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The objects of this corporation shall be, to prevent the infraction of the civil and religious rights of Jews, in any part of the world; to render all lawful assistance and to take appropriate remedial action in the event of threatened or actual invasion or restriction of such rights, or of unfavorable discrimination with respect thereto; to secure for Jews equality of economic, social and educational opportunity; to alleviate the consequences of persecution and to afford relief from calamities affecting Jews, wherever they may occur; and to compass these ends to administer any relief fund which shall come into its possession or which may be received by it, in trust or otherwise, for any of the aforesaid objects or for purposes comprehended therein.
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Nineteen forty-six, the fortieth year of the American Jewish Committee, was the first year following the ending of hostilities in the greatest of all global wars and the overthrow of the regime which exterminated some six million Jews. It was a year in which the world, though war-weary, was finding the path to peace beset with many difficulties. Fortunately, the economic dislocations attendant to reconversion, which it was feared might substantially increase the already disturbingly high level of anti-Semitism in our own country, did not occur. In Eastern and Central Europe, however, tragic and uncertain conditions prevailed for our co-religionists; while in Palestine no solution was found to a crisis which holds threats of dire consequences.

Foreign Affairs

The activities of your Committee in the area of foreign affairs—pursuant to its Charter obligation to protect the civil, political and religious rights of Jews wherever they may be over the world—consequently reached a new peak during the year. These activities were pursued on the broad international level (through the United Nations and the Peace Conference); on the level of intervention with our own government officials and—with their knowledge—with individual foreign governments, and on the level of cooperation with the leaders of the foreign Jewish communities.

As you know, Judge Proskauer, your President, and Mr. Jacob Blaustein, the Chairman of your Executive Committee, serving as consultants to the American delegation at the San Francisco Conference in 1945 (where the United Nations was organized), played a role in the adoption of provisions in the United Nations Charter, whereby responsibility for the protection of fundamental human rights was assumed by the new organization. To make these provisions truly effective, there must be implementation and enforcement. Implementation has been assigned by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to its subsidiary, the Commission on Human Rights.
Your Committee has followed closely throughout 1946—and continues to follow—the proceedings of the Economic and Social Council and its Commission on Human Rights. Official memoranda communicating our views to the Commission were supplemented by the personal appearance of your President before it on May 13, 1946, when Judge Proskauer strongly urged, among other things, adoption of an International Bill of Rights. The Commission on Human Rights has now received authority from the United Nations Assembly to draft a Bill of Rights, and is engaged in its formulation. Members of the Commission assigned to this task are understood to be relying to a large extent on a book which, on the recommendation of our Peace Problems Committee in 1944, the American Jewish Committee commissioned Dr. Hersch Lauterpacht, Professor of International Law at Cambridge, England, to write, and which is recognized as the authoritative work on the subject.

Finding that consultative status to the Economic and Social Council would be conferred on non-governmental organizations only if they have an international membership, the American Jewish Committee has formed a Consultative Council of Jewish Organizations to meet that requirement, consisting of the Anglo-Jewish Association, the Alliance Israelite Universelle and itself. Your deputies on the Consultative Council are Judge Proskauer, Governor Herbert H. Lehman, Judge Samuel I. Rosenman and Mr. Jacob Blaustein.

Pending formulation and adoption of an international Bill of Human Rights binding on all countries, it was obviously desirable that appropriate guarantees be included in the peace treaties with the defeated nations. In April, 1946, your Committee submitted a memorandum—based on the studies of our Peace Problems Committee—to the Council of Foreign Ministers (the Big Four) urging such inclusion in the drafts then being prepared of treaties with the former Axis satellites (Italy, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Finland). As originally presented to the Peace Conference in Paris by the Big Four last August, the draft treaties contained human rights provisions, but of much too general a nature.

The American Jewish Committee accordingly sent a delegation to Paris, headed by Mr. Jacob Blaustein and including Judge Phillip Forman and Mr. Morris D. Waldman of your Executive Committee, accompanied by several members of our staff (Dr. Max Gottschalk, Dr. Simon Segal and Mr. Zachariah Shuster) and by Dr. Lauterpacht, as technical consultant, for the purpose of persuading the Peace Conference to recommend the strengthening of the human rights clauses in these treaties and the inclusion of other clauses
relating to the victims of persecution. In Paris, ten other Jewish organizations from various parts of the world were likewise represented. With them, despite many divergent views and differences of ideology, your delegation was able to evolve a set of joint peace treaty proposals and to effect coordination of effort in bringing these proposals to the attention of the Allied statesmen. We were thus in a position to speak to these statesmen with a united and powerful voice, representing the vast majority of the Jews of the world.

This joint activity bore fruit. The Peace Conference in Paris recommended, and the Big Four, at their meeting in New York in the fall of 1946, approved an amendment, among others, which is a strong enlargement of the human rights clauses, making them much more specific than in the original drafts and designed to protect minorities, including Jews, in the former enemy countries, from all future discrimination.

Our interest in the peace treaties was not confined to their human rights provisions. Restitution of property is another matter to which our Peace Problems Committee called attention long before the war was over, and concerning which the American Jewish Committee has been persistently alert ever since. It was one of the major items in the joint proposals sponsored by the American Jewish Committee and the other Jewish organizations in Paris. It is encouraging to report that the final Hungarian and Rumanian treaties call for full restitution to victims of racial laws of property and other rights of which they have been deprived. The final treaties also impose upon governments of these countries the obligation to transfer to appropriate relief and rehabilitation agencies all heirless and unclaimed property of those who were the object of racial, religious or other discriminatory measures.

Remembering that the minorities provisions in the treaties concluded at the end of World War I were disregarded in several countries, we urged that all of these new treaties should give jurisdiction over infractions to the International Court of Justice. Though this was not done, the treaties do provide for arbitration machinery designed to ensure the faithful execution of their terms.

Meanwhile, the American government has been at work on plans for restitution from Germany. Close contact has been maintained by us with the appropriate officials. Our Restitution and Reparations Sub-Committee, under the chairmanship of Prof. Herman A. Gray, studied the War Department's preliminary plan and made numerous suggestions for improving it. In this area, too, it is important to avoid conflicting recommendations by Jewish organizations. We have
accordingly been in close and continuing cooperation with four other major Jewish organizations interested in this problem.

Last November, Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, then in charge of the Office of Military Government of the United States in Germany, was in the United States, and the Jewish organizations, with Judge Proskauer acting as their spokesman, conferred with him about the German restitution law. Gen. Clay accepted in principle several of the suggestions then made. The American military authorities in Germany have now approved for the most part a revised draft of the proposed German restitution law, embodying these suggestions.

Much of the property once owned by Jewish individuals and communities in Germany will unfortunately go unclaimed for lack of heirs. Gen. Clay was therefore also urged—and agreed—to approve a proposal which we strongly sponsored, that an agency be created to act as trustee both of the property of heirless individual Jews and of Jewish communal property in the American occupation zone.

Still more urgently engaging our attention has been the problem of the displaced Jews, and we have seized every opportunity to press for its alleviation and ultimate solution. A year ago it was estimated that upwards of 100,000 homeless Jewish men, women and children were housed in the camps maintained by the American Army in its German and Austrian occupation zones. Their numbers have since been swollen by refugees from anti-Semitism in Poland and other East European countries to an estimated 200,000 homeless Jewish souls in these zones alone (about 170,000 in Germany and 30,000 in Austria), living an abnormal existence with little to encourage their hopes of permanent resettlement and restoration to normal living. The heavy infiltration of Jews fleeing from Poland and other countries, particularly after the infamous Kielce pogrom, severely taxed the resources of our military commanders, and at one time last summer there was danger that the borders of the American zone might be closed. Before yielding to pressure to this effect, Secretary of War Patterson and Under-Secretary of State Acheson invited the American Jewish Committee, along with other Jewish organizations, to a conference in Washington. With the Chairman of your Executive Committee serving as their chairman, we succeeded in convincing these officials that the incoming Jews were actually fleeing for their lives, and that it would be inconceivable for the American government to deprive them of asylum.

Not only was the border not closed at that time, but when Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, Commander of the United States occupation
forces in Europe, a few weeks later invited Mr. Blaustein and Judge Forman and three representatives of other Jewish organizations to Germany to confer with him and his Chiefs of Staff and Rabbi Philip Bernstein, his adviser on Jewish affairs, he assured us that he would continue to give refuge to another 100,000 Jews from Poland over the balance of 1946. In our conference with Gen. McNarney, we urged most strongly that some plan be evolved to satisfy the strong demand of the displaced persons for a chance to work without, however, having to work for Germans. Gen. McNarney was most cooperative as to this and a number of other matters discussed with him.

On the same trip, your representatives and those of the other Jewish organizations met with Director-General LaGuardia in Geneva while UNRRA was in session there, and secured his help in ensuring that relief to displaced persons would not be discontinued with the dissolution of UNRRA in December, 1946, but would be extended until June, 1947, by which time it was hoped the proposed International Refugee Organization would be in position to take over.

We did not confine ourselves to consultation with these and other officials and the Central Committee for Displaced Jews, but made a survey of five displaced persons' camps. At each of them, the displaced Jews by the hundreds would follow us, crowd around us and talk to us, eagerly searching for some word of improvement of their condition and some word of hope as to when they would be moved to a permanent country of residence. For anyone who has seen these people and the camps with his own eyes the conviction is inescapable that, from a humanitarian standpoint, there rests upon the governments of the world a responsibility, and upon us more-fortunately situated Jews a moral obligation, to do everything in our power—without trifling unduly about ideologies—to have the gates of Palestine and other countries opened at the earliest possible moment.

It would be unrealistic, as past experience has shown, to rely too heavily on intergovernmental action to find homes for them. True, the United Nations approved last month the constitution of an International Refugee Organization to continue the repatriation of those displaced persons who wish to return to their countries of origin, and to resettle in new countries those who do not wish to return. But the IRO is not yet actually in being, and in any event we dare not be too optimistic of its ability to effect resettlement.

It behooves us, then, to press for supplementary solutions of the displaced persons' problems, and this we have been and shall continue
Two countries hold the key to resettlement—the United States, which could itself offer a home to a fair share of the displaced persons of all faiths, and in so doing set a needed example to other countries; and Great Britain, as the Mandatory Power for Palestine, where very large numbers of Jewish displaced persons could be absorbed.

At no time has the American Jewish Committee regarded Palestine as the only haven to which Jews would want or should have a right to immigrate. In August, 1946, recognizing that the world was looking to this country to take a lead in meeting this world problem, and realizing, too, that our current immigration law makes possible the early admission of only a relatively small number of displaced persons of all faiths, President Truman announced his intention of asking Congress to enact appropriate legislation to admit this country’s fair share. Judge Proskauer immediately commended the President and pledged our Committee’s full support of the proposal, and your Administrative Committee at its next meeting decided to make liberalization of immigration a major feature in our current program, and appointed a committee under the honorary chairmanship of Gen. Edward S. Greenbaum and the active chairmanship of Mr. Irving M. Engel to guide our staff and to rally our chapters behind this effort. You will be told more about this project and about the organization of a non-sectarian National Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons by Mr. Engel this afternoon.

We continue to press with all the vigor at our command for the opening of the gates of Palestine and other countries. Events of the past year with respect to Palestine have been sadly disillusioning. The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, before which your President testified early in January, 1946, and on which his testimony made a deep impression, issued in April a unanimous report, embodying, along with proposals for eventual action, immediate recommendations calling, in essence, for abrogation of the 1939 White Paper and the prompt admission of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine. While reserving judgment on the long-range recommendations, President Truman promptly hailed this proposal. Judge Proskauer immediately pledged our support in implementing it.

Almost immediately, however, it became apparent that the British Government was unwilling to accept this recommendation. On May 1, the Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, made solution of the political problem of Palestine, and assurances of American military and financial assistance, conditions precedent to any relaxation of its current immigration policy.
Your Executive Committee, meeting four days later, pondered the situation and adopted a resolution which, besides endorsing Judge Proskauer's action, urged that controversy over ultimates be subordinated to the immediate necessities of the remnant of European Jewry, and pointed out that, the British as well as the American members of the Anglo-American Committee having unanimously made their recommendations without contingent conditions, their recommendations should be effectuated at once.

On June 14, 1946, in another effort to break the impasse, President Truman agreed to the appointment of the Secretaries of State, War and Treasury as the American members of another Anglo-American Committee—a Cabinet Committee on Palestine and Related Matters. The American secretaries named deputies to act for them, two of whom, Messrs. Henry Grady and Goldthwaite H. Dorr, were visited by your Executive Vice-President and the Chairman of your Executive Committee shortly before they were to leave Washington, and urged to press for the immediate immigration of 100,000 displaced Jews into Palestine.

The American-British conferees announced on July 26 a plan, generally known as the Morrison-Grady Plan, which largely ignored the recommendations of the Committee on Inquiry and called for the federalization of Palestine, whereby there would be established, in addition to two British zones, an Arab and a Jewish zone—the latter of only 1,500 square miles—both with only very limited autonomy, with central control, including control of immigration, to remain in the hands of the British. The Morrison-Grady Plan provoked widespread opposition on the part of both Arabs and Jews, Zionist, and non-Zionist alike. With the British government holding fast to its insistence that a political solution was the sine qua non for increased immigration (beyond the 1,500 per month now allowed), the chances of the displaced Jews gaining admission into Palestine were as black as ever. Judge Proskauer then spent several days in Washington where he ascertained that neither the Committee of Inquiry report nor the Morrison-Grady federalization plan could then be implemented.

Judge Proskauer further learned that members of the Jewish Agency were prepared to propose a new plan, calling for partition of Palestine into two sections, in one of which there is a Jewish majority of the population and in the other an Arab majority. Both sections would enjoy full autonomy, including control of immigration; and full democratic rights—civil and religious—would be guaranteed to all inhabitants, Arabs, Jews and Christians. The area, subject to
negotiation, would be much greater than under the Morrison-Grady Plan.

Judge Proskauer communicated with Mr. Blaustein, then in Paris. He, too, conferred with Jewish Agency and other officials there and in London. Both officers, as well as your Executive Vice-President, were in accord that such a solution, though far from ideal, would in no way contravene the democratic principles for which the American Jewish Committee has always stood. This partition plan is a far departure from the Biltmore Resolution Plan, which would mean a Jewish state comprising the whole of Palestine, with a Jewish minority ruling the Arab majority. Under the Jewish Agency partition plan, the Jewish section already has a preponderance of Jewish population and, if thought of in terms of a Jewish state at all, it would be a Jewish state only in the same sense that the United States, with a preponderance of Christian population, might be termed a Christian state. Your officers also agreed that no other solution then apparent would assure a haven in Palestine for the displaced Jews, whose numbers were then rapidly mounting and whose morale was rapidly falling. On August 20, your President, in a statement pointing out that responsibility for negotiating a feasible partition plan rested with the Jewish Agency, indicated his feeling that, with so many human lives at stake, a quick practical compromise was preferable to continued search for ideal solutions.

This view Judge Proskauer, supported by your Chairman and others, presented to your Executive Committee at its meeting on September 15, 1946. The Executive Committee was also apprised that the American Jewish Committee might be invited to participate in the Conference of Arabs and Jews called by the British Government to meet in London later that month. Convinced that humanitarian considerations should prevail at this crisis, your Executive Committee empowered your officers to attend the conference in London, if invited, and, while maintaining our full independence and freedom of action, to work there for the best possible settlement which would permit the largest immigration at the earliest moment, together with the maximum development—economic, cultural and social—of Palestine itself. Since the September Executive Committee meeting, the Palestine Sub-Committee (Judge Horace Stern, Chairman) of the Peace Problems Committee has met a number of times to consider the stand that should be taken by the American Jewish Committee in the light of present realities. This and other later developments, such as the refusal thus far of the Jewish Agency to participate in the conference, will be reported to, and discussed by, you this afternoon.

For some time, many non-Zionists have felt that the Jewish Agency
should be reconstituted with proper non-Zionist participation, or it should be made clear to governments and others that the Jewish Agency does not speak for non-Zionists. To explore the situation, Judge Proskauer addressed a letter about eighteen months ago to Dr. Chaim Weizmann (until recently President of the Jewish Agency); and Mr. Blaustein, en route to Paris, had a long conference with Dr. Weizmann in London. This was followed up with conferences with other members of the Executive of the Jewish Agency in Paris, which resulted in the Executive authorizing the American members of the Executive to negotiate with us here toward possible reconstitution.

On November 19, 1946, a committee of the American members and Dr. David Ben-Gurion, Chairman of the Executive, met with your officers in New York and views were exchanged, but nothing concrete evolved. Your officers do not say that the Jewish Agency should or can be satisfactorily reconstituted, but the matter remains open for further exploration and consideration.

So much for the inter-related questions of the displaced persons and of Palestine. Our foreign activities also included numerous interventions with high dignitaries of foreign governments, such as Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Greece, on matters affecting their nationals of Jewish faith. Time does not permit reporting on these in detail.

Nor does it allow for an adequate report of the really notable progress made during the past year in establishing contact with Jewish communities in many parts of the world. To many of these, the American Jewish Committee was little known and greatly misunderstood. We have had opportunity in the last year to meet with many Jewish leaders from both hemispheres, and to establish cordial relations with them.

Most helpful of all was the London Conference of Jewish Organizations held from February 23 to March 2, 1946. At this Conference, sponsored jointly by the American Jewish Committee and the Anglo-Jewish Association, our delegation consisted of Messrs. Jacob Blaustein, Alan M. Stroock, Edward A. Norman, Jerome J. Rothschild and Dr. John Slawson, accompanied by a strong representation from our staff (Doctors Max Gottschalk, Simon Segal, Messrs. George Mintzer, Richard Rothschild, Zachariah Shuster and Miss Rayle Schupper). The Conference, attended by sixty delegates from fifteen countries in Europe, Africa, North and South America and Australia, afforded opportunity for a free exchange of information and views on such topics as rehabilitation, restitution, resettlement, human rights, Palestine and cultural reconstruction, as well as anti-Semitism and
the methods of combating it in the various countries. The other delegates were most favorably impressed by the scope of our program and the soundness of our approach. No attempt was made to set up a formal over-all organization, but arrangements for future clearance of information concerning anti-Semitic activities in Europe and America were agreed upon.

Your representatives returned with the realization that the European Jewish communities want our advice and assistance on their various problems and that we have a responsibility to make these available to them. Out of this realization has come a plan for continuous and extensive activity in the Old World, about which you will hear further from Dr. Slawson later in the day.

Nor have we forgotten the great need for effective defense programs in Latin America, both for the sake of our fellow-Jews there and for our own protection here. Mexico was twice visited during 1946 by members of our staff, and our specialist on Latin-American affairs visited eight other countries in Central and South America. These visits, supplemented by consultations in New York with leaders of the Jewish communities in Latin America, have greatly strengthened our relations with them.

**Domestic Activities**

We turn now to our own country, where our primary, though not exclusive, concern is with the problem of anti-Semitism.

Although 1946 was marked by considerable unrest, resulting in a major political overturn, and by grave tensions between management and labor, the nation continued prosperous and organized anti-Semitism was unable to make headway.

Our Legal and Investigative Department reports that avowedly anti-Semitic organizations are fewer than in pre-war years, and smaller in membership. The public, the press and law enforcement officials are thoroughly alert to the menace of domestic hate movements, due in good measure to the activities of the American Jewish Committee and other pro-democratic organizations. Thus, attempts last year to revive the Ku Klux Klan were nipped in the bud by the prompt and vigorous action of the Attorneys General in several states. The still more Nazi-like Colombians in Atlanta were quickly checked by local authorities.

Encouraging as this is with respect to organized anti-Semitism, we must not allow ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security. What is true today may not, with changed economic conditions, be
true tomorrow. We dare not relax our vigilance, and our Legal and Investigative Department must continue to keep closely informed of anti-Semitic movements, and at the appropriate moment expose them.

Moreover, we must not gauge the Jewish position in this country solely by the evidence of organized anti-Semitism. Latent anti-Semitism must also be reckoned with. We know that hostile attitudes of varying degrees of intensity are entertained by a disturbingly large proportion of our fellow-Americans. We must, then, do all in our power to cure those elements of the population who are not already incurably anti-Semitic, and to preserve the immunity of others.

This is the task of our Department of Public Information and Education, to which Mr. Walter Mendelsohn serves as lay advisor. In all of its work it proceeds on the premise that anti-Semitism is a threat to society as a whole, and the essential issue is not Jews, but divisiveness in American life. Instead of refuting vilification against Jews, it warns that the slanderers are seeking to fabricate a "Jewish problem" as a first step toward undermining the American way of life. This basic message, in which we appeal not to tolerance but to the self-interest of our fellow-citizens, and many corollary themes, is conveyed via a wide variety of media—newspapers and periodicals, radio, pamphlets, cartoon books and speeches. To these is now being added a new medium of rapidly growing importance, the educational film.

Besides the so-called mass approach—the appeal to the general public—the Department also undertakes a class approach, differentiating its basic theme to meet the particular interests of special groups within the population, such as organized labor, church groups, women, veterans and youth. We know that the number of non-Jews who can be influenced to fight anti-Semitism for the sake of the Jew is small compared with the number who will fight it for their own sake. For each of these groups the staff includes one or more specialists. To their number has now been added a specialist in business and industry, an extremely important group to keep lined up for the preservation of the American way of life. It is the function of these specialists to work with non-sectarian organizations in the respective areas, to enlist the cooperation of leading personalities who mold opinion among them, and to devise, in collaboration with them, programs designed to further wholesome attitudes among their millions of members.

In our constant striving to perfect our materials and to sharpen our procedures, invaluable aid has been forthcoming from our Department of Scientific Research, established in 1944. The experts
of this Department enable us to evaluate and improve our techniques and materials by subjecting them to scientific tests. This Department is also conducting a number of long-range studies, which are expected to throw important light on the causes of anti-Semitism, and perhaps to point the way to more fundamental methods of combatting it.

Our Community Service Department supplies local community public relations organizations and key individuals over the country with advice and information, educational materials and project suggestions, both by correspondence and by the visits of field workers to communities. In meeting its problems, this Department has had the guidance of Mr. Jerome J. Rothschild.

At our last Annual Meeting it was announced that the American Jewish Committee would sponsor and finance a new non-sectarian organization to be known as the National Institute of Social Relations. This organization, under the presidency of Mr. Frank L. Weil, who also serves as chairman of our own Community Group Discussion Service Committee, is now a full-fledged reality, operating in six selected communities. Its purpose is to apply to civilians the group discussion technique which was found so useful by the Army in replacing ignorance with knowledge and eradicating misconceptions and prejudices. It is not contemplated that this project will continue indefinitely to depend exclusively upon your Committee for its financing, but rather that it will attract support from many groups and individuals of all creeds and walks of life.

In 1946 your Committee took a position on two questions which have been greatly concerning the American Jewish community. The first of these was discrimination in higher education. This discrimination, which has long existed, became extremely acute in 1945–46. In order to consider how best to meet this problem, the American Jewish Committee in October convoked a Conference on Higher Education for Jews, attended by more than twenty Jewish trustees of colleges, professors, educational experts and communal workers. Their recommendations, subsequently approved by your Administrative Committee, call for four lines of action: (1) direct approach to educational institutions and associated groups; (2) support for the extension of public facilities for higher education; (3) education of the public to the need for doing away with educational discrimination and (4) appropriate governmental action, including legislation.

Another delicate problem on which your Administrative Committee took action in 1946 concerned religion and the public schools, specifically the Released Time Plan, whereby school children whose parents so desire, are freed from the schoolroom one or more hours a week in order that they may receive religious instruction at
centers maintained by their respective faiths. This plan, now operative in forty-seven states, and strongly backed by both Protestant and Catholic leaders, has been characterized by many abuses, giving rise to legitimate fears that the plan may be an entering wedge for the introduction of religious instruction into the classroom. Your Administrative Committee therefore reaffirmed our conviction that religious training is properly the concern of the home and of the church and synagogue, and not of the public school; declared the Dismissed Time Plan, whereby the school week is shortened for all children, and the school undertakes no responsibility to enforce the attendance of children at religious classes, less objectionable than Released Time; and recommended establishment of an inter-denominational commission to supervise the operations of Released Time, where operative, and to eliminate its abuses.

In addition to our elaborate program of working in behalf of the Jewish community with other elements of the public, we have an obligation to work with Jews themselves. We are, therefore, as you know from the discussion last night, evolving a program designed to strengthen their inner defenses and to help them to make a complete adjustment to American life without sacrificing the religious and cultural values which are their immemorial heritage.

Though our cultural program has only recently come into the forefront of our thinking, it marks no essential departure from, but rather an extension of, the traditional philosophy of the American Jewish Committee, which abjures Jewish nationalism and assimilation alike. We have long recognized that the American Jewish community, to be strong and healthy, must be informed. For many decades, in the American Jewish Year Book, the organization has prepared the standard and indispensable record of information of interest to American Jews. Our Library of Jewish Information, whose operations are now directed by a committee headed by Prof. Salo W. Baron, makes a notable contribution by the numerous publications embodying its careful researches. Supplementing them is our monthly magazine, Commentary, which reflects the many facets of Jewish life in America. Barely in its second year, Commentary is already the acknowledged leader among Jewish periodicals. Credit for its achievement is due not only to the editorial staff, but to the Commentary Publications Committee, of which Mr. Ralph E. Samuel is Chairman.

Proud though we have reason to be of these publications, we must recognize that it is only as a by-product that they promote Jewish adjustment. A program aimed directly to that end is required. At the Executive Committee meeting in May, there was a consensus
that many Jewish children are growing up without adequate preparation; that many Jewish adults are baffled in their attempt to orient themselves to the real meaning of their Jewishness and to an appreciation of our fine heritage, history and culture; and that the American Jewish Committee, without encroaching upon the priorities enjoyed by other religious and secular organizations, could and should develop appropriate educational concepts and program suggestions. A lay committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Alan M. Stroock, is guiding the staff in evolving an appropriate program.

Chapter Program

Notable progress during the past year was made in the development of our chapter program, now emerging from its experimental stage. Many problems of organization, of functioning and of the relations of the chapters to the national organization have arisen. These have now been assiduously studied by our Community Activities Committee, composed of chapter leaders from all over the country, under the chairmanship of Mr. Joseph Willen. Its carefully considered recommendations are about to be submitted to the Executive Committee, and are expected to determine our future chapter policy.

Meanwhile, we have been building gradually and solidly. We are not seeking a mass membership, but rather a cross-section membership composed of men and women influential in their respective communities with a great variety of economic, social and vocational background, but like-minded in the sense that all are concerned with the perpetuation of Jewish life both here and abroad, while at the same time they are fully identified with American life as a whole. In an interim report, submitted to the Executive Committee in May, the Community Activities Committee, without setting any ultimate maximum, recommended a chapter membership of 10,000 as our goal for the next few years. With a present membership of 6,700 we are well along towards that goal.

Our chapters have not only provided us with a larger constituency, but have proved to be of great functional value. More and more the thinking of our members around the country is being reflected at the Committee's center. More and more, too, they are proving helpful in implementing our national program on the local scene. Thus, their help has been of enormous value in connection with the current effort to liberalize immigration. The chapters are also proving a most effective medium for communicating our point of view to the communities.
Other of our activities have likewise contributed to a greater understanding of the American Jewish Committee in the year just past, and with understanding has come appreciation. Our Committee Reporter continues to bring to the attention, not only of our own members, but of a large number of Jewish community leaders, knowledge of our purpose and activities. We have worked constructively with other Jewish organizations, despite ideological differences, wherever a mutuality of objective exists and no sacrifice of principle is involved.

In the domestic field, we cooperate continuously with other agencies through the National Community Relations Advisory Council. Our President and the Chairman of our Administrative Committee represent us on the Executive Committee of that organization; Mr. Ben Herzberg is the chairman of its Legislative Information Committee; and several other members, as well as members of our staff, serve on its various sub-committees.

Joint Defense Appeal

Many of our members—men like Mr. Gustave Berne and Mr. Albert H. Lieberman, to mention only two—have been making an invaluable contribution by representing us in the fund-raising efforts of the Joint Defense Appeal of the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League. Thanks to them, we have had strong representation in that agency. Full and active support by our members throughout the country is assured to the newly organized National Council of the Joint Defense Appeal, of which Mr. Donald Oberdorfer, a member of our Executive and Administrative Committees, is Chairman. To the able, self-sacrificing men who are making it possible for your organization to obtain the financing required by its expanding program, the deep gratitude of the entire membership is due—as it is to all of the devoted members who have served us throughout the year, not only in the fund-raising effort, but in the organization and the work of chapters, in service on our Administrative Committee, under the able chairmanship of Mr. David Sher, and on our numerous sub-committees, and as our representatives at conferences with other organizations.

George Z. Medalie

The year which brought us great access of new strength also bereaved us of two of our most distinguished leaders. Shortly after his notable career as a lawyer was crowned by his appointment to the
highest court of New York State, and after his fellow-members, in recognition of his great service to the American Jewish Committee as Chairman of its Foreign Affairs Committee, had elected him Honorary Vice-President, Judge George Z. Medalie was taken from us. His memory will long continue to inspire us.

Max M. Warburg

Within the last few weeks we lost another venerated member of our Executive Committee, Mr. Max M. Warburg. An outstanding leader of the Jewish community in his native Germany, his sense of responsibility for his fellow-Jews continued unabated during the last years of his life in this country, and his extraordinary knowledge of men and affairs proved invaluable to our Foreign Affairs Committee.

Conclusion

And now we enter upon the first year of our fifth decade. Our high task, so nobly conceived forty years ago, so devotedly pursued throughout four decades, goes on. It has, indeed, under the impact of changing conditions, attained a magnitude undreamed of by our founders. To carry out the mandate laid down by them, it has become necessary to expand our staff in recent years until it now totals 224 men and women, in New York, in Washington and in the field. Thanks to the creative inspiration and the great administrative talents of our Executive Vice-President, Dr. John Slawson, these staff members are co-workers in a closely knit organization, serving a cause in which they deeply believe.

On our organization rests today a responsibility heavier than it has ever been before. With European Jewry decimated and its surviving communities struggling desperately with scanty resources to rehabilitate themselves; with a crisis appallingly great in Palestine; with 200,000 homeless Jews leading a bare existence rather than a life in camps in Central Europe; with the seeds of anti-Semitism scattered by the Nazis still sprouting in both hemispheres, the challenge to the American Jewish Committee is of unprecedented enormity. That challenge we hereby solemnly pledge ourselves to meet.