsible, and which has made them the exceptionally unfortunate victims of a common disaster, the economic depression.

The Secretary, during his visit to Poland last July, saw a number of statesmen and later had interviews with others in Geneva, headed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Auguste Zaleski. When in Warsaw, he submitted a statement of the complaints of the Jewish population, supported by specific data.

In the Secretary's interviews with the Polish representatives, considerable discussion revolved about the work of the Institute of Minorities and especially the Committee for Jewish Affairs recently established in Poland for the purpose of studying the economic problems affecting Jews, with a view to their solution. The Committee consists of distinguished Polish and Jewish economists. The representatives of the Polish Government, among them Dr. Stanislaw Poprocki, the Secretary of the Institute of Minorities, and Count Edward Raszynski of the Foreign Department, pointed out that the phases that are being especially considered by this Committee are:

1. The removal of boycott in Jewish industry and trade.
2. The development of export in Jewish manufactures.
3. Increased credits to Jewish kassas and cooperatives.

The Secretary also spoke with a number of Polish Jews more or less actively identified with public life and community affairs as well as with representatives of European organizations and other well-informed persons.

In spite of the unequivocal language of the special treaty between the Allied Powers and the Government of Poland in 1919, according to which persons belonging to minority religious and racial groups in that country were assured equal civil and religious rights in every direction, these rights have been accorded only in a measure. It is true that the Jewish population no longer occupies an inferior civil status as it did under the Tsarist régime. They are full-fledged citizens possessing the right to vote, the right to engage in any and all legitimate occupations, the right to own property, the right to move freely within
the territory of Poland and out of Poland equally with all other persons. The Jewish population possesses the right to its own cultural and religious community life, to the use of its own languages, Yiddish and Hebrew, in its communal affairs and in its public relations. It is entitled to equitable financial support from the government and the municipalities for the maintenance of its religious, educational and philanthropic institutions. The Jews, in common with persons belonging to other minorities, are by this treaty accorded the equal right to employment in public services of all kinds, civil and military, as well as to honors that may accompany such service. They have free access by this treaty to all the public educational facilities existing in that country, general, professional, and technical. The Jews enjoy freedom of their own press, freedom of assembly, and equality in the courts of law. A fair proportion of Jews are found in the Polish Parliament. Many Jews occupy the elective offices of municipalities. Nominally and formally, these rights are recognized by all the government and municipal authorities of the country and to a considerable extent, they are recognized in practice. They are incorporated in the constitution of the land and are formally reinforced by the protection of the League of Nations.

Notwithstanding these broad and specific rights, discrimination against the Jews is being practiced in many directions, especially in the economic field. Though the Jewish population, 3,000,000 in number, constitutes about 10% of the entire population of Poland, the number of Jews employed in public service and in quasi-public service is well nigh negligible, and is considerably smaller than before the War when Poland was a vassal province of Russia. Moreover, when Poland, in line with its socialist policy, launched its campaign of étatism, or government monopoly of industry, thousands of Jews who had been engaged in these industries, like salt, tobacco and alcohol, were dismissed, and non-Jews were employed in their places. Jewish physicians find great difficulty in being admitted to official or semi-official positions, notably in the health insurance panels upon which the mass of physicians depend so largely for their livelihood. Jewish lawyers
are greatly handicapped because of the regulation which provides that a lawyer may not practice unless he has been employed by a Polish court for at least three years, and Jewish lawyers suffer discrimination in the opportunities for securing the preliminary court practice. Discrimination has been generally complained of in the collection of taxes, in the granting of licenses for the operation of all kinds of businesses, in the letting of public contracts, in the operation of laws which handicap Jewish artisans, in the law making it obligatory on the part of Jews to close their businesses on Sunday, in the inadequate and disproportionately low appropriations made from government and municipal funds to Jewish institutions, in equally inadequate and inequitable appropriations to Jewish cooperative loan organizations.

These discriminations added to the peculiarly heavy burdens which the Jews suffer as the largest commercial class have virtually impoverished the whole Jewish population and have created a thoroughly intolerable situation. As will be recalled, the World War contracted the whole economic circumference of Poland. Huge markets were lost upon which thousands of Jewish merchants and manufacturers had depended. The drastic changes in both the forms and control of industries eliminated many small traders. The overwhelming burden of taxation is placed upon city populations of which the Jews form a disproportionately large number, and on top of all this has come the world depression, under which Poland, as a whole, suffers more intensely than most other countries. These problems which have assumed a chronic, though we hope not an incurable character, are problems with which your Committee has concerned itself.

The Committee does not question the sincerity of the desire of the present government to deal equitably with its Jewish citizenry. Yet there is no doubt that discrimination in various directions is practiced by many who are responsible for the administration of the machinery of federal and municipal government. Moreover, the Government, prior to the recent organization of the committee to study the Jewish economic situation, has done little, directly and constructively to correct the discriminations and remedy
the injustices which have insidiously grown up and now honeycomb the whole of Poland's economic structure. As indicated before, the Committee takes the position that it is the duty and to the interest of the Polish Government not merely to rest satisfied with pious wishes but to deal with this critical situation in a positive and constructive manner.

There is no doubt that the Government desires the good-will of its Jewish population and the good-will of Jews outside of Poland; nor is there any doubt that the Government is jealous of Poland's prestige as a modern and progressive country. The Jewish population have shown an extraordinary willingness to cast in their lot with the country. Unlike some other minority groups they entertain no irredentist ambitions. Just and equitable treatment would undoubtedly make them a powerful factor for the upbuilding of Poland's economy and culture. But it is futile for the Polish Government and the Polish people to expect the fervent cooperation of the Jewish population unless and until its members are whole-heartedly received into the political and economic life of the country as rightful sharers of the opportunities as well as the responsibilities of citizenship, and cease to be regarded as aliens in a country where they have lived for nearly a thousand years.

GERMANY

Your Committee watched with considerable attention and anxiety the course of events in Germany.

Owing to the tremendous vote polled by the National Socialists (Fascists) in the elections to the Reichstag, in September 1930, a grave concern was felt by Jews all over the world for the fate of the German Jewish community, because during the first shock over the Nazi victory, the belief was widespread that there was great danger that the National Socialists would obtain control of the Government. The results of the elections caused a veritable panic among some Jewish groups in Germany, and a number left the country; the exodus from Bavaria was greatest. That there was no reason for such hysteria was the view of Jewish leaders, who pointed out that the huge increase
in the votes for the Nazis, did not indicate a corresponding growth of hostility to Jews, but was rather a symptom of despair in the face of depressed economic conditions and unemployment.

When the Reichstag opened on October 13, 1930, Berlin Jews were attacked and the windows of shops owned by Jews were broken, but the police were able to prevent looting. These riots increased existing disquietude in Jewish circles, because of the fear of similar occurrences in other cities. This outbreak, the responsibility for which the Hitlerites denied, did much to cast discredit upon the party, which their conduct in the Reichstag, and, especially their walking out in a body in protest against the passage of rules against obstructionist tactics, went very far to increase. Both before and after the Reichstag elections, Germany witnessed the same exhibitions of anti-Jewish fury and folly as have come to be universally associated with the Hitler movement,—street attacks against Jews, molestation of Jews in cafes and theatres, disturbance of religious services in synagogues and of Jewish meetings of all kinds, desecration of synagogues, and pollution of cemeteries.

What has been described by reliable observers as the worst of such street attacks took place in Berlin on September 12, 1931, Rosh Ha-Shanah, just as worshippers were leaving the synagogues. This attack gave evidence of advance planning. Many persons, some of them non-Jews, were set upon and beaten, seven being badly hurt, although a number who were also injured did not report. Upon their arrival the police experienced some difficulties in quelling the rioters, and arrested a total of 67, who were tried before a special riot court and a number of them given severe sentences.

The spirit of desperation which underlies the support of the National Socialists is also prevalent among the students of Germany, and there were clashes at several universities between Fascist students and Jews, as well as demands for a *numerus clausus* for Jewish students.

