REVIEW OF THE YEAR 5693*

BY HARRY SCHNEIDERMAN

The world-shocking catastrophe which has befallen the Jews of Germany during the past five months is of such momentous significance to Jews everywhere, that all other events affecting our people appear to be of comparatively slight importance. The present review, therefore, will be concerned chiefly with events in Germany and their repercussions in other countries; in a special section the most important happenings and trends in Palestine will be briefly sketched, and another chapter will be devoted to the few occurrences, unrelated to the tragedy in Germany.

I

THE CRISIS IN GERMANY

Although the rapid changes in Germany’s Government during the year preceding the Nazi revolution presaged a political crisis which would be met by a dictatorship, yet the elevation of Adolph Hitler to the Chancellorship of the Reich came as a surprise even to close observers of the German scene, and, probably, also to Hitler and his followers. But the events which ensued, the widespread acts of violence against all the opponents of the Nazis and their allies, the Nationalists, and, later, the premeditated elaboration of a network of laws deliberately intended to achieve the political, civil and social degradation of the Jews of Germany and their economic ruin, caused even greater amazement and shock.

And yet, when the history of the preceding thirteen years is studied, it is discerned that these events were but inevitable links in a chain, the forging of which was begun with the

* The period covered by this review is from July 1, 1932 to June 30, 1933. It is based on reports in the Jewish and the general press of the United States and a number of foreign countries.
then scarcely noticed launching of the National Socialist movement in 1920. It is now evident that the course and propaganda of that movement during the succeeding years could have led to no other result, especially under those circumstances which attended the accession to power of the leaders of the movement.

The Jews of Germany had been shown many "signs and portents" of what was to come, in the sequence of events from the time of the elections in September 1930 when 107 National Socialists were elected to the Reichstag which had, until then, not had more than 14 representatives of that Party. From that time on, owing to a fateful combination of internal and external factors which served to heighten the despair psychology of the German people, the Nazi movement grew from strength to strength, with more and more Germans coming to regard it as the panacea for all the ills afflicting their country.

It will be recalled that the results of the September 1930 elections caused a panic among some sections of the Jewish population of Germany, resulting in a considerable exodus. But the subsequent ludicrous tactics of the Nazi deputies in the Reichstag, on the one hand, and the reassuring faith of the leaders of the Jewish community in the sanctity of the Weimar Constitution and in the determination of President von Hindenburg to safeguard its observance, on the other hand, soon dispelled or, at least, quieted these fears. That the Constitution could be abrogated or even amended was deemed a theme for academic discussion only. How could the necessary two-thirds vote in the Reichstag be achieved? Furthermore, it was plausibly argued, even if the Hitlerites should attain power, the responsibilities of office would have so sobering an effect upon them that they would not even dream of carrying out the more revolutionary parts of the Nazi program, including the fantastic threats against the very survival of the Jews.

Events, however, proved that these hopes were illusory, because the premises upon which they were based had failed to give sufficient weight to the desperation of the masses, to the fanaticism of the Nazis, to the ruthlessness and trucu-
lence of Hitler and his lieutenants, and, last, but perhaps more important than all other factors, to the indifference of German non-Jews, of all classes, lay and clerical, to the fate of 600,000 Jews, so firmly had Nazi anti-Jewish propaganda taken root in the fertile soil of the birth-land of modern "anti-Semitism."

It will be the task of historians to determine whether the Nazi movement might not have been destroyed in the germ if it had not been for this indifference.

Our preceding Reviews sketched the course of events in Germany up to July 1932, culminating in the passage by the Prussian Diet on June 27, of a resolution instructing the Government to submit the draft of a law providing for the confiscation of the property of all East European Jews who entered the country after August 1, 1914. The passage of this resolution, which was not carried into effect, was made possible by an alliance of the National Socialist and the Communist deputies in the Diet.

Following the dissolution on June 5, 1932 of the Reichstag elected in November 1930, began a pre-election campaign which was attended by unprecedented disorder and violence, resulting in numerous cases of physical injury and even loss of life. The von Papen Government found itself compelled to forbid all out-door rallies and meetings. Although the Nazi campaign in the provinces was virulently anti-Jewish and results of the election held on July 31, 1932 showed that no less than 230 Nazi deputies, more than double their number in the previous parliament, had been elected, yet the Jews found a basis for encouragement in two facts,—first, that no anti-Jewish expressions were used in the campaign by Hitler and some of his leading friends, and second, that even in combination with the German Nationalist Party of Hugenberg, the Nazis would not be able to muster a majority and acquire control of the Government.

This encouraging feeling did not last very long, however, because acts of violence by Nazis, chiefly against Socialists and Communists, but also against Jews, regardless of political affiliation, continued unabated and showed every indication of being part of a premeditated plan to create
a crisis which would force President von Hindenburg to give the Nazis a share in the Government. Disquieting, also, was the apparent reluctance of the von Papen regime to take any vigorous measures to prevent these disorders. Early in August the Government issued a decree establishing special riot courts and imposing the death penalty for armed assaults. Attempts to apply this law, met with such popular protest, led by the Nazis, that it was never actually put into effect. Much misgiving was also caused by rumors of negotiations between von Papen and Hitler for the latter's participation in a coalition cabinet; by negotiations between the Nazis and the Catholic Centre Party, which had been actively supported by some elements of the Jewish population who believed that Party would never approve an anti-Jewish policy; and by the offer made to Hitler by President von Hindenburg of a secondary Cabinet post and the latter's insistence on being appointed Chancellor.

So confused was the political situation that the new Reichstag which met on August 30th was dissolved by the Government on September 12th, when a Communist motion of no confidence in the von Papen Government was carried.

There followed another election campaign which was not as violent as its predecessor. The results of the election on November 6, 1932 appeared to furnish a real basis for a feeling of relief among republican elements and Jews, for the Nazi popular votes turned out to be 11,700,000, as compared with 13,750,000 polled by them at the July elections, and their representation in the Reichstag dropped from 230 to 195. These results were hailed in anti-Nazi circles as an indication that the movement was definitely declining. On the other hand, however, the election results were indecisive and, therefore, meant a continuation of the political confusion which would, sooner or later, lead to a crisis. This came less than two weeks after the election when the Centrists and Bavarian People's Party refused to back von Papen, thus confronting the President with the choice of again dissolving the Reichstag or retiring von Papen. Marshal von Hindenburg chose the latter course and began negotiations with the leaders of the principal parties, including Hitler, with a view to creating a cabinet
of "national concentration." Upon the failure of these efforts, owing chiefly to Hitler's unacceptable demands, the President appointed Lieutenant General von Schleicher, who had been Minister of Defense in the von Papen Government, Chancellor of the Reich; the latter at once reappointed the entire von Papen cabinet, with a few minor exceptions. This outcome appears to have satisfied none of the leading parties, and after a brief existence of only two months, the Schleicher government resigned and President von Hindenburg appointed Hitler to the Chancellorship of a new coalition government of twelve members, including only two Nazis in addition to Hitler. But one of these, Dr. Wilhelm Frick was made Minister of the Interior and thus, placed in supreme control of the police. The other, Captain Herman Goering, Minister Without Portfolio, was appointed to the equally important post of Deputy Commissioner for the Interior, of Prussia, the virtual dictatorship of that most important State.

Several explanations have been offered for President von Hindenburg's appointment of Hitler after so definitely rejecting the latter's conditions and despite the reduced vote polled by the Nazis in the November 1932 elections. Some observers have advanced the view that the President shared the disgust of the populace with the continuous turmoil and clamor and the unsettling effects upon business of the frequent changes of Government, and turned in desperation to Hitler who had so often boasted that only under his leadership could internal peace and order be restored and maintained. This probably comes very close to the true explanation, but whether in turning to Hitler the soldier-President was moved by a measure of sympathy with the directness, and even audacity of the Nazi program, or by that sense of duty which has made him famous, or by a combination of both, will be another task of historians to determine. Other observers, again, saw another explanation which was adequately expressed by an editorial writer for the London Morning Post, who held the view that Hugenberg was the key to the mystery. "He has probably made up his mind," said this writer, "that Hitler is a spurious Mussolini, who will be quickly exposed for what
he is by the test of office and responsibility, and if Hitler crashes, Hugenberg would succeed to his mantle." In some similar explanations, the name of von Papen, or both those of Hugenberg and von Papen, were substituted for that of Hugenberg.

Whatever the explanation, the event has made luridly clear that von Hindenburg's action has set Germany on a road of internal and external adventures which are bound to have unpredictably momentous effects upon Germany and other nations, and has unleashed forces which menace the survival of the Jews in Germany.

In so far as its policy toward the Jews is concerned, the course of the Nazi Government—from the beginning the Nationalists have had little more than a nominal participation—from the accession of Hitler to the time this article is being written (early in July 1933), may be divided into five periods, although in some respects these divisions overlap. The first period extends from the appointment of Hitler on January 31 to March 5 when the elections for the new Reichstag took place; these five weeks are characterized by a cautious policy with regard to the Jews; there were acts of repression, but most of these appear to have been directed against political opponents of the Nazi-Nationalist coalition. The second period corresponds roughly to the next two weeks, to the date of the Reichstag session which abdicated its powers and transferred them to the Government for four years; this is the period during which many anti-Jewish excesses took place, accompanied somewhat tardily by official appeals to the victorious Nazis to refrain from such acts. The third period covers the ten days up to and including, April 1, the date of the historic one-day official anti-Jewish boycott; during this period, denials of atrocities came from official circles, and from private sources, including Jewish individuals and organizations in Germany, followed by the announcement of a boycott, alleged to be in reprisal for so-called "atrocities propaganda" for which it was charged the Jews of Germany were responsible. During the next week there was the proverbial calm before a storm, for it ushered in the campaign to destroy the Jews of Germany by strictly "legal" means.
During the first five weeks of its existence, acts of the new regime appeared to support those observers who had expressed the view that the Hitler forces would not carry out the more fantastic planks of their platform. This view was well put by the London Daily Telegraph. "Not from this Government," said a writer in its columns, "will come the vaguely Socialistic semi-Fascist dictatorship, the attack on banks and the bourses, the anti-Jewish pogroms, which are the nearest approach to anything definite to the Nazi outlook. Herr Hitler in office is very far from being the national and international peril that he has so often vowed himself to become if given the chance." Others pointed reassuringly to the fact that the new Government was a coalition and that Hitler's extremism would be curbed by the "watchdogs" in the Cabinet. For the brief space of a month, such views appeared to be borne out by the facts. Looking back at those weeks now, we see that the new Government's strategy, was, before embarking upon any strong policy of "Nazification," cautiously to feel out the extent of the popular support behind its opponents; anti-Jewish steps were only a small part of these tactics. The period was made noteworthy by such events as expulsions from the National Academy; the suppression of meetings of the League for Human Rights and the Culture Union for Free Speech; Nazi clashes with Socialists and Communists; the suspension of Vorwaerts, the Socialist newspaper, and Germania, the organ of the Centre Party; a decree prohibiting the press from attacking the Government; Captain Goering's impudent rebuking of a Swedish newspaper for criticising Hitler; the ruthless dispersal of the Reichstag's committee for the defense of the people's parliamentary rights, accompanied by the forceful ejection from his chair of Dr. Paul Loebe, for many terms speaker of the Reichstag, amid anti-Jewish cries; the invasion of Catholic meetings, impelling former premier Bruening to appeal to the President to assure a free election. It appears that when the Government saw that these measures were not resisted—how could they be, with Nazi Storm Troopers transformed into auxiliary police?—it became more ruthless and unscrupulous. Toward the end of February, all non-Nazi meetings were forbidden; there were more wholesale
arrests of Communists; more newspapers were suppressed; the former imperial flag with the Nazi banner alongside was raised over public buildings; non-Jewish musicians, actors, and university professors, of liberal tendencies, and Jews in these callings, irrespective of political affiliation, were dismissed from their posts; and, long before the electorade had registered its will, officials were dismissed to be replaced by Nazis or Nationalists. Finally, following the mysterious burning of the Reichstag building, came the issuance of the amazingly drastic emergency decree suspending all constitutional articles guaranteeing private property, personal liberty, freedom of the press, secrecy of postal communications, and the right to hold meetings and form associations. Backed by this cancellation of all individual rights, the Government went to even greater extremes in its repressive measures, at the same time enlisting the approval of the populace by filling the Nazi and Nationalist press with scare-mongering assertions that the burning of the Reichstag building was to have been the signal for a Communist revolution. With the rest of the press muzzled, this and other accusations against the opposing camps went unchallenged, and filled large sections of the population with fear of an impending disaster from which Germany could be saved only by the election of the Nazi-Nationalist alliance. No wonder rumors spread of an impending massacre of all Socialists and Communists, and other rumors of a St. Bartholomew’s eve, a “night of the long knife for the Jews!”

