The Jewish Community

Demography

The results of Canada's decennial census, held on June 1, 1971, have not yet been published. However, as early as April, Louis Rosenberg, research director emeritus of the Canadian Jewish Congress, issued his own estimates of what he believed to be the population of the Jewish community at the time. He based his figures, he said, on the 1961 census and official government statistics for the years 1961-1966, as well as on the assumption that the rate of natural increase of the Jewish population (excess of births over deaths) during the 1961-1971 decade was approximately the same as during the years 1955-1960, the latest period for which statistics were available. Below are his estimates for the provinces, as they compare with the 1961 census figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>1961 Government Census</th>
<th>1971 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>109,344</td>
<td>131,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>104,727</td>
<td>126,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>19,981</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>2,710</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>7,816</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>6,045</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Isle</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West Territories</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Yukon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Canada</td>
<td>254,368</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rosenberg also estimated the Jewish population of the major Canadian centers as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City (Metropolitan)</th>
<th>1961 Census</th>
<th>1971 Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>102,724</td>
<td>113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>88,724</td>
<td>97,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>19,376</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>7,301</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>5,533</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>3,858</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>2,495</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>1,315</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regrettably, the figures do not take into account demographic studies undertaken by several local communities, most notably Toronto. The findings of the Toronto community study were significantly higher than Rosenberg's estimates: 110,000, as compared to 97,000.

A major reason for this discrepancy was that the Rosenberg estimates did not take into account the major immigrations from Israel and America during the 1961–1971 decade.

**Israeli and American Immigration**

The 1960s saw the arrival in Canada of large numbers of "landed immigrants" from two unexpected sources: Israel and the United States. Both were determined by unusual factors, and both may indeed have a long-term bearing on the future of the Canadian Jewish community.

It is reliably estimated that, by 1971, some 25,000 Israelis had come to Canada, most of them during the economic recession in Israel, which lasted from 1965 through May 1967. Several hundred went to Ontario's smaller cities, Winnipeg and Vancouver; of the rest, about half settled in Toronto, and half in Montreal, so that the Jewish population of each has been increased by about 10,000 in a very short space of time.

The integration of the yordim into the Canadian Jewish community has often been minimal, and always difficult. Currently, in their middle age (many now were past forty) they said they would return to Israel "one day," when they were financially well off. Most have not been as successful as they had anticipated; at the same time, they were afraid of starting all over again in Israel. Yet, paradoxically, they also were reluctant to identify with the local Canadian Jewish community, which has been very generous in its support of Israel and working hard to help new Jewish immigrants come to
the country. As a result, these 25,000 Jews remained, for the most part tragic, marginal men.

Jewish immigrants from the United States too, were posing unique problems for Canada's Jewish community. Some of them were academics who found positions on the burgeoning Canadian university campuses. In 1971, "academic revolts" broke out against "imported" American professors on campuses across the country. Most others came because of the Vietnam war and their protest against it. No one in Canada knew exactly how many Americans of draft age had in fact come, how many of them were Jews.

Some observers suggested that, by 1971, as many as 80,000 young American war protesters had moved to Canada, and that at least 20,000 of them were Jews. Some 10,000 of the latter were believed to be in Toronto, 7,500 in Vancouver, and the rest in Montreal. A much more likely and reasonable estimate, however, put the maximum number of American Jews at 8,000, out of a total of some 30,000 draft protesters. Of these 8,000 it is believed some 2,000 to 3,000 lived in Toronto, 3,000 to 4,000 in Vancouver, and about 1,000 in Montreal. In any case, thousands of young American Jews of draft age set down roots in Canada, and thousands more seemed to be contemplating such a move. Many of these youths, alienated as they were from America—as well as from American Judaism—were not very willing to identify with the larger Canadian Jewish scene, even after the passage of time. Canadian Jewish social agencies have only begun to deal with this problem. Not unlike the Israeli newcomers, they are marginal immigrant Jews to Canada.

Major Jewish Movements: Identity Crisis, 1971-Style

Following the example of the American Jewish Congress, the Jews of Canada established in 1919 the Canadian Jewish Congress (CJC), a democratically-elected, single, national representative organization, also called the "parliament of Canadian Jewry." By 1920, shortly after the end of the Versailles peace conference, it had become totally inactive. From 1939 through the mid-1960s however, CJC remained virtually unchallenged as the principal voice and major national spokesman of Canadian Jewry. In 1971 CJC was suffering a crisis of confidence in all parts of the country. Montrealer Monroe Abbey, Q.C., who had served as its president since 1968, was succeeded by Winnipeger Sol Kanee, at a stormy CJC plenary assembly held in Montreal in mid-November. The young Jews had become somewhat disenchanted with the "old guard" leadership of Congress. Its stand on Soviet Jewry, which currently became positive and more activist, had been lethargic, often passive, during the decade of the 1960s.

And, while in Quebec, CJC advocated assistance to Jewish day schools, in Ontario, it remained aloof from the question, preferring to concentrate its attention on issues of church versus state in the teaching of religion in
the public school system. It repeatedly presented briefs to the Ontario government (the last in June), maintaining that "in accordance with the best interests of education in Ontario the course in religious instruction should be discontinued." The projection in 1971 of a high-school course in "World Religions" to replace a sectarian Protestant-oriented course, which had been part of the curriculum since 1944, was perhaps more a tribute to the growing awareness of the pluralistic religious nature of the Province, than to the efforts of Congress, which, in fact, only grudgingly accepted this idea.

Outside Quebec and Alberta, where provincial grants were given to all denominational schools, Congress tended to line up against such aid. In Ontario, which had the largest number of Jewish day schools, Congress remained neutral on the issue. For those who wished to express what seemed to be a growing Jewish grass-roots opinion in Ontario in favor of government aid, a vigorous campaign was instituted by a newly-formed group, the Ontario Committee for Government Aid to Jewish Day Schools, founded and headed by Toronto's Rabbi Stuart E. Rosenberg. Despite the many thousands who joined across the province, despite the joint effort with Protestant and some Catholic groups working in the same field, this committee failed in its immediate objectives, when the Progressive-Conservative party, headed by William Davis, former minister of education, and now prime minister of Ontario, swept into office with a large majority. Davis had campaigned on a program specifically denying aid to Catholic schools beyond the tenth grade, and altogether refusing aid to Jewish or Protestant religious day schools on the ground that they were private schools. The Rosenberg committee made it clear to Jews, Christians, and government alike that, should state aid ever be given—as even Manitoba was then contemplating—Jews would no longer be overlooked.

The Canadian Jewish Congress could point to some further extension of its pioneering efforts in various provinces to establish and promote human-rights codes, and fair employment practices acts. The government of Newfoundland proclaimed a human-rights code, to become effective on March 31, 1971. While the code covered public accommodation and employment, it did not deal with housing. With the enactment of similar legislation in Prince Edward Isle in 1970, all ten Canadian provinces had by then some form or other of antidiscrimination law.