The Jews of Germany have not remained supine during the campaign of hatred waged against them by the Na-
tional Socialists. Through the Central-Verein deutscher Staatsbuerger jiidischen Glaubens, the Jews carried on a defensive campaign.

Considerable interest and some misgiving were aroused in this country by the disclosure of the fact that active Hitlerite cells exist in the United States, engaged in preaching the philosophy, and defending the policy of the German Fascist movement. Such groups were found in a number of cities, including New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Milwaukee. During the year, also, National Socialist newspapers in Germany frequently devoted space to attacks against American Jews,—attacks which were generally absurd and fantastic. In November, for example, the Voelkischer Beobachter, the leading organ of the Nazis, published an article entitled “Chicago the City Without a Soul,” asserting that all places of amusement and a majority of the business houses in Chicago are in Jewish hands, and that 80% of its judges are Jews and “sell their services mostly to Chicago criminal elements.” A count made by the Committee showed that only thirteen of the one hundred judges in the courts located in Chicago were Jews.

In this connection your Committee’s attention was called to an article on the Jews of the United States, which is published in a German hand-book of information which is extensively used in Germany as a reference book. The article in question is almost scurrilous in character, representing the Jews of this country in an extremely unfavorable light; such facts and figures as are given are grossly inaccurate. Your Committee called the attention of the publishers to the incorrectness of this article, supplying them at the same time with statistical material published by the Committee, and we have been assured that the article will be replaced in future editions by an entirely new one based on reliable data.

Mexico

Beginning in November 1930, somewhat disquieting reports had been coming from Mexico, indicating that an anti-foreign agitation was afoot in that country, with the small Jewish trader as its chief target. On April 30, came
reports that the municipal authorities of Mexico City had forcibly expelled several hundred of these traders from one of the markets. Upon receipt of word that the situation appeared to be serious, your Committee joined with the Jewish Telegraphic Agency in sending a special investigator to Mexico, who had held a responsible position there under a former government and was acquainted with public leaders. This investigator reported that the anti-Jewish agitation was only one phase of an anti-foreign movement brought about by the intensification of business competition. The affair reached its climax on June 1, 1931, when a large procession paraded in Mexico City. Ostensibly, the procession was held as part of a celebration of the first annual “Dia del Commercio,” but many of the manifestants carried banners and placards bearing expressions of anti-foreign sentiment, some of them specifically directed against Jews. The authorities had evidently feared outbreaks of violence, for the paraders were surrounded by police; despite repeated acceptances of invitations to witness the parade, the president and cabinet officers were not present. In his final dispatch before leaving Mexico, the Committee’s investigator expressed the view that the agitation was not likely to extend and might even gradually die out because, first the government had recently indicated its disapproval, and, second, the agitation could not extend much further without involving business and commercial interests of foreigners who are nationals of Great Britain, the United States, and other friendly countries.

At the suggestion of your Committee, the Emergency Committee for Jewish Refugees, which, it will be recalled, was organized in 1924 by a number of organizations including the American Jewish Committee, took steps, in cooperation with the B’nai B’rith which had for a number of years carried on useful activities among the more recent Jewish settlers, to relieve the distress of the peddlers who had been ousted from the markets. Your Committee took a number of other measures which, it believes, have been helpful,—all of them after consultation with the late Senator Dwight W. Morrow, formerly Ambassador to Mexico, whose death we, in common with all our fellow-citizens, deeply mourn.
Several weeks ago, reports were published in the press to the effect that the headquarters of the Jewish Cultural League at Havana, Cuba, had been closed by the authorities, its books seized, and a number of its members arrested; it was reported also that its entire membership numbering upwards of 800 were threatened with deportation, on the alleged ground that the society was engaged in communistic activities. According to reliable information obtained by your Committee, while it may be true that some of the members of the League entertained radical economic and political views, this could be true of only a very small part of the entire membership. Certainly, there has not appeared any basis for a charge of overt acts of a subversive character. Realizing that the deportation of a number of Jews would affect the entire community of from six to eight thousand most unfavorably, your Committee at once took steps to call the attention of the Cuban authorities to the injustice of mass action. Subsequently, the Minister of the Interior announced that an investigation which was being made had convinced him that while a few of its members are communistic the League is not, and that when the investigation is concluded it will be possible for the society to reopen.

ROUMANIA

Up to the spring of 1931, the outstanding fact in the life of the Jews of Roumania appeared to be the almost daily attacks upon them in one part of the country or another. As pointed out in last year's report, the scene of the anti-Jewish outrage was chiefly in the agricultural section of south Bukowina, Bessarabia, and Transylvania. Taking advantage of the depressed condition of the peasantry, agitators went among them and incited them to do violence to Jews, to whom the agitators pointed as the cause of the agrarian depression. The Government, preoccupied with political disputes and harassed by financial difficulties, appeared to regard these outbreaks as of minor importance, and, when they were brought to its attention, issued reassuring communiqués, minimizing the occurrences and promising to take energetic measures.
It was not until August 1930, following the investigation and report of your Secretary, that the gravity of the situation was recognized by the authorities, and effective measures were taken to suppress further outbreaks. In October 1930, a reorganization of the cabinet, under Gregory Mironescu took place. Shortly thereafter, a new series of measures, upon the urging, it was said, of the King, was announced. Anti-Semitic societies were to be dissolved, anti-Semites to be classed with Communists, and to be tried as rebels when accused of disorders; students convicted of participating in anti-Jewish disturbances, were to be expelled from the universities, and inflammatory publications were to be liquidated. Raids were actually made by the police on the headquarters in a number of cities of the organizations known as Iron Guard and Archangel Michael, where arms and ammunition were found; and hundreds of high school students, found to be members of a secret anti-Semitic society, were expelled from the schools. In April of this year, the Jorga Government, which came to power as a result of the elections, announced its intention to suppress all outbreaks against any section of the population whatsoever. Since then, reports of outbreaks were less frequent, but within the past few weeks reports have been received indicating renewed agitation.

In this connection your Committee calls attention to the death during the past year of Dr. Adolphe Stern of Bucharest, who was for many years the courageous leader of the Jewish community of Roumania, and who devoted himself unselfishly to promoting their political and civil rights. Your Committee has requested Mr. Leo Wolfson, President of the United Roumanian Jews in America, to present a brief eulogy on Dr. Stern at this meeting.

GREECE

Early in July, a cablegram was received from The Va’ad Leumi, Jerusalem, urging the Committee to take action in view of anti-Jewish riots in Salonika, Greece. The disturbances began on June 23, following the distribution of leaflets charging that the delegates of the Mac-
cabee Sport Club of Salonika, at a convention of Maccabee societies held in 1930 in Sofia, Bulgaria, at which speakers demanded the liberation of Macedonia from Greek rule, failed to protest, and inciting Greek patriots to avenge this treason against Greece by boycotting the Jews. In spite of the fact that Premier Venizelos and other influential leaders denounced this charge against the Jews as false, the disorders kept on and culminated on June 29 in a mass assault upon a Jewish quarter in which two hundred and fifty families resided, during which the entire quarter was set fire to, rendering the inhabitants homeless and destitute. They were given temporary shelter in Jewish schools and in the high school maintained by a French Lay Mission. Thereafter vigorous measures taken by the government succeeded in preventing further outbreaks.

Upon receipt of the cablegram from Jerusalem, the matter was called to the attention of the State Department with the request for further information. In reply to a letter, the Department stated that, as no telegraphic communication on the subject had been received from the American representative at Salonika, it was assumed that no American citizen or American property had suffered harm, but that the Department is instructing its representative there to submit a report on the matter. Subsequently, the Department informed the Committee that our representative had reported that no American persons or property had been harmed, and that the local authorities had the situation completely in hand.

In the meantime the President and the Secretary of the Committee had conferred with representatives of the Jewish community of Salonika who had come to Basle, Switzerland, and had obtained from the Alliance Israélite Universelle a report of what had occurred, submitted by their local representative.