As intimated above, the Jews of Germany were singled out for but few blows during these first five weeks, but anti-Jewish blows there were, including a few of those acts of sadistic violence, which were so frequently complained of during the following three weeks. The Government explored the possibilities of expelling alien Jews, but found such expulsions would embroil it with foreign governments; the Federal radio station began to be used, not only for pro-Nazi election speeches, but also for attacks on Jews; the expulsion of Jews from office was carried on extensively, but not systematically; and, following the Reichstag fire, the sensational raid on the headquarters of the Central Verein deutscher Staatsburger juedischen Glaubens, on
the trumped-up excuse that there were grounds for suspicion, later acknowledged to have been baseless, that that organization had had something to do with that fire. While Jews in the large cities were unmolested, the lot of the small-town Jews was not always so happy during these first five weeks. During this period, the Nazi press, now become the unofficial spokesman of the Government, indulged in anti-Jewish diatribes, more virulent and shameless, if that were possible, than the vituperations of the past. In the meantime, the Government publicly reassured the Jews of other lands that those of Germany had nothing to fear from the new regime. The event shows that these declarations were intended for foreign consumption only.

All these repressive measures were reflected in the elections held on March 5, 1933, when over 17,250,000 voters cast their ballots for the Nazi slate, giving that party 288 seats in the new Reichstag, which, added to the 52 won by the Nationalists, gave the coalition a total of 330, a clear majority. The two-thirds vote required to suspend the Constitution and give the Government dictatorial powers was simply obtained by the arrest of all the deputies elected on the Communist ticket.

This victory appears to have called for a celebration by the victors in the form of acts of barbarity, some of which were unspeakably brutal. Owing to the press censorship in force, reports of these acts were held back for a time, but they gradually became known to foreign newspaper correspondents who were privately informed of them, at great risk, by the victims or eye-witnesses, or obtained reports of complaints lodged at foreign embassies and legations, by alien victims, including citizens of the United States. Later, fugitives from Germany told of experiences through which they themselves had passed, or of which they had been informed. The knowledge that relatives and friends remaining in Germany would be made to suffer because of such disclosures, caused many of these refugees to hold their tongues, and made it impossible for representatives of the press to disclose the identity of their informants. The number of these atrocities will probably never be known, but that there were many is clearly established by official
statements, including some by persons high in the German Government. So scandalous did these outbreaks become that on March 12th, Chancellor Hitler issued a rescript which was broadcast a number of times on that day over the Government radio in which he made the following guarded admission:

"Unscrupulous individuals, especially Communist stool-pigeons, are endeavoring to compromise our party through isolated actions that have no connection with the great achievement of national rising and can only burden and disparage the accomplishments of the movement."

Two days earlier, in a speech at Essen, Captain Goering, Minister of the Interior of Prussia, declared:

"The police are not a defense squad for Jewish stores... They tell me I must call out the police to protect them [the Jews]. Certainly, I shall employ the police, and without mercy, wherever German people are hurt, but I refuse to turn the police into a guard for Jewish stores... The nation is aroused. For years past we told the people: 'You can settle accounts with the traitors.' We stand by our word. Accounts are being settled."

Finally, in a telegram dispatched on March 26, to the heads of American Jewish organizations who had previously invoked the good offices of the Government of the United States, the Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, made the following statement upon the basis of a report received by him from the American Embassy in Berlin:

"A reply has now been received indicating that whereas there was for a short time considerable physical mistreatment of Jews this phase may be considered virtually terminated. There was also some picketing of Jewish merchandising stores and instances of professional discrimination. These manifestations are viewed with serious concern by the German Government. Hitler in his capacity as leader of the Nazi Party issued an order calling upon his followers to maintain law and order to avoid molesting foreigners, disrupting trade and to avoid the creation of possible embarrassing international incidents. Later von Papen delivered a speech in Breslau in which he not only reiterated Hitler's appeals for discipline but adjured the victors of the last elections not to spoil their triumph by unworthy acts of revenge and violence which could only bring discredit upon the new regime in foreign countries..."

Limitations of space do not permit the recording in this Review of any of the numerous reliable reports of these
excesses. The interested reader is referred to the files of the leading daily newspapers, especially the Times, London, the Manchester Guardian, the New York Times, the New York Herald-Tribune, and the New York Evening Post. A selection from reports in these and other newspapers has been published in “The Jews in Nazi Germany: The Factual Record of their Persecution by the National Socialists,” issued in June, last, by the American Jewish Committee.

The exact dates of the beginning and the end of this wave of outrages are not known and probably never will be, but all available evidence indicates that it began a day or two following the elections on March 5, reached its greatest height about the 12th, and subsided quickly thereafter; it appears that after March 28, the date on which the Reichstag abdicated its rights and duties in favor of the Government, instances of this kind were few and scattered. Belated reports continued to come through, however, for a number of weeks, and there were sporadic cases for months following.

The news of these events shocked the outside world, and aroused an outcry which gave vivid evidence that the conscience of the civilized world was outraged. This expression of public indignation did not reach the German people because independent newspapers had either been bludgeoned into silence or been “coordinated,” that is, converted to organs subservient to and entirely in the control of Dr. Paul Joseph Goebbels, one of the Nazi leaders, for whom had been created the position of Minister of Public Enlightenment and Propaganda. But the protests did reach the members of the Government, but not until a few days after the outrages had begun to subside. This fact made it possible for them to deny that there had been any outrages, or, at least, that there were any at the time of the protests. By this time, however, the public in many countries was thoroughly aroused and was expressing its indignation in many ways. Meetings of protest were about to be held in many places, especially one which had been called by the American Jewish Congress in New York City, to be held on March 27, 1933. There is no doubt that Germany’s
businessmen were alarmed at the inevitable damage to German international commerce resulting from this reaction of public opinion, and that this alarm explains the frantic denials by members of the Government and the veritable flood of messages sent abroad by leading individuals and societies insisting that all was orderly in Germany and that all reports of atrocities were false. Undoubtedly, some of these messages were sent in good faith, owing to the fact that the German press assured the public that the so-called "atrocity agitation" was baseless and was inspired by the enemies of Germany, and that the Jews outside of Germany had invented the reports in order to bring disgrace upon Germany. But there is also no doubt that some of these reassuring messages were sent under duress, for it is difficult to account in any other way for the messages sent by Jewish organizations which certainly must have known that outrages did in fact occur. But all these messages failed to convince any section of the public. Besides, it was not only reports of physical outrages which had evoked universal indignation. The outside world had been informed also of indignities that were not physical, yet equally, if not more outrageous,—the summary expulsion of judges from the bench, of lawyers from the courts, of physicians from hospitals and clinics, of professors from universities, of brokers from bourses, of merchants from commodity exchanges, and of officials from administrative posts. The world had also been made aware of the picketing of shops by Nazis who terrorized would-be customers from entering, of the enforced discharge of Jewish employees, and similar acts of business sabotage. The reassuring messages, therefore, did not silence the voice of protest, and demonstrations were not abandoned. On the contrary, in some quarters agitation for a boycott of German products was launched.

This failure of their counter-propaganda infuriated the Nazi leaders, and the Party announced that in reprisal for the "atrocity agitation" and boycott movements abroad, there would be a country-wide boycott of all Jewish business, embracing, not only trades, but professional callings, as well. This boycott was to begin on Saturday, April 1st, and to continue until the Party ordered it to be stopped.
The boycott proclamation instructed Nazi workmen to explain to their colleagues the harm done to German labor by the hostile agitation in foreign lands; Storm Troops were ordered to picket Jewish shops and warn would-be customers against entering; besides, thousands of meetings were to be arranged, and these were to adopt resolutions demanding a percentage restriction on the admission of Jews to universities and to the professions; the boycott committees, to be set up by every local Nazi group, were instructed to persuade every German who had relatives, friends, or business connections abroad to write, telephone, or telegraph denials of atrocities; but the strictest discipline was to be maintained, so that "not a hair of a Jew's head is disturbed."

Although the boycott was ostensibly a Nazi Party measure, yet it had the approval of the Government. The Chancellor explained that the boycott was necessary to prevent the anti-Jewish movement from assuming "undesirable forms" which would be prevented by organization.

The proclamation of the boycott, which was intended to frighten foreign public opinion into silence, had the reverse effect; the fiendish barbarity of making the Jews of Germany hostages for the "good behavior" of outraged humanity intensified already existing indignation. Foreign Governments made unofficial representations, and the few friends whose good-will Germany had not entirely alienated, protested through their personal and business connections against this mad escapade. These representations and protests, and doubtless also, the pressure of German bankers and industrialists, appear to have had an effect, for we find the Government announcing a few days before April 1st, that the boycott would be restricted to that one day, but that it might be renewed on the following Wednesday, April 5th. The boycott was conducted in an orderly manner; on Monday, April 3d, business was resumed on outwardly normal lines, and although public opinion abroad did not become inarticulate, the organized boycott was not resumed on Wednesday, April 5th.