But aside from these achievements—which has given Congress a stance principally of an antidefamation, civic-defense type of organization, rather than of the "Jewish parliament" it claimed to be—it had many other serious problems to face. For example, it completely failed with regard to most religious issues affecting Canadian Jews. There is no synagogue council of a national, transdenominational type. For some years, CJC tried to assume the role of such a body through its National Religious Affairs Committee. In 1971 it even set wheels in motion to establish an activist program that would not be bogged down by differences among Reform, Conservative and
Orthodox Jews, and sought to have a national conference to deal with these matters. Yet even on such limited questions as kashrut in penal institutions, civil service regulation on observance of Jewish holy days; religious broadcasting, and interfaith dialogues and contacts, there was no real agreement. The CJC Religious Affairs Committee was in search of a program. To date, it has achieved little by way of serious cooperation among the various Jewish denominations.

Nor was there great cooperation among the growing number of new central power structures of the various metropolitan welfare funds, which objected to CJC's desire to retain its old role as the single, central spokesman for Canadian Jewry.

Indeed, by 1971 even the leadership of Congress, particularly some of the younger men, was wondering out loud about the organization's future.

The problems facing us are serious. A different community is emerging. Consider some changes:

- The community's rank and file are a different breed from a generation ago. Most Canadian Jews are Canadian born, worshipping very different household gods from those lares and penates of their fathers and grandfathers; the high proportion of the population under 35 is a factor of great significance; the ratio of college students and college graduates to 1,000 of the population is tremendously higher than the ratio in previous generations of Canadian Jews; the foreign-born of our population has a very high percentage of people whose experience in the Europe of the 30's and 40's was very dissimilar from that of the Jewish immigrants of the late 19th and early 20th century. And to this must be added an entirely new accretion of population—those born and brought up in the ambience of an Arab civilization; the stabilizing influence of religion in the life of the majority of the pre-1940 population is significant by its very absence or by the markedly changed role of religion in the life of the ostensibly religiously committed individuals; the cynicism of today's population is in direct antithesis to the more comfortable and more naive attitudes of former years; the impact of Israel on the inner feelings of Canadian Jews and its reflection in attitudes cannot at all be evaluated in the same comparison scale with the influence of pre-1918 Zionism. A former generation's lingering adhesion of ghetto life has been shed to be replaced by a new, vigorous, and healthy diaspora Jewish posture and meaning; the affluence of North American society has changed the course and meaning of its Jewish component; the younger element, imitatively or thoughtfully, are "fed up" with established institutions and community leadership or, worse, are apathetic to them.*

- It has been jocularly said that when Washington sneezes Ottawa catches cold. The same truism may apply to the two Jewries—of the United States and Canada. After World War I, when the Jewish community in the United States had grown considerably and began to reflect a broader diversity, it became impossible for a single American Jewish organization to serve as a central spokesman or national coordinator of Jewish affairs. A similar process may have started to take shape just now in Canadian Jewish life. Could

---

Congress still retain its role in a larger, better educated, more ideologically diverse, and thus more complex Jewish community? Indeed, in an age of so-called participatory democracy, could, or should, any single group purport to speak for "all" Jews? Even in Canada?

Zionist Activity

The Canadian Jewish community has never had a significant number of anti-Zionists, but, like the Canadian Jewish Congress, the old-line Zionist organizations were suffering serious organizational problems in 1971. In February 1967, at the urging of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem, the Federated Zionist Organization of Canada (FZOC) was established in an attempt to replace the traditional pre-State Zionist party structure. However, by 1970, FZOC already was on the verge of falling apart. The Zionist Organization of Canada, which had prided itself on its nonalignment stance, moved its head office from Montreal to Toronto and was making ready to join the World Confederation of General Zionists. FZOC thus became merely a roof organization, with each of its component groups still retaining its own party structure and organizational alignment.

Also, the Canada-Israel Committee (CIC), a public-relations network set up after the 1967 Arab-Israel war jointly by Congress, the Zionists, and the B'nai B'rith, fell apart in 1971, when B'nai B'rith refused to go along with decisions unless they were unanimous and pulled out, taking its budgetary allotments with it. At year's end, CIC had not yet been put together again, although its so-called national office had been moved from Toronto to Montreal.

During the last months of 1971, there was concerted effort by the major Canadian Zionist parties—including paid advertisements in the Jewish press—to solicit votes for their delegates to the World Zionist Congress, scheduled for January 1972 in Jerusalem. However, a great deal of public resentment was aroused by the election which served to politicize Canadian Zionism and divide parties even more, and ultimately brought no serious or basic change in the previous patterns of representation at Zionist congresses. As in the years since 1967, Zionist work was essentially fund raising by the United Israel Appeal (Keren Ha-yesod), Bonds for Israel, the Jewish National Fund, and similar nation-wide efforts to help rebuild Israel and absorb its new immigrants.

Canada-Israel Relations

The most important step forward in Israel's relations with Canada was the inauguration, in March 1971, after many years of negotiations with the Canadian government, of bilateral air services from Montreal to Lod airport, including several nonstop El Al flights weekly. Canadian Pacific Airlines was awarded the reciprocal rights to fly to Israel, El Al continued
to press for landing rights in Toronto, which, by far, had the largest traffic to Israel, but the Canadian government continued to refuse to grant such rights.

An Israel Government Tourist Office with headquarters in Montreal, was opened in Toronto—another indication of the growing interest in travel to Israel from the Ontario region. (Indeed by 1972, the national office had been transferred to Toronto.)

Israel aliya centers operated in Montreal and Toronto; but still another indication of the growing importance of Toronto as a major center for Israel-oriented commercial activity was the relocation, late in 1970, of the office of the Israel Trade Commissioner for Canada, from Montreal to that city. Menachem Lahat took up the post of trade commissioner late in 1970.

There were also several changes in the Israel diplomatic corps in Canada. Israeli Ambassador to Canada Ephraim Evron, who became a deputy foreign minister in Israel, was replaced by Theodore Meron, a legal expert and former legal adviser to the Israel foreign ministry.

Abba Gefen, consul-general in Toronto was succeeded by Lieutenant Colonel Jacob Monbaz, the consul-general in Montreal. David Ephrati became consul-general in Montreal.

Public Opinion on Peace in the Middle East

A Canadian Gallup poll in 1971 on the question, "Do you think that peace between the Israelis and Arabs is, or is not, possible?" reported the following findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent's education</th>
<th>Peace is possible (Per cent)</th>
<th>Peace is not possible (Per cent)</th>
<th>Can't say (Per cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school/technical</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The poll also gave a choice of three possible concessions Israel might make to Arab demands, and the results for all respondents were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concession</th>
<th>Approval (Per cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Withdraw to its original frontiers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return most of the Arab territory it now occupies, but retain some of it, such as Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep all, or most, of the territory it now occupies</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arab Propaganda in Canada

While the United Church Observer, under the editorship of A. C. Forrest, continued to act as an editorial mouthpiece for Arab claims and demands, the general impact of groups supporting al Fatah and their ilk was clearly on the wane in 1971. This doubtless reflected the defeat of the Palestinian terrorists in Jordan, but also the strong condemnation by the Canadian press of the September 1970 hijacking of planes to Jordan. The direct result was that, in 1971, Canadian newspapers carried few if any, editorials supporting Arab terrorist claims, as had often been the case before. On the contrary, the weight of editorial opinion, even of news coverage, throughout Canada was clearly seen to be shifting toward a more moderate, if not totally pro-Israel position. President of Egypt Anwar al-Sadat's empty threat that 1971 would be the "year of decision," also did not go unnoticed in most Canadian newspapers, and strongly influenced Canadian public opinion.