Subsequently, it was reported that the Greek Government which had, at the time of the outbreaks, promised to indemnify the victims of the riots, had agreed to give the Jewish community of Salonika the sum of $60,000 for the purpose of providing new dwellings for those Jewish families whose homes had been destroyed, but according to information received by your Committee the payment
of this grant has not yet been effected, and the victims are still being housed in community buildings. Your Committee has, therefore, communicated with the Greek Minister at Washington inquiring as to the situation, and has been informed that the inquiry has been conveyed to the Greek Government.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Your Committee has closely watched the course of events affecting our brethren not only in the countries heretofore referred to, but also in other lands, and took such steps, when occasion offered, as were deemed helpful. In its efforts to ameliorate conditions, your Committee continued, as in former years, to enjoy the cooperation of kindred organizations in other countries, and it wishes again to acknowledge with thanks the aid given by these bodies, and the courtesies extended to the President and the Secretary during their visits abroad last summer.

B. ORGANIZATION MATTERS

1. NECROLOGY

Your Committee has the painful duty of reporting the death, during the past year, of the following Corporate Members:

ISAAC W. FRANK of Pittsburgh, Pa., on December 1, 1930.
BEN SELLING of Portland, Ore., on January 15, 1931.
NAT STONE of Milwaukee, Wis., on January 20, 1931.
MORRIS ROSENBAUM of Philadelphia, Pa., on February 10, 1931.

JOSEPH LEBLANG of New York City, on April 17, 1931.
DAVID HOLZNER of Trenton, N. J., on June 12, 1931.
LEE K. FRANKEL of New York City, on July 25, 1931.
WM. GERSTLEY, of Philadelphia, Pa., on November 14, 1931.

Minutes expressing the Committee's sense of loss, were adopted by your Executive Committee.
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-fourth Annual Report on pages 63 and 64, agreed to serve. 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, the following Nominating Committee, empowered to name candidates to succeed those members whose terms expire today, and to fill existing vacancies, was appointed:

District

I. Leonard Haas, Atlanta, Ga.
II. Ben H. Stein, Vicksburg, Miss.
III. Barnett E. Marks, Phoenix, Ariz.
IV. Harry Block, St. Joseph, Mo.
V. Leo J. Falk, Boise, Idaho
VI. Henry M. Butzel, Detroit, Mich.
VII. James Davis, Chicago, Ill.
VIII. David Philipson, Cincinnati, Ohio
IX. Jacob Billikopf, Philadelphia, Pa.
X. Edward N. Calisch, Richmond, Va.
XI. Felix Vorenberg, Boston, Mass.
XII. Lewis L. Strauss, New York City
XIII. Mortimer Adler, Rochester, N. Y.
XIV. Philip Dimond, Paterson, N. J.

Following is a list of the nominees of the Nominating Committee:

II. Nathan Cohn of Nashville, Tenn., to be reelected.
III. Louis C. Ilfield of Las Vegas, N. M., to be reelected. J. K. Hexter, Dallas, Texas, and Isaac H. Kempner, of Galveston, Texas, to be reelected.
IV. Henry Sachs, Colorado Springs, Colo., Henry Wallenstein, Wichita, Kansas, Charles M. Rice, and Aaron Waldheim, St. Louis, Mo., to be reelected.
V. M. J. Finkenstein, Los Angeles, Cal., Max C. Sloss, San Francisco, Cal., and Daniel Alexander, Salt Lake City, Utah, to be reelected.

VII. Alfred K. Foreman, M. E. Greenebaum, Julian W. Mack, all of Chicago, Ill., and W. B. Woolner of Peoria, Ill., to be reelected.

VIII. Edward M. Baker and D. A. Huebsch of Cleveland, Ohio, S. Marcus Fechheimer and Murray Seasongood of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Sigmond Sanger of Toledo, Ohio, to be reelected.

IX. Cyrus Adler, Horace Stern, and Morris Wolf of Philadelphia, Pa., to be reelected.

X. Albert Berney of Baltimore, Md., to be reelected; Irving May of Richmond, Va., to succeed Merrill E. Raab.


XII. Herman Bernstein, David M. Bressler, Benjamin N. Cardozo, Henry Ittelson, Jacob Kohn, Arthur K. Kuhn, Herbert H. Lehman, Alexander Marx, Hugh Grant Straus, Sol Stroock, Cyrus L. Sulzberger, Israel Unterberg, and Felix M. Warburg, all of New York City, to be reelected; Solomon Lowenstein to succeed Lee K. Frankel, deceased; David M. Heyman to succeed Grover M. Moskowitz, and Roger W. Straus, Simon Bergman, and Harold Riegelman to fill existing vacancies.

XIII. Joseph L. Fink and Herman Wile of Buffalo, N. Y., and Henry M. Stern of Rochester, N. Y. to be reelected.


During the year, Leo M. Brown, Esq., of Mobile, Ala., who had been a member of your Executive Committee, tendered his resignation which was accepted with regret; Fred Lazarus, Jr., of Columbus, Ohio, was elected to fill the vacancy thus created.

Your Committee takes pleasure in nominating the following persons for Membership-at-Large, to serve for one year:

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
Albert C. Lehman, Pittsburgh
Samuel D. Leidesdorf, New York
Jacob M. Loeb, Chicago
Isidore D. Morrison, New York
Reuben Oppenheimer, Baltimore
Milton J. Rosenau, Cambridge
Lessing J. Rosenwald, Philadelphia
Victor Rosewater, Philadelphia
Morris Rothenberg, New York
B. C. Vladeck, New York
Frederic W. Wile, Washington
Leo Wolman, New York

3. REVISED PLAN OF ORGANIZATION

For sometime past, your Committee has felt that, in view of the increasing spread of the Jewish population of the United States, the existing basis of geographical representation which was adopted in 1916, required revision in order especially to make possible closer contact with the growing number of communities. Accordingly, your Committee elaborated a plan which provides for the substitution of a system of community representation in place of the present district basis. Under the proposed plan, every city in which there is a Jewish community of 1,000 or more will be entitled to representation in the Committee. The change will have the effect of increasing the Class A, now known as District Membership, from 160 to 300. These, together with the 30 Members-at-Large (Class B),
and the Delegates from National Organizations (Class C) will constitute the Corporate Membership of the Committee. In order to effect the proposed reorganization, your Committee has prepared the necessary amendments to the by-laws, upon which you will be asked to vote today.

4. Finances

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.......................... $32,915.84
- from Community Funds and Foundations....................... 8,631.25
- from Special Contributions................................. 22,331.57
- from interest on bank balances................. 102.20

A grand total of.......................... $63,980.86

Of this sum there was expended for:

- the maintenance of the Committee's office.................. $40,168.54
- for the Statistical Department......... 14,300.49
- for editorial and other expenses in connection with the American Jewish Year Book........ 1,695.39
- and for special purposes................ 12,230.67

The total expenses paid and accrued were.......................... $68,395.09

being in excess of the receipts
of the year by.................. $ 4,414.23

During the past year, your Committee received from the Estate of Louis Marshall the amount of $14,089 on account of the bequest to the Committee provided for in the will of its former President. Although no conditions were attached to the legacy, your Committee nevertheless decided to set the proceeds aside as a special fund to be known as the Louis Marshall Memorial Fund to be used only for special purposes contemplated in the Committee's
objects, but not for meeting routine maintenance or operating costs of the office of the Committee.

Owing to the unfavorable business conditions, our Committee has suffered a serious loss in sustaining membership which would have been embarrassing had it not been for the kindness of a number of good friends of the Committee who, appreciating the necessity of unabated activity on our part, particularly in the light of the increasing gravity of the problems with which we have been dealing, furnished us with extra funds. We managed to complete our year with only a small deficit, including unpaid bills, of $4,414.23. A perusal of the table of contributions by states reflects an inequitable situation with respect to our annual support. Whereas no community has furnished us with a larger sum than it can reasonably be expected to give, many communities have fallen far short of their proportionate share in financial support for our work. A number which had contributed fairly substantial amounts last year, gave a greatly decreased sum this year. The funds required by the Committee are so modest that, if properly distributed over the entire country, they would constitute a small burden upon each community. The Executive Committee hopes, therefore, that every corporate member of the Committee will cheerfully assume the responsibility to see that his particular community will promptly furnish us with its proportionate quota for the current year. These quotas as set by the Committee on Finance will be mailed to all the corporate members of the Committee. It is hoped that every member present at this meeting will express his assurance that, after his return home, he will energetically take the necessary steps to secure the amount assigned to his community.

