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Intergroup Relations and Tensions in the United States

In 1967 the fabric of the American nation was severely shaken by widespread political, social, and racial confrontations. Racial violence rocked over 100 cities, and a national commission was created to study the riot problem.

In this setting, discrimination against Jews continued to show marked variations. Acts of overt antisemitism were rare, but they aroused much concern when they did occur. Self-awareness among Jews and their interest in the attitudes of others toward them made for an intense interest in fathoming the roots of antisemitism, and intergroup hostility in general. However, general preoccupation with anti-Jewish prejudice among Negroes obscured awareness of its other dimensions in the nation.

More than ever before, the elections in November were the focus for important intergroup struggles. The campaigns and voting in two cities, which elected Negro mayors, had manifest racial overtones. While, in each case, backlash votes were insufficient to carry the election, the margins of victory were such as to indicate that the racial element would, in the future, be an explosive electoral factor in many cities.

The divisive effects of differences regarding church-state issues continued to plague particularly Catholic-Jewish relations. The outstanding episode in this area was the highly charged campaign in New York state over the proposed constitution repealing the Blaine amendment, which, if enacted, would have permitted the use of public monies for private sectarian education.

Aspects of the Arab-Israeli June war sparked concern in religious circles for the future of Christian-Jewish dialogue. Many Jewish religious leaders expressed regret over the failure of important churchmen to give moral support by condemning the Arab threats of genocide against Israel (pp. 220–23).

Patterns of Antisemitism

Surveys and Studies

In May Jews were cautioned that a vast reservoir of more than 35 million Americans still retained anti-Jewish attitudes, although overt antisemitic acts had declined sharply. The report, prepared by the American Jewish Commit-
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tee, said that while sociological studies indicated a decrease of 41 per cent in such persons since the early years of World War II, this figure may be somewhat low, since expressed prejudice was becoming less and less respectable.

In fact, Bertram H. Gold, executive director of the American Jewish Committee, said in December that Jewish communities throughout the country were experiencing "increasing hostility" from extremists of both the right and the left. He spoke of the antisemitic attitudes of such right-wing groups as the Minutemen, John Birch Society, Liberty Lobby, Congress of Freedom, and the Defendant of the Constitution (p. 260). To these, he said, could now be added "the thunder from the left"—specifically, the antisemitic statements in the June-July issue of the *SNCC Newsletter* (p. 242) and the resolution condemning Israel as the aggressor in the June war, pushed through at the New Politics conference in Chicago (pp. 228–29).

*The Many Faces of Antisemitism*, a pamphlet prepared by the American Jewish Committee in December, summarized the theological, economic, sociological, political, and psychological sources of antisemitism. It urged that the study of antisemitism move into new areas, with the improvement of tools for scientific analysis and attitude research. "Not every antisemite is a rabid bigot or a practicing demagogue," the report held. "Some are mere fellow travelers. Science is just beginning to investigate what makes the bigot's fellow traveler act as he does." In his foreword to the pamphlet, the sociologist Nathan Glazer held that, in light of "the gravity of the American racial crisis, one can suggest that the understanding of antisemitism may also do something to reduce the more virulent prejudice of white against black which has had such evil consequences for American society."

**Public Opinion Polls**

A Gallup poll, released June 3, found that 82 per cent of Americans would vote for a Jew for president, if he were qualified. Only 13 per cent said they would not, and 5 per cent had no opinion. Thirty years ago only 46 per cent said they would vote for a Jew for president; 46 per cent said they would not; 8 per cent had no opinion. The 1967 poll showed that 89 per cent would vote for a Catholic for president. However, only 54 per cent said they would vote for a qualified Negro for president.

Rejection of a Jewish, Catholic, or Negro possible presidential candidate was greatest in the South. Only 67 per cent of Southern respondents said they would vote for a Jew, compared with 83 per cent in the Midwest, 89 per cent in the West, and 91 per cent in the East. More educated respondents were less prejudiced: 93 per cent of college-trained persons said they would vote for a Jew, compared with 84 per cent of high-school graduates and 66

---
In the continuing series of surveys conducted by Gallup for the Catholic Digest, a 1966 survey published in the periodical's August 1967 issue, showed considerable improvement in attitudes of trust toward Jews as compared with a similar study made in 1952. When asked whether Jews were about the same, better, or not as good as members of their own religious group “in being fair in business,” 61 per cent of Catholic respondents said that Jews were the same as most Catholics; only 45 per cent of Protestants said Jews were the same as they. Among Catholics, 23 per cent said Jews were not as good; among Protestants, 28 per cent. In response to a question about honesty in public office, 74 per cent of Catholics said Jews were the same as others, compared with only 55 per cent of Protestants. Despite these findings, which show Catholics as less prejudiced against Jews than Protestants, Jews still continued to regard Catholics with greater suspicion. Thus, 26 per cent of Jews thought that Protestant employers would discriminate against them, compared with 37 per cent who said Catholics would do so. (Conversely, 11 per cent of Protestants thought Jews would discriminate against them in employment, while only 8 per cent of Catholics thought so.)

Executive-Suite Discrimination

The Federal Equal Opportunity Commission's report on its investigation of hiring practices in New York City revealed that only a small number of Jews were employed as high-level business executives. While Jews constituted 25 per cent of the city’s population, only 4.5 per cent of the 2,104 officers in major corporations were Jews. Banks, insurance companies, shipping companies, and law firms had the smallest number of Jewish executives.

Antisemitism in the Academic Community

Some observers have expressed anxiety that the lowering of barriers against Jews as faculty members at American colleges and universities, particularly the more prestigious ones, was arousing some resentment, envy, and discontent among less successful non-Jewish faculty members. An exaggerated expression of such disgruntlement was evident in an anonymous 19-page single-spaced antisemitic tirade, dated April 1967 and mailed from Chicago, Ill. on May 17 to thousands of social scientists. It charged that “Jewish culture and Jewish influence have been so pervasively and incessantly imposed on many generations of Americans that we already have, to some extent, undergone alterations in our value system, in our culture content, in our vocabulary, and in our world view.” More subtle expressions of resentment against Jewish success in the academic community appeared in letters to the editor in Chemical and Engineer News, December 4, 1967, and Columbia University Forum, Summer 1967.
**The New Left and Antisemitism**

The discernible Jewish presence among the New Left and hippies has aroused and/or exacerbated latent antisemitism. A case in point was the trial of Captain Howard B. Levy, an army doctor who had refused to train the army’s Green Beret medics in the treatment of skin disease and who was found guilty on June 2 by a general court martial at Fort Jackson, S.C. Charles Morgan, Jr., American Civil Liberties Union lawyer who defended Levy, suggested that the decision to punish Levy was rooted in anti-Jewish prejudice. At the trial, Morgan drew an analogy between Levy and Alfred Dreyfus. Though the parallel was farfetched, the case stirred anti-Jewish sentiments throughout the South.²

Another illustration was the case of Leslie A. Fiedler, professor of English at the New York State University at Buffalo, novelist, and literary critic, who argued that his advocacy of the legalization of marijuana triggered anti-semitism:

> ... the first really vile note I received after my arrest and the garbled accounts of it in the local newspapers (made worse by a baseless reference to “trafficking in drugs” in the initial release from the University concerning my case) should have struck an antisemitic note, reading, “You goddamned Jews will do anything for money.” Though I had not really been aware of the fact, antisemitism was already in the air and directed toward the University of which I was a member. (Hate mail from an organization calling itself MAM, or more fully, Mothers Against Meyerson, had already begun to refer to Martin Meyerson, the President of our University, as “that Red Jew from Berkeley.”) It was all there, ready to be released: hostility to the young, fear of education and distrust of the educated, antisemitism, anti-Negroism, hatred for “reds” and “pinkos,” panic before those who dressed differently, wore their hair longer, or—worst of all—dissented from current received ideas.³

At the University of Wisconsin, demonstrations by Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) against campus recruitment by the Dow Chemical Company, manufacturer of napalm, aroused anti-Jewish comments and stimulated some state senators to try to limit out-of-state student enrollment at the University to 15 per cent, instead of the present 25 per cent. The general assumption in the community was that the trouble on campus had been caused by some two to three hundred “New York Jew agitators.”⁴

An editorial in Madison’s *Capital Times*, November 29, 1967, commented on the hostile reaction to the demonstrations, “Everywhere you went about town you heard sneering remarks about the ‘Brooklyn Indians.’” The *Milwaukee Journal*, February 17, 1967, remarked that “charges of antisemitism also were heard, since many of the Eastern students are Jewish.”

In sharp contrast to these incidents on the New Left, which provoked antisemitic reactions, was one showing antisemitic tendencies within the New Left itself. The San Francisco Mime Troupe, a left-oriented, "revolutionary" theater group presented in 1967 an avant-garde production of "L'Amant Militaire," a classic 18th century Italian farce by Carlo Goldoni. The play was presented in San Francisco, New York, and elsewhere. In this production the original play had been converted into an allegory on contemporary American society, with implicit and sometimes explicit parallels with the war in Vietnam, the draft, hippies, and other American phenomena. This modern adaptation turned the original Italian villain in the plot into a Jew:

Pantalone wears an exaggerated hook nose, speaks with a Yiddish accent, and uses Yiddish expressions. He is portrayed as an ugly, sexually depraved scoundrel, obsessed with making money. At one point he muses at length about selling his own daughter.5

Wherever the play was performed, it elicited protests from Jews. But both actors and backers of the play justified and even praised its anti-Jewish aspects on the ground that it mirrored current reality. Most of the Mime Troupe's personnel are themselves Jews, who share the New Left alienation from middle-class values and life styles, which they associate with their Jewish parents and the community in which they were raised.

Vandalism and Violence

In 1967 reported incidents showed a characteristic pattern.

January: More than 100 gravestones and monuments in two Jewish cemeteries were smeared with hammer-and-sickle emblems, or with such inscriptions as "They shall die" and "Six million—was it enough?", in New Orleans.

February: Swastikas, Nazi slogans, and obscenities were painted on the walls of the Hebrew Congregation synagogue in Somers (Westchester County), N.Y.

March: A fire, which caused damage estimated at tens of thousands of dollars, was set, and a swastika and the word "Juden" scrawled on the blackboard of a basement classroom in the Beth Israel synagogue in Trenton, Mich., a residential town southwest of Detroit.

June: On the eve of the six-day war, 72 headstones were vandalized, with damage totalling $19,000, in the Mount Lebanon cemetery in Hyattsville, Md., a Washington suburb.

A bomb threat, that proved to be a hoax, forced the evacuation of Torahs and other valuables of the new $2 million Temple Emanuel in Denver, Colorado, which was smeared with several large swastikas.