Activity in Support of Soviet Jewry

One of the most significant and useful of Jewish activities, and perhaps the best coordinated in 1971, was the special effort made in behalf of Soviet Jews during the Soviet Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin's visit to Canada in October. An estimated 10,000 persons participated in the national demonstration which took place in Ottawa on October 19. Participants came by car and by chartered buses from Montreal, and Toronto, and from other communities. The entire Ottawa Jewish community took part. On the day preceding the demonstration, rabbis from cities in every part of the country assembled in the city for a 24-hour study and prayer vigil.

On October 21, the day of Kosygin's visit to Montreal, a mass rally attended by 2,000 persons was held in the city's Place Bonaventure Exhibition Hall. At the conclusion of the rally, the crowd joined the Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry in a spontaneous manifestation opposite the Queen Elizabeth Hotel, where Kosygin stayed.

The Actions Committee for Soviet Jewry in Vancouver, Toronto, and Edmonton arranged mass demonstrations to coincide with Kosygin's visit to those cities. The events were widely reported by the press, television and radio. The Vancouver manifestation, which drew a crowd of 2,000, took place in the Provincial Court House Square across from Kosygin's hotel. Religious services were held and a group of demonstrators who managed to get into the hotel lobby past police guards, sang Jewish religious songs. No move was made to eject them. The press quoted a spokesman as saying that "they were not protesting against Mr. Kosygin's visit but were lending their support to Jewish demands for right to freedom of worship and freedom to practice the Jewish religion in Russia."
In Edmonton a torch parade was arranged, including an automobile caravan from Calgary.

In Toronto, there was a continuous vigil in front of Kosygin's hotel, from six o'clock in the evening of October 24 until early the next morning, when Kosygin left Toronto. It culminated in a march, that evening, to a field close to the Ontario Science Centre, where the Soviet premier was addressing a dinner meeting of the Canadian Manufacturer's Association. An estimated 10,000 to 12,000 persons participated in these activities.

**Developments in Education**

**QUEBEC**

A historic amendment to the Education Act on Franchise of Jews was introduced by the Minister of Education Guy St. Pierre to enable Jews in certain areas in Montreal to vote in the 1971 school board elections.

The amendment, which was unanimously adopted by the National Assembly on March 30 and became effective immediately, read:

1) . . . This section [580 of the Education Act (Revised Statutes, 1964, chapter 235)] shall not be interpreted as depriving a person professing the Jewish religion of the right conferred by other parts of this act, to vote and to be a school commissioner for any school municipality contemplated in section 46 or 49, except as regards the Protestant Board of School Commissioners of the City of Montreal, the Protestant Board of School Trustees for the City of Outremont and the Protestant Board of School Trustees of the City of Verdun.

2) This act shall come into force on the day of its sanction.

An explanatory note to the amendment states:

This Bill confirms the right of persons professing the Jewish religion to vote in school elections and to become School commissioners in certain parts of the Montreal region.

**School Enrollment of Jewish Children in Montreal**

The number of Jewish children attending Jewish Day Schools in Montreal in the 1971–72 school year was 5,062, of whom 382 were in nurseries, 563 in kindergarten, 3,261 in elementary grades, and 856 in high schools. The figures for 1970–71 were: 5,020, of whom 415 were in nurseries, 596 in kindergarten, 3,254 in elementary grades, and 765 in high schools. 2,213 children were enrolled in the 16 existing afternoon schools. The figure for 1970–71 was 2,622.

The number of Jewish children attending Protestant schools under the jurisdiction of the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal was 10,477 (5,050 in elementary schools and 5,427 in high schools). The figure for 1970–71 was 11,748 (6,083 in elementary schools and 5,665 in high schools).

All Jewish day schools had associate status with the Protestant School
Boards of Greater Montreal and of Greater St. Martin. One school operated within the framework of the Catholic School Commission.

The Quebec Minister of Education Guy St. Pierre advised the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal and Ben Beutel, president of the Association of Jewish Day Schools in Montreal, that the agreements between the Jewish day schools and the Protestant School Board of Greater Montreal for the continuation of associate status had been approved and thus become operative for the 1971-72 school year. They provided for a $365 grant per pupil from kindergarten to the seventh grade, and $540 per student in the eighth to eleventh grades for general studies; the costs of the Hebrew studies have been borne by parents and the Jewish schools.

ONTARIO

In 1971, the Ontario Department of Education authorized the teaching of languages, other than those currently permitted in high school, which would also allow for instruction in modern Hebrew. The language program in Ontario had been limited to English, French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish, Latin, and classical Greek. Additional courses were to be confined to students in the senior division, and would be taught by persons holding basic Ontario certification and having fluency in the particular language. It was expected that in North York (Toronto) with the country's largest school board, Modern Hebrew would be introduced in September 1972.

The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, which conducted a three-year survey of textbooks used in the public high schools of that province, discovered that none of the textbooks examined gave an "adequate" presentation of "what must be considered one of the most atrocious chapters in the whole history of mankind"—the Nazi treatment of Jews and other minorities. The information was compiled in a 130-page volume, Teaching Prejudice, which was prepared by Garnet McDiarmid and David Pratt of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education for reporting to the Ontario Human Rights Commission. The writers noted:

On the whole, the texts mention only Jews among the persecuted groups and are vague about the total number killed. Most of the discussions neglect to mention the philosophical or social roots of anti-Semitism, the Allied failure to assist the Jews, or the Nazis' treatment of political opponents, gypsies, Slavs, and Poles. Above all, there is little or no attempt to indicate to students that the gas chambers and ovens of such concentration camps as Dachau, Auschwitz, and Treblinka are the outcome of discrimination against minorities taken to its extreme conclusion.

HIGHER JEWISH EDUCATION IN CANADA

In 1971 additional courses in Judaica were introduced at McGill and Sir George Williams universities in Montreal, the University of Toronto, and
the University of Manitoba. York University, in Toronto, also offered several courses in modern Hebrew. In all, well over 1,000 students were enrolled in Jewish Studies courses at Canadian universities.

The establishment of Jewish studies programs was supported by the Canadian Foundation for Jewish Culture with several grants to universities and guidance to students at various institutions in moving toward the establishment of such programs. It also provided scholarship grants and graduate fellowships to Canadian scholars working in the field of Judaica. President of the Foundation was Rabbi Stuart E. Rosenberg; chairman of its academic review committee was Dr. Louis D. Levine of the University of Toronto and the Royal Ontario Museum.

Ontario Sunday Observance Law

Since 1906, the Federal Lord’s Day Act has “protected” the day of rest of the majority, but defaulted “in the protection of the Sabbath of other faiths.” Thus began a brief submitted by the central region of the Canadian Jewish Congress to the Ontario Law Reform Commission on Sunday Observance Laws, April 1970. The Ontario Lord’s Day Act was enacted only in 1960–61 for the purpose of establishing more restricted exemptions from, and exceptions to, the federal act.