5. Twenty-Fifth Anniversary

Your Committee has made arrangements for a public meeting this afternoon at 3:30 o'clock to celebrate the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the founding of the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

The Executive Committee.
ADDRESSES DELIVERED

AT

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY MEETING

ADDRESS OF DOCTOR CYRUS ADLER

The twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of an organization is not a particularly significant occasion, even in this newer land of America, nor is it in the Jewish community of the United States, whose beginnings go back some two hundred and seventy-six years. Some of you remember, and no doubt took part in, the anniversary celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth landing of Jews in America held in New York City and in many other places in November 1905.

In spite of what is known as the solidarity of the Jews, the existence of an organization in America which endeavored to combine all of them together for any purpose has been fraught with great difficulties, and so a quarter of a century is after all really notable.

It is quite possible that much of what I am going to say to you I have said before, or maybe others have said it, but this is a time to be reminiscent and reminiscences involve repetition. The first effort made by the Jews of America to combine together for any single purpose was in the year 1790. There were then six Jewish congregations in the United States—New York, Newport, Philadelphia, Richmond, Charleston and Savannah. Moved by a common impulse, an impulse which was stirring all of their neighbors in the thirteen states which had emerged from the thirteen colonies, they desired on behalf of the Jewish congregations to present a joint address to George Washington upon the successful winning of the independence of this country, upon the adoption of the Consti-
tution of the United States and upon his election and inauguration as President. This joint effort was partially, but only partially, successful. The Congregation of Newport took advantage of the appearance of Washington in the synagogue at Newport, and presented a separate address to him, while the Congregation at Savannah, fearing that it would be outdistanced, sent a separate address through the delegate of Georgia in the Congress; Charleston likewise sent a separate address. The other three congregations, after discussing for some months, the question as to which President should have the honor of drafting the address, finally yielded the palm to Philadelphia and thus succeeded in uniting, Charleston joining them. As a result George Washington had to write four addresses to the six Jewish Congregations.

There seems to have been no other effort at union until 1840, at the time of the persecutions in Damascus and this effort had no result; but in 1859, the notorious Mortara incident, resulted in an institution known as the Board of Delegates of American Israelites established with a charter comprising many worthy causes, including the creation of a college. This Board was absorbed into the Union of American Hebrew Congregations as a Committee and was active for many years mainly in the person of Simon Wolf, who also acted on behalf of the Independent Order B'nai B'rith in presenting such matters in Washington as required attention. Both of these organizations were controlled from the West—the one from Cincinnati, and the other from Chicago.

In the meantime there came the vast Jewish population which settled on the Atlantic seaboard, so that gradually within the radius of one hundred miles of New York City, more than three-fourths of the Jewish population of the United States resided.

To meet this new situation, there had been various proposals,—principally one of Mr. Abraham S. Schomer for what was then already called a Jewish Congress which came to no fruition.

And now let me introduce a personal note which I hope that no one will think is brought in for the purpose of self-aggrandizement. It shows how important things
may come out of accidental beginnings. I lived in Washington from 1892 to 1908 and in 1901 I undertook, with others, two pieces of work which required my frequent presence in the Metropolis. One was the reorganization of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and the other was aiding in the editing and, even to a certain extent, the financing of the Jewish Encyclopedia. For a period of four or five years and by an arrangement with my chief in Washington, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, I came weekly to New York and spent several days here. I found, somewhat to my dismay, that most of the leading men of the Jewish community of that time had no social relations with each other and, except under pressure, a certain lack even of general community interest. Mostly each was doing his work in his own way. I had had relations with some of the Jewish problems that were handled in Washington through Judge Nathan Bijur, Cyrus L. Sulzberger and Professor Morris Loeb as a Committee who looked after the immigration cases that came up in connection with the Baron de Hirsch Fund and other communal organizations in New York and many of them were relayed on to me. In these matters I had cooperated with Simon Wolf and later with his son-in-law, Myer Cohen—always as an individual and without authority from anybody. Much important legislation relating to immigration, census, etc. was attended to without hearings before committees. We were fortunate in having the sympathetic interest in these matters of Lucius N. Littauer in the House of Representatives and of Simon Guggenheim in the Senate.

There had also come a great disaster in what was known as the Kishineff Massacres in 1903; and, while there had been need for relief in Russia before, when this disaster befell our people there was no organization in existence of any national scope that could take it up. Three men on their own responsibility—Oscar S. Straus, as Chairman; Jacob H. Schiff, as Treasurer; and Cyrus L. Sulzberger, as Secretary—undertook to raise a huge fund required to restore the Kishineff community which had been so ruthlessly attacked. It is rather interesting to note now what can be done without organization provided the men are
capable and resolved. I remember Mr. Sulzberger telling me that on the day of the meeting of these three big men, fourteen hundred telegrams were sent to fourteen hundred communities in America, apprising them of the disaster and asking them for funds. The funds were forthcoming in superabundance.

To get back to my narrative on the personal side. I found it very difficult to do the things I wanted to do without getting leading men of the community together, so in a modest little library which I had set up in New York, I gave a man's party to some sixteen or eighteen men—bankers, lawyers, merchants, artists, architects and professors and a newspaper publisher. No sort of business was talked at all. In the simplicities of those days, I made a Welsh rabbit in a chafing dish and we drank beer. After the party was over, Mr. Schiff said that this gathering ought not to be allowed to lapse and he invited all the men to his house for two or three weeks afterwards. For several years, these men, who called themselves the Wanderers and who had no officers, no regulations and no dues, met together and talked about all the things under heaven and earth.

One night, Mr. Schiff struck a serious note. It was after the Kishineff Fund had been disbursed and after he and his colleagues had received the usual meed of criticism from the Jewish press, that he said he felt that some sort of an organization should be established which, without interfering with any existing organization, should deal in a broad way with such Jewish affairs as interested the Jews of America or which might be helpful to their brethren in other lands. He stated most emphatically that never again would he take such a tremendous personal responsibility.

I have not found the original call and I do not know by whom it was issued, but on Saturday night, February 3d, and Sunday, February 4th, 1906, a conference was held in the City of New York to consider this proposal. Fifty-eight men were invited and they came from such diverse places as Albany, Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Charleston, S. C., Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Denver, Detroit, Indianapolis, Louisville, Mil-
waukeet, Minneapolis, Newark, N. J., New Orleans, New York, Peoria, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Portland, Oregon, Providence, Richmond, Rochester, San Francisco, Salt Lake City, Seattle, St. Louis, Syracuse, Washington and Wilkes-Barre. Mr. Marshall acted as temporary Chairman. He explained that a general desire had been expressed for some organization to deal with Jewish questions at large, but the methods by which such a body should be constituted or by which its representation should be selected were all in doubt, and so this meeting was called. Mr. Adolph Kraus was proposed as Chairman of the meeting, but he declined, and thereupon Judge Mayer Sulzberger, of Philadelphia, was selected as Chairman and Professor Joseph Jacobs as Secretary. Mr. Kraus requested a formulation for discussion, which Mr. Marshall made. Judge Samuel Greenbaum; Judge Julian W. Mack, of Chicago; Dr. Max Heller, of New Orleans; Mr. Jacob H. Schiff; Dr. Emil G. Hirsch of Chicago; the present speaker; Doctor Judah L. Magnes; Doctor David Philipson, of Cincinnati; Honorable Simon Wolf, of Washington; Mr. Cyrus L. Sulzberger; Doctor H. Pereira Mendes; Mr. Harry Cutler, of Providence; Judge Nathan Bijur; Mr. Oscar S. Straus; Mr. Abraham S. Schomer; Doctor Joseph Stolz, of Chicago; Doctor Harry Friedenwald, of Baltimore; Mr. Nicholas Aleinikoff; all took part in this two days' debate.