September: For the second time in three months, vandals desecrated and damaged headstones in the Mount Lebanon Jewish cemetery in Hyattsville, Md. Damage was estimated at $15,000. The cemetery, one of the largest in

the Washington area, serves a score of Jewish synagogues and fraternal organizations. Since no damage was done to nearby nonsectarian or Christian cemeteries, authorities concluded that these were antisemitic incidents.

A hit-and-run bombing damaged Temple Beth Israel in Jackson, Miss.

A swastika was burned on the lawn of a Jewish home in Cleveland Heights, Ohio.

October: Within less than two weeks, the Beth Moses congregation of Detroit, Mich., was the victim of three fires and two break-ins.

A robbery and arson, at a loss of $25,000, took place at the Beth Aaron synagogue in Detroit, Mich. Its cantor had been assaulted some time before.

November: The home of Rabbi Perry E. Nussbaum of Temple Beth Israel in Jackson, Miss., was destroyed by bombing. It was generally acknowledged that the bombings of the rabbi's home, and of his temple two months earlier, had been executed by a secret band of terrorists in retaliation against recent arrests and trials of Ku Klux Klan members on civil-rights charges. Rabbi Nussbaum cited the Klan and the Americans for Preservation of the White Race as being responsible for creating a climate that permitted this "reign of terror." He believed that the bombings were a "gesture" against the Jewish community which has supported various civil-rights movements. Mississippi Governor Paul B. Johnson, Jr., and Governor-elect John B. Williams asked the people to cooperate in apprehending "these depraved bombers" and vowed to protect the citizens, no matter what the cost. Among Jewish organizations, both the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the American Jewish Committee urged law enforcement officers to take swift and firm action to prevent similar incidents in the future.

More than 130 gravestones were overturned in the Jewish section of Zion Hill Cemetery, Hartford, Conn. Some strong expression of sympathy and outrage at these acts came from the Christian community.

December: A threatening circular, by the Minutemen, was mailed to members of the Houston, Tex., Jewish community.

The Sharey Zedek synagogue in Southfield, Mich., was robbed and the guard brutally beaten.

Antisemitic Attitudes

WAYNE, N.J.

The suburban town of Wayne, N.J., furnished the most dramatic example of underlying antisemitic attitudes. The turmoil centered around what otherwise would have been a routine school-board election. What occurred prompted one observer to note that "once again the problem is not that so many are committed to antisemitism; the problem is that too few are committed against antisemitism."

Of the five candidates running for three vacancies on the board, Jack Mandell, an attorney standing for reelection, and Robert Kraus, a corporation
executive seeking a first term, were Jews. A week before the election, on February 6, the school board's vice president, Newton Miller, attacked Mandell and Kraus in a statement to the local daily *Wayne Today*. Both favored a proposed increase in the school budget, as did two other candidates and all board members except Miller. Miller's statement read in part:

Most Jewish people are liberals, especially when it comes to spending for education. If Kraus and Mandell are elected and Lafer [another Jewish board member] is in for two more years, that means a three to six vote [on the nine-member board]. It would only take two more votes for a majority and Wayne would be in real financial trouble. Two more votes and we may lose what is left of the Christ in Christmas celebrations in our schools. Think of it!

These remarks transformed the previously obscure township of Wayne into a center of national attention. Reporters and television crews publicized the pre-election events across the nation. Public officials and clergymen from every part of the country sharply criticized Miller's remarks. Both the school board and the township council censured Miller; the board voted 8 to 1 to "censure Mr. Miller's appeal to bigotry," and called for his resignation. Miller refused to resign and denied that he was prejudiced. Although he apologized, he defended his statement, which he refused to retract, as true, but misinterpreted. By election day, community leaders and officials in Wayne, Jewish and Christian alike, were confident that the strong negative reaction to Miller's statement had erased this issue from the voters' minds. One community leader summed it up by saying, "Open political antisemitism simply is no longer tolerated in American life." But the general certainty that Miller's appeal to prejudice would be repudiated at the polls proved to be unfounded.

A record number of voters—10,000 out of 16,000 who were registered—turned out on election day. Kraus and Mandell were defeated 2 to 1, and the proposed school budget of $8.5 million was turned down 3 to 1. The largest vote went to David Caliri, a known supporter of the school budget; Miller's candidate, John McLaughlin, who was generally considered to be a conservative and was opposed to the budget, received the second-highest number of votes.

Shortly after the election, the school board replaced Miller as vice president with the one remaining Jewish member, Fred Lafer. The board then gave Miller a unanimous vote of confidence. The proposed school budget was again defeated on March 1 by 2 to 1, and the school board acted on March 10 to reduce the proposal by $300,000. At the same time, the Wayne township council defeated a proposal for the establishment of a human-relations commission. One local columnist suggested that the idea failed because its creation might have given the erroneous impression that Wayne had prejudice problems.

---

The Wayne incident aroused concern because hundreds of other American towns like it might become the scenes of similar antisemitic occurrences.

Aside from exclusionary practices in the Packanack Lake and Pine Lake communities in Wayne, which had been closed to virtually everyone who was not a white Protestant (the New Jersey courts had invalidated these practices in Packanack Lake in the spring of 1966), the 2,500 Jews of Wayne seemed to be integrated into the community and were active in civic affairs. Besides the two Jewish members that had been on the school board, two others were elected to the nine-member township council. The general impression was that harmonious Christian-Jewish relations prevailed in the town.

This tranquillity was shattered by Miller's pre-election statement, and the resultant responses. The array of reactions indicated the latent nature of this kind of antisemitism. Miller's own failure to recognize the antisemitism in his remarks was mirrored in the reactions of many Wayne residents. In the vast collection of statements and condemnations, there was very little effort to explain to the Wayne residents exactly what was antisemitic about them. Instead, most of the discussion locally and elsewhere centered around the general evils of antisemitism. Thus, while most seemed to agree that antisemitism was deplorable, they could find nothing antisemitic in the school board controversy. Comments from local people, such as: "My God, we tried and tried to apologize and they wouldn't accept it. Now I ask you, what do you make of that?", and "People have said worse things in a campaign. It wasn't the right thing to say, but he apologized, what more can he do?"—these echoed prevailing sentiments.

Many other residents were simply hostile because of the unwelcome publicity their town was receiving. Some even suggested that Jews were responsible for having injected religious prejudice into the campaign.

The reactions of Jewish leaders and organizations differed. Some local spokesmen, hoping that the incident would lose in importance, withheld immediate comment. Others, however, quickly branded Miller's statement as antisemitic. The involvement of several regional and national Jewish organizations seemed to add to the confusion. The underlying problem they all grappled with had to do with clarifying the antisemitic nature of Miller's remarks to the Wayne residents. If the election results were a measure of their success, then their combined efforts either failed to make the point, or the community was not unreceptive to Miller's allegations.

The Wayne episode was probed further, as a case-study of antisemitism in the United States in the mid-1960s, prepared by Rodney Stark and Stephen Steinberg, research sociologists at the University of California. Shortly after the election, they went to Wayne to interview local residents and talk with community leaders, clergymen and teachers. Their analysis of the climate of opinion, especially in relation to antisemitism, has implications.

7 Stark and Steinberg, op. cit., p. 78.
8 It Did Happen Here (University of California, Berkeley: Survey Research Center, 1967).
for Jews in every suburban community. In their view, "roughly a quarter of the nation’s population holds a substantial number of negative stereotypes about Jews as crafty, pushy, greedy, unethical, clannish, and the like." These attitudes, they contended, are quite far from the virulence of classic European antisemitism. And while they are not strong enough to motivate anti-Jewish behavior, they are sufficiently hostile to support some varieties of discrimination. Holding that “American anti-Semitism is characteristically a matter of shades of grey,” Stark and Steinberg described persons with such attitudes as “dark grey” antisemites. In their view, however, America also has a blander, or “light grey” form of antisemitism:

The light grey American anti-Semite holds some of the less noxious beliefs about Jews, but these are not sufficient to cause him to recognize that he dislikes Jews. Perhaps his feelings are not strong enough to intrude in his response to individuals. For such light anti-Semites it is actually true that, although they have mild feelings about Jews generally, it is entirely possible for some of their “best friends” to be Jewish. Such persons do not recognize that they are tainted with anti-Semitism because they do not face any internal sense of hostility towards Jews with whom they come in contact. Thus, their sense of innocence goes unchallenged in the day-to-day world.

From their exploration, the key to understanding what happened in Wayne, and indeed what might happen elsewhere, lies in the distinction between shades of antisemitism. Black and dark grey antisemites, if and when they exist, are too few in number to turn the electoral tide. Rather, “the electoral outcome lay with that substantial number of residents who fall into the light grey area of anti-Semitism.” Their prejudice was not manifest but acquiescent. Above all, it was their naive perspective that made them insensitive.

HILLSIDE, N.J.

In Hillside, another New Jersey town, a different type of antisemitic incident occurred in August. Here a 13-year-old Jewish boy was barred from a summer typing class because he insisted on wearing a yarmulke. The school superintendent ruled that yarmulkes were not allowed because they “would disturb” non-Jewish children and “might cause incidents.” “Anything that identifies a person as a member of any race, creed or color can cause a disturbance and must be eliminated,” he said.

This action drew a quick and strong response from many Jewish organizations, including the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, and the American Jewish Congress. They joined with others in the following petition to the state education commissioner:

While our immediate concern is the right of Orthodox Jewish children attending the public schools of this state, we share as well a broader commitment to

---

9 Ibid., p. 18.
10 Ibid., p. 19.
11 Ibid., p. 19.
the principles of religious freedom and of public education. While the ruling we request may affect directly only a small number of children in the state, it is nevertheless required both for the preservation of religious freedom and the advancement of public education.

Differences among several of the sponsoring groups led to the withdrawal of the petition in September. The student in question stopped attending class, and the problem became “academic.” No report of formal school-board action was recorded.

Negro Antisemitism

Growing antisemitism among Negroes was a matter of serious concern in 1967 (p. 244). Overt expressions were closely associated with the radicalization of the Negro protest movement.

In the wake of the Israeli-Arab June war, a vicious attack on Zionism and Israel, with antisemitic cartoons and photographs of alleged Israeli atrocities appeared in the June-July issue of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee’s SNCC Newsletter (p. 228). At a press conference in August several SNCC leaders repeated that “the Jews were imitating their Nazi oppressors” and committing “some of the same atrocities against the Arabs.” SNCC, they said, was not against all Jews, “only Jewish oppressors,” those in Israel and “those . . . in the little Jew shops in the ghettos.” At the National Conference for New Politics (NCNP), in Chicago on the 1967 Labor Day weekend, a resolution sponsored by the so-called Black Caucus “to condemn the imperialist Zionist (Arab-Israeli) War,” which, it said, “does not imply antisemitism,” was carried over the protest of many delegates, who walked out of the convention.