The brief explained:

In the years since 1950 there has been an expansion of the excepted activities and more and more municipalities have passed bylaws permitting Sunday sports, movies and theatrical performances. . . . In this area Ontario has taken advantage of its right to exempt but no step has ever been taken in the province to alleviate the position of the person who, for religious reasons, observes a day of rest other than Sunday. For instance, the Jew who observes his Sabbath will close down his place of business, if he is in business, from Friday sundown to Saturday sundown. He must then suffer the added disability of keeping closed on Sunday, a penalty imposed by a law which has given no recognition to those citizens who, for reasons of faith, observe a rest day other than the first day of the week . . .

. . . It is a distinct irony of history that the religious community which originated the concept of one day’s rest in seven and gave it to the world should in this country wind up with its own adherents penalized and suffering a kind of religio-economic discrimination for observing this very historical precept—because a statute was enacted stemming from the religious ideal. This is a disability which seriously detracts from the vaunted religious freedom of our society and our law . . .

. . . What we ask is that provision be made to enable Sabbath-observant persons, who refrain from work or business on the seventh day of the week, to engage in such work or business on the first day of the week. This is a principle widely recognized in numerous jurisdictions and is essential to rectify the omission of these many decades . . .

In March 1971, the Sunday Observance Report by the Ontario Law Reform Commission rejected exemption for Jewish and other Sabbath observers.
The Jewish Press

There were two developments in Jewish journalism. The Yiddish paper, Kanader Adler—Jewish Eagle, founded in 1907 in Montreal, and published on a non-profit basis by the Jewish Cultural Association, changed to tabloid-size. The weekly was to have an expanded section in Yiddish, as well as sections in English, French, and Hebrew.

After ten years of publication, the English-language weekly Canadian Jewish News was purchased from its private owner in July by three community leaders, Ray Wolfe, Murray Koffler, and Al Latner, as a “corporation without share capital.” It received indirect subvention from the United Jewish Welfare Fund of Toronto, since it was mailed weekly free of charge to the more than 20,000 contributors to the fund. Apparently, the Jewish community was increasingly unwilling to support a privately-owned Jewish press.

Literary Efforts

Canada’s Jewish poet laureate A. M. Klein was the subject of a book by Miriam Waddington, the Canadian poetess and teacher of English at York University (A. M. Klein; published by Copp, Clark). Mordecai Richler described Jewish life in the Montreal of his childhood in his book, St. Urbain’s Horsemen (McClelland and Stewart). The Werner Family, a novel by Canadian Stephen Nadasy, was published in New York (Vantage Press). In Baneful Domination (Longman’s), Glen Frankfurter discussed Canadian identity.


A single, important volume of poetry to appear was Nail Polish, by Irving Layton, one of Canada’s greatest poets (McClelland and Stewart); a volume of Layton’s Collected Poems, also was published during the year.

Personalia

In Manitoba, Justice Samuel Freedman, long time chancellor of the University of Manitoba, was appointed by Prime Minister Trudeau as Chief Justice of the province. The leaders of the minority parties were also Jews: Sidney Spivack, Winnipeg lawyer and the former minister of industry and
commerce in Duff Roblin's Conservative government, was elected head of the provincial Progressive-Conservative party, and thus became official leader of the opposition; Israel Harold (Issie) Asper, a leading tax expert was elected leader of the Liberal party.

On the national scene, for the first time in Canadian history, a Jew was elevated to the rank of national leader of a political party. David Lewis of (York-South) Toronto, for several years deputy leader of the New Democratic party, was elected its head at NDP’s national convention in April. His son, Stephen Lewis, had become leader of Ontario’s provincial NDP party several months earlier.

Among those elected in 1971 to the Ontario provincial parliament were Philip Givens (Liberal); Allan Grossman (Progressive Conservative); Vernon Singer (deputy leader, Liberal party); and Dr. Morton Shulman (NDP)

In Winnipeg a new “Unicity” Council was elected to take over the operation of the enlarged city council on January 1, 1972. Four Jews were elected to the council: Lawrie Cherniack, Abe Yanofsky, Morris Kaufman, and Joe Zuken.

In November, Trudeau appointed two Jews to the Senate of Canada: H. Carl Goldenberg, Q.C., O.B.E., of Montreal and Sidney Buckwold of Saskatoon.

The appointment of several Jewish judges also was announced: Justice Mayer Lerner, of London, was named to Ontario’s Supreme Court; Ben Guss was appointed to the probate court of Saint John county, the first Jew to sit on the bench in New Brunswick. A Montreal lawyer, Moe Moscovitch, was named a judge of the Montreal provincial court and vice president of the Quebec liquor control commission.

Justice Bora Laskin, only Jewish member of the Supreme Court of Canada, received the Canadian Association of University Teachers’ first Milner Award, awarded in the cause of academic freedom.

Sydney Robins, Q.C., a Toronto lawyer, was elected “Treasurer” (equivalent of president) of the Law Society of Upper Canada (Ontario), the first Jew, and at the age of 47, the youngest lawyer to hold this office in the organization’s 175-year history.

In Quebec, Professor Arthur Lermer, member of the national executive of CJC and chairman of its national committee on Yiddish, was named by Quebec minister of education to serve for a four-year term as a member of the province’s Superior Council of Education, consisting of 24 members, of whom at least one was to be neither Catholic nor Protestant. He succeeded Professor Perry Meyer, a member since the council’s inception in 1964.

The annual J. I. Segal Fund awards in the field of Jewish culture, named after the famed late Yiddish poet of Montreal, were presented to M. M. Shafir of Montreal, for his contributions to Yiddish literature; Isaiah Rabinovitch of Toronto, for Hebrew literature; J. Zipper, for contributions to
Jewish education in Montreal; Oskar Morawetz of Toronto, for music, particularly for his composition “From the Diary of Ann Frank.” Srul Irving Glick of Toronto and Elie Rubinstein of Montreal received honorable mention for their contribution to Jewish music in Canada.

Rabbis Maurice Cohen of Montreal, Stuart E. Rosenberg, of Toronto, and Wilfred Shuchat of Montreal received honorary doctor of divinity degrees from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, at a convocation in New York, in November. Allan Grossman, minister of revenue in the Ontario cabinet, received an honorary doctorate from the University of Ottawa. Rabbi Emil Fackenheim of the University of Toronto was similarly honored by Sir George Williams university, Montreal. Also awarded honorary degrees were Mrs. Ayala Zacks by the University of Toronto; Chief Justice Freedman of Manitoba by York University in Toronto; Sylvia Ostry by York University.