The questions which rendered this lengthy debate necessary did not differ very much from the questions which continue to agitate Jews. Should the proposed organization be formed upon a purely religious or communal basis? Should it be formed upon a National basis? Should it be an organization composed of delegates of all the National Organizations in existence? Should it act independently or should it tie itself up with the Jewish Organizations abroad to form an international union? These were the topics. A resolution was actually adopted which might have formed a committee and concluded the meeting then, but as the majority was only three in favor of the plan, it was felt that the division was too close and Judge Sulzberger pointed out that it was clear that the conference had not yet made up its mind to any definite plan; whereupon Mr. Schiff proposed a Committee of Seven to further
consider the subject and when they had reached a conclusion, to ask the Chairman to re-convene the Conference.

This Conference was re-convened on May 19, 1906—that is three months after the first Conference, during which time there had been much discussion in the press and much correspondence. In the meantime, certain new forces had come in, for I see in the Report of the second Conference the names of Samuel Grabfelder, of Louisville, E. W. Lewin-Epstein and Judge Seligman J. Strauss, of Wilkes-Barre. Mr. Marshall had, in the meantime, prepared a plan which had been published. However, the group representing the Independent Order B'nai B'rith had decided to absent themselves from the second Conference and on May 12th they sent a letter from Chicago to Judge Sulzberger, giving the reasons therefore. In effect, they were that the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Order B'nai B'rith were already performing all the functions that were required and it would, to use their own words, "not only be inadvisable but almost dangerous" to create a new organization. Judge Seligman J. Strauss, one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., proposed a plan for the creation of The American Jewish Conference, using the name that had been originally employed and one which was again suggested later.

The longest debate, as I recall, was on the inclusion in the proposed resolution which afterwards formed the basis of the Constitution of the phrase "to promote the cause of Judaism" and this phrase was finally stricken out due largely, I think, to the Rabbinical fear that this Organization would interfere with the existing Congregational Organizations. I said then, and I say now, that it seems strange that in any Jewish organization it is improper to promote the cause of Judaism.

Both of these meetings were very earnest and lasted far into Saturday night and all day Sunday, and I believe the second one up into Sunday night. Judge Sulzberger, who was always very punctilious in holding court and being on time, viewed with a great deal of anxiety the extension of a meeting beyond an hour at which he might get to Philadelphia at night, so that he would be ready for court
the next morning. At a certain period in a lengthy debate, after Judge Sulzberger had appealed to the delegates to keep to the point and stick to the actual resolution or amendment before them, Judge Seligman Strauss arose and began, in order "to clarify the situation," to rehearse the whole matter. Judge Sulzberger said: "You are out of order" but Judge Strauss continued. Judge Sulzberger said: "You will take your seat"; whereupon Judge Strauss said: "Are you going to become the Czar?"; to which Judge Sulzberger flashed back: "He needs some good man to take his place," and the tension was broken.

It was resolved to proceed slowly and so a Committee of five was appointed to advise with the Chairman in the nomination of the Committee of Fifteen which would form the nucleus of the larger Committee to be created. Judge Sulzberger's very simple letter, dated June 17, 1906, explains the actual beginnings and indicates his own attitude of mind, which meant that he took the Chairmanship and the authority that had been given him by the Conference as he afterwards took the Presidency,—with great reluctance.

June 17, 1906.

Prof. Joseph Jacobs,
Secretary of Jewish Conference,
Dear Sir:

In pursuance of the authority conferred on me by the Conference, I have (after inviting the advice of the Special Committee of Five named by that body) appointed the Committee of Fifteen, deeming their appointment at the present time of great importance.

No favor was conferred upon me to name me Chairman. In order to avoid misunderstandings on this subject, I have arranged the names in alphabetical order:


Very truly yours,

Mayer Sulzberger,
Chairman of Conference.
I have spent a good deal of time on the preliminaries because the record thereafter is easier to read; this portion has depended somewhat upon memory and it will not be long before there will be few persons able to describe the beginnings from the living memory.

There were certain well defined ideas about the work of the Committee from the very beginning. One was to collect information which might be useful in cases of emergency or attack. There was a Division of Statistics and Information from the first, and this was largely in the minds and care of Professor Morris Loeb, who, though a chemist, was one of the earliest methodical Jewish social workers in the United States, and of Professor Joseph Jacobs, that very versatile scholar, who was a born statistician. The idea further was that the Jews of America could become more consciously a useful influence, both in the lives of their own community and of those abroad, if they were accurately informed; and hence, in accordance with the policy of work with existing institutions, the American Jewish Committee early entered into an arrangement with the Jewish Publication Society of America, whereby its collections of information, its statistics, its records of institutions, etc., should become available in the American Jewish Year Book, to Rabbis and to all people who were interested in what the American Jewish community was and how it was growing. I venture to say that whatever measure of unity of action has been attained by the Jews in America is more largely due to this publication than to any other single cause, because it enables the Jews of America to know who they are and what they are.

In the early days, when there was no central relief society, our Committee undertook relief work. In 1908 Oscar S. Straus received a cable from Constantinople, reporting a fire which rendered many people homeless and a fund was brought together and remitted there. In the previous year, at the time of what the people in California called the San Francisco fire, a relief effort was undertaken and nearly $75,000, a not inconsiderable sum so many years ago, was brought together for that purpose. Likewise, at the close of the Balkan Wars in 1913, a fund was collected throughout the United States for the sufferers
of these two disasters which trod upon the heels of each other.

Immigration and its difficulties have engaged the Committee from the beginning. The so-called passport question was taken up as early as 1908 and for a number of years formed one of the principal efforts of the Committee. I shall speak of it more fully a little later.

The Committee realized that initially it was self-appointed, although it had been its intention to draw its membership from the representatives of the large organizations, some of which, however, refused to join. Every effort was made to carry out what is implied in the blessed word "democracy" and this was done on two plans: the endeavor to create Kehillahs or Jewish Communities in various large cities in the country, which in turn would elect the delegates from those cities, and the creation of Advisory Councils, which would also be self-elective by those cities, and would advise the Committee upon their local problems and nominate their representatives to the Committee. Kehillahs were successful for a time but they have not maintained themselves. They were largely disrupted because of the so-called National questions which arose during the War. The Advisory Councils, however, have developed into another form in that there is a regular election by districts of membership in the Committee. The annual meeting this morning witnessed a further extension of this plan, so that as far as I can see and in the best American sense, this Committee is representative of the Jewish people of the United States in so far as they are willing to be represented in it. It will consist of three hundred members from all parts of the United States and of delegates from sixteen national societies composed of many thousands of Jewish men and women.

Undoubtedly, it was the situation of the Jews in Russia, which you must recall at the time included what are now Poland, the Baltic Republics, and part of what is now Roumania—and where, in all probability, 7,000,000 of the Jews of the world then lived, that most concerned this Committee and was the major cause for bringing it into existence. Every effort had been made through our Secretaries of State and through our Presidents to bring pressure
to bear upon Russia to treat its Jewish subjects—many of them its unwilling subjects, because the majority had come to Russia through the partition of Poland—I say, to treat its Jewish subjects even as well as they treated their cattle. Similarly efforts were made and had been made long before the Committee was formed through representations on the part of one or another about this matter of the passport.