But boycotting did not cease; it had been going on before April 1st and it was resumed after that day without any
blare of trumpets, but with deadly effectiveness, none the less. Accompanying the boycott movement was a process of ruthless elimination of Jews and other bearers of Nazi animosity from all positions of honor and dignity. These acts, which were for a time arbitrary and illegal, were soon invested with legal sanction. On April 4th began a legislative pogrom against the Jews of Germany. On that day was published the law for the Restoration of the Regular Civil Service, which declared that "for the restoration of a nationally minded Regular Civil Service, civil servants of non-Aryan origin must retire." Exception was made in favor of those "officials who were employed as officers of the Civil Service on the 1st of August, 1914, or who, during the Great War, fought at the front for Germany or her allies, or who lost a father or sons in the War."

On April 11th was issued the first ordinance for carrying this law into effect, which defined non-Aryan Descent as "descent from non-Aryan, and especially Jewish, parents and grandparents, even though only one of the parents or grandparents was of the Jewish descent." Furthermore, those civil servants who were not such on August 1, 1914 were required to prove that they are of Aryan descent or that they fought at the front in the War, or that they are sons or fathers of men killed during the War. "If Aryan descent is doubtful, an opinion must be requested from the authority on race questions (Sachverstaendiger fuer Rasseforschung) of the Ministry of the Interior."

In order to understand the full significance of this law, the following facts should be borne in mind: First, under the Imperial regime the number of Jewish officials was small, so that very few of those Jews who had not yet been arbitrarily removed from office, were able to claim exemption on the ground of having been appointed before August 1, 1914; second, as practically no one less than twenty-one years of age was an official on that date, all Jewish officials forty years of age or less were affected by the law; third, soldiers in the army during the war could not choose the scene of their service and those who were not at the Front

1 Quotations are from "The Jews in Nazi Germany," published by the American Jewish Committee.
were not responsible for that fact; fourth, no female officials or employees could claim exemption on the ground of service at the Front; fifth, discrimination against those who did not serve at the Front was an injustice for another reason, namely, that service behind the lines, as everyone knows, was often of equal importance with service at the Front, even if not as hazardous. No further analysis is required to indicate that the exemptions from the law were meaningless and that the number of Jewish officials excepted was negligible.

This law was the first of a long series. The non-Aryan "principle" was soon applied to the admission of Jews to the legal profession, to the Patent Lawyers' Association, to the exercise of the function of tax consultants, to service on grand and petit jurors, to the admission of physicians to the National Health Insurance Service (the source of about nine-tenths of the income of physicians), to commercial judgements, and to tax assessorships.

On May 4, a second ordinance for giving effect to the Law for the Restoration of the Civil Service was published, providing that the provisions of that Law shall apply to all persons in the service of the Reich, the Federal States, the municipalities and municipal associations, public corporations, and all bodies of corresponding status.

The laws enumerated not only limited, they practically eliminated Jews from all public or quasi-public positions, for through such associations as the Union of National Socialist German Physicians and other professional bodies, the Nazis continued their boycott movement with such deadly effect that the practice of Jewish physicians, lawyers, etc., who were excepted from the exclusion laws was drastically reduced, if not wholly destroyed. In the universities, the Studentenschaften or student bodies were able to decide the fate of their professors. Though not given the right to dismiss members of the faculty, these organizations have, in a number of cases, browbeaten the administrative officials by means of boycotts and other forms of agitation into forcing out Jewish or liberal professors legally exempted from dismissal. Furthermore, a decree of May 6, 1933 declares that teachers in colleges and universities who have
been retired or dismissed on the basis of the Law for the Restoration of the Regular Civil Service "automatically lose the license to teach or to lecture."

These edicts were nothing less than the legalization of robbery, on a vast scale, for they actually robbed tens of thousands of working men and women of the lawfully acquired means of sustenance, in preparation of which they had toiled for years.

On April 26, 1933 was issued another Law reducing the number of "non-Aryans" who may be admitted to schools, colleges and universities, to 1.5% of the total number of students in these institutions; where the proportion of non-Aryans actually in attendance at the time the law went into effect was not in excess of 5%, no reduction was required. With access to the professions closed to all "non-Aryans" in the future, it is hard to understand why any German Jews should attend the universities and professional schools, unless it be with the intention of practicing their professions in exile. Attendance at elementary schools of all Jewish children is possible within the "non-Aryan" quota, because the percentage of Jewish children to the total number of children of school age is less than 1.5%, probably less than 1%. But, already it is evident that Jewish children cannot, without great mental agony, attend the public schools, in which will be taught the Nazi brand of "racial science," a basic principle of which is the inferiority of the Jewish "race," and the Nazi version of the history of the past twenty years according to which Germany defended herself heroically against the whole world, but German Jews and Marxists betrayed the Vaterland, which was given a new birth and dignity by the patriotic efforts of the Nazis. It appears clear that the Jews of Germany will have no alternative to establishing and maintaining their own schools, and even this will be impossible because of the certain impoverishment of the Jewish population which results from Nazi policies. If the future of the adult Jews of Germany is obviously hopeless, what shall we say of the future of Jewish children?
A pitiably ludicrous outburst of Nazi fanaticism was the announcement of the "enlightenment campaign of the German student body" which was nailed to the doors of colleges and universities throughout the Reich about the fourth week in April, 1933. The proclamation, which called for a "campaign of enlightenment" to last until May 10, when all "un-German" books would be publicly burned, demanded that "Jewish writings appear in Hebrew" as "the Jew can speak only Jewish" and "when he writes in German, he lies."

Administrative action completed the ruinous process of elimination begun by the "Aryan" decrees. In Hesse, for example, newspapers were forbidden to employ non-Germans; in Munich, the Commissarial Mayor issued orders forbidding the letting of municipal contracts to, or the ordering of supplies from Jewish or "Marxist" firms; in Breslau, all municipal contracts with Jewish physicians, lawyers, chemists, or tradesmen were cancelled, and "newspaper undertakings and all those vital to the interest of the State" were ordered to dismiss Jewish employees; in Berlin, all Jewish court reporters were dismissed; all over the Reich, large corporations, including some established and developed under the leadership of Jews, were forced to dismiss their Jewish employees, and, in a number of cases, Jews on the directing boards were compelled to resign; the German Lawn Tennis Association decided to exclude Jews from representing it in official contests, and all societies belonging to the German Gymnastic League were instructed to exclude all Jews from membership; at a meeting in May of the Boersen Verein der deutschen Buchhaendler (Association of German Booksellers) representing the entire book publishing and selling trades, it was decided that books by Jewish authors in Germany or abroad, will not be published in Germany; at about the same time, the Union of Tobacco Retailers resolved to prohibit Jews from selling tobacco products; even the Red Cross was "Aryanized" in June, as a result of an agreement between officials of the German Red Cross and the Minister of the Interior, thus eliminating all Jewish nurses from hospital or private
service, as, in Germany, all nurses are part of the Red Cross, except those who belong to Catholic religious orders. These and numerous other barbarous measures followed one another in rapid succession, with scarcely a protest from any element of the population. One of the few voices raised in condemnation was that of the Catholic Episcopate of Bavaria which, in a pastoral letter it issued in May, repudiated on principle "every infringement of rights and and every deprival of equality in respect of members of our own State, in consequence of race or creed."

The effect of these unspeakably cruel measures has been to make living in Germany literally impossible for tens of thousands of Jews, with the number rapidly increasing from day to day as the net of Nazi repression grows tighter and tighter, and the savings of those who have them are exhausted. Many have sought refuge in flight from the country; others in self-destruction. Only a fraction of the number of suicides becomes public, owing to the measures taken by the authorities to suppress such facts. And it must be borne in mind that the victims of the Nazi terror are recruited not only from the 600,000 Jews in Germany, but also from additional hundreds of thousands who had Jewish parents or grand-parents, as well as from those who are married to Jews, or have close "social relations" with Jews.

The net result has been vividly described by Michael Williams, Editor of the Commonweal, Catholic weekly review, published in New York. In an appeal sent to the League of Nations, following a visit to Germany, Mr. Williams said:

"Between 200,000 and 300,000 Jews have been deprived of any hope of the future. The older Jews must live out their lives deprived of all rights of citizens as long as the present appalling dictatorship dominates Germany.

"The situation of the Jews in Germany is deplorable beyond words. Israel in Germany is perishing under a yoke only comparable to that under which its forefathers groaned in Babylon and Egypt."

And like their enslaved forefathers in Egypt, the Jews of Germany are not permitted to leave their "house of
bondage." Legal exit from Germany is hedged about with technicalities and costs which make departure impossible for many. Besides, even those who do manage to secure the necessary exit visa are not permitted to take their capital, if they possess any. Furthermore, the restriction of immigration, which has become a fixed policy in most countries, drastically reduces the number of places to which fugitives can go, especially those who are penniless, as many of the Jewish emigrants from Germany are or would be. Those who have left Germany illegally, with the exception of the small number who were able to take any funds with them, are already destitute or rapidly becoming so. Their property in Germany has been sequestered and their bank accounts attached. No withdrawals can be made even for the payment of taxes or interest on their real estate, if any, in Germany, with the inevitable result that their property will, in the long run, be lost to them.

And yet, despite the obvious hopelessness of the situation, the Jews of Germany are struggling to keep from drowning. They have pooled all their community resources and have united their forces to save themselves from utter destruction. A Central Committee for Relief and Reconstruction—hopeful name!—has been set up in Berlin to advise and aid bewildered Jews to cope with their problems. This Committee will be assisted with funds by Jewish communities abroad. These communities are also aiding those agencies which are caring for the tens of thousands of refugees from Germany. It appears to be clear, as this Review is being written, that the Jewish catastrophe in Germany can best be met only by the emigration of the Jews, and that, eventually, the Jewish communities in other countries will have to make an heroic effort to accomplish this result. For the ardor and enthusiasm with which the anti-Jewish policies of the Nazi regime have been welcomed by a large section of the people of Germany, with scarcely a voice raised in protest, appear to support the tragic conclusion that no matter what changes may take place in the Government of Germany in the near future, the situation of the Jews in that country will remain, at best, extremely precarious.
II

THE WORLD'S REACTION

We have previously referred to the optimistic manner in which the world outside of Germany received the news of the formation, late in January, of the government of national concentration in Germany, with Hitler at its head. Outside of France and Poland where the ascendancy of the National Socialists, whose program included threats at the territorial status quo, was regarded with some dismay, the consensus of public opinion appeared to be that the German people had the right to have the kind of government they desired, that they were evidently not ripe for a democratic regime; otherwise, it was argued, they would have resisted more vigorously the turning over of the reins of government to the leader of a party which advocated the abolition of the parliamentary system and the institution of the "total state," in which the liberty of the citizen would be circumscribed, in every phase of his life, by what the government regarded as the supreme requirements of the State. As for the "blood and thunder" elements of the Nazi program, these, it was generally believed, had been merely bait for catching adherents, and would unquestionably be laid on the shelf, now that the Nazis have arrived. Confronted with the heavy responsibility of coping with difficult internal and international problems, Nazi exuberance would be sobered. Besides, it was pointed out reassuringly, the Nazis are represented by only three in a cabinet of twelve and even the German Democratic Party, in its official bulletin, described Hitler as "an ex-corporal amidst a count and four barons" and as a Socialist who is "under the supervision of the foxy capitalist, Hugenberg." And what could have been more reassuring than the unanimous decision of the Cabinet, at its first meeting, to avoid "all policies of suppression, economic adventure, and financial experimentation?"

These comforting views were eagerly adopted in many Jewish circles. Even after the elections of March 5, but before the reports of excesses came out of Germany, the Jewish press continued to be hopeful that the worst would not happen. There were the conservatives in the Cabinet; beyond that bulwark was von Hindenburg, "sane, civilized,
loyal to his constitutional oath”; furthermore, the country required pacification at home and goodwill abroad; and, finally, was not Germany a civilized nation, proud of its Kultur?

Opposed to this reassuring chorus a few discordant voices were faintly audible. These reminded the world of the Nazi propaganda of thirteen years duration which had poisoned the minds and hearts of the youth of Germany; they pointed out that the anti-Jewish elements of the Nazi program were the only ones that could be carried into effect without arousing any serious objection in Germany, and that they would doubtless be put into effect in order to satisfy the popular expectation of something new and revolutionary from the Nazi leadership.

The foregoing summary is presented because the attitude of public opinion outside Germany is part of the record of events, and because it will help to account for the outcry which soon followed.

That outcry came from every continent, and from virtually every country. And not from Jews only. The repressive and destructive tactics of the Hitler-Goebbels-Goering triumvirate were aimed at the ruthless crushing of all who were in opposition to the Nazi brand of salvation—not only Communists and Socialists, but also persons who adhered to democratic and liberal doctrines of individual liberty and to the universally accepted principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Furthermore, the Nazi program called for the elimination of the Catholic Church from politics, and resistance to Nazi efforts in this direction was rigorously and unscrupulously suppressed and punished. Even the 28 autonomous Protestant church organizations had to be welded into a Reichskirche, subservient to the State; the short-lived resistance to this process was also mercilessly crushed. These measures, together with such others as the muzzling of the press and of speech, aroused resentment and indignation in all civilized countries; but there is no doubt that the treatment meted out to the Jews of Germany, more than any other single factor, evoked the phenomenal protest which the world has witnessed during the past few months.
This protest took a number of forms. Eminent individuals, either singly or in groups, publicly expressed their condemnation of Nazi acts; church leaders and bodies went on record in the same way; associations of lawyers, physicians, teachers, adopted resolutions of sympathy with the members of their professions in Germany who had been ousted; in almost every important city, public massmeetings of protest were held, frequently upon the initiative and under the auspices of non-Jewish elements; in some cities, there were also protest parades, especially on May 10, the day of the public burning of "Jewish" books in Germany; in some countries, the situation in Germany was the subject of discussion in legislatures and parliaments; it was debated also at national and international congresses of scientific and other bodies; in some Jewish communities, the rabbis proclaimed special fast days, and in some, Jewish merchants kept their shops closed on a certain day; and, in addition to these and other measures, a boycott of German goods and services was inaugurated in a number of countries. In connection with all this widespread protest, Jewish and non-Jewish societies directly interested in the situation found themselves called upon to disseminate information regarding it, first, because of the keen public interest, and second, because of the efforts of sympathizers with, and apologists for, the Nazi regime to becloud the issues or to minimize their gravity. In some countries, especially those having any considerable population of German origin, the protest movements and especially the boycott agitation met with irritation from some sections of the German population and led to counter-agitation and anti-Jewish boycotts, which posed an additional problem for the Jewish community.

Limitations of space prevent any detailed record of the crowded events of the past four months, March to June, outside of Germany. But a brief enumeration of the more important occurrences will, we believe, suffice to show the nature and the extent of the repercussions of the crisis in Germany in other lands.

As has been noted above, demonstrations of protest against physical atrocities began after these had already
begun to subside, about March 12. There followed a series of demonstrations in many countries. Massmeetings were held in a large number of places, including the following:

ARGENTINE: Buenos Aires
AUSTRALIA: Melbourne and Sydney
BELGIUM: Antwerp, Brussels and Ghent
BRAZIL: Rio de Janeiro
BULGARIA: Sofia
CANADA: London, Ottawa, Toronto, Welland, Windsor (Ontario); Montreal (Quebec); Winnipeg (Manitoba)
EGYPT: Alexandria
FRANCE: Bordeaux, Lille, Lyons, Marseilles, Paris and Toulouse
GREAT BRITAIN and NORTHERN IRELAND: Glasgow, Hull, Belfast, Birmingham, Leeds, London, Newport and Nottingham
HOLLAND: Amsterdam and Rotterdam
IRAQ: Bagdad
IRISH FREE STATE: Cork and Dublin
LATVIA: Riga
MEXICO: Mexico City
PALESTINE: Tel Aviv
PORTUGAL: Lisbon
TUNISIA: Tunis
TURKEY: Istanbul

In the UNITED STATES, massmeetings were held in over sixty-five cities in over twenty-five states.

Most of these meetings were convened by interdenominational committees, and some were held entirely under non-Jewish auspices, but all were participated in and addressed by Jews and non-Jews. Probably the most notable were those held at Madison Square Garden in New York City on March 27, at the Trocadero in Paris on May 10, and at Queen’s Hall, London on June 27.

The Madison Square Garden meeting in New York City was called by the American Jewish Congress. It was presided over by Mr. Bernard S. Deutsch, the president of the Congress, and was addressed by a number of prominent

The Trocadero meeting in Paris was held under the auspices of the French Committee for the Protection of Persecuted Jewish Intellectuals. It was presided over by deputy and former Minister, Louis Rollin, and the speakers included members of parliament, distinguished professors, and churchmen of all Christian denominations, Professor Sylvain Lévi, president of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, and Grand Rabbin Israël Lévi.

The Queen’s Hall massmeeting in London was likewise a historic gathering, attended by members of the House of Lords and the House of Commons, religious leaders, metropolitan mayors and members of the London County Council, distinguished leaders of the legal and medical professions, educators, authors and editors, and other men and women prominent in political, civil and social life. The chairman was Lord Buckmaster, formerly Lord Chancellor, and the Archbishop of Canterbury moved the resolution which stated that it was the view of the meeting “that the discrimination now being exercised against the Jews in Germany is contrary to the basic principles of tolerance and equality which are accepted in the modern world in relation to the treatment of religious and racial minorities.” The Archbishop led the discussion of the resolution, and was followed by the Rev. Dr. J. Scott Lidgett, representing the independent churches, and Lord Iddesleigh. The passage of the resolution was followed by a brief speech by Lord Reading, the only Jewish speaker, proposing a vote of thanks to those who had addressed the meeting.

Public opinion found expression also in resolutions of important organizations, pronouncements bearing the signatures of groups of prominent persons, and statements of eminent individuals. The following enumeration does not lay claim to completeness, but it will serve as the basis for an estimate of the wide scope of the protest and of the
distinction of the organizations and individuals who gave voice to it.

**United States:** In March, Rev. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, Protestant Church leader, issued a statement in which he appealed to Christianity to organize against anti-Semitism; Dr. John Grier Hibben, President of Princeton University, (since deceased) issued a statement denouncing Hitlerism as a menace to world peace; a group of prominent non-Jews in Louisville, Kentucky, addressed a letter to the Government asking that the Department of State register a protest; the American League of Human Rights and the Church Peace Union sent similar petitions to the President; in letters to the American Jewish Congress, a number of Governors and members of the United States Congress expressed their sympathy with the Jews of Germany and their condemnation of the Nazi oppression; the State House of Representatives of Tennessee and the State Legislature of New Jersey adopted resolutions of protest.

In April, Signor Arturo Toscanini, world-renowned musician and conductor, and ten other famous musicians sent a protest to Hitler against the persecution of musicians in Germany; the German Society of Maryland sent a cablegram to Hitler, urging him to treat Jews on the same footing as other Germans; Governor Gifford Pinchot of Pennsylvania issued a statement denouncing the anti-Jewish drive in Germany; the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut adopted a resolution expressing sympathy with Jewish lawyers in Germany, and declaring that "there can be no true and actual feelings of fraternity or fraternal intercourse between the members of the Federal bar of New York, Connecticut and New Jersey, and the bar of any nation so long as they permit or encourage the persecution of our brothers because of race or religion."

In May, the New York Pharmaceutical Conference condemned the attitude of the Hitler Government; the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York adopted a resolution of sympathy; at a meeting of the National Conference of Jews and Christians, Christian leaders expressed their sympathy with Jews over the Hitler persecution; students
at the University of Cincinnati adopted a resolution protesting against anti-Jewish restrictions on enrollment in colleges and universities; a protest petition signed by 1200 Christian clergymen, in 406 cities in 41 States and Canada, was published; fifty-one distinguished members of the New York bar sent a protest to the State Department with the request that it be transmitted to the German Government; the Board of Directors of the Philadelphia County Medical Society adopted a resolution of protest; the American Association of University Professors protested against the violation of the fundamental principles of academic freedom in Germany.

In June, the Philadelphia Bar Association adopted a resolution of protest; and resolutions were adopted also by the American Medical Association and by a massmeeting of 1,200 delegates to the National Conference of Social Work, then meeting in Detroit, Michigan.

**FRANCE:** In March, Cardinal Verdier, Archbishop of Paris and head of the Catholic Church in France, addressed a letter to Grand Rabbin Israël Lévi, expressing sympathy with the Jews of Germany and stating that he would request his followers to pray to God to cause the persecution to cease.

In April, the Rev. Marc Boegner, president of the Protestant Federation of France, in a letter to the Grand Rabbin, conveyed the assurance that the Protestants of France join their Jewish compatriots in protesting against Nazi fanaticism, and stating that during Holy Week all Protestant churches in France would hold services of intercession in behalf of the Jews of Germany; after listening to an address by ex-premier Edouard Herriot, president of the Radical Socialist Party, that body adopted a resolution protesting energetically against the unjustifiable maltreatment of the Jews of Germany, and demanding that "by agreement of all nations remaining faithful to the liberal spirit, the necessary measures be taken to safeguard them [the Jews] materially, intellectually, and morally."

In May, a group of physicians and surgeons on the staffs of Paris hospitals issued a protest against the treatment of their Jewish colleagues in Germany; the General Council
of the Department of the Marne, sitting at Châlons-sur-Marne, adopted a protest resolution, and similar action was taken by the General Council of the Department of Constantine: a protest declaration was issued by the leading citizens of Mulhouse; Monsignor E. J. Hurault, bishop of Nancy and of Toul, and Rev. A. Cleisz, president of the Consistory of Reform Churches of Lorraine sent letters of sympathy to Grand Rabbin Haguenauer.

In June, the Bar Association of Paris circulated a resolution among the members insisting that their colleagues in Germany be permitted to resume the exercise of their rights, and declaring that their protest would be continued until this was done.

BELGIUM: In April, a delegation representing the four federated Protestant Churches (Union of Churches, Christian Missionary Church, Methodist Church, and Protestant Liberal Church) called upon Dr. Wiener, Grand Rabbin of Belgium, and, in the name of their churches, expressed their sympathy with the persecuted Jews of Germany; the Federation also dispatched a letter to Dr. Kapler, president of the Federation of Protestant Churches of Germany, asking the Federation to intervene to bring about "the reinvestment of the German Jews with all their rights as citizens."

In May, 154 professors of Belgian universities issued a manifesto protesting against "the violation of the spirit of tolerance and of justice;" the Conference of junior barristers of Brussels protested against the exclusion of lawyers in Germany, because of their religion.

HOLLAND: In May, the Holland section of the World Union of Churches called upon the Central Committee of the Union to do everything in its power to bring an end to "a state of things, which evokes the emotion and indignation of Holland and of the entire civilized world;" a protest signed by 73 leading non-Jewish personalities of Holland was published, expressing their "profound indignation against acts which we would have, until now, believed impossible, and which constitute a shameful backward step
of a civilization painfully achieved, putting Europe back to the most barbarous primitive times."

**Switzerland:** In April, 22 leading non-Jews of Geneva made public a declaration addressed to the various Protestant bodies in Switzerland drawing their attention to "an attitude which is the negation of the Evangelical spirit which is a synonym for love, independence, and mutual aid," and urging them to "raise their voices in order to demand for the Jews of Germany the same justice which they should exact for all other oppressed minorities."

**Great Britain:** In March, Archbishop Downey denounced Hitlerism in an address at a meeting of the Liverpool University Jewish Society.

In April, Bishop G. C. Stewart issued an appeal to the German people to end persecution; Sir P. Dawson and P. J. Hannon addressed a similar appeal to President von Hindenburg; H. W. Austin and F. Perry, British tennis stars protested against the announced exclusion of Daniel Prenn, a Jew, from the German Davis Cup Team; and Sir Matthew James Barrie, President of the British Society of Authors, in a letter to the German ambassador, protested on behalf of the Society, against the proscription of German authors on the ground of race or religion.


In June, the Archbishop of Canterbury appealed to Hitler, on behalf of the Christian churches of the world, for tolerance toward the Jews of Germany.

Protests against Nazi persecution were also voiced in the halls of parliaments. On March 30, an imposing demonstration took place in the British House of Lords, when Viscount Cecil, Lord Iddesleigh, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Lord Reading, protested in the name of humanity and civilization, against the persecution in Germany. On the same day, a brief discussion took place in the House of Commons, in the course of which, Sir John Simon, Foreign Secretary, stated that in the view of the Foreign Office, there is no article in the Covenant of the League of Nations
under which the British Government could properly bring
the German situation before the Council of the League of
Nations.

On April 13, there was an impressive debate in the House
of Commons. Representatives of all parties were in full
agreement in condemning the Nazi policies and in warning
the German government that its course was destroying the
goodwill toward Germany which had slowly and with
difficulty been restored in Great Britain since the Armistice.
The address of Mr. Austen Chamberlain, former Foreign
Secretary, who had been a consistent advocate of a liberal
policy toward Germany, was especially pointed. He said,
in part:

What is this new spirit of German nationalism? The worst of
the all-Prussian Imperialism, with an added savagery, a racial
pride, an exclusiveness which cannot allow to any fellow-subject
not of "pure Nordic birth" equality of rights and citizenship
within the nation to which he belongs. Are you going to discuss
revision with a Government like that? Are you going to discuss
with such a Government the Polish Corridor? The Polish Corridor
is inhabited by Poles; do you dare to put another Pole under
the heel of such a Government? . . . After all, we stand for some-
thing in this country. Our traditions count, for our own people,
for Europe and for the world. Europe is menaced and Germany
is afflicted by this narrow, exclusive, aggressive spirit, by which it
is a crime to be in favour of peace and a crime to be a Jew. That is
not a Germany to which we can afford to make concessions. . . .
Before you can afford to decide or to urge others to decide, you
must see a Germany whose mind is turned to peace, who will use
her equality of status to secure her own safety but not to menace
the safety of others; a Germany which has learnt not only how to
live herself but how to let others live inside her and beside her.

The matter came up in the Chamber of Deputies of
France on April 5, when one of the deputies, in asking the
Minister of the Interior what provision would be made for
the reception of the victims of German anti-Semitism,
delivered a speech, which was loudly applauded, condem-
nning the Nazi excesses as the most prodigious return to
barbarism in modern times. The Minister of the Interior,
Camille Chautemps, replied that from the very first day
the Government had decided that persons who would ask
for asylum on French territory would be welcomed in
conformity with all traditions of French hospitality. The
subject was referred to in the Chamber again on April 2,
when the government proposed the establishment of a chair in mathematical physics at the Collège de France, to be occupied by Albert Einstein; the government's motion was adopted on April 13. The German situation was discussed in the French Senate also on May 11.

In the United States Congress, a number of resolutions requesting the Administration to take action were introduced in both Houses, and several speeches on the subject were delivered in the House of Representatives. On June 10, the Senate was the scene of a number of earnest speeches by leaders of both Parties. The debate was opened by Senator Joseph T. Robinson of Arkansas, Democratic leader, who was followed by Senator Jesse H. Metcalf of Rhode Island, Republican leader. They were followed by Senators Royal S. Copeland and Robert F. Wagner of New York, David I. Walsh of Massachusetts, Henry D. Hatfield of West Virginia, and Millard E. Tydings of Maryland. Senator Robinson struck the keynote of this debate when he said:

> It is sickening and terrifying to realize that a great people whose advance during thousands of years has been marked by notable achievements in the arts and sciences, should respond to impulses of cruelty and inhumanity, which, when they have spent their force, will have lowered German civilization in opinion of all peoples with whom Germany must have social and commercial relations throughout the future. It is not suggested that the United States intervene or attempt to determine the domestic policies of the German people.

> Such cruel policies as are referred to will bring their own penalties. They will result in loss of international prestige, in moral reaction among the German people of far-reaching effect, in loss of trade and commerce.

> May we not with propriety express the hope that wholesome world opinion may influence sentiment in Germany so that in time—a short time—the iron grip of racial hatred may be relaxed and the Jews again be permitted to enjoy fair freedom?

The complete text of these impressive addresses is given in "The Jews in Nazi Germany," the publication of the American Jewish Committee, already referred to.

Besides these and other actions within the various countries, certain international bodies, in which Germany was represented, also took steps to indicate that public opinion
outside of Germany was profoundly stirred by the suppression of personal liberty and the proscription of Jews. Toward the end of May, at the Congress of P. E. N. clubs, at Ragusa, Italy, the delegates from France, Belgium and Poland demanded that the Congress denounce Nazi persecution against men of letters on the ground of race or faith. The German delegates, supported by those from Switzerland, Holland, Greece and Austria, insisted that such action was outside the scope of the Congress, but the delegates from seventeen countries voted against the German contention, whereupon the German delegates left the Congress.

In June, at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the International Olympic Commission, at Vienna, Brig.-Gen. C. H. Sherrill, the United States delegate, declared that unless Germany guaranteed the equality of foreign Jewish athletes and of German Jewish athletes in participating, the Olympic games would be transferred from Berlin in 1936. General Sherrill's declaration was followed by a cablegram, signed by twenty American Olympic champions sent to him at the instance of the American Jewish Congress. Eventually, the German government gave a specific promise not to exclude German Jews from the Olympics, and the Executive Committee decided to approve Berlin as the scene of the 1936 Olympics. At the time this is being written, news reports appear to indicate that efforts are being made to evade the fulfillment of the pledge of the German government.

At about the same time, the International Union of League of Nations Societies, meeting at Montreux, Switzerland, over the objections of the German delegate, who insisted that the matter was one of internal and not international concern, unanimously adopted a resolution recalling that the League of Nations had expressed the hope that at least the same rights which are guaranteed to racial, religious, and linguistic minorities, in all the treaties of peace, except the Treaty of Versailles, would be respected by all the members of the League, and that the same attitude had been consistently maintained by the German delegates to the League of Nations. The resolution went on to express satisfaction at the fact that the Council of the League had begun to examine the situation of the Jews in
Germany, and the hope that the German League of Nations Association would exert all its efforts to obtain the reestablishment in their country of civil and political equality in accord with the principles of the League of Nations and of the Union, and concluded with the request that the president of the Union, Lord Cecil, in communicating the text of the resolution to the German Association, interpret the sentiments of the Union.

In carrying out this request, in a letter to Dr. von Schnee, head of the German delegation to the Union, Lord Cecil referred to the Nazi anti-Jewish policy in the following terms:

"It seems impossible to our Union to reconcile a discrimination of this nature not only with the spirit of the Covenant of the League of Nations, but also with the development of western civilization in the course of the past two or three centuries, a civilization to which Germany made so eminent a contribution. Our Union sees in this a recrudescence of the faith in pure force, independent of justice, as an instrument of Government; and this recrudescence, which is inseparable from certain public declarations of official personalities, who occupy high positions in the German Reich, has aroused a profound anxiety in a large number of countries."

The Union of League of Nations Societies adopted also a resolution favoring the international guarantee of fundamental human rights, within the framework of the League of Nations, and appointing a committee of seven to study the bases upon which a convention on such an international guarantee can be established.

The reference in the resolution on the German situation adopted by the International Union of League of Nations Societies to the fact that the Council of the League of Nations had begun to examine the situation of the Jews in Germany referred to the discussion which was then in progress at the meeting of the Council of the League. The Jewish communities of many countries had almost instinctively turned their eyes to Geneva, and several organizations had sent protests and petitions to the League. As has already been noted, the question of the League's competency to intervene had been raised in the British Parliament, eliciting from the Foreign Office the view that the matter could not be brought up on the basis of any article of the
Covenant. But it was brought before the Council on the basis of the German-Polish Convention of May 15, 1922, relative to Upper Silesia, in the petition of one Franz Bernheim, a resident of Gleiwitz in Upper Silesia. This petition claimed that Germany had violated the German-Polish Convention as to Upper Silesia, in respect of the pledges given in that treaty by Germany for the equal rights of persons belonging to racial, religious, and linguistic minorities; these rights had been declared matters of international concern and been placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations. After various efforts to obstruct the consideration of the Bernheim petition by the Council, the German delegate on June 6, abstained from voting on the report of Sean Lester, the representative of the Irish Free State, who had been appointed rapporteur on the Bernheim petition. This report, which was adopted by the Council, held that the anti-Jewish measures put into effect in Upper Silesia violated the convention with Poland, and took note of the formal statement of the German government, that “the anti-Jewish measures taken by subordinate authorities that were not compatible with the Silesian convention would be corrected.” As by this time, the Aryan decrees had been in force for several weeks and the non-Jewish population had been greatly influenced by the intense anti-Jewish propaganda, the practical effect of the League action was probably slight. Morally, however, it was a great demonstration of Germany’s loneliness among the nations on the basic issue of human rights, and served to focus public opinion on the Jewish situation in Germany. Besides, the Czech and Polish representatives on the Council made it clear that they would bring the question up again, using it as a lever for extending the principle of minority rights to the whole of Germany.*

Another petition based upon the German-Polish convention as to Upper Silesia was submitted to the League of Nations by Dr. Leo Motzkin and Dr. Emil Margulies, in the name of the American Jewish Congress, the Jewish

*The text of the Bernheim petition and the official minutes of the Council of the League regarding it, are given in an appendix to this Review.
Party of Czechoslovakia, and Jewish Organizations in Poland, Bulgaria, Roumania, Austria, Belgium, Lithuania, Egypt, and other countries.

In addition to those forms of protest already enumerated, another was employed in many parts of the world—a boycott against German goods and services. The boycott movement began simultaneously during the last week of March in a number of countries, and eventually embraced Argentine, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Great Britain, and the British Dominions, Greece, Yugoslavia, Palestine, Poland, Roumania, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, and the United States. In some countries, particularly Great Britain and the United States, the boycott movement was not officially endorsed by the leading Jewish organizations. In the United States, the American Jewish Committee and the B'nai B'rith publicly condemned the boycott in a statement issued on April 28. In England, the movement was promoted by a new body called the World Alliance for Combatting Anti-Semitism; in the United States it was launched by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, and was actively pushed by that body and by a new organization calling itself the American League for the Defense of Jewish Rights. The boycott was ardently advocated by Mr. Samuel Untermyer, the well-known attorney and public worker.

The difference of opinion within the Jewish community regarding the wisdom and righteousness of a boycott of German goods and services was paralleled by a difference of point of view on the general methods of meeting the situation. In the United States, for example, the American Jewish Congress, on the one hand, and the American Jewish Committee and the B'nai B'rith, on the other, disagreed as to the approach to the situation. The Committee, the Congress and the B'nai B'rith parted company with the Jewish Congress, when the latter announced, on March 15, that it would initiate and promote mass demonstrations by Jews. On March 20, the Committee and the B'nai B'rith issued a joint statement in which they vigorously protested against “the anti-Jewish action in
Germany which is denying to German Jews the fundamental rights of every human being in a spirit contrary to the traditions of American freedom of conscience, religion, and liberty.” The statement went on to say: “Every proper step must be taken to remedy these injustices. Such efforts must at the same time be intelligent and reasonable. Prejudice must not be fought merely with appeals to passion and resentment, however justified passion and resentment may be.” The two organizations concluded the statement with a pledge “to discharge the solemn responsibility which rests on our two organizations to marshal the forces of public opinion among Americans of every faith to right the wrongs of the Jews of Germany and for the vindication of the fundamental principles of human liberty.”

The American Jewish Congress, on the other hand, believed that it was the duty of Jews to protest. In a letter to Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of the Committee, the president of the Congress, Mr. Bernard S. Deutsch declared: “But nothing that our government may be moved to do, nothing that non-Jewish bodies may be led to see that it is their duty to do, in the name of the decencies of civilization and humanity, exempts us as Jews from the solemn obligation of standing up as a people in the sight of the world and protesting against the horror and the shame of the Hitler war upon the Jewish people.”

When, in April, the American Jewish Congress announced a mass procession on May 10, the day of the public burning in Germany of “un-German” books, the Committee and the B’nai B’rith issued another joint statement in which they confirmed their previous position.

In accordance with their views, the American Jewish Committee and the B’nai B’rith did not join the American Jewish Congress in sponsoring massmeetings and other forms of protest under Jewish auspices, but restricted their efforts to representations to the United States government and to measures calculated to inform and direct public opinion, such as cooperation with non-Jewish bodies and the dissemination of information regarding the facts of the situation. Similar steps were taken also by the American Jewish Congress which also initiated and encouraged mass demonstrations in various forms. The difference between
the two groups of organizations aroused considerable controversy in the Jewish community, but toward the end of June, the three bodies established a Joint Council for the interchange of views and united action insofar as this would be possible.

On June 13, the American Jewish Committee published a booklet entitled "The Jews in Nazi Germany: The Factual Record of Their Persecution by the National Socialists," which was extensively circulated, and was generally favorably received by the press and public. The booklet was a compilation, from official sources, of the anti-Jewish decrees and ordinances of the Nazi government, supplemented by reports in German and in trustworthy non-German newspapers of acts of violence, of the expulsion of Jews from public office and the professions, and the ousting of Jews from business. Another section of the booklet presented important facts about the Jews of Germany, frequently misrepresented by the Nazis to justify their persecution of the Jews. Appendices dealt with the reaction of American public opinion as expressed in speeches in the United States Senate, in the resolutions of important organizations, and in the editorial comment of the leading newspapers throughout the country.

In England, there was a similar divergence of opinion within the Jewish community. The leadership of the Board of Deputies counselled restraint and opposed public demonstrations under Jewish auspices, including an anti-Nazi boycott. But a considerable section of the community held different views, and several organizations sprang into being which fostered public agitation and the boycott. As this review is being written, there are indications of a rapprochement between the opposing camps. The Board of Deputies also published and widely circulated bulletins for the information of the public, made representations to the Government regarding the facilitation of immigration of German Jewish fugitives to England and to Palestine, and refuted misrepresentations of Nazi propagandists and apologists.

Governments were appealed to in a number of countries, besides the United States and England. In Canada a delegation of Jews waited upon Prime Minister R. B.
Bennet, in March, who promptly requested an official of the State Department, then in London, to submit a full report on the situation. In Ireland, Chief Rabbi Isaac Herzog, conferred with President Eamon de Valera. In Italy, a delegation of Jews, headed by Chief Rabbi Angelo Sacerdoti of Rome, called upon Premier Benito Mussolini, who expressed his sympathy. A delegation of the world Orthodox union, Agudath Israel, had an audience with the Pope.

Considerations of international comity prevented other governments from making direct representations to that of Germany, except when non-German nationals were affected, as when the governments of Poland and the United States submitted to the German Foreign Office complaints of maltreatment lodged with their embassies by their nationals. But not a few governments gave unmistakable signs of their sympathy for the victims of Nazi persecution. We have already referred to the statement of Camille Chautemps, Minister of the Interior of France, to the effect that from the very first day the French government had decided that persons who would ask asylum of French territory would be welcomed in conformity with all traditions of French hospitality. The French government not only admitted virtually all refugees who applied for admittance, but also supplemented the efforts of private organizations by granting to refugees permission to seek employment, wherever such permission would not aggravate the existing unemployment situation. Similar steps were taken by the governments of other countries, notably Holland, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, and Belgium.

There were some exceptions to this rule, undoubtedly resulting from unfavorable conditions. Thus, it was reported late in May, that the government of Argentina had refused to grant the request of three leading Jewish organizations that the government permit the entry of refugees, despite the existing ban on all immigrants except relatives of residents.

In England, where the unemployment situation is still acute, Douglas Hacking, Under Secretary for Home Affairs, stated in answer to a question in the House of Commons that, in accordance with the time-honored tradition of the
country, no unnecessary obstacle would be placed in the way of refugees seeking admission. On April 13, 1933, Sir John Simon, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, stated in the House: “I am sure that at the present time the sentiment of our own people will not wish us to be unfeeling or niggardly in administering that branch of the law.” As regards Palestine, Sir John Simon stated that the High Commissioner had “authorized an advance of 1,000 certificates for distribution to Jewish men and women of the laboring category in Germany on account of the half year commencing the first of April, ante-dated in order that the certificates may be available.” With regard to those persons possessing some capital, the High Commissioner had also modified the regulations with a view to facilitating their admission, and he had also “given express orders that there should be considerate treatment for applications by German Jews already settled in Palestine for the admission of parents or other relatives of theirs at present living in Germany.”

Some governments showed a special interest in exiled intellectuals. A number of invitations were extended to Dr. Albert Einstein to join the faculties of national universities. The French government, as has already been noted, established a chair at the Collège de France especially for him. In May, it was reported that the government of Turkey had decided to invite fifteen German physicians to come into the country, and that the government of Egypt had taken a similar step. In all countries bordering on Germany, local committees of Jews and non-Jews were formed to care for the refugees, and in all cases the efforts of these committees had the benevolent approval of government organs. In Amsterdam, for example, the City Council placed a building at the disposal of the Committee of Dutch Professors, as a headquarters for exiled academicians. In France, the local committee was headed by Paul Painlevé, former prime minister. In Holland, over forty eminent professors in Dutch universities established a committee to help Jewish intellectuals. In England, the most distinguished scholars and scientists issued an appeal for funds to help secure appointments for exiled teachers in British universities. Similar steps were taken in Belgium, where
the staffs of the four universities contributed to a fund for this purpose.

In the United States, the New School for Social Research in New York City, through an advisory committee consisting of distinguished University men and publicists, laid plans for the establishment of "The University in Exile," to which about fifteen of the proscribed German professors, regardless of political views, race, or religion, were to be invited; the project was planned for a period of two years. Besides this, other committees were set up to assist refugee academicians to find posts in American universities.

The total number of refugees is not definitely known, but reliable estimates place it between 60,000 and 75,000. Virtually every European country has a number of them, and their chief stopping places appear to be Holland, Belgium, Switzerland and France. A small number have been going to Austria, whence most of them pass on to Czechoslovakia or to Palestine. A few of the refugees are able to settle in these countries or to go on to other lands where they have kin or friends; others, who are destitute, are cared for by local committees. These bodies work not only to maintain the refugees but also to carry on negotiations with the authorities for the establishment of new industries in which refugees may be employed, and conduct training courses in agricultural work to fit the younger refugees for settlement on the land. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Jews of Egypt have decided to establish an agricultural colony to prepare refugees for eventual settlement on the land in Palestine. It is quite clear that the problem of the refugees as well as that of the Jews remaining in Germany will, sooner or later, require the setting up of a central clearing house to make possible coordination of the work of the various committees.

While the communities in which the refugees are staying are doing all they can to defray the cost of this work, yet they require and are receiving assistance from Jewish communities in other countries, especially Great Britain and the United States. In the latter country, the Joint Distribution Committee launched a campaign for a special German relief fund of $2,000,000; at the time this is being
written, it is reported that more than half of this sum has been subscribed. In England, the Central British Fund for German Jewry was set up at a meeting in London on May 23; by the middle of July, about £160,000 (approximately $720,000) was collected by this Committee.

The Jews of Poland also formed a United Relief Committee to care for refugees from Germany, most of them former residents of Poland.

All over the world, Zionists and other Jews interested in the upbuilding of Palestine saw in that country a natural refuge for their persecuted German brethren. There was considerable discussion regarding the capacity of Palestine to absorb a large section of German Jewry, and agitation for securing from the Mandatory and from the Palestine Administration measures for facilitating the immigration of refugees from Germany. The fact that economic conditions in Palestine during the past year were favorable disposed the Mandatory to adopt a somewhat liberal policy, as we have noted elsewhere. At the same time, the Jews of Palestine were deeply touched by the calamity which had befallen their brethren in Germany and took steps to promote the rapid absorption of as large a number as the Mandatory would permit to enter the country. The community was especially interested in the plight of the Jewish children in Germany. A special committee was set up to raise funds for relief purposes and for the education of German Jewish children. The Jewish Agency for Palestine also appreciated the emergent character of the situation, and toward the end of May, the Agency began to gather special subscriptions to a Palestine Fund for German Jews. The sponsors of the fund included Lord Robert Cecil, David Lloyd George, Sir Herbert Samuel, General Jan Christian Smuts, Doctor Cyrus Adler, Mr. Morris Rothenberg, Dr. Nahum Sokolow, Mrs. Felix M. Warburg, and Dr. Chaim Weizmann. The fund, it was announced, would be employed to provide permanent homes in Palestine for German refugees, by the purchase of land, to finance industrial undertakings, to assist artisans, to furnish credit, and also to help Jewish scholars and scientists to continue their work in Palestine.
This description of the world's reaction to Nazi persecution would be incomplete without mention of the unfavorable repercussions of the Nazi anti-Jewish policy. While sympathy for the Jews of Germany, condemnation of their oppression, and eagerness to help them were widespread, well-nigh universal, yet, in many places, extremely unpleasant situations arose. Forced by public opinion into a defensive position, the Nazis endeavored to justify their unconscionable measures by a campaign of slanderous propaganda. They attempted to justify their proscription of all the Jews, and all Christians of Jewish descent, by spreading untrue accounts of the extent and nature of the anti-Jewish measures, misrepresentations and falsehoods about the Jews of Germany. This propaganda was promoted by diplomatic and consular representatives of the Nazi government in foreign countries, whose utterances, because of the prestige attaching to their positions, were, for a time, believed, with the result that the public was confused. But it was not long before information drawn from authoritative sources including official Nazi utterances and government laws and ordinances, as to whose authenticity there could be no question, was published. Nevertheless, Nazi propagandists and sympathizers persisted in their efforts to justify the Nazi course by carrying on an unscrupulous anti-Jewish agitation. This was especially true in the United States where Nazi agents had been active even before Hitler's accession to office. There is evidence that, in the United States, there is a well-organized network of propaganda units, which are circulating anti-Jewish broadsides, pamphlets, and books, many of them imported from Germany. In some cities, there are weekly newspapers patterned after the *Voelkischer Beobachter* and similar Nazi journals appearing in Germany. These pro-Nazi elements are especially resentful of the anti-German boycott agitation, and are retorting with efforts to foment an anti-Jewish boycott.

The situation in Germany also encouraged non-Nazi anti-Jewish agitators to intensify their activities. The success of the "Brown Shirts" in Germany has led to the rise in the United States of organizations which are attempting to create American imitations, whose members are
required, on formal occasions, to wear shirts of this or that color. In some cases, these "shirt" organizations of Americans are closely allied with Hitlerist camarillas, and participate in their nefarious, un-American activities.

This agitation is obviously aimed at engendering in the United States and in other countries the same anti-Jewish fanaticism as that which has made possible the acceptance by the bulk of the German people of a policy which has brought down upon the present regime in Germany the condemnation of all right-thinking men and women, non-Jews as well as Jews, in every civilized country in the world. The history of similar movements in the past, in the United States, affords a basis for the hope that decent, law-abiding people of this country will not long tolerate these pernicious activities which seek to drive a wedge of suspicion and hatred between sections of the population, and to fan into a devastating flame the smouldering embers of religious bigotry and racial animosity.

III

MISCELLANEOUS EVENTS

The Jewish community of the United States, apart from its activities in behalf of the stricken Jews in Germany, was for the most part occupied by its communal institutions, many of which were being threatened by the continuing economic crisis. It also followed with great anxiety the instances of anti-Semitism that manifested themselves throughout the country, many of these arising as a result of the stimulus of the Hitlerite victory in Germany.

One event in this category that aroused great indignation among Americans of the Christian and Jewish faiths, was the address made in the House of Representatives by Representative Louis T. McFadden, in which he attributed the governmental fiscal policy to the machinations of so-called international Jewish finance. A number of Congressman rose to protest against this mischievous charge, and a letter was read on the floor of the House from Dr. Cyrus Adler, president of the American Jewish Committee,
in which he pointed out that McFadden's statements and quotations from the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" were based on a proven forgery.

During the year, furthermore, a number of Nazi cells made their appearance, some of which published Jew-baiting magazines in both the English and German languages. A weekly magazine "Liberation," published in the South, engaged in the anti-Semitic agitation and spewed, week after week, the most slanderous accusations against the Jews. This magazine purported to be the mouthpiece of an organization known as the Legion of the Silver Shirts, which duplicated in its aims and methods, those of the Nazi party in Germany.

The South was also the scene of an unfortunate anti-Jewish outburst on the part of a county solicitor in open court. This took place at the trial of the nine Scottsboro Negroes at Decatur, Alabama, at which the chief defense attorney was Samuel L. Leibowitz of New York. The solicitor of Morgan County, Wade Wright, addressed the jury with the following words: "Let it be demonstrated by you that Alabama justice cannot be bought and sold by Jew-money in New York."

These manifestations appeared ominous because the continued economic stringency in which the country found itself offered fertile grounds for the activities of unscrupulous agitators. There was even one instance of a revived Ku Klux Klan activity in Long Beach, California, where a Jewish home was invaded and its occupants attacked by a band in the K.K.K. regalia. A number of people were subsequently indicted for this outrage and were held for trial.

In November and December 1932, the community was shocked into attention by a series of anti-Jewish student outrages in Poland, which began with a street brawl at Lvov, in the course of which a non-Jew was killed. The outbreaks spread to a number of universities, and clashes occurred also outside these institutions. There appeared to be indications that the authorities in some places were dilatory and perfunctory in their efforts to suppress the outbreaks. The American Jewish Committee, the American
Jewish Congress, the B’nai B’rith, and the Federation of Polish Jews in America joined in publishing a protest and in making appropriate representations to the Polish government, through its Ambassador in Washington.

Canadian Jewry continued to be agitated by the same events that brought it concern in the preceding year. Anti-Jewish attacks were repeated time and again in *Le Miroir*, *Le Goglu*, and *Le Chameau*, as well as in an English language publication that was issued in August, 1932. *Le Miroir* was especially scurrilous, reiterating the blood ritual libel, and calling upon anti-Semites all over the world to unite in a boycott of the Jews. To stop this agitation a bill on defamatory libel was introduced in the legislature of the Quebec province; this bill, however, was later withdrawn, as the Goglu periodicals, against which it was in the main aimed, ceased publication. Earlier in the year, Premier R. B. Bennet, instructed the Canadian Post Office system to refuse to deliver mail carrying anti-Semitic stickers, and the use of these stickers was branded as criminal action.

There were several other disturbing events in the year under review. One was in connection with the charge that several insurance companies in Toronto had cancelled policies because the holders of these policies were Jews. An investigation, still being conducted, was subsequently ordered by Premier Henry of Ontario. Late in June of this year the Jewish community, along with other liberal groups in Canada, was shocked to learn that the Mayor of Verdun had invited a Canadian Fascist organization to hold its annual parade in that city. This group had incorporated into its program a number of anti-Semitic planks.

A news item of interest was the announcement made last August by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics that the Jewish population of Canada numbered 155,606 souls. These reside for the most part in Ontario and Quebec, although there are communities of Jews scattered throughout Canada.

English Jewry in the past year watched with continued interest the growth of several Fascist movements. On a
number of occasions, meetings and parades of the Fascists were utilized for the purpose of making inflammatory attacks on the Jews. Several clashes were also reported as a result of these meetings. In Manchester, Fascists entered upon a campaign urging a boycott of the Jews, and as part of their program posted Jew-baiting slogans on store windows in the Jewish quarter. Along with these sporadic outbreaks of ill-will, it was pointed out by the *Manchester Daily Express*, there was a growing tendency to refuse employment to Jews. According to the writer, anti-Jewish discrimination in northern England appeared under various forms and brought suffering to 100,000 Jews in the region.

An occurrence that shocked the English Jewish community concerned the *Hibbert Journal*, the review of religion, theology and philosophy which, early in the year, printed a footnote charging that ritual murder by Jews had been substantiated by modern scholarship. In a subsequent issue, however, an editorial note was published in which this footnote was disclaimed.

In the main, Jewish life in Great Britain and in other countries was chiefly colored by the tragic events in Germany. These events not only stimulated Jewish activity looking toward relief of Jews, but also evoked a number of local anti-Semitic outbursts that sorely tried the various communities. A brief review of such events and a few others of importance will be given in the following pages.

In Argentine the municipal council of Bernascony issued an order forbidding *Shehita*, the Jewish traditional method of slaughtering animals for food. This was the first time in the history of Argentine that such action had been taken, and it aroused widespread resentment among the Jewish population.

Austrian Jewry watched with apprehensive interest the tide of Hitlerism that beat against the shores of their country. Within Austria itself Nazi outbreaks against Jewish students and Jewish business men continued as in the preceding year. A number of anti-Semitic scenes also took place in Parliament. Furthermore there was an increasing fear that in his desire to win over the Nazi
sympathizers in Austria, Chancellor Dolfuss would make concessions to the anti-Semitic wishes of the Nazis. The political atmosphere was so heavily charged with anti-Jewish feeling that even the Socialist headquarters in Vienna were requested by their branches in the provinces not to send Jewish speakers to their communities.

Two other items of the past year deserve to be recorded. One was the revelation that the Jewish population in Austria was decreasing both by the excess of deaths over births, and by the large scale resignations from the Jewish communities. The other was the discovery of a 14th century synagogue in the town of Bruck, in Styria, which the Austrian government ordered to be preserved under the supervision of its monument department.

After the excesses against the Jews in Germany occurred, the press in Czechoslovakia engaged in a campaign against Czechoslovakian Jews on the grounds that these were ready to receive German Jews into the country despite the unemployment situation and the general economic suffering. Earlier in the year the Prague municipality adopted a resolution which was interpreted as being tantamount to a boycott plea against the Jewish merchants and Jewish products.

In Roumania the year was marked mainly by the continuance of the anti-Semitic agitation of the Iron Guard and a number of resulting disturbances in which Jews were attacked and injured. These outbreaks reached the Chamber of Deputies where a brutal attack was made upon Deputy Michael Landau by anti-Jewish deputies. In August, 1932, when the Roumanian anti-Semitic group celebrated its 10th anniversary, police guards stationed in the Jewish quarters prevented the occurrence of any clashes. On other occasions, however, police guards were inadequate to save the Jews from boycott appeals, disturbances, and hooligan outbreaks.

Outstanding among the news reports from Poland were those revealing the enormous extent of the impoverishment among the Warsaw Jewish population. The Jews suffered
as a result of their elimination from employment opportunities, as well as from the hardships resulting from the world economic situation. A number of physical attacks were also made in various localities, and Jews were terrorized and beaten up. Periodic attempts were made to agitate for a boycott, although an official communiqué issued by the Polish government declared that stringent measures would be adopted to suppress such propaganda.

In Russia, events of the greatest importance to the Jews were connected with developments in Bira Bidjan. While crop failures resulted in acute suffering among the population, work did not slacken in the development of this territory. As part of the project for the establishment of a Jewish republic in that region, the government commission in charge has mapped out a plan providing for the settlement of 300,000 new immigrants during the next five years.

The anti-religious agitation in Russia continued to affect the Jews in several ways. As in other years, an anti-religious campaign was waged shortly before the Jewish high holidays in the fall of 1932. In Moscow the central anti-religious museum opened a special Jewish department. A number of efforts furthermore were made to restrict the baking of matzoth for Passover and to prohibit their importation into the country.

There remains to be recorded a number of events in various countries all over the globe. At Harbin, China, Chinese bandits attempted to extort money from Jews by threatening to arouse the White Russians against them. In Denmark, the centenary of a Jewish synagogue was celebrated in April, with King Christian the Tenth and other official dignitaries present. In Hungary, anti-Semitic excesses were revived at the universities. At one time the projected modification of the existing numerus clausus regulation led to a strike in protest at all Hungarian universities. At Bombay, India, a Jewish school was opened in a new building constructed by the local community. The Jews in Italy welcomed the published conversation between Mussolini and Emil Ludwig, in which Il Duce declared that anti-
Semitism does not exist in Italy. Signor Mussolini also ridiculed the claims of pure races, stating that "I shall never believe that any race is able to prove itself biologically pure." In Tokyo, Japan, an organization was formed at the initiative of Tabun Sakai, a Japanese, whose main function is to support the rebuilding of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. This organization restricts its membership to native Japanese. In Tunis there occurred a number of attacks by Arabs on Jews. Measures were promised by the authorities against these attacks, and in several instances military forces were called out to restore order.

Although many of the responsible Jewish organizations of important countries refused to participate, a world Jewish conference to consider the advisability of establishing a World Jewish Congress was held in Geneva in August, 1932. In the three-day session, ending August 17th, the convening of a World Jewish Congress was approved, and an executive committee of twenty was named to carry out plans for its establishment. The resolutions adopted at the conference were as follows:

"1. The Geneva Jewish World Congress gives expression to its profound conviction that the critical situation of the Jewish people, the menace to its civil and national rights in many lands, the impoverishment of the Jewish masses and the necessity of comprehensive measures for improvement, and the task imposed on the present Jewish generation of the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, make the calling of a Jewish World Congress an urgent necessity. This World Congress, based on the conception of the Jewish people as a unified national organism, should be a legitimate representation, authorized and in duty bound to deal with all questions of Jewish life, and to represent the Jewish people to the outside world, in a struggle for its civil and national rights.

"2. The delegates of the World Congress shall be selected by direct, secret, equal, and proportional elections, in which all Jews and Jewesses of age shall have the right to participate. Persons of 18 years of age or over shall be entitled to be candidates."
"3. The date of the convoking of the World Congress as well as the time of the holding of elections in the various countries, shall be set by the Initiating Committee. But the World Congress must take place not later than the summer of 1934."

IV

PALESTINE

In Palestine, events of the past year continued, as in the year preceding that, to be largely of local interest. As against the gloomy situation that came upon the Jews in Germany and the continued economic difficulties that depressed Jewish communal life elsewhere throughout the world, Palestine Jewry enjoyed a year of comparative prosperity and, save for a few minor exceptions, political calm.

In the report on the political and economic status of Palestine, made by the Mandatory Power to the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations on November 10, 1932, the stability of the economic structure which had been built up in Palestine in the last ten years was emphasized, and evidence of the considerable progress made by the community in its industrial and agricultural development was recorded. Following are some of the more important points brought out in the report:

The Palestine Government's income-profit over expenditures amounted to 585,139 pounds; 4,075 Jewish immigrants were admitted in the year covered by the report, and 8,000 who had entered Palestine illegally had their entry legalized by registration; certain import duties and protective tariffs had been introduced by the Government for the advantage of Jewish industry; there were many examples of cooperation with the Jewish Agency on such matters as immigration, the census, industrial development, Jewish educational subsidies, etc. The report also brought out that while Jewish immigration of that year somewhat exceeded that of the year preceding, Jewish emigration from Palestine was the lowest since the War—666 as compared with 1679 in the year preceding. The Jewish birth rate, the report added,
had somewhat declined, remaining as before, the lowest birth rate, as compared with those of the Christian and Arab populations; the Jewish death rate, however, is also the lowest.

In presenting this report before the Commission, Lieutenant General Arthur Wauchope, High Commissioner of Palestine, declared that the attitude of the British Government with regard to the establishment of a Legislative Council in Palestine had not changed. He said that steps would be taken towards the formation of a Legislative Council when the new Government ordinance with regard to Municipal Administrations is carried out. It will be recalled that Palestine Jewry is strongly opposed to the Legislative Council, as well as to the new Municipal Administration ordinance. Towards the latter they have been joined in opposition by the Arabs. The report also contained a reference to the French report, which, while not yet made public during the year in review, had been opposed in advance of publication by both the Jewish Agency and the Arab Executive. Meanwhile, Mr. French resigned his post as Director of Development.

An event which promised to be of considerable economic and political consequence in the development of the Jewish home land in Palestine was the announcement, early in January 1933, that Emir Abdullah, ruler of Transjordania, had offered to lease 55,000 dunams of his own land to a Jewish Company. Immediately after this was made public, a strong campaign against this proposal was launched in the Arab press through the anti-Zionist Arab leadership; this campaign led to the cancellation of the offer.

The advantageous economic condition of Palestine, which was described in the report to the Mandates Commission, continued for the remainder of the year. A report of the Palestine Economic Corporation of America stated that progress had been made in the orange industry; that there had been no bank failures in Palestine during the year; and that only one credit cooperative society had liquidated. Exports of manufactured articles, the report continued, had increased, with the exception of the soap industry. Since
this report was made public, a moderate "boom" has developed in Palestine and has been marked by an accelerated industrial activity and an increased immigration.

Another sign of this activity was evident in the number of immigrant visas allowed by the Government for the year beginning October, 1932. This attained a total of 10,000, the highest figure since 1926. Of these allotments over a thousand were reserved for Jewish immigrants from Germany, and a special ordinance of the Palestine Government reduced, in the case of such immigrants, the financial requirements for admission. As added indications of the improved economic life in Palestine, there must be mentioned the enlarged tourist traffic, the establishment of an air-plane service between Egypt and Iraq and Palestine, the opening of a radio broadcasting station in Tel Aviv, direct telephone lines to various points in Europe and the United States, and the launching of several new publications to serve the needs of the expanding community.

At the same time, world-wide depression was not without its influence on the country. Income for the work of the Jewish Agency shrank considerably and led to a number of crises in the Executive. To the stringency of money may be traced the difficulties which the Jewish community had in its school system and with its teachers.

A tragic event which overwhelmed the community was the assassination in June, 1933, of Dr. Chaim Arlosoroff, member of the Executive of the Jewish Agency and a leader of the Palestine Labor Party. Dr. Arlosoroff was shot down in cold blood in the presence of his wife. The murder was attributed to party strife, and a number of Revisionist leaders were temporarily detained by the police. At this writing, a suspect of the crime is being held. The affair created a profound disturbance in the country and resulted in a number of clashes between groups of Laborites and Revisionists.

Shocking as this tragedy was, it came at a time when the community was already heavily troubled by the news of events in Germany. Reacting to the outrages against the Jewish citizens of Germany by the National Socialist regime,
Palestine joined in the world-wide protest. Spontaneously there arose a boycott movement among the Jews, who determined to abstain from commercial dealings with Germany until the persecutions of the Jews in Germany were halted. Arab press opinion on the excesses was divided between subdued jubilation at this blow to the Jewish people and alarm lest the exodus of the Jews from Germany result in the increased immigration of large numbers of them into Palestine.

In other respects the Palestine Jewish community continued to foster its local activities. A number of noteworthy celebrations were held during the year: the 60th anniversary of the birth of Chaim Nachmann Bialik; the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Chovevi Zion movement; the 50th year of the founding of the Rishon le-Zion Colony; the opening of the amphitheatre donated to the Hebrew University by Samuel Untermyer of New York; the opening of the Harry Fischel Foundation for Research in the Talmud, and the cornerstone laying of the new Keren Hayesod building in Jerusalem.

A widely welcome announcement was one to the effect that Albert Einstein had definitely accepted a chair to the Hebrew University. This announcement balanced, to a degree, an earlier report that the Hebrew University might close down temporarily because of lack of funds.

One domestic unpleasantness which sorely vexed the population occurred when Government Advocate Elliott made a statement before the Session of the Court of Appeals that Jews were commonly guilty of arson. In this he was sternly rebuked by Justice Frumkin, and later he made an apology before the court.

The year witnessed increasingly, manifestations of goodwill from the Arabs, although, as in earlier years, there were a number of acts of vandalism,—uprooting of trees, wilful destruction of goods, incendiary acts, and even attacks on life and limb. As against these, however, there were a number of other circumstances that tended to mitigate the significance of these anti-Jewish acts. The report, for example, of the cancelled lease of Transjordania land evoked a protest from many Arabs, Sheiks and land owners, who made it plain that they welcomed the opportunity of Jewish
activity in Transjordania. On the anniversary of Balfour Day, too, when the Arab Executive called a general strike, large numbers of Arabs did not heed this call and continued to indicate their good will to their Jewish neighbors. Furthermore, although Arab leaders called for non-cooperation in the Agricultural Conference at Acra, fully 150 Arab agricultural representatives were present, together with a delegation of Arabs from Transjordania. In like manner, the Jews indicated their willingness to live on terms of friendly relationships with the Arabs. At Yan Yavneh, for example, the Jewish settlers abandoned their right to one-third of the harvest of the Arab tenants on Jewish land because this year's harvest was very poor.