Edward E. Gelber, a former president of the Zionist Organization, and leader of virtually every Zionist and cultural cause in Canada, who settled in Israel in the mid-1950s, died in Jerusalem in March, at the age of 67. Samuel Bronfman of Montreal, one of the world’s wealthiest Jews, long-time president of the Canadian Jewish Congress; vice-president of World Jewish Congress and chairman of its North American section; vice-president of the Conference of Jewish Material Claims Against Germany; past president of the United Jewish Relief Agencies; president of the Canada-Israel Corporation, and of the Canada-Israel Development Limited. Companion of the Order of Canada, 1967, Knight of Grace of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, 1969, died in Montreal on July 10, at the age of 80.
French Separatism: Its Implications for Canadian Jewry

Twenty-one million Canadians inhabit a hundred-mile band of land north of the United States, reaching from coast to coast. In all, 300,000 Jews now populate Canada; their story is little more than a "tale of two cities." Montreal, with 125,000 Jews, and Toronto, with 110,000. One has to travel one thousand miles westward to encounter Winnipeg's 18,000 Jews, and beyond the Rockies to the water's edge in Vancouver to come upon another 9,000.

Will Canadian Jewry survive if Quebec's growing traumas are not reduced or relieved? Will it survive if Quebec should actually separate from the rest of Canada? What place can Quebec's Jews, the founders of the Canadian community, have in any pitched political battle between the English and the French, which is already shaping up? The crucial problem of Canadian life and history has always been the "unfinished" business of "the sovereignty" of the province of Quebec. And this problem cuts across so many other Canadian issues that it must inevitably affect all Canadian Jews.

At the moment, the spirit of Canadian nationalism is riding high throughout the other nine provinces—to be sure, often more anti-American than pro-Canadian. In Quebec, a different spirit reigns. Even some of those who just a few years ago were strong protagonists of Canadian federalism, as opposed to French-Canadian nationalism, are now quietly or vocally opting for total separatism from the rest of Canada.

Where do these circumstances leave the Jews of Canada in general, and, more particularly, what are the portents for the Jews of Quebec, almost all of whom live in Montreal?

Historical Backlight to Problem

Salo W. Baron has reminded us that "the unification of a country on a national basis held many evil portents for Jews. As soon as a medieval country was converted into a 'national state'—however unclear and often subconscious medieval nationalism still was—it began to resent deeply the presence of the only 'alien' minority in its midst. . . . There are deep connections between the process of national unification and the growth of religious intolerance. . . ."¹

Language, like law and religion, has played an important role in modern nationalism, and this is most particularly so in Quebec. Indeed, René Lévesque, leader of Quebec's official parliamentary separatist Parti Québécois, who predicts Quebec's separation by 1976, has proclaimed 1972 as "the year of the French language in Quebec." What Levesque and others, both inside and outside politics, actually mean is that linguistic policy will now emerge as the major political issue in the province, and ultimately also throughout all of Canada. Indeed, in the 1960s, the sentiment in western Canada was to try to understand what Quebec wanted. But as one astute observer put it: "No one in the West any longer asks, 'What does Quebec want?' The question has been replaced by a statement: 'Let them separate.'"

For Jews, the problem is not a new one. Long ago even before the Exile, they had learned to acculturate to the majority. "The Jewish force" of mercenaries sent to Elephantine Egypt, at the beginning of the sixth century B.C.E. wrote and spoke not Hebrew but Aramaic, which had become the language of the land then under Persian rule. But the same seeds of the modern Jew in French Canada were present even there, in pre-exilic Egypt. Jews flourished in Elephantine. But when the Egyptians rebelled against Persia toward the end of the fifth century, the Jews, who continued to live there, were refused the right to rebuild their Temple, the center of their unique Hebraic culture. What happens to Jews when the "outs" get in?

Lessons also can be drawn from the various partitions of Poland. These partitions brought to Prussia a Jewish population 12 to 15 times as large as that of the former Prussian territory incorporated into Poland, and about four times that of Prussia itself. In Posen, Jews comprised more than one-quarter of the city's population; in some cities they even constituted the majority. As a result, regulations were instituted, for example, requiring all rabbis to know German as well as Polish. Both languages were made obligatory in all state-maintained schools for Jews. When Prussian dominance over the Posen region was restored after the downfall of Napoleon, in 1815, the Jews were only 7 per cent of a total population of 800,000 in the Grand Duchy of Posen (Poles were 50 per cent, Germans 40 per cent). Still, they remained a most important factor in the economic life of the cities, particularly Posen.

In the ensuing struggle between the pro-German forces, and those favoring the maintenance of the Polish style, in language and culture, the Jews, as often before, were caught between the two. However, the Jews behaved in a way that has almost always characterized them simply because they were a peripheral, marginal group; they adopted, by and large, the more sophisticated culture, and this was usually the one more closely linked to the trade and commerce of the country. Thus it is not surprising that most Posen Jews were closer to German than to Polish culture.

But the Jewish experience in Poland was a repetition of Elephantine
Jewry's. As Polish nationalism became stronger, it became more virulently anti-Semitic, not least because of the Jewish attachment to German, in preference to the Polish culture and language. After World War I, when Polish nationalism took over completely, the Jews were driven out, and their number declined from well over 6 per cent to only 1.2 per cent of the population.

Will this also be the fate of the Jews of Quebec? Will they filter out of the province, as French-Canadian nationalism becomes stronger and possibly tainted with anti-Semitism, not unlike developments in Posen after the first World War? René Levesque, speaking to a Toronto audience in December 1971, supported such a possibility. "I know," he publicly stated, "that eighty to ninety percent of the Jews of Quebec are nervous about the effects of separatism. I know that history shows that a rise of nationalism means Jews get it in the neck. But what can I do about it? I can't change your history. But I also know that anti-Semitism is not a significant French-Canadian characteristic. The more serious problem for the Jews," he prophesied, "is that Jews in Quebec are closely related to the English community. If they choose to put in with them, what can I do?"

The experience of the Jews of Czechoslovakia is still another case in point. Before the Thirty Years War, Bohemian Jews commonly used the Czech language in their daily relations with the local population. It was decreed only after the war, in the mid-17th century, that "Jews must write all contracts, bills, account-books, wills, and, in general, all legal and private documents in the German 'state-language' [Staatssprache]." The purpose of the rules became increasingly clear and obvious: to destroy Hebrew and Yiddish (since Czech was considered a dying language, in any case) and to Germanize the Jews in every way. Needless to say, when Czechoslovakia finally became an independent state, after World War I, the fact that Jews had been forcibly "Germanized" did not give pause to Czech nationalists; it only turned them against Jews, despite the fact that for long years the Germans had given the Jews no chance to identify with the Czechs.2

There is a familiar echo of all this, too, in modern French Canada. If, in the past, Jewish immigrants to Quebec had identified with the Anglo-Saxon community (as indeed the Italians and most other ethnic communities had also done) it was due to factors external to their thinking or their needs as Jews. The identification, as elsewhere and before in Jewish history, was based on several important facts determined not by the Jews, but by the French-Canadian environment: English was the dominant language of the economic community of the province; more important, the French-Canadian community then was still living in a withdrawn state; the Quebec provincial French-language schools were Catholic by legal definition, by dogma, and

by sectarian practice in ways in which the Protestant, English-speaking schools were not, making it clearly impossible for Jews to send their children to them.