Reactions from both Jewish and Negro leaders was quick and sharp. They indicated growing misgivings about increasing antisemitism among Negroes, as well as concern among civil-rights leaders over what effect this hostility might have upon continued Jewish support of their cause.

Nathan Perlmutter of the American Jewish Committee, referring to the SNCC statement, said it was “interesting and ironical and sad that this outrageous attack is of a piece with a similar attack in the current issue of Thunderbolt, the official organ of the racist National States Rights party (NSRP).” Benjamin Epstein of the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith revealed that a study, conducted by his organization, found SNCC and NSRP publications sharing the same Arab sources of antisemitic hate materials. SNCC, he said, is “no longer a civil-rights group,” but one seeking the “radical overthrow of American political, social and economic institutions by any means necessary, including violence.” Will Maslow of the American Jewish Congress asserted that SNCC had “disqualified itself from any claim to be taken seriously in the struggle for human decency. There is no room for racists in the fight against racism.” Hadassah president Mrs. Mortimer Jacobson put her organization on record as strongly protesting “the language and
intent” of the NCNP resolutions in Chicago. “It is a disservice to Americans,” she said, “to pretend to add new dimensions to American freedom by attacking the very organizations and movements which have been in the forefront of the fight for these freedoms.”

In the same vein, Whitney Young, Jr., of the National Urban League, maintained that “Negro citizens are well aware of the contributions made to the drive for equal rights by Jewish citizens. Negroes have been the victims of racism for too long to indulge in group stereotypes and racial hate themselves.” A. Philip Randolph and Bayard Rustin of the A. Philip Randolph Institute made a joint statement, saying they were “appalled and distressed by the antisemitic article” in the SNCC Newsletter. Rustin later elaborated: “One of the more unprofitable strategies we could ever adopt is how to join in history’s oldest and most shameful witch-hunt, antisemitism.”

The late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in a letter to American Jewish Committee President Morris Abram, put the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) on record as having “expressly, frequently and vigorously denounced antisemitism and will continue to do so. It is not only that antisemitism is immoral—though that alone is enough. It is used to divide Negro and Jew, who have effectively collaborated in the struggle for justice.”

The discussion of Negro antisemitism was centered particularly around Negro-Jewish relations in the urban ghettos. Bayard Rustin, writing in the Amsterdam News, a Negro newspaper published in New York City, said:

This attitude, though not typical of most Negro communities, is gaining considerable strength in the ghetto. It sees the Jew as the chief and only exploiter of the ghetto, blames the ghetto on him, and seems to suggest that anything Jews do is inherent in the idea of their Jewishness.

Let’s face it: Everybody gets a piece of the action in the ghetto: those who are Jews and those who are Christians; those who are white and those who are black; those who run the numbers and those who operate the churches; those—black and white—who own tenements, and those—black and white—who own businesses.

A series of articles, “Semitism in the Black Ghetto,” in the black nationalist magazine Liberator, moved novelist James Baldwin to resign in protest from the publication. Commenting on the series, he said, “I think it is distinctly unhelpful, and I think it is immoral to blame Harlem on the Jew. Why, when we should be storming capitals, do you suggest to the people we hope to serve that they take refuge in the most ancient and barbaric of European myths?” In a subsequent essay on Negro antisemitism Baldwin probed the basis for these feelings:

The root of antisemitism among Negroes is, ironically, the relationship of colored peoples—all over the globe—to the Christian world. This is a fact which

---

may be difficult to grasp, not only for the ghetto's most blasted and embittered inhabitants, but also for many Jews, to say nothing of many Christians. He [the Jew] is singled out by Negroes not because he acts differently from other white men, but because he doesn't. His major distinction is given him by that history of Christendom, which has so successfully victimized both Negroes and Jews. And he is playing in Harlem the role assigned him by Christians long ago: he is doing their dirty work.15

A strongly antisemitic incident involved Cecil B. Moore, a militant Philadelphia lawyer and civil-rights leader. Acting as defense attorney for several men, who appeared at a court hearing in November for involvement in a black-power demonstration at the Board of Education building, Moore shouted at the opposing lawyer, "Jew get out of our business; I'm tired of you Jews who try to run our business." The resultant unprecedented decision by the Board of Judges of the Common Pleas Court to look into Moore's professional conduct brought strong reactions from Negro militants, as well as from the Jewish community.

The local National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) passed a resolution to defend Moore against "the challenge of the Jewish community to try to discredit him in his profession." Moore, himself, said in a letter to the Philadelphia B'nai B'rith, the Jewish Community Relations Council, and others, that he did not consider calling a person by his "self-designated name" an antisemitic slur, and that he resented their attempts to divide the Negro community. He suggested that the community "rid [itself] of the Jews who exploit black men."

The local chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) distributed a vicious mimeographed leaflet titled, "We the Black Community of Philadelphia Demand that the Jewish Community Censor"—and as the object of what obviously should have read "censure," CORE listed the Jewish merchants "who rob and cheat Black people," Jewish "slumlords," Jewish individuals and organizations calling for action against Moore, and those "who continually scream antisemitism as a defense for their own injustice against Black people."

In West Hartford, Conn., a largely Jewish middle-class suburban community, the Black Caucus, under the leadership of John Barber, staged a march for open housing on Yom Kippur night. The group had been conducting marches to end housing discrimination in several Hartford suburbs. In August its demonstration in an Italian section touched off rioting and arrests. However, in West Hartford they were joined by white marchers, some of them Jews.

It was reliably reported that attempts to stop the march on this High Holy Day, had no effect on Barber. When he was cautioned that the march might alienate the Jewish community, he allegedly replied that he was more concerned with Negroes than Jews—or any other liberal group. If Jews

15 As reported in Chicago Daily News, September 30, 1967.
wanted to help, he was quoted as saying, they could start by publicly con-
demning the "slumlords" and merchants in the ghettos for their shoddy busi-
ness methods.

The writings of LeRoi Jones, the controversial Negro poet who was arrested
during the Newark riots, are examples par excellence of Negro antisemitism. 
His antisemitic style is best exemplified by several poems offered in the De-
cember 1967 issue of Evergreen Review, a New York avant-garde literary 
magazine with a tendency toward pornography. One, "The Black Man Is 
Making New Gods," referred to the "atheist Jews" who have "double-crossed 
the Negro and stolen his secrets." Jones' bitterness was reflected in the con-
nection he made between Christianity and Judaism in his general attack 
against the white man:

... They give us  
to worship  
a dead Jew  
and not ourselves  
chained to the bounties  
of inhuman  
mad chains  
of dead jews  
The empty Jew  
betrays us, as he does  
hanging stupidly  
from a cross, in an oven, the pantomime  
of our torture,  
so clearly, cinemascop the jews do it  
big, hail the whiteness of their  
waking up unhip.

The poems were subsequently widely distributed by Liberation News Service, 
a press service supplying the New Left underground campus and hippie pub-
lications.

Jewish Response

Concern over growing Negro antisemitism was challenged by Gary T. 
Marx in Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community  
(New York: Harper & Row, 1967), based on interviews conducted in 1964 
with 1,119 Negro adults in Chicago, New York, Atlanta, and Birmingham. 
Marx found that generally there was less antisemitism in the Negro commu-
nity than in the country as a whole. This conclusion was based on an index 
of antisemitic attitudes, which he constructed from responses to statements 
about the economic behavior of Jews, their "power" in American society, 
and their "clannishness—" e.g., "Jews have too much power in the United

16 It is part of the continuing investigation of antisemitism in American life conducted by 
the Anti-Defamation League, in conjunction with the University of California Survey Research 
Center.
States"; "Jews are warm and friendly"; "Jews stick together too much"; "Jews
are just as honest as other business men."

Marx found Negro responses showing an index of antisemitism on a par
with, or lower than, that of responses by whites to similar statements. Thirty-
six per cent of the Negro sample emerged as not antisemitic, 40 per cent as
low on the antisemitism scale, 18 per cent high, and 6 per cent very high.
Nationally, 24 per cent of Negroes considered Jewish landlords to be better
than other white landlords, and 7 per cent worse; 20 per cent said Jewish
store owners are better than other white store owners, 7 per cent worse; 34
per cent found Jews better to work for than other whites, 19 per cent worse.

After the summer riots, major Jewish organizations formulated programs
aimed at promoting better Jewish-Negro relations. The National Community
Relations Advisory Council (NCRAC), the coordinating body of nine na-
tional Jewish agencies and eighty local Jewish community councils, called
on American Jews to intensify their efforts to help the Negro achieve full
equality, despite the antisemitic utterances by "black demagogues." NCRAC
released a Guide to Program Planning for Jewish Community Relations in
1967–68, in which it declared:

Jewish community-relations agencies have a continuing obligation to interpret
intensively to the Jewish community the facts of antisemitism among Negroes,
its nature, its origins, its real significance, and the effective ways of combating it.

The guide also warned against mistaking "legitimate protest" by Negroes for
antisemitism and "exaggerating the true dimensions" of anti-Jewish expres-
sions that may arise. "For the Jewish community to be deflected from its
support and advocacy of equality for Negroes on the ground that Negroes
are antisemitic," it said, "would not only be self-defeating but to repudiate
a fundamental tenet of Jewish tradition—equal justice for all."

NCRAC made the following recommendations to its affiliated groups:

Work for the adoption of appropriate national policies and programs to solve
the national problems of slum housing, unemployment, and poverty.

Create wherever feasible community-wide groups to assure proper maintenance
of law and order and to take all necessary steps against the misdirection of law
enforcement and the subversion of civil liberties.

Establish in each community appropriate procedures and mechanisms for review
and appeal of conflicting charges against the local police in coping with out-
breaks of racial violence.

In a similar move, the leaders of American Reform Judaism formulated
a wide-ranging program to help the Negro achieve full economic, social, and
political equality. At the biennial assembly of the Union of American Hebrew
Congregations (UAHC), Albert Vorspan, director of its Commission on So-
cial Action, said: "While anti-Negroism is more pervasive than Negro anti-
semitism, and while both are dangerous, both are irrelevant to the desperate
problems of saving the American city from decay, violence and even insur-
rection.” Among other things, it was decided that congregations and rabbis exert moral pressure on “Jewish slumlords and ghetto profiteers. [establish] a code of ethical business practices,” and participate in such programs as “Project Equality,” in which religious institutions pledged to do business only with companies that do not discriminate against Negroes in employment.

Irving Fain, chairman of the Action Committee, cautioned American Jews that, “in this whole area of racial injustice, our goal is to take the initiative though it be unpopular. Here we Jews must fulfill our destiny as gadfly to the conscience of mankind.”

At its biennial national convention in November, the Jewish Labor Committee called for the forging of a new Negro-labor alliance and restoration of the liberal coalition to fight “the juggernaut of backlash and bigotry which is loose in our midst.” The delegates approved resolutions which reaffirmed their support of the Negro civil-rights movement but repudiated extremism, and called for a massive assault on poverty by the adoption of A. Philip Randolph’s “Freedom Budget.”

To these substantive programs, Jewish leaders added general cautions on Negro animosity toward Jews. A statement, in November, by Arnold Aronson, secretary of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, was typical of others:

Negro antisemitism exists, it is growing, and Jewish leaders should denounce it when it appears.

They also have a right to expect the Negro leadership to denounce it.

But the best way to counter Negro antisemitism is to help wipe out the conditions under which anti-white and anti-Negro bias are both spawned. These are bred in frustration, denial, and want.

THE URBAN CRISIS

In the summer of 1967, rioting, looting, and arson erupted on an unprecedented scale in dozens of cities, large and small. The cold statistics were: 85 persons dead, approximately 3,200 injured, some 16,000 arrested, and estimates of more than $550 million in property damage. Most of the rioters were Negroes—who, many observers believed, were responding to decades of discrimination, poverty, slum housing in congested ghettos, low-paying jobs, and unemployment.

Two cities, Newark, N.J., and Detroit, Mich., were the scenes of the most serious upheavals. Violence broke out in Newark on July 12, following the arrest of a Negro cab driver. Burning and looting continued for five days and completely destroyed several blocks in the run-down Negro district. The grim totals were 25 persons killed, 1,200 injured, at least 1,600 arrested, and property damage estimated at more than $15 million. Stokely Carmichael, who was in England at the time, tersely remarked: “In Newark, we applied war tactics of the guerrillas.” In Detroit rioting occurred July 23-28.
Here, too, there was widespread looting and violence. The dead numbered 41 and property damage was some $500 million—the most extensive in any city.

Rioting and violence occurred in scores of other cities and towns across the nation, among them Chicago, Ill., Houston, Tex., Boston, Mass., Syracuse, N.Y., Washington, D.C., Cambridge, Md., Des Moines, Ia., Cincinnati and Dayton, O., Atlanta, Ga., Milwaukee, Wis., San Francisco and Fresno, Cal., and Wichita, Kan. During the June 14 outburst in Dayton, SNCC chairman H. Rap Brown told a crowd: “How can you be nonviolent in America, the most violent country in the world? You better shoot the man to death; that's what he's doing to you.” The next night, in Cincinnati, Brown said the city “will be in flames until the hunkie cops get out.” On that day he said “SNCC has declared war.”

In some cities the uprisings were so violent that National Guard units had to be called in to clear the streets and help impose strict curfews. President Johnson responded to Michigan Governor Romney’s July 24 request for federal troops to restore order in Detroit—the first time since 1943 that federal soldiers had to be used in such disorders.

There was no overwhelming evidence that Jewish-owned businesses were the special target of looters during the riots of the past several years. ADL officials from New York, Detroit, Chicago, and Milwaukee reported that Jewish-owned stores were not singled out during the riots in the summer of 1967. Some were “hit” and some were not. In a report on the Newark riots, David Stoloff of the American Jewish Congress maintained:

Approximately 1,200 business establishments were damaged, many of them looted and some fire-bombed. Most of the heavily damaged stores were owned by whites, of whom an estimated 90 per cent were Jews. However, the riots left no overt signs of antisemitism such as swastikas or other markings that might have been expected if antisemitism had been an important factor, nor were any Jewish institutions located in Negro districts touched by the riots.17

As with general antisemitic vandalism and violence, this statistical census is incomplete, for it cannot offer any real understanding of underlying attitudes. One thing is clear: The Jewish presence in the Negro slums is a fact of American life. In the major cities of the northeast, Jewish business predominates in Negro districts. In the South and West there are considerably fewer Jews in such areas. Whether or not the rioting and looting were purposefully directed at merchants and landlords because they are white and/or Jewish, the results were equally painful, and widened the gulf between black and white.

17 The Impact of the Newark Riots of 1967 on the Jewish Community (New York, American Jewish Congress, 1967; mimeo.).
Public Reaction

The real casualty of the violence was the civil-rights movement itself. As civil disorders increased in 1967, there was a hardening of public attitudes against programs designed to aid Negroes, and an increasing disinclination on the part of Congress to enact civil-rights legislation, or to maintain or expand war on poverty and urban programs. In a poll, conducted in August among members of Congress, governors, and mayors, each respondent singled out joblessness, especially among young Negroes, as the major cause of the urban ghetto riots.18 There was much less agreement on a solution. The respondents fell into two broad categories: those favoring greater federal, state, and local efforts to solve social problems, and those favoring stiffer punishment for rioters and persons inciting to riot.

Public reactions to the summer turbulence showed even greater differences. Negroes and whites disagreed sharply on the causes of the riots and ways to prevent future trouble.19 A national Louis Harris survey, released August 14, revealed that among whites interviewed, 45 per cent contended the violence was provoked mainly by “outside agitators,” “minority radicals,” or “Communist backing.” Only 7 per cent of the Negroes took this view: 93 per cent cited Negro frustration over lack of progress on jobs, education, and housing as the prime cause. Another 40 per cent of the whites, generally those at higher educational levels, attributed the riots to the “way Negroes have been treated in the slums and ghettos of the big cities” and “the failure of white society to keep its promises to the Negroes.”

Of the whites interviewed in a Gallup Poll (released August 15), 32 per cent said they thought differently about Negroes from “several months” ago. Virtually all in this group said they had less regard or respect for Negroes now, describing them as “too violent,” “demanding too much,” or “going too far.”

In August a Senate subcommittee, chaired by Abraham Ribicoff (Dem., Conn.), began a series of hearings on the role the federal government should play in attacking urban problems. The hearings ended 10 months later, in June 1967, a few weeks before the riots broke out. All social scientists with experience in the cities agreed that the urban problem stemmed from racial injustice and poverty, and that the nation’s current urban policies were bankrupt.20 They disagreed, however, on the best way to tackle the problem: Daniel P. Moynihan and Lee Rainwater argued for some form of a guaranteed annual income; Kenneth B. Clark suggested that an agency like the RAND Corporation be created to study urban problems; Herbert J. Gans and Anthony Downs supported massive housing programs.

18 The poll was conducted by Congressional Quarterly and reported in Congressional Quarterly Guide (Washington, D.C.), Spring 1968, p. 134.
19 From public opinion polls, reported ibid., p. 137.
The primary value of these hearings lay in the very fact that they were held. Their occurrence symbolized a growing national concern for and commitment to urban problems and the plight of the Negro as a racial and economic minority group; but the meaning of the concern remained unclear. In a rapidly changing context, the very purposes of traditional "integration" programs—in education, jobs, civil rights, etc.—were undergoing radical redefinition by both the black and white communities. The disparity of opinions within each of these two groups was often as great as the differences between them.

This uncertainty was reflected in the ever-changing meaning of Black Power. The militant essence of the Black Power slogan conveyed the image of H. Rap Brown, the SNCC chairman, and his urgings to violence, his labeling of all whites as "honkeys," his call for Negroes to arm themselves and to burn. The moderate flavor of Black Power was conveyed, for example, by Bayard Rustin's call for a "coalition politics" of liberal blacks and whites, pressing for massive economic and social reforms.

Just what effect these extremes in appeal have had upon the mass of Negroes is unclear. Some of the research reported in 1967 revealed the ambivalence created by "rising expectations." From his 1964 data, Gary Marx predicted that larger proportions of the Negro community would become aroused and militant.21 He saw continued progress, in which whites were achieving quicker gains in education, health, and welfare, as one impetus for increasing militancy among Negroes. At the same time, Marx said, his index showed that the more militant Negroes were also the most tolerant and the least anti-white. He found militancy more prevalent among better-educated and more prosperous Negroes. The volatility and instability of the racial situation was reaffirmed by the fact that a half of the sample said riots did some good, and a third felt that violence could help.

A special survey conducted by Fortune magazine reported in December that a new mood, marked by a mixture of "hope and anger," was emerging among American Negroes.22 The study rejected what it described as a prevalent myth about urban Negroes—that they had little sense of priorities and small desire to help themselves. Better education for their children, better jobs, more job training, more police protection, and neighborhood improvement were among the goals cited by those interviewed. Seventy-five per cent felt their condition was better than it had been in recent years. Almost half of all those interviewed were more angry than they had been a few years ago. Three out of four Negroes felt more hopeful that the problems of blacks would be solved, while four per cent were less hopeful. A majority endorsed the aggressive, nonviolent tactics of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., whereas more than a third advocated more violent tactics. The survey also found a new feeling about integration:

One Negro in 20 of those interviewed rejects integration as a primary objective; in the 16 to 25 age group, the proportion is nearly double. At the other extreme, about one Negro in 10 wants integration in every sense of the word—i.e., believes in the dismantling of all racial barriers. But a substantial majority of urban Negroes—77 per cent—opt for "limited integration." To them, integration is useful mainly as a means to equal opportunity and increased self-respect.

The report found that, thus far at least, the radicalization of the Negro protest movement had not gained the support of the overwhelming number of black Americans, despite the succession of major events since 1964—the Watts riots, the shooting of James Meredith in Mississippi, the death of Malcolm X, the birth of Black Power, and the spread of rioting and looting to black slums in scores of American cities. By the end of 1967 conflicts over goals and approaches in the black community seemed to be adding up to an impetus for black separatism, a movement reportedly endorsed by many white liberals (New York Times, December 17, 1967). Its rising momentum, based on the feeling that Negro institutions must be built up first, further complicated the problem.

The Storm over Urban Education

The 1966 Coleman report 23 stirred a controversy which continued in 1967. Its main thesis was that lower-class children perform better in schools with high proportions of middle-class students. In its report on Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, released in February, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 24 made the logical extension from class to race, contending that only massive school integration will result in educational progress for Negro children.

The Coleman report itself was attacked on substantive and methodological grounds. 25 One aspect of the controversy centered around the opposing values of integrated education vs. segregated schools. Joseph Alsop argued that the quality of educational programming in predominantly Negro urban schools was far more important than black-white student ratios. For, he said, regardless of efforts to integrate schools, "the great majority of ghetto children are inevitably going to be educated in ghetto schools for a very long time to come; and this is why the prospects of improved education in the ghettos now constitute a subject of such urgent interest and importance."

Opponents contended that the experience of integrated schooling would have greater value in education and socialization.

The slow and seemingly inadequate response of boards of education, in New York and elsewhere, to the proposals for change highlighted the urgency of the educational problem. The connection between school issues, race relations, and living patterns in the cities was evident in the responses of fiscal conservatives, who would curtail expenditures, and public-office seekers, who based their campaign on open or covert promises to oppose busing and similar programs. Such appeals served only to harden attitudes, especially among those less inclined to accept the responsibilities for cooperative social reform.

The great concentration upon education as the key to the socio-economic and racial liberation of the Negro was reflected in the unprecedented anger aimed at the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) for its strike against the New York City Board of Education in September. UFT’s action was widely condemned as doing damage to the education of black children. The resultant controversy highlighted the issue of unionism vs. professionalism and the extent to which the teacher had become a special focus of public attention. It also revealed the expectations—that the school would play the primary role in creating and altering future economic and social roles.

In New York City the storm over educational policies also revealed active hostilities and intergroup tensions. A group of black teachers, members of the African-American Teachers Association (formerly the Negro Teachers' Association), took violent issue with UFT and announced that they would work during the strike. Congress of Racial Equality leaders in Brooklyn called upon the Board of Education to send striking teachers to Vietnam. Their stands produced angry confrontations with pickets, in some cases actually making it impossible to maintain a picket line.

Of equal concern was the fact that the controversy over education became the arena for the release of certain Negro hostility towards New York City Jews. One incident, in June, involved the distribution of antisemitic literature in teachers’ mailboxes at P.S. 284 in Brooklyn, telling Jewish teachers, in specific and vulgar language, to get out. Various Brooklyn CORE officials, who were blamed for these outrages, called the charges fictitious and a cover-up for the poor quality of education in many schools in Brooklyn’s Negro neighborhoods. The breakdown of school discipline and of community-school relations at this and other schools in the city moved many teachers to declare their intentions of leaving. At P.S. 284 the faculty members, many of them Jews, viewed the incident as just one aspect of a generally threatening attitude toward the schools.

The turmoil over education in the slums often made it difficult to distinguish specific antisemitic feelings from general anti-white hostilities. But the large number of Jewish teachers and administrators in New York’s school system tended to increase the likelihood that criticism of the edu-

cational establishment at times would have antisemitic overtones. Floyd McKissick, national director of CORE, condemned all expressions of antisemitism and threats of violence, and reaffirmed the March 1966 CORE policy statement, advocating the expulsion of anyone espousing such “evil doctrine.”

Open Housing

Another focus of civil-rights protest activity in 1967 was open housing. In Milwaukee, Wisc., Father James E. Groppi, assistant pastor of St. Boniface Roman Catholic Church, began a series of marches in August to induce the city council to pass a strong open-housing ordinance. Father Groppi, who is white but who was quoted as having said, “I am a Negro with white skin,” attracted nationwide attention. His demonstrations soon assumed the form of a movement. Its heart was the Milwaukee Youth Council of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

In all, Groppi led between 200 and 2,000 Negroes and some whites in about 200 nightly demonstrations against such acts of discrimination as the white-only membership practice of the Milwaukee Eagles Club—to which all top city officials belonged, and the city's repeated refusal to enact an open-housing law. The marches divided the Catholics, more than a third of the area’s residents. Archbishop William E. Cousins of Milwaukee refused to stop Father Groppi because he believed that the majority of Catholics supported him.

The mounting tension became evident on September 9, when Father Groppi led 1,000 Negro and white civil-rights marchers into the heart of Milwaukee’s predominantly Polish Catholic southside district. The white crowds of the neighborhood, carrying placards with such slogans as “Burn Groppi, Burn,” aimed most of their dissatisfaction at him. On their trek across the local bridge, connecting the Negro and Polish districts (it is a local joke that the half-mile-long viaduct is the longest bridge in the world because it connects Africa and Poland), the marchers were greeted by shouts of “Sieg Heil, Sieg Heil,” from a group of white men who gave the Nazi salute.

The Jewish community in Milwaukee was placed in an especially precarious position. On the one hand, its lay leaders and rabbis, who had been supporting open housing from the beginning, increased their pressure for such legislation in paid newspaper advertisements and clear statements of their positions in news stories. On the other hand, however, they tried to avoid direct association with Father Groppi and his Youth Council movement. This labeled them as reluctant liberals, unwilling to plunge into the battle which would prod the city into action.

The national headquarters of some Jewish groups working for civil rights inquired why participation of local Jews in the Groppi marches was not greater, and whether they should send delegations to the marches. They were informed that such action would very likely alienate local Jews and drive a
wedge between them and their neighbors. Quite a few individual young Jewish men and women did participate in the marches.

In September the Milwaukee Jewish Council announced its strong support for enactment of a municipal ordinance guaranteeing to all, regardless of race, the right to buy, rent, or lease property. It urged the city council "to show the moral leadership so desperately needed," and called on the state legislature "to enact enabling legislation if such were required." The statement also expressed the Jewish Council's "deep concern with the events of recent days which have witnessed intolerable bigotry and violence, the brandishing of swastikas and other racist symbols on public streets, the appearance of self-styled Nazis and their ilk in our community, who are attempting to exploit the emotionally charged atmosphere for their evil purposes."

On December 13 the Milwaukee Common Council passed an open-housing ordinance, which, however, was far weaker than the one demanded by the civil-rights groups during their three-and-a-half-month demonstrations. The ordinance simply restated the provisions of the state law, which did not apply to an estimated 66 per cent of the housing in Milwaukee. The only change was the transfer of enforcement powers from a state agency to the city attorney's office. Father Groppi's reply was that the demonstrations would continue and intensify. He called the Milwaukee marches "perhaps one of the last tests of peaceful demonstration for racial goals." "If this fails," he said, "the young militants would then be able to say you marched for that many days and that many of your people went to jail and nothing happened. Violence then would be inevitable."

GROUP TENSION IN POLITICS

The dominant issues in the off-year elections had crystallized: American policy in Vietnam and race conflict in the cities. In some areas the question of race impelled more voters to go to the polls than in any other by-election year. Backlash, an important factor in the 1966 voting, figured prominently in elections in Buffalo, Boston, Gary, Cleveland, and New Jersey. Religious prejudice was a discernible aspect of the campaigns in Kentucky, New York State, and Philadelphia.

Anti-integration Candidates

Two women candidates, who spoke up against changes in the status quo and thus against school integration, met different fates at the polls. In Buffalo Mrs. Alfreda Slominski, a Republican, received the highest vote for city council, shaking loose one of the seats formerly held in tight control by the Democratic majority. Mrs. Louise Hicks in Boston, with a similar political stance and a comparable white ethnic constituency, met defeat, primarily because Negroes turned out in large numbers to vote for her opponent in
the race for mayor. Of all the registered Negroes in Boston, 69 per cent went to the polls; Kevin White received 83 per cent of their vote.

**Election of Negro Mayors**

Both in Gary, Ind., and in Cleveland, O., Negroes were candidates for mayor, and in both elections Negroes voted in unusually high proportions. In Cleveland 80 per cent of all registered Negroes turned up at the polls, and of these, 95 per cent voted for the Democrat Carl Stokes, the Negro candidate. In Gary, Negro voters turned out in higher proportion than whites, and were able, by a bare plurality, to elect the Negro Democrat Richard Hatcher.

White voters in both communities could not break habits of prejudice. In Cleveland the party lost about 80,000 Democrats, who voted for the white Republican candidate; in Gary, Hatcher received only about 17 per cent of the white vote.

**New Jersey Backlash and Counter-backlash**

In the New Jersey elections for the state legislature there was an unexpected and sweeping upset of the Democratic majority. Newly-elected Republican senators and assemblymen outnumbered Democrats 3 to 1, despite the fact that Governor Richard Hughes, a Democrat, had been reelected by a landslide as recently as 1965. Informed opinion attributed the strong defection from the Democratic party to a white backlash, intensified by the Newark riot, by fears about school busing and a Negro invasion of the suburbs, by suburban resentment of high taxes to pay for inner-city problems, and by a general mistrust of Governor Hughes's numerous legislative innovations.

Only one community, Englewood, went against the tide. Here, for the first time in 56 years, the mayor and other city officers elected were Democrats. The five-to-one Democratic vote was a tribute to the decisive action taken by the Negro community and those, like Rabbi Arthur Hertzberg, whose consciences were aroused by the overtones of racism in the local Republican campaign.

**Religion**

Kentucky, where registered Democrats outnumbered Republicans 2 to 1, elected its first Republican governor in 20 years. Lou B. Nunn, a conservative, pro-Goldwater Republican, won 51.2 per cent of the votes after a singularly colorless campaign, whose main feature was opposition to Johnson's Vietnam policy. His Democratic opponent, Henry L. Ward, was in essential agreement with him on domestic issues; he took no stand at all on the war. The real issue contested in Kentucky was not Vietnam, but civil rights. In a tense primary election Nunn defeated a more liberal Republican, County Judge Marlon W. Cook, whom he accused of having "consorted" with the
wealthy, liberal Louisville Jews of the Louisville-Jefferson County Human Relations Commission. In the rural areas of the south-eastern Bible Belt, Nunn's supporters distributed anti-Catholic literature (Cook is a Catholic); in urban areas they promoted the image of Cook as a renegade Republican, who "coddled and encouraged agitators" during a Negro open-housing demonstration and would deliver the Kentucky delegation in 1968 to the "Romney-Javits ticket."

The Republican national leadership came to Nunn's aid when he won the primary, sending in prominent Republicans to speak for him. In a last minute deal with right-wing Democrats (such as former Governor A. B. "Happy" Chandler), they were able to deliver a split vote—conspicuous in Democratic voting in western Kentucky—that elected Nunn as governor and the Democrat Wendell Ford as lieutenant-governor. In the cities the choice between Nunn, a conservative Republican, and Ward, a non-liberal Democrat, evoked no partisan enthusiasm, with the result that the Negro turn-out was less than 75 per cent of what it had been in the 1963 election.

In Philadelphia the Democratic incumbent James H. J. Tate, a loyal party man and a Catholic, defeated Arlen Specter, a liberal Republican and a Jew, for mayor. The scene of one of the nation's first riots, in August 1964, Philadelphia had continued to have problems of race conflict and inner-city tensions. Under the Democrats, Negroes were able to find civil-service jobs, were admitted to all labor unions, and held a fair number of electoral positions. But housing, unemployment, and education remained sources of tension. For reasons of internal politics Tate did not have the Democratic machine behind him, but he did command the loyalty of ward captains and union leaders. Tate also needed the Catholic vote—according to 1960 estimates, Philadelphia had 3½ times as many Catholics as Jews—and in courting it, he appeared to assume an anti-Jewish posture. Specter's spectacular vote-getting ability when he ran for district attorney and his liberal, sophisticated approach to the race problem won him the great majority of liberal and Jewish votes, but not quite enough to win.

The New York state election was of a different dimension. It was not a choice between candidates but a referendum on whether to reject or accept a new constitution. The proposed charter included a number of liberal reforms, but also a repeal of the provision against the use of state money for church-affiliated schools. Proponents and opponents of the proposed constitution were divided mainly on the church-state issue. Those whose interest lay in parochial schools—Catholics and Orthodox Jews—were for the charter; those who, above all, believed in the sanctity of church-state separation—most Jewish and Protestant groups—voted no. However, the pattern was not universal. Many Catholics, more concerned about higher taxes, ignored the advice of their religious leaders and joined the 72.4 per cent who voted down the proposed constitution in the referendum. Many Negroes voted for it.
INTERRELIGIOUS RELATIONS

Church-State, Education, and the Supreme Court

In October the United States Supreme Court agreed to hear arguments on whether taxpayers could challenge Federal grants to church-related institutions on the ground that they violated the principle of separation of church and state. The Court granted appeal in the Fast v. Gardner case, in which seven New York taxpayers challenged the constitutionality of Federal aid to parochial schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], pp. 134–35). Sponsored jointly by the American Jewish Congress, the New York Civil Liberties Union (CLU), the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), and the United Parents Association (UPA), the test case was brought against Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare John W. Gardner and Commissioner of Education Harold Howe 2nd. The individual complainants were Mrs. Florence Fast, president of UPA; Mrs. Helen D. Henkin, former president of UPA; Albert Shanker, president of UFT; Frank Abrams and C. Irving Dwork, officials of the American Jewish Congress; Mrs. Florence Levin, a tax-payer, and Mrs. Helen D. Buttenwieser, a lawyer and member of N.Y. CLU.

A decision in this case would have broad implications for a wide variety of federal spending programs that annually allot millions of dollars to church-related institutions for programs in higher education, health, research, and anti-poverty and welfare projects. A ruling in this case would be the first Supreme Court action since 1923 when the court ruled, in Frothingham v. Mellon, that taxpayers could not sue in such cases because their share of the tax burden was too small to give them a real interest in the decision. This precedent has largely prevented judicial consideration of federal aid to sectarian schools.

The court's decision to accept the case was hailed in a joint statement by the four organizations sponsoring the suit as having "paved the way to an authoritative judicial determination of the constitutionality of Federal aid to religious schools."

Abortion Law Reform in New York State

The attempt to liberalize New York's 84-year-old abortion law stirred a significant political, social, and religious controversy in the state. In January Assemblyman Albert Blumenthal (Dem.) of Manhattan introduced a bill in the state legislature to expand the present law which allows an abortion only when necessary to save the mother's life. The Blumenthal bill would also have permitted abortions when continued pregnancy would "permanently or materially" impair the mother's physical health or so impair her mental health as to make her "a mentally ill person as defined in the [state's] mental-hygiene law;" when there was substantial risk that the child would be born
physically deformed or mentally defective; when the pregnancy resulted from incest or first- or second-degree rape; or when the pregnancy occurred while the woman was mentally ill or mentally defective.

Catholic opposition to the bill was intense. On February 12 a pastoral letter, read at all masses in most of the state's 1,700 Catholic churches, declared:

Since laws which allow abortion violate the unborn child's God-given right, we are opposed to any proposal to extend them. We urge you most strongly to do all in your power to prevent direct attacks upon the lives of unborn children.

The pastoral letter was the first ever issued jointly by the bishops of New York's eight dioceses. Earlier, Richard Cardinal Cushing of Boston had urged "all persons of good will to unite in opposition" to nationwide movements for revising abortion laws. Catholic opposition was based on the religious teaching that a fetus is a human being from the moment of conception and that its destruction therefore constitutes murder.

The Blumenthal bill had the endorsement of medical societies, civic groups, and Protestant and Jewish organizations. Support among medical groups came from the New York Academy of Medicine, County Medical Society, Obstetrical Society, and Gynecological Society. Polls indicated that 90 per cent of the psychiatrists and 85 per cent of the gynecologists in the state also favored the reform.

In a joint statement issued on February 25, the Protestant Council of the City of New York, the New York Federation of Reform Synagogues, the Association of Reform Rabbis, and the (Conservative) New York Metropolitan Region of the United Synagogue of America called the Roman Catholic Church's posture in efforts to liberalize the abortion law "harsh and unbending." The groups maintained that their support of these efforts was based on the same "concern for human life as Catholic opposition, and that the contemporary spirit of ecumenism had not been reflected in the public discussion to this point." Read by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, the statement declared that religious groups must "respect each other's differences as well as their much greater areas of agreement if ecumenism is to have any real meaning."

Catholic opposition, although widespread and intense, was not total. Under the leadership of Ethan C. Eldon, a Catholic and executive director of the New York Committee of Democratic Voters, the parent organization of New York city's Reform Democrats, a group of 40 Roman Catholic laymen, most of them active in the organization, broke with the Church's position and urged passage of the bill. In a brief statement, they said that while "we as Catholics may believe that the abortion of a child is both wrong and sinful, this should not be imposed on persons of other faiths," and that legislation should be passed "to allow individuals the free exercise of their conscience."

The controversy seemingly also affected Blumenthal's status in the legislature. When it was revealed in February that Assembly Speaker Anthony
Travia (Dem. Bklyn.), had removed Blumenthal as chairman of the influential Democratic advisory committee, there was speculation that the move had been brought on by differences over the abortion law reform. On March 7 the Assembly codes committee voted 15 to 3 against reporting the bill to the floor.

**Sabbath Observance**

In the middle-class suburban community of Merrick-Bellmore, Long Island, N.Y., which has equal numbers of Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic residents, the question of sabbath observance was raised in connection with the scheduling of local school events. In the spring Jason Bauch, a cantor, requested the school board to reschedule Friday-night events so that his sons could participate. The board, having rejected the request, subsequently turned to the Merrick Clergy Council representing the major religious faiths, for advice. The council recommended in June that school events not be scheduled either on the Jewish Sabbath or the Christian Sunday "out of respect for the religious integrity of the community."

The board rejected this recommendation, and instead adopted a policy which allowed for requests to reschedule events within two weeks of their initial announcement, specifying reasons for the change, proposing alternate dates, and estimating the number of people affected. This policy was protested in December at a meeting called by the seven Jewish congregations in the area and attended by more than 700 persons. Petitions gathered at two Roman Catholic churches and an Episcopalian church also protested the board's action.

Edward T. Rogowsky
Rightist Extremism

A n assessment of the current state of the right-wing movement, particularly of the lunatic fringe, must consider its reaction to two 1967 events that deeply affected the American people: the summer race riots and the Middle East conflict in June.

Race Riots

Contrary to expectations, the gutter bigots, racists, and native American stormtroopers failed to exploit the rioting in many of America's large cities (p. 247). Membership recruitment, fund raising, and national publicity, all seemed obtainable to organized hatemongers in the early days of the uprisings. All that racist organizations needed to achieve some measure of identity as fighters for white America and to exploit the rising resentment against the Negro rioters, was to be physically present. The hate press, their advance men, and membership recruiters had long proclaimed their leaders and their organizations to be the saviors of the white race, excepting, of course, the Jews. Respectable or status groups, such as the John Birch Society, which were publicly committed to preserving the status quo of the Negroes under the guise of saving America from internal subversion, had for more than a decade claimed that all civil-rights efforts were part of a Communist plot. Nevertheless, the ultra-rightists' response to the riots was merely a collective "we told you so."

For many months before the riots broke out, militant black leaders, speaking under the auspices of such organizations as the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Black Panthers, Mau Maus, Revolutionary Action Movement, publicly urged ghetto uprisings and death to the white man. Yet, neither the Ku Klux Klan, nor other antisemitic and violently anti-Negro groups were in evidence during the riots. The reason was that, with the exception of the various Southern-based movements, they have all but disappeared. The assassination of George Lincoln Rockwell has led to the virtual dissolution of the American Nazi party, and the hundred odd members of the Georgia-based National States Rights party lacked the necessary commitment and mobility to take action even close to home, in the Atlanta ghetto.

However the hate literature of these groups exploited the riots for their own ends. In Newark, there was widespread distribution of antisemitic and racist material. Common Sense (Union, N.J.)—once the most widely distributed hate sheet in the United States, but now published only sporadically—ran a special printing of its May 1, 1967 issue for the large circulation in the ghetto. It called the rise of Negro antisemitism a setback for Zionist plotters,
and used standard canards to explain why Jews were disliked by Negroes. National Renaissance party literature, produced by the relatively small and insignificant Yorkville group, also found its way into the hands of Negroes in the ghetto.

The John Birch Society maintained that Communist influence and involvement in planning and executing the riots was all pervasive. (J. Edgar Hoover, in testimony before the President’s Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders in August, indicated that, while outside agitators played a role in the ghetto riots of 1967, there was no evidence of any conspiracy, and no evidence had been uncovered indicating a relationship between the riots in one city and those of another.) Billy James Hargis, in the August-September 1967 issue of the Christian Crusade, denounced the “gelatine manner in which the crisis was handled in Washington, D.C.” The National Economic Council, in its Economic Council Letter, September 1, 1967, maintained that “in the past political leaders never questioned their obligation to maintain the civil peace forces; and law-enforcement agencies never questioned their responsibility to enforce the law.” Others denounced what they called “preferential treatment” of Negroes and asked whether the passage of more civil rights laws would not in fact give the Negro greater license to loot, burn, and pillage.

The hate press played heavily on the theme of a “Negro threat” to white America. Gerald L. K. Smith screeched in banner headlines in The Cross and The Flag, October 1967, “The Black Revolution Is On—Anarchy in Force!—America on Fire,” and blamed the riots on the Supreme Court, “the sappy preachers, insipid educators—and Moscow-trained agitators.” The Thunderbolt, official publication of the National States Rights party, bitterly protested that Negroes were given jobs as a reward for bloody rebellion; and White Power, the American Nazi party successor publication to the Rockwell Report, urged its followers: “The time was now at hand to stop the blacks.”

The casualness of the Ku Klux Klan’s response to the riots was surprising. Fiery Cross, official publication of the United Klans of America, merely deplored the eruption of violence and complained that its press releases on the riots were ignored by the newspapers. Subsequent Klan claims that it dispatched armed resistance groups to white areas to resist “Negro gangs which were roaming Newark” appeared to be nothing more than a sop to impress its members. Responsible police officials in Newark reported no Klan presence during the 1967 riots.

Middle-East Crisis

America’s right wing and, indeed, the ultraconservatives, have not been distinguished for their friendliness or sympathy for Israel. For years they called the Jewish state “socialistic” and, as such, anathema to America’s right wing. To some, Zionism somehow was thought to be akin to Communism, and editors of right-wing journals did little to clear up this misconception. Therefore it was surprising that a section of the right wing, those organiza-
tions with no programmed antisemitism, circumspectly, but unmistakably, showed a pro-Israel attitude. In the tense May days leading up to the actual outbreak of hostilities, there was some demand in their publications that the United States live up to its commitments to Israel by making arms available, and to help break the Egyptian blockade of the Strait of Tiran. However, the majority remained silent during a crisis, which in previous years and with different antagonists might have produced a harshly critical reaction.

It was only after Israel’s military victory and the confirmation of Russian involvement that the rightists came out strongly for Israel. Among the loudest in praise was the John Birch Society.\(^1\) Its organ *Review of the News* of July 5, 1967, in an unaccustomed vein, observed that “the nasty Israelis had put an end to the Russo-American scheme to install Comrade Gamel as undisputed Communist gauleiter in the area.” With more characteristic severity, the publication also declared that the United States “should treat the Israelis exactly as we should have treated the Hungarians if they had won in 1956— we should support them—firmly, openly and decisively.”

Surprising, too, was the mild reaction to the sinking by the Israelis of the *Liberty*, and the resultant loss of 44 American lives. With some exceptions, the right-wing press castigated the Defense Department for its “stupidity” in dispatching what was generally conceded to be an electronics intelligence-gathering ship to the war zone, and played down the fact that the ship was sunk by Israeli torpedoes at pointblank range.

The overwhelming Israeli military victory became the springboard for the rightist charge that United States policy towards Russia was timid, and for the advice that where Communist-oriented states confronted the United States, a “damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead” policy was the only effective and typically American response. But, above all, the magnitude of the Arab defeat provided the right wing with a rare opportunity to gloat over the reverses of the Soviet Union. However, on balance, it would be justifiable to conclude that the right wing did not love Israel more, but rather that it loved Nasser and the Russians less.

By contrast, the lunatic fringe antisemitic movement was in a difficult situation because of the contending forces in the Middle East war. For years they had proclaimed that Communism was but another manifestation of the international Jewish conspiracy. An enduring antisemitic equation has been that Judaism was Zionism, and Zionism was Communism. How then explain away Jewish armies fighting forces backed by Communist Russia?

Ultimately, Edward Fields, like most antisemites, maintained that “a giant hoax is being perpetrated upon the American people. They’re being fooled into believing that Communist Russia is supporting the Arabs in their confrontation with Israel.” It was only reasonable, wrote Fields, that the “heavily Jewish Soviet government would certainly aid their fellow Jews in Israel.”

Gerald L. K. Smith saw the Mid-East crisis as a “Jewish conspiracy” to “start a third world war in the Middle East, hoping that we [the United States] will enter it and thus be compelled to withdraw our forces from the Orient and surrender to Communism.” He asked rhetorically, “Now will we fight World War III to enthrone the Jews and enslave the Arabs and later ourselves?”

Thunderbolt, Common Sense, and The Cross and the Flag, all sought to prove at great length that the Russians were not really supporting the Arabs. Indeed, the July 1967 Thunderbolt attempted at some length to “prove” that Russia had made a “secret deal with Israel not to help the Arabs.”

If the right-wing extremist press sought to play down the sinking of the Liberty, the hate press used the tragedy as a reason to hate the perfidious Jews. The Thunderbolt demanded vengeance, while Common Sense brought old slogans up to date, “Remember the Alamo, remember Pearl Harbor, remember the Liberty.”

**Arab Propaganda**

In the wake of the six-day war, Arab propaganda in the United States increased perceptibly. In contrast to such efforts after the 1956 Arab-Israel hostilities, when professional propagandists tried to engage the antisemitic hate press in a campaign against Jews and Israel, the propaganda thrust in 1967 was a do-it-yourself venture. In the main, Arab students, Arab intellectuals, and Arab professors teaching on American college campuses articulated the Arab point of view. The quick closing of Egyptian and other Arab embassies and consulates in the United States in protest against alleged American military assistance to Israel, deprived the Arabs of more professional spokesmen.

Data and materials were supplied by the Arab information centers, maintained by the Arab League in New York, Dallas, Chicago, and San Francisco. Their propaganda, apparently carefully designed to avoid the charge of pandering to anti-Jewish prejudice, that frequently combined the legitimate presentation of the Arab point of view with the kind of anti-Israel and anti-Zionist propaganda that aroused hostility against all Jews. Official Arab statements concentrated on Israeli “atrocities,” using photographs of napalmed victims of Israeli “aggression” and the plight of the Arab refugees, and contained many accusations of pro-Israel bias or Zionist control of the American press. There were frequent allegations of wanton civilian killings, bombings of hospitals, and looting by Israeli soldiers, as well as assertions that Israel, peopled largely by victims of Hitler’s cruelty, had a war machine hardly distinguishable from Nazi militarists—a charge subsequently repeated by Communist and left-wing sources in the United States.
Ku Klux Klan

The Ku Klux Klan failed to make significant membership gains in 1967. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, in his annual report to the United States Attorney General on FBI activities in 1967 (released January 1968), declared that the 14 Klan organizations concentrated in the South had a total membership of 14,000 to 15,000. On December 11, 1967 the House Un-American Activities Committee made public a final report based on a three-year investigation of the Ku Klux Klan, which stated that, as of January 1967, the total Klan membership, exclusive of a handful of Northern adventurers, was 16,810. It would appear from these reports that the Klan in the South dropped during a period of heightened racial tensions.

The dominant characteristic of today's Ku Klux Klan continued to be its fragmentation—in sharp contrast to the flourishing, monolithic invisible empire it had been in the 1920s. The number of Klan groups fluctuated from month to month, but federal authorities pinpointed it as between 14 and 17. All these groups adhere to the broad organizational objectives of white supremacy, anti-Communism, anti-Catholicism and antisemitism, and had similar rituals and insignia. But the constant struggle for control among various competing leaders unwilling to share authority and, of course Klan-derived income, doubtless was an important factor in the failure of the groups to unite. Another was the absence of a leader, who was able to consolidate the various factions.

The largest and most influential of all American Klan groups was the Alabama-based United Klans of America, Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, led by Imperial Wizard Robert M. Shelton of Tuscaloosa. Other Klans known to be functioning in 1967 were the Association of Arkansas Klans; the Association of Georgia Klans; the Association of South Carolina Klans; the Dixie Klans, Knights of the Ku Klux Klans Inc.; Improved Order of the United States Klans, Knights of the Ku Klux Klans, Inc.; Militant Knights of the Ku Klux Klans; Mississippi Knights of the Ku Klux Klans; National Knights of the Ku Klux Klans, Inc.; Original Knights of the Ku Klux Klans; United States Klans, Knights of the United States Klans Inc.; United Florida Ku Klux Klans; United Knights of the Ku Klux Klans, and White Knights of the Ku Klux Klans.

Besides the off-again on-again existence of skeletal Klaverns in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Wisconsin, New York, New Jersey, and Michigan, with an estimated combined membership of 500, Klan efforts to secure a foothold outside the old Confederacy were unsuccessful. The units north of the Mason-Dixon line proved to be little more than outlets for individuals, enamored of Klan paraphernalia and ritual. Indeed, Detroit News reporter Michael Maharry, who penetrated the city's Ku Klux Klan and reported his

---

findings in a series of five articles concluded (April 14, 1967 issue), that the members of the Klan in Michigan, the largest of any state, except the South, "do not engage in organized violence. They do not use threats or intimidation to 'keep the niggers in their place.'" Reporter Maharry noted that, in fact, "they don't do much of anything."

The year's most startling development in Klan activity in the North was the December 28 disclosure by Chicago Police Superintendent James B. Conlisk, Jr., that a year-long investigation by his department had uncovered six city patrolmen who were members of the Ku Klux Klan and that a raid on their homes produced a supply of weapons, 20,000 rounds of ammunition, and a quantity of hate literature. While Klan penetration of police departments and sheriff's offices in the deep South was not uncommon, the Chicago affiliation was the first known case of Northern police department membership since the 1920s.

At the end of 1967 the Ku Klux Klan had lost all popular appeal. With the main thrust of the summer's riots in Northern cities, it failed to recruit members among Northern whites. In the South, which, with the exception of Atlanta, was spared racial disorders, but nonetheless was apprehensive about Negro militancy, membership declined.

Perhaps, primary among reasons for the Klan's failure to exert a major role in Southern life was that Klan attitudes on the Negro were now shared by a substantial majority of Southerners. Legitimate Negro aspirations could be thwarted through the ballot box, a much safer and easier method than bullets or burnings. Then, too, the Klan for all its romanticized past, has suffered a total loss of status. Status is important in Southern life, and the Klan has lost it because the genteel folk of white Southern society look with abhorrence on the Klan's crudities and disrespect for law and order. Even the widespread use of scores of front organizations operating as hunting, fishing, or gun clubs (AJYB, 1966 [Vol. 67], p. 125), a thinly disguised way of providing Klan affiliation without the present stigma attached to membership, failed to lure the wary.

Another significant factor which discouraged membership was the growing inclination by local authorities to prosecute Klansmen for indictable acts of violence. More importantly, there was a discernible effort by the federal government to step in and prosecute in situations where city, country, or state was reluctant to enforce the law when breached by Klansmen, or where local juries refused either to indict or convict despite damning evidence. Utilizing the broad "conspiracy against the rights of citizens" section of the U.S. Code (Section 241, Title 18), the U.S. Department of Justice prosecuted members of the United Klans of America who had been accused and absolved of the fatal shooting of Lt. Col. Lemuel Penn, a prominent Negro federal official, on a Georgia highway in July 1964.

In a far-reaching and significant case, the Justice Department took legal action against seven Mississippi Klan terrorists who were convicted in October
by a federal court, with a Mississippi empaneled jury, of participating in a 
Ku Klux Klan conspiracy to murder three young civil rights workers in 
Neshoba County. That a federal jury of Mississippi citizens convicted white 
Mississippians, though on a conspiracy rather than a murder charge, after 
repeated nonfeasance in local courts was a serious, if not fatal, blow to the sur-
vival of the indigenous White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, the most vio-
lent of all Klan splinter groups in the United States. Damaging testimony was 
offered against the defendants by federal agents who had infiltrated the Klan 
and become key leaders. FBI penetration of various Klans also was a strong 
deterrent to the growth of Klan membership.

Despite anti-Catholic and anti-Jewish trappings, the overriding Klan objec-
tive remained the preservation of “white supremacy,” as indicated by the 
hearings. Violence attributable to the Klan has been targeted against Negroes 
or those whites indicted by the Klan as “nigger lovers.” The House Un-Ameri-
can Activities Committee noted 3 that there were relatively few reports of 
any overt Klan action aimed against Jews and Catholics in recent years, and 
concluded:

Klan activity targeted against Jews appears in the main to consist of the dissemi-
nation of anti-Semitic literature seeking to create animosity and social ostracism 
of Jews and indeed Catholics and aliens. 4 The extent and quantity of such litera-
ture cannot be measured, but its distinguishing characteristic promotes the under-
lying theme that contemporary scalawags are the “alien thieves and traitors 
who control the United States government and the Communist-directed com-
bination of Negroes and Jews.”

John Birch Society

Despite reports in the early part of 1967 of a precipitous drop in the mem-
bership of the society, it managed to show signs of a rapid recovery. Receipts 
for the year totaled $4,258,000, as against $4,089,000 in 1966. Birch Society 
members spent another estimated $1.5 million on billboards and local adver-
tising, and planned to hire eight new full-time and 24 part-time coordinators. 
The Birchites were able to send to various congressmen mass petitions with 
675,000 signatures, urging an all-out drive for a Vietnam victory. The Birch 
Society fronts TACT (Truth About Civil Turmoil), Support Your Local 
Police, and TRAINE (To Restore American Independence Now) were active 
on the local level. With the exception of the lunatic fringe, America’s ultra-
right wing never officially espoused a hate program. Yet, there has been 
increasing seepage of antisemitism into the movement. The John Birch So-
ciety, which remained the largest, most tightly disciplined, and perhaps most 
effective right wing extremist group, continued to promote the works of 
antisemitic authoress Nesta Webster, while its founder, Robert Welch, dis-

3 The Present-Day Ku Klux Klan Movement, op. cit., p. 75.
4 The perpetrators of bombing outrages in the fall of 1967 against the home and synagogue 
of Jackson, Miss. Rabbi Perry Nussbaum, an outspoken advocate of Negro civil rights, while 
 presumed to be Klansmen, have not as yet been positively identified (p. 238).
missed the whole issue of antisemitism in America by simply calling it one of the chief Communist weapons. According to him, the Communist method of doing irreparable harm to anti-Communists was to accuse them of antisemitism. But in order to do so, the Communists logically must insure that there is enough antisemitism by fomenting it.

**Liberty Lobby**

Liberty Lobby grew in importance as a catalyst of extreme rightist activity. Its publication *Liberty Letter*, as reported by *Group Research Report* of December 29, 1967, had the widest circulation of any right-wing publication. Originally formed to influence pending legislation, Liberty Lobby now openly called for the capture of the Republican party. Columnist Drew Pearson, in a series of newspaper articles apparently based on Liberty Lobby files, claimed late in 1966 that they revealed "a conspiracy against both Jews and Negroes." He described Willis Carto, its founder and still a vital force in the movement, as an open admirer of Adolph Hitler. Listed on Liberty Lobby's policy board in 1967 were antisemites Kenneth Goff; Joseph P. Kamp; Ned Touchstone, publisher of a viciously racist and antisemitic periodical, *The Councilor*, and Professor Austin App, a Nazi apologist. Allen Zoll, a notorious and active Christian Front antisemite of the pre-World War II days, joined Liberty Lobby's professional staff in 1967.

Through Carto's efforts, *Western Destiny*, a magazine of intellectual racism, merged with the *Washington Observer*, a Liberty Lobby newsletter with growing antisemitic tendencies. The once respected *American Mercury* magazine, which had become a viciously antisemitic sheet under Russell Maguire's ownership and ceased publication in the early 1960's, reappeared with strong Liberty Lobby backing. On its editorial board were Austin App and David Hoggan, both open Nazi apologists. Among its contributing editors were such known antisemites as W. Henry McFarland; Richard Cotten, radio broadcaster and publisher of *Conservative Viewpoint*, Curtis Dall, Joseph P. Kamp, and Ned Touchstone.

**The Minutemen**

New Orleans District attorney James Garrison, maintained (*Playboy Magazine*, October 1967) that President John F. Kennedy was assassinated by anti-Castro Cuban exiles operating, at the "control level," under the direction "of a number of people of ultra-right wing persuasion, not simply conservatives, but people who could be described as neo-Nazis, including a small clique that had defected from the Minutemen because it considered that group too liberal." So far, no federal fact-finding agency or responsible investigator has been able to prove the existence of such a group. However, there was no doubt about the existence of a potentially dangerous Minutemen movement. On October 25, New York State Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz, at a press conference marking the conclusion of a lengthy and exhaustive
investigation of the Minutemen by his office, reported that the Minutemen were active in 15 states; that their members included policemen, national guardsmen, members of the armed forces, doctors, teachers, public servants, and employees in sensitive industries, and that fanatics among them were prepared to assassinate high-ranking governmental officials. Lefkowitz concluded that they were a potential threat to the peace and security of New York and other states.

A previous investigation and report, *Para Military Operations in California, April 1965*, prepared under the direction of California Attorney General Thomas C. Lynch, stated that "The founders [of the Minutemen] arrogated to themselves the right to pass judgment on what was pro-American, and what was anti-American." After concluding that the Minutemen were in fact "insurgents," having their own military force, the report recommended, without indicating how, that their activities in California be curbed.

While the total national membership of the Minutemen organization was probably less than 10,000, the fanaticism of its members, their access to arms and ammunition, their addiction to violence, and their apparent readiness to condemn those with whom they disagree, all point to a potential for doing considerable harm.

Originally avoiding politics, the Minutemen established in spring 1966 the Patriotic party as "the political arm of an overall resistance movement," although they had no hopes that it would be a third party in 1967. As Robert DePugh, leader of the Minutemen said in a special message to key members, "no third party can possibly be developed in the short period of freedom that remains in the U.S." (Kansas City *Star*, November 5, 1967). During the year, the Minutemen also departed from a previously-held tenet that racism and antisemitism were not to be tolerated. It began to attract racists and rightists; it changed from a group, whose literature originally consisted primarily of training manuals into one stocking the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. It now accepted antisemites as members, and the notorious long-time antisemite Kenneth L. Goff became one of its top speakers.

**American Nazi Party**

The sniper's bullet which killed George Lincoln Rockwell on August 25 may have put an end to the American Nazi party. The shot fired by John Patler, one-time Rockwell confidante and high in the party hierarchy before his expulsion for protesting too vehemently against the partiality to Nordic types within the party, highlighted the intra-party warfare and disillusionment of many of Rockwell's followers.

In its nine-year existence, the Rockwell-conceived and Rockwell-commanded party became the most widely publicized antisemitic force in the United States. Rockwell's flare made him and it internationally notorious.

---

5 Patler was found guilty of Rockwell's murder on December 16, 1967 by an Arlington, Va. county jury.
Stunts such as troopers picketing the White House during the Eisenhower administration with such signs as "Save Ike from the kikes," staging counter-demonstrations to the then regular civil-rights marches, with members dressed in guerrilla costumes; sending into the Congress chambers a member made up as a Negro, who carried the sign: "I's the Mississippi delegate;" and strutting around America's streets in what looked like Nazi uniforms with swastika armbands, were sure-fire media copy.

At no time did the party's ranks exceed 150. But Rockwell propelled it into the forefront of the hate movement. His followers, for the most part political illiterates and often men with criminal records, who did not understand the Nazi philosophy and cared less, joined the American Nazi party for several reasons. Rockwell's personality held them in the movement. Rockwell allegedly left a will bequeathing party command to his deputy, Matthias Koehl, Jr. The 33-year-old Koehl, a dark, intense, articulate man who, before his involvement with the American Nazi party, belonged to other hate groups, lacked Rockwell's flare, leadership, ability, and personal magnetism. Under Koehl's leadership, the party has virtually disintegrated. A few units, notably the one in Los Angeles, moved to become autonomous rather than follow Koehl. There was some evidence that, immediately before his death, Rockwell tried to eliminate one important deterrent to the party's growth—the avowed declaration that it was a Nazi party—and to capitalize on growing white backlash. In January Rockwell changed the name of his group to National Socialist White People's party, and that of its organ from The Stormtrooper to White Power.

Other Antisemitic Activity

Other right-wing extremist groups veering toward antisemitism included the Congress of Freedom and Women for Constitutional Government. The former bestowed merit awards on Gerald L. K. Smith, and others of his ilk. The latter featured antisemitic speakers and opened the pages of its organ Woman Constitutionalist (July 1967), to Opal Tanner White, a long-time confidential secretary and close ally of Gerald L. K. Smith, for the promotion of Maurice Pinay's violently antisemitic book, The Plot against the Church.

The Let Freedom Ring telephone network, conceived and promoted by Dr. William Campbell Douglass, a Sarasota, Fla. physician and a self-proclaimed member of the John Birch Society, continued to carry tape recordings of right-wing messages to telephone dialers in approximately 100 American cities. For the first time, in 1967, one of its messages was antisemitic in character, charging that the hallucinatory drug LSD was being manufactured by the Weizmann Institute in Israel and smuggled into the United States as the institute's contribution to the Communist design for destroying the moral fiber of American cities.
Third Party Movement

For the first time in many years a political force with clear racist and potentially antisemitic overtones emerged in the United States. In January supporters of former Alabama Governor George Wallace openly launched a Wallace-for-President Club movement. Among its prominent figures were former Selma, Ala., sheriff, Jim Clark and Asa (Ace) Carter, a key figure in several racist and antisemitic organizations in the late 1950s. Carter first achieved notoriety when he led a faction of violent activists out of the Citizens' Councils of Alabama to form an antisemitic splinter group, the North Alabama Citizens' Council. He also had been organizer of the original Ku Klux Klan of the Confederacy and a close collaborator of John Kasper, the founder of the now extinct antisemitic Seaboard White Citizens' Council.

Other workers for Wallace were Karl Allen, former deputy commander of the American Nazi party in Virginia, and Gerald L. K. Smith in Hollywood, California. In Ohio, Wallace's candidacy was promoted by the George Wallace Christian Conservative party, a Cleveland-based group whose campaign headquarters featured racist and rightist literature, as well as antisemitic material, such as *The Talmud Unmasked*, written by Col. Eugene Sanctuary under the pseudonym Justin B. Pranaitis, and Henry Ford's *The International Jew*.

Among the organized groups working for Wallace were the Liberty Lobby, segments of the John Birch Society, Citizens' Councils, and the Ku Klux Klan. In the spring Imperial Wizard Robert Shelton boasted, "We have made him Governor and we must make him President." The National States Rights party promoted Wallace-for-president material and distributed campaign buttons as well as Bill Jones’ official biography, *The Wallace Story*. In March, the miniscule, crudely antisemitic Sons of Liberty declared its support of Wallace, as did the late George Lincoln Rockwell. Wallace pointedly has refused to repudiate the support of any of these groups.

Milton Ellerin