I am going to recall an incident which I suppose may now be told,—because so much is being told about great men,—with regard to President Roosevelt. Many of my hearers, of course, have realized and realize to-day the terrible economic plight, and even in some countries, political plight, of the Jewish people; but, with all the horrors that we have passed through, it is difficult to project oneself back to those years when the Russia of the Czars was relentlessly driving out the Jewish people and crushing out their lives. It used to haunt us and so I was asked to make their condition the subject of discussion on the occasion of a presentation to President Roosevelt of a medal. A very beautiful gold medal was struck in honor of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the settlement of the Jews in New York, I believe it was struck at the instance of Mr. Schiff, and because of his friendliness to the Jewish people, as evidenced in New York and elsewhere, the original in gold was to be presented to the President. I was asked to do this in person and the matter was readily arranged. I remember the interview very well because it gives a sort of picture of Mr. Roosevelt. I handed him the medal with great solemnity. He examined it and found on one side a Hebrew inscription. He said to me: “Have you not brought a translation?” I replied that I understood that at Harvard University, Hebrew was a required subject and that there was an annual Hebrew oration at the Commencement. He replied with great seriousness: “Yes, that was true, but it was abolished about fifty years before I entered College.” And then we talked about Russia and I told him about the horrible conditions and about our great anxiety. He said to me: “I have done everything that diplomacy can do. Do you want me to go to war with
Russia?" And I said: "Mr. President, great as is our anxiety and great as is the suffering, we would not wish America to be embroiled in a war."

Up to about 1910, the Committee had acted entirely through private interviews with officials, and with members of Congress and had done whatever was possible, but the passport question was getting under the skin of the Jews of America. It did not only refer to Russian Jews, about whom there might have been a difficulty because at that time it was a crime for a Russian to expatriate himself, but natural-born citizens of the United States whose ancestry had gone back several hundred years—even a member of Congress of Colonial ancestry—had been refused visas. And so the American Jewish Committee felt that it had not succeeded with the Presidents of the United States, possibly because it had always been too considerate of the President. We generally waited a year or a year and a half, until they were firmly seated in the White House, then took up the matter and by the time it became serious with them, their terms were over. So we decided to take the subject up with President Taft, at the time of his nomination. When he was preparing his letter of acceptance, he was asked to consider the subject seriously and he did. After he had been in office several years and various efforts had been made and nothing had resulted—in other words, after being patient for nearly two and a half years—the Committee decided to appeal to Congress through arousing public sentiment and in this we were wholeheartedly joined by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. A great meeting was held in Carnegie Hall, just twenty years ago to-day, presided over by Andrew D. White, at which Woodrow Wilson delivered the most important address; meetings were held in many States of the Union: Ohio, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Connecticut, New Jersey, Arkansas, Missouri, Washington, D. C.—I do not know how many. We approached party conventions: the Democratic, the Republican, the Progressive. We left no stone unturned to bring this matter to the attention of the American people. I have told in the biography of Jacob H. Schiff and in other places about the wonderful presentation of the subject that was made
before the Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate by Mayer Sulzberger and Louis Marshall, a presentation which resulted in a unanimous vote of both Committees to meet our request and abrogate the Treaty, since we held that Russia was violating it in refusing these visas. I have always been of the opinion that the greatest act ever undertaken by any state or by any single country in behalf of the Jewish people—for they all knew that they were doing it in behalf of the Jewish people—was this act of abrogating the Treaty of Commerce with Russia, then one of the most powerful nations on earth, and its reverberations are to be found in later years in some of the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles.

In 1914, at the end of August, it was the American Jewish Committee which inaugurated the movement for the relief of the sufferers of the Great War which afterwards attained such enormous proportions through these constituent committees: the American Jewish Relief Committee, which was the one specifically called into existence by the American Jewish Committee; the Central Relief Committee; and the Peoples Relief Committee; whose efforts were pooled and whose distributions were made through the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the largest single philanthropy that the Jewish people have ever known.

I can well recall a hurried meeting at Mr. Marshall's office downtown at the end of August, 1914, in response to a request of the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, then United States Ambassador at Constantinople, for the sum of at least $50,000 to aid the Jews in Palestine who, by reason of the blockade of Mediterranean ports, had been entirely cut off from the outside world. The sum requested was supplied, one-half coming from the American Jewish Committee and the other half from Mr. Jacob H. Schiff and the Federation of American Zionists. The distribution was based upon a plan created by Doctor Arthur Ruppin and upon the personal investigation of Mr. Maurice Wertheim, who went into Palestine immediately after the beginning of the War and made his report direct to the American Jewish Committee. The Committee issued a call for the larger fund on Sunday, October 25, 1914, and
invited the participation at this conference of all of the Jewish organizations in the country that had national character.

Up to 1915, the two Presidents of our Committee, Judge Sulzberger and Mr. Marshall, carried the duties alone with the aid of a Secretary, and that year the office of Chairman of the Executive Committee was created and has been continued ever since.

As early as May 1915, the Committee took steps toward a conference which would in turn be representative of all of the Jewish organizations in America making preparation for the eventual peace and the amelioration of the conditions of the Jews in the eastern war zone. Every effort was made to bring the organizations together and they were so brought together in June 1915, with the exception of certain organizations: the Federation of American Zionists, the Federation of Roumanian Jews, the Independent Order B'nai B'rith, the Independent Order Brith Sholom and the Order of the Sons of Zion. At the time, the American Jewish Committee, finding that it could not get agreement, adopted a formulation for what would be their ultimate hope for the Jews of Europe in the future: "Full rights for the Jews in all lands, and the abrogation of all laws discriminating against them." The Committee sent a delegation to the Peace Conference at Paris to this end and did its share toward securing the rights for Minorities in the treaties of Versailles and the subsequent treaties.

From the very beginning, the Committee placed itself in relationship with the established Jewish organizations abroad: the Alliance Israélite Universelle, the Jewish Colonization Association, the Russo-Jewish Committee, the London Board of Deputies, the Hilfsverein in Germany, the Allianz in Vienna.

When the Czarist régime was over, the Provisional Government granted equal rights to all the inhabitants of Russia. Our congratulations were sent to Paul Miliukov on March 21, 1917, then Minister for Foreign Affairs in the Provisional Government.

Although not committed to the Zionist programme, the
Committee welcomed the Balfour Declaration in a resolution, the conclusion of which is as follows:

"The opportunity will be welcomed by this Committee to aid in the realization of the British Declaration, under such protectorate or suzerainty as the Peace Congress may determine, and, to that end, to cooperate with 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."

The American Jewish Committee also undertook initially on its own account, afterwards joined by the Jewish Welfare Board, the study of the Jews in the service of the Army and Navy of the United States during the Great War and published various preliminary reports on the subject. It was a contributor for a number of years to the Bureau of Jewish Social Research and also had a part in the government of that institution.

Not long after the close of the War, there was begun the first, and let us hope the only serious anti-Jewish agitation in the United States, started by the surreptitious introduction into this country of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion—their circulation first in a mysterious way, then their publication and the espousal of the cause of their genuineness by the Dearborn Independent. The American Jewish Committee had acted on various minor matters of discrimination from time to time more or less in a private way, but this agitation seemed so serious that more general action was required and while it was not believed it would injure the rights or property of any Jew in America, it was feared that such continued agitation, distributed, as it were, on the street corners, would form a public opinion which might eventually have violent results. The Committee then again resorted to conference, to which all American Jewish national organizations were called together and by solemn declaration widely spread throughout the United States and by evidence it was established that the Protocols of the Elders of Zion were forgeries and the ascription of Bolshevism to the Jews entirely unwarranted. This step resulted in a document
signed by the American Jewish Committee, the Zionist Organization of America, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations, the United Synagogue of America, the Provisional Organization for the American Jewish Congress, the Independent Order of B’nai B’rith, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, the Rabbinical Assembly of the Jewish Theological Seminary and the Union of Orthodox Rabbis of the United States and Canada, toward disproving these unfounded and false accusations. The matter was complicated by the growth of an organization called the Ku Klux Klan, largely political and directed at least as much against our Catholic fellow-citizens as against ourselves, but, in any event, it was an act of poetic justice that when Mr. Henry Ford finally saw the error of his ways, his retraction was placed in the hands of Louis Marshall. Outside of the position of the Jews in Russia, it was that of the Jews in Roumania and Poland abroad at least, which largely occupied the minds of the Committee and actively of its President and Executive Committee.

Many of those who took part in the formation of this Committee have passed away. The list is so long that if read it would turn the celebration into a memorial meeting, but it will not be invidious if I mention a few. Our first President was Mayer Sulzberger, who was not readily excited, calm, yet capable of strong advocacy in spite of his being a Judge, and with a very good knowledge of political affairs. He occupied the Chair seven years and voluntarily retired at the age of seventy. Judge Sulzberger, as a matter of policy, rarely resorted to public meetings, to public addresses, or to newspaper propaganda. In fact the latter has only become an art since the War. But he had two qualities: first, he could present a matter most succinctly and forcefully in conference, and second, he had a sort of administrative ability, not so common in members of the legal profession, to employ other people than himself—in other words, delegate the work. Much of the success of the effort in 1911 was due to the fact that he delegated some work to almost every member in every State of the Union and saw to it that particular piece of work was done.
Louis Marshall, more aggressive, more forceful in many ways, who sat at the feet of Mayer Sulzberger during the latter's Presidency and often took his advice thereafter, was more inclined to come out into the open. He had a vigilant eye for everything relating to the Jewish people in America and abroad. In the first instance, he tried to meet it by the writing of letters and who of us does not remember those hundreds of forceful letters, strong, sound, always to the point, never vituperative, but letters which must have seared into the very souls of some of the people who received them. In fact, it may be said of the administration of both of these Presidents and as expressive of the temper of the Executive Committee and of the whole Committee that they preferred persuasion to abuse, argument to noise, diplomacy to the use of the bludgeon, and it was only when all these private means were exhausted that they resorted to the force of public opinion.

On the other hand, we have taken every means to inform the Jewish public, and in proper form through our own reports and through the press to keep the general public aware of what we were trying to do in carrying out our purposes "to prevent the infraction of the civil and religious rights of Jews, in any part of the world; to render all lawful assistance and to take appropriate remedial action in the event of threatened or actual invasion or restriction of such rights, or of unfavorable discrimination with respect thereto; to secure for Jews equality of economic, social and educational opportunity; to alleviate the consequences of persecution and to afford relief from calamities affecting Jews, wherever they may occur."

But I am getting away a little from a few of the men that I want to mention who were prominent in the work of the Committee. After the two Presidents, I should say unquestionably there should be recalled the name of Jacob H. Schiff, who, unless he was abroad, never missed a meeting, who had a fund of information on Jewish conditions, who had a remarkable combination of caution and courage, and who heartened his colleagues on many an occasion. And then, singling out just one more, Oscar S. Straus, the experienced diplomat and the experienced
statesman, who brought the wealth of his knowledge and judgment in both of these fields and a sort of uncanny Jewish wisdom into the service of his people through this Committee.

I cannot mention too many. But after all it is the Secretaries, the permanent officials who carry the day to day work. Upon them devolves the execution of the policies of Presidents and Executive Committees and so I recall Joseph Jacobs in our organization period; Herbert Friedenwald in the Passport period; Herman Bernstein on the eve of the World War and special expert in the Elders of Zion period; and Morris Waldman of the present, and let me hope, of the future. Harry Schneiderman has been our standby for a generation, and Harry Linfield is become the statistician of the Jewish people.

It is a duty at the conclusion of even a sketchy review of these twenty-five years that a word should be said about the future—not only our own future, but the future of the work by the Jews in America for which this Committee was organized. I do not believe that there is a single officer of this Committee nor a member of the Executive Committee nor of the whole Committee who has such pride of organization or such desire to hold office that he would continue the work of this Committee for one moment if there be any other organization in existence that is able to do it better. I want to speak with extreme frankness on this point, because I think I owe it to my colleagues and to the Jewish public at large. We had set out to form, as it were, a Committee of Committees, a Conference of existing Jewish organizations in the United States, which might on necessary occasions represent to our Government or through our Government to foreign governments or to the public at large the condition and the needs of the Jewish people. We had witnessed the gradual growth of many fraternal orders, organizations based upon countries of origin, Landsmanschaften, even congregational and Rabbinical bodies, also women's societies, who in cases of difficulty or need would wire or send resolutions or call upon the President of the United States, who by virtue of his unfortunate situation is probably the most accessible man in the world. It was no doubt
wearisome and probably still is wearisome to some of these busy people to hear the same story from one, two, three or five sources. It was so from the beginning. George Washington, as I have said, had to write four addresses to the Jews when there were only six congregations and a handful of us in this country. There was probably no President of the United States who had a deeper feeling for wanting to aid in righting the wrongs of the Jews than Woodrow Wilson. I remember very well when Mr. Marshall and I went to see him at his house in Paris in 1919. We had received cables upon cables from New York about the dreadful situation in the Ukraine and Poland and we came to tell the story to the President; he said that he knew about it; that he had received some thousands of telegrams on the subject and then turning to me, he said: "Doctor Adler, it was only a few days ago that I learned that there were only 15,000,000 Jews in the world" in a tone which indicated to me that judging by the amount of material that he had placed before him he might expect 300,000,000. It was not many minutes afterwards that President Wilson, in discussing the Minority Rights clauses and other things which we had asked about, said that there was nothing in his power that he would not do for the Jewish people because he thought that Christendom had done the Jews such wrong that he owed every reparation in his power.

But in spite of all this, we have not succeeded fully in securing unity of action. We have reduced the number of appeals and letters and telegrams, but we have not co-ordinated all of them. What I feel bound to say to this company and what I say to those who may be beyond the reach of my voice is that neither in America nor elsewhere can the Jews afford the luxury of their constant divisions.

Can there not be enough sinking of individualism, can there not be enough unselfishness, can there not be enough real zeal to promote the cause of Israel as to put an end to this desire to use that cause for organization aggrandizement? The situation is serious enough to warrant real heart searching to answer this question. And this is the problem of the next quarter of a century. I pray that it may not take that long to solve. On this festival of
Hanukah, when we recall with pride the valiant and successful struggle of our Maccabean ancestors against the hosts of Hellenism, let us rekindle the lights of our hope and our courage. And so long as we have work to do, we shall be guided by the motto on our seal “Let us be strong and strengthen ourselves in behalf of our people.”

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE IRVING LEHMAN

On this occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the American Jewish Committee, even a carping critic cannot sincerely question that in the past the American Jewish Committee has rendered valuable and effective service in defending the civil rights of Jews here and abroad. By appeal to reason as well as to human sympathy, by force of an aroused and enlightened public opinion, it has at many times been able to avert or to remedy injustice and wrong, and to prevent misery or alleviate it where prevention was impossible. I leave to others a recital of the achievements of the Committee. A recital of a record of unquestioned achievement is valuable only insofar as it leads to the question of how the organization can render equally, and, if possible, more, effective service in the future. To that question I want to address myself briefly this afternoon.

I became a member of this committee during the dark days of the Great War, but the darkness of those days was at least relieved by the hope that that war would be the last manifestation of racial and national antipathies. The spirit of each of the warring peoples was sustained by the conviction that it at least was fighting against injustice and aggression and in defense of inherent rights. That conviction may have been, and indeed in many cases undoubtedly was, based on appeals which were consciously or unconsciously false; nevertheless in a world of hideous realities the appeal to idealism seemed the most potent force. Especially for the Jews it seemed that a brighter day was dawning. In all armies, Jews were fighting side by side with their fellow citizens. In all countries,
even those where they had been the victims of injustice, Jews forgot all except that their country called for their help. They gave themselves unstintedly, and I at least felt that their unstinted sacrifice would receive unstinted recognition.

Perhaps even now that day is dawning. Often it is said that the darkest hour is the hour before dawn, and it is that thought alone which keeps me from a feeling of hopelessness, for rarely, if ever, has the hour been darker for the Jews than it is today in some of the Continental countries. The same classes and groups which often for their own selfish interests led their deluded countries to misery and defeat, now seek to place the blame for their defeat upon the Jews who sacrificed so much in trying to avert it. Injured pride of race, thwarted nationalist purposes, place the sins of others upon the usual scapegoat, the Jews. To men of reason it seems incredible that in this twentieth century men of education and inherited culture can be deceived by such palpably false propaganda as is disseminated in Germany, Hungary and Poland. The only possible explanation is that passion strengthened by misery has dethroned reason. My incurable optimism prevents me from doubting that reason, though dethroned, will regain its sway, but meanwhile the plight of our brethren is most deplorable.

That is the situation we are facing today and have been facing for some years past. In this world-wide depression, men's thoughts have perforce been engrossed by their own material circumstances and troubles. Where there is worry in one's own home or business, where distress is stalking through the streets of one's own city and misery is prevalent throughout one's own country, injustice, oppression and misery in far-off lands may seem relatively unimportant. Even so, I venture to say that the Jews of America cannot be reproached with obliviousness or unconcern at the danger and suffering of their own brethren, or indeed, with unconcern for injustice or suffering even where the victims are not their own brethren. We are not, and never will be, I hope, deaf to the call of suffering or the challenge of injustice. We need no appeals either to anger or to sympathy. Rather, we are burning to express our indignation
and sympathy; but the question still remains, how we can make our feelings of indignation most effective.

The members of the American Jewish Committee come from all sections of the country. They hold varying views on every subject, social, economic, or religious. Some are descended from families who have lived in America during its Colonial days, and others are themselves immigrants to this country; so they differ among themselves in wealth, social background, ancestry and religious belief; but they have one thing in common—each man has been selected because he is respected in his own community and is a man of influence there, and together they reflect the ideas and the sympathies of all groups of Jews here. It has sometimes been said that they have no mandate to speak for the Jews of the country. The American Jewish Committee claims no such mandate. They consult, they speak, and they are listened to, because the collective wisdom of men whose leadership has been recognized in their own communities should be used to devise plans to meet our general problems, and the collective influence of such leaders must be a force in welding public opinion and in carrying such plans to fruition.

Great mass meetings may at times present the opportunity for the Jews to voice unitedly and publicly their indignation at some wrong. At times such meetings may serve a useful purpose by demonstration of our unity and our strength of purpose. In a condition such as exists now in Central Europe, such movements I think can be of little avail, for none can doubt either our unity or our strength of will at this juncture. Only those who are blinded by prejudice can have any sympathy with the anti-Semitic movements of Europe, and prejudice cannot be met by denunciation or manifestations of indignation on the part of those against whom the prejudice is directed. We can and must meet falsehood by proof of the truth. Only in that way can the effects of prejudice be overcome or even limited. That is one of the things we must now do, and we must do that in a way which will safeguard and not endanger the position of the Jews where their position is threatened. The Jews of Germany, Hungary, Poland and Roumania are loyal citizens of their own
countries, even though some parties in those countries, yes, perhaps some governments—are disloyal to their Jewish citizens. That must always be borne in mind. Our righteous anger must be directed against those whose acts elicit righteous anger. Our anger must not be directed against the deluded and the deluders, the reasonable and the prejudiced alike, and we must never give the erroneous impression that the Jews of any country ask their brethren to support them by measures inimical to such country. Firmly and ardently we will render help where we can give such help. If we have no mandate to represent all the Jews of this country, we do know that all the Jews of this country will stand back of us in anything that we can do to help our brethren. They will stand back of us, not because they have told us to speak for them, but because, when we speak, they know that we are reflecting their views and that the Committee is an effective instrumentality for carrying out the common purpose of all those who are Jews at heart.

There is no room for dissension amongst Jews in the face of our present problems. Each must render the service that he can. If other organizations and individuals can work effectively for the same purposes as we work, we welcome their cooperation; our function is to counsel wisely and to act effectively. If we cannot do that, we will have, and should have, no influence or followers. If we can and are doing that, we need not concern ourselves with any question of what following we have. We may rest secure that those whose thoughts we adequately reflect, whose will we adequately perform, will follow where we lead.

I have spoken only of the situation abroad, for the Jews of this country have no serious reason to complain of the attitude of their own fellow-citizens. True, the day has not yet come, even here, when ignorance and prejudice have completely vanished. It has been said that no man is worthy of liberty who is not ready to defend it, and at the slightest threat of any infraction of the civil rights of a Jew, all the Jews here must be ready to defend such rights. We owe that not only to ourselves as Jews but to our country itself; for injustice and inequality
may sap the foundations of all society. That may not blind us to the fact that we have reason to be thankful and proud that the occasions are rare when in this country we are called upon for protest.

The American Jewish Committee has been very fortunate in its leaders. Judge Sulzberger, its first president, molded its policies and demonstrated its effectiveness. When he was compelled to relinquish the responsibilities of his position, without a dissenting vote Mr. Louis Marshall was accepted as its leader. His courage, his force, his eloquence, are too well known to require any comment. When death deprived us of his leadership there was only one man who could possibly be considered as a fit successor. Dr. Adler has worked wisely, sympathetically and forcefully as our leader during the past two years, and Judge Stern has worked with him in perfect cooperation. To such leaders we should pledge our wholehearted cooperation. With such leaders we may be confident that the work of the Committee will be well performed. Wherever the Jews of America have a duty to perform, wherever the Jews of America can assist or lead in the age-old fight against oppression and injustice and misery, the American Jewish Committee under the leadership of these men will do what is possible for the Jews of America and with the Jews of America.

ADDRESS OF JAMES MARSHALL, ESQ.

Of course, my memory does not go back quite as far as Dr. Adler's. I cannot recollect what was done in the days of Washington. But it does go back at least twenty-five years, and perhaps, in many respects, in greater detail than Dr. Adler's. He took part in the work of the Committee at its monthly meetings, but I heard its reports every night at dinner.

In these twenty-five years, the battle of the Committee has been with anti-Semitism in many lands, and not only in many lands but in varying aspects and in many different forms. We have had social anti-Semitism, as exemplified in hotel advertising. We have had political anti-Semitism,
as illustrated by non-recognition of passports held by Jews, and we have even met old medieval bigotry such as the discredited ritual murder charge. All these various forms of anti-Semitism we have fought and struggled against; and, being different in kind, we have used various and different methods of combat. But one fact is clear, that no matter where or how or through whom we fought, we have always fought in a manner that would reflect honor upon, and add to the dignity and self-respect of the Jewish people.

It may be bold on my part to say that we know more of anti-Semitism now than we did twenty-five years ago. Possibly, it is only I, myself, who knows more now than twenty-five years ago. But I have the feeling that we do know and can understand something of its historical causes, and of anti-Semitism in political action, and, even more important, we have a new conception of the psychological background of anti-Semitism. And in the same way we know more of the historical, economic and political effects of anti-Semitism. One thing we must realize is that we cannot hope to eradicate in a single lifetime prejudices which have been borne against Jews for over two thousand years; nor can we terminate forever, in one lifetime, persecutions which have been in existence for almost a thousand years. We cannot hope in a few decades to break the mental pattern that has given rise to Jew-baiting. Nor can we expect people living in lands of starvation, in lands which are suffering from fear of war and the great miseries that follow war, to listen to reason and arguments. All we can do is stand up for our human rights and not accept anti-Semitism, not take Jew-baiting, lying down.

But I don't think that in the future, this Committee should, or will, or can restrict its activity to first-aid measures. We are beginning to realize, or, better said, during these first twenty-five years we have come to realize, the possibilities which man possesses to change his environment, not only his physical environment, but also his cultural and psychological background, through education and understanding. And I believe that, in the next twenty-five years, we will not only become more familiar with the specific causes of anti-Semitism but will acquire a
better understanding of the Jewish people and Jewish problems. We will have the opportunity to show to others the fallacies that underlie discrimination and anti-Semitism, not only anti-Jewish discrimination, but all discriminations. We will rid Jews of ghetto habits, of those ghetto fears and that sensitiveness which persist not only in Eastern Europe but also in this country. There is no great difference between the Jew in his kaftan cringing before the Gentile and the Jew in a silk hat ashamed of being called a Jew.

So, in addition to the immediately necessary work of first-aid, we shall have, first, the internal task of teaching ourselves self-respect, and secondly, the external task of teaching the non-Jew to understand in himself the basis of his anti-Semitism and to accord to the Jew the respect to which he is entitled.
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