**SOME EXCEPTIONS**

It is not easy to establish a single consistent, and simple historic law. But there were some instances of pro-Jewish action by linguistic minorities, who were moved by the desire to use the Jews as a bridge-group between contesting parties. Two, in particular, stand out. In the second half of the 19th century in the region of Poland known as Galicia, Jews tended more and more to identify themselves both culturally and politically with the Poles. Both were active in trade, and constituted the chief elements of the cities. The Ruthenians, on the other hand, were concentrated mostly in the villages. In the 1907 Austrian parliamentary elections, Jews elected nine deputies to the lower chamber despite the rise of Polish nationalism and its concomitant antisemitism. Although most of the Jews had a distinctly Jewish, rather than Polish orientation, the Polish rulers did not allow them to separate themselves from Polish life because they regarded the Jews as an important element in helping the Poles (46 per cent of the population) maintain a stronger, more stable majority over the Ruthenians (43 per cent of the population).

Professor Arthur A. Lermer, a leading Montreal Jewish intellectual, has suggested that Jews can serve a similar very special purpose in the economic sphere, if Quebec should separate from Canada.

Any separate Quebec existence is bound to lower the standard of living of the people of this province. One professor at the University of Montreal has estimated it would decline by 30%. Furthermore, if this province had to survive as an independent economy, it would have to invite capital for further development of its resources... because... it must compete on this continent with the gigantic structure of modern corporations... We [Jews] should invest in the great economic potential of Quebec and thereby show our people that there is a future on which we can build. A society with an advanced economy has always shown better attitudes towards its minorities. Throughout the world there is a very close correlation between the position of the Jews and the economic development of a country. Thus, for many reasons, a more advanced Quebec is also a better Quebec for the Jews.

The question remains whether 125,000 Jews can serve as a bridge, even if only as an economic bridge, between the five million French Canadians and the one million or so English Quebeckers. A second question is whether Quebec, as an increasingly nationalist province, if not a separate state, will grant Jews full rights as individuals but will by-pass them as a cultural or
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ethnic group and deny them special cultural and educational group rights of their own. During the French Revolution, Clémont-Tonnère had given the classical formulation of the attitude of 18th-century (indeed, we may even say 20th-century) liberalism toward the Jews, proudly proclaiming: "Everything must be denied to the Jews as a nation; everything must be granted to them as individuals."

The history of Jews in Hungary provides some interesting parallels and insights. In 1867, at long last, a law was passed granting them emancipation and offering them full civil rights as individuals, but not equality as a religious group. They had to wait until 1895 before the Hungarian parliament would grant them full equality with the Christian religion. Peculiarly enough, the parliamentary act rested on the recognition by the Hungarian Magyars that it was an effective instrument for deepening the sense of identity of the Jews with the Magyar nationalists. If the Magyars, who constituted barely 49 per cent of the total population, could arrange for the Jews, who comprised 5 per cent of the population, to identify as Magyars, they then would maintain a clear majority of 54 per cent. Without the Jews, the Magyars would possibly have forever been a minority in their own country. Jews also belonged to the most active elements in the Hungarian economy, and this, too, helped cement the ties between them and the Hungarians, who were trying desperately to break away from their continuing dependence on Austrian economic hegemony.4

In the case of Hungary, the ability of the Jews, who constituted only 5 per cent of the total population, to serve as a bridge group, indeed to help further the "Magyarization" of the country, points to the distinct possibility that Professor Lermer’s thesis of the Jews as an important minority, even in a separate state of Quebec, may in fact come to pass, as long as the French-Canadian will feel that they are useful to the economy. The rest of Canada was clamoring for greater restrictions on foreign investment in the country, and, indeed, was pushing the Trudeau government toward a major policy change, and Herb Gray, the Jewish federal minister of revenue was delegated to chart a new course in this regard. Nevertheless, all parties in Quebec, among them the separatist Parti Québécois were more concerned with creating jobs in the province than with “economic nationalism.” The Montreal Gazette (January 11, 1972) was reporting that the Quebec government of Robert Bourassa (Liberal) “has not made it a secret that economic nationalism runs contrary to its immediate objectives. Premier Bourassa told New York investors . . . to disregard the nationalist trend publicized by the Canadian media.” And René Levesque, was saying the very same thing at the very same time: “Our first duty is to make sure that Quebeckers have a job, then we can proceed with other matters such as ownership . . .

Economic nationalism may represent a ‘personal objective’ for many including myself, but job creation must always be the priority.”

Clearly, if even the leader of the Quebec separatist party could forsake ideology in favor of pragmatic need for investment funds to insure an economically viable Quebec, the Hungarian example of the 1890s could prove to be, at least in the short run, a useful model for the survival of the Jews as a vital and significant minority in French-Canada. This would be so, as long as a substantial number of Jews continued to have faith in Quebec’s future (even as a separate state) and as long as men like Levesque would continue with a pragmatic rather than a purely doctrinaire approach. However, among Quebec’s separatists, there are other voices, more strident, more chauvinistic, more Marxist.

**Anglophone-Francophone Dispute: Historical Dimension**

A careful study of the textbooks used in Canadian schools reveals that there actually are two different and antagonistic versions of Canadian history: an English and a French version, reflecting the existence of two differing, and often antagonistic societies. This creates a problem that now, more than ever before, poses a threat to Canada’s national identity. At the same time, the nature of the Canadian federal system—its partnership, or as it is usually known, Confederation—depends on what one group believes about the other. The dominant theme in the French-language textbooks is the development and survival of French-Canadian society. According to a Royal Commission report⁵ “men and events” described in these books, are always judged by their contribution to “survival”—la survivance. They dwell at great length on the history of New France, the establishment of the French colony before 1663, and the period of the royal government lasting until what is constantly called the “Conquest” by the British in 1763, which is repeatedly called “un catastroph e pour notre peuple”. Generally, at least half of the textbook is devoted to the period leading up to that point, while the events of the next two centuries are pressed into the remaining pages.

English textbooks, on the other hand see national development in terms of a continental Canadian economy which has helped to foster Canadian unity. They treat the “Conquest” not as the end, but as the beginning of Canada’s history. Discussing the antagonism between the French and the British, “the two founding races”, as they are called in the 1867 British North America Act of Confederation which joined Lower Canada (Quebec) and Upper Canada (Ontario) into one country, the same Royal Commission report significantly commented:

> With the two dominant themes of French-Canadian survival and the survival of Canada as a political union, it comes as no surprise that Canadians of ethnic
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⁵ Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 1968), Book II.
origins other than French or British, are almost ignored. Their presence in Canada is usually overlooked and the scattered references to them suggest that they will become good Canadians when they have submerged their ethnic identity.\(^6\)

And this is despite the fact that 26 per cent of Canadians, whose mother tongue is English, are of non-British origin.

But if the roots of French-Canadians can thus be traced back to 1760, at the close of what most French-Canadian historians refer to as their "Golden Age," a parallel and analogous English-Canadian separatism began to develop immediately after the American Revolution. In the words of historian A.R.M. Lower, many English-Canadians "are Americans who did not break the tie with England, and ... feel more than any others, the tragedy of the cleavage. They are the children of lost parents, and they know the bitterness of a broken home. In the heart of the Canadian of English speech there will be found if he will confess it—as he often will—a profound spiritual wound, the division in the race, the American Revolution."\(^7\)

Paradoxically, the current clash between Francophones and Anglophones in Quebec, but also throughout Canada, is often the result of romantic or nostalgic, not truly political, issues. On the one hand, the rankling presence of a "Conquest" in the imaginative and retentive mind of Quebec explains much of the vitality of contemporary French-Canadian nationalism. On the other hand, the problem of French separatism, in a most ironical way, is a reaction to North American continentalism, and not really an answer to issues raised by English-speaking, Anglophone Canadians. The giant called America feeds the insecurity of French-Canadians; perhaps without it, the French and English cultures would be able to make a better accommodation to each other, as have smaller bilingual countries of Europe, such as Switzerland and Finland. "Linguistically," the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism stated, "the proximity of more than two hundred million Anglophones cannot help but strongly condition Canadians—and especially French-Canadians, whose minority situation becomes particularly evident when it is viewed on a continental scale."\(^8\) (Emphasis added.)

In this context, the evident concern of Quebec's Jews over their future is understandable. Not only are they identified as members of the English-speaking majority, and therefore as outsiders, but they also are regarded as vital and omnipresent creators of American culture, on stage, screen, radio, and television, and in literature. For long years, too, to be English was to be Protestant, which was difficult enough, for it was to be not only the progenitor of inter-Canadian tensions, but also to help foster continuing re-
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\(^6\) Ibid., p. 282.


ligious intolerance. For the Jews—as neither Catholics nor Protestants—it was more difficult, even perilous, to live in a society seething with nationalist, linguistic, as well as interreligious tension.

Indeed, although not officially a separatist, Claude Ryan, one of Quebec's leading intellectuals, and editor of Montreal's prestigious *Le Devoir*, wrote as recently as 1969:

French Canadians have known in the past only the one kind of stranger—the Englishman. And since the Englishman personified both the reality of domination and the threat of assimilation, the French Canadian was tempted to consider all strangers as being like the Englishman. All the more so, since most of the newcomers to the city [Montreal] had a natural inclination to integrate with the English rather than with the French-speaking community. Jews as well as other groups, had tended to identify with the English culture, and the English speaking part of the community. They have espoused its way of life, its institutions, and secretly, or overtly, aspired to share its comforts and privileges...

... In the eye of the average French-Canadian, the Jew is still first and above all a money-maker. He is considered a person who will do practically anything in order to make a fast buck...

... *I think the myth that Jews killed Jesus Christ is still very much alive among French Canadians.*... (Emphasis added.)

... French Canadians have observed that Jews speak French more than the English do in Montreal. In the legal profession, for instance, practically all the members of Jewish background speak French and have French customers and clients, and can deal with French Canadians pretty easily. *But French Canadians believe that they do this because of self interest rather than because of any genuine interest in French Canadians, their way of life and their culture.*

(*Emphasis added.*)

**Quebec's Future: Various French-Canadian Positions**

Perhaps the most succinct argument for the retention of a federal Canada as the best solution for the Francophones is to be found in the introduction to the Royal Commission report.

Anglophones form the majority in nine of the ten provinces; Francophones form the majority in Quebec. This is a state of affairs which should be turned to account. Indeed, the concentration of four million Francophones in a single province is the only factor which gives some reality at the outset to the concept of equal partnership.

Quebec constitutes an environment where the aspirations and needs of four out of five Francophones in Canada can be satisfied. The mere fact of this concentration leads to a spontaneous French way of life and makes that way of life easier to organize.

This is why we believe the place of the Québécois in the French fact in Canada will in practice have to be recognized much more than it is today; we are
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9 "A French Canadian Looks at the Jews" (from a speech delivered to a B'nai B'rith Lodge in Montreal), *Viewpoints*, October, 1969, pp. 5–9.
thinking particularly in the world of work, in the Federal public sector and
in the private sector. But there is also a political aspect. Québec is the only
province where French-speaking Canadians are in the majority and English-
speaking in the minority. Here the weight of numbers favours the Francophones,
and it is a powerful lever. They can exercise a preponderate influence in their
own province; they can also make themselves heard by the rest of the country,
especially in the Federal Parliament, and thus take an active part in the life
of Canada. Of course there are risks involved. (Emphasis added.)
The problem can be succinctly formulated. How can we integrate the new
Québec into present day Canada, without curbing Québec's forward drive, and, at
the same time, without risking the breaking up of the country?  

AUTONOMY, NOT SEPARATISM

A group of leading French-Canadian intellectuals, led by Claude Ryan,
advocate autonomy for Quebec. “It would be much more practical,” Ryan
believes, “for the rest of Canada to go English all the way, although they
would probably decide to give some limited forms of recognition to the
French-speaking citizens, as they would do for their citizens of Ukrainian,
German, or Polish extraction. . . . My position has always been that we must
achieve some form of what I used to term sovereignty, but now term auton-
omy, for Quebec. A form of autonomy is required for the satisfactory ex-
pression of the distinct personality of Quebec. However, I always thought
and still do, that this can be reconciled with our participation in the federal
system of government.”  

Autonomy was preferable, in Ryan’s view, because, “if Quebec should
separate I don’t think we will get magnanimity for the French-Canadian
minorities outside of Quebec from the leaders of English Canada. Their
prospect would be gloomy.” Indeed, in light of his tart comments on the
Jews, it is highly doubtful, at least in his opinion, whether, in a separated
Québec, Jews would have brighter prospects for their own cultural growth
or would be shown great magnanimity by the French.

SEPARATISM

René Levesque believes that, by 1976, Quebec will be a separate French
nation-state, established by peaceful means. His writings are reminiscent of
the views of early Zionist theoreticians, who were not looking for individual
freedoms for Jews, but for a territory where Jews could grow in freedom,
as a sovereign people with its own unique culture.

Levesque and his followers are not interested in spreading the “French
fact” across Canada. “It would not solve our problem,” they maintain. As

11 Quebec: Year Eight, Glendon College Forum (CBC Publications, 1968),
pp. 101 ff.
individuals, French-Canadians have rights under the laws of Canada. But in Quebec, where most French-speaking Canadians live, they started off as “a concrete people,” who quickly became a minority in their own home. The rights and privileges given to the English minority in Quebec were those of a dominant minority representing the “conqueror.”

Indeed, French-Canadians were forced out of Quebec to seek a livelihood in some other province. Said Levesque: “In seven out of nine provinces outside Quebec, survival of minorities is a very bad joke. It’s finished. . . . The same applies to at least one-third of all French-Canadians outside of Quebec (whose total is 1,300,000). We are not abandoning 1,300,000. In Ontario, the official figure is close to 700,000 French-Canadians, but barely two-thirds of these still speak French. The rest were just assimilated which was inevitable. We’re not abandoning them.”

Summing up, Levesque’s language clearly reflects the same urgency any Jewish nationalist leader would have expressed in the early days of Zionism, and perhaps even today:

I’ve just told you about one-third of our minority being assimilated in the rest of our so-called country. We cannot help it. The only place where we are really at home, the only homeland that accepts us because we are a minority, is Quebec. And it is too late to stop it, because we have started fulfilling ourselves as never before. This is our homeland. This is where our nation began. We were the discoverers of America but the only place where we were ever at home was on the St. Lawrence. And it still is. . . . Twenty years ago French-Canadians believed in the revenge of the cradle; we were going to reconquer America. We did not wait for the Vatican to decide about the pill. It became a social flood in Quebec. The cradle started emptying fifteen years ago [1953]. In fifteen years, the birth rate in Quebec went from above the national average to way below the national average, to where it is now [1968]. . . . Nine out of ten immigrants have been assimilated into the English group. First of all because the traditional priority is to recruit in Northern Europe as much as possible in English-speaking countries. Secondly, because all the policy, traditionally majority-oriented, lies in Ottawa where we will always be in the minority.12

MARXIST SEPARATISM

Many Quebec Jews are not nearly as concerned over René Levesque’s Parti Québécois, which most French-Canadians consider moderate, as they are over the growing evidence of a small, but vocal, militant, and extremist form of Marxist separatism. Its followers consider Levesque too tame, and even a threat to Quebec’s real independence. Quebec’s number one best seller in 1971 was Pétit Manuel d’Histoire du Québec, by Léandre Bergeron, which also appeared in an English edition under the title, The History of Quebec: A Patriote’s Handbook. Bergeron condemns Levesque for not having

12 Ibid., p. 49.
considered "getting rid of capitalism and American imperialism in Quebec." That this is a cardinal sin of all separatists, except Marxist separatists, is made clear by Bergeron:

Our history can be divided into three parts:
The French Regime, which dates from the first French explorations at the beginning of the sixteenth century to 1760, date of the conquest of New France by Great Britain.
The English Regime, which begins with the Conquest of New France and continues into the beginning of the Twentieth Century when it gives way to the American Regime.
The American Regime, which begins with the invasion of American capital at the beginning of the Twentieth Century and follows with increasingly greater hold by American capitalists, first on our economy, then on our politics, and finally on our culture.

According to this version of Quebec history, the struggle for a Québécois régime—a régime in which the Québécois could be masters of their own destiny—did not begin until 1960, with the formation of the Rassemblement pour l'Indépendence Nationale (R.I.N.). This, its members believe, was the first real effort to deal seriously with what they regard as the subterfuge of Liberal Premier Jean Lesage's "Quiet Revolution." "The majority of Québécois," Bergeron claims, "became cheap labour in industrial centres for American, English-Canadian, French-Canadian, and Jewish capitalists . . . and our colonizers supported by our small and middle bourgeoisie concentrated on the Liberal party and elected "the Negro-king" Lesage, supposedly to launch our "Quiet Revolution!""

In an adroit, but transparent way, Bergeron projects Quebec antisemitism onto the English-Canadian "capitalists," making the French quite guiltless:

Some say that the Jews of Montreal are our worst enemies. By playing the capitalist game, a few of them managed to escape from the exploited class to become the owners of small businesses, factories, shops and grocery stores—copying the life-style of the Montreal English bourgeoisie. They adopted the exploiters' language—English, using French only to give orders to their employees in their shops and to their maids at home.

So to some people, the exploiters of the Québécois no longer seemed to be the English for pulling the hidden strings of high finance in big business, but the Jews of St. Lawrence and Craig Streets and the Jewish shoe and clothing manufacturers who operate more openly.

But anti-Semitism in Quebec existed largely in the minds of the English who were only too happy to stir it up on occasion and bring it forward as more "evidence" that the Québécois are inescapably fascist and reactionary and not to be trusted to govern themselves. The English rejoiced all the more when
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13 Ibid., pp. 216-17.
the Québécois could be persuaded the Jew was his chief exploiter. Hiding behind the big enterprises and institutions of high finance the English and American capitalists cynically played off Jews against Québécois. In fact, the real anti-semite was the English imperialist colonizer, who kept the Jewish bourgeois out of his social club and shuddered to see Jews buying property in Westmount.14 (Emphasis added.)

There can be little doubt, however, that this type of separatism, which is linked, not only in spirit but often in fact, to such violent groups as the Front de Libération du Québec (FLQ) has an anti-Jewish core. It identifies with the Palestinian anti-Israel terrorists; it even sends its members to Algeria and Jordan for training in guerrilla warfare.

Many Quebec Jews do not fear Levesque's separatism through peaceful, democratic means, which holds out hope for regular and normal political relations with the rest of Canada. But, they are wondering whether a separate Quebec would not ultimately be taken over by extreme Marxist groups, who act as if they were the only true saviors of the Québécois, and deride attempts by all others as mere window dressing. Could Jews remain a viable group in a Quebec whose rulers identify with movements like FLQ?

**Options for Jews**

The problems raised by separatism for the Jews are many. Can they survive in a homogeneous nation-state? Historically, in a homogeneous nation-state there has been a trend toward fourth-generation "Jewish evaporation."

And what options remain for Jews in Canada, if the "mother city" of Montreal, with almost half of the country's Jewish population, separates? Or even if it does not separate, what are the chances for a strong Jewish consciousness and cultural verve to continue to grow, if Jews are caught in the cross-fire between the Anglophones and Francophones of Quebec and the resultant unrest in the rest of Canada?

As we have seen, there was no way the Jews could have worked more closely with the French in the past. French-language schools were Catholic; indeed, they were specifically organized to retain a unity between Catholicism and French Canadian culture. But the percentage of Jews speaking French as their first language is larger than ever before; and a growing proportion of the remaining Jews are either bilingual or learning French. According to the 1961 Dominion Census, 36.5 per cent of the Jewish population of Quebec spoke both French and English. Thus, in the entire province, Jews ranked highest among its bilingual residents, except in metropolitan Montreal, where Jews were second only to French-speaking Canadians.

Studies made of Italians in Montreal—according to the 1961 census,
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there were about 130,000, almost the same number as Jews—showed that, while they were strongly sympathetic to French-Canadian attempts to obtain more power for the province of Quebec, they largely sent their children to English schools. About three-quarters of them do, and the proportion increases annually. But they are overwhelmingly opposed to separatism; they do not aspire to be members of either the French or English communities, and they see themselves as Italian Canadians, or simply as Canadians without ethnic label. There is no indication of any attempt by the Italian community to serve as a bridge group between the English and the French.15

Some Quebec Jews, on the other hand, feel that it may be possible for Jews to serve as a bridge group between the English and French, and to readdress what they consider to be mere accidents of history. They believe that the time has come for Jews, as individuals, as well as for Jewish institutions to reorient themselves to the new Quebec; to opt for the French language and for French-Canadian culture. They point out that, throughout the Middle Ages, the Jews of Europe, the Middle East, and Asia obviously had been capable of adjusting to a variety of cultural and political settings. As a result, they had been multilingual and multicultural, and had derived benefits for themselves, as well.

To help support this view is the fact that the more than 12,000 North African and Iraqi Jews of French background, who immigrated in recent years, are almost completely at home in the Quebec culture of today. The Catholic Church, too, like many other Quebec institutions, is also moderating its positions. It is becoming receptive to the wider possibilities of French culture, without identifying itself solely with the French-Canadian position, as it always had done in the past. Secularism never pervaded French-Canadian society, as it did life in France. Throughout the 19th century the French-Canadian Church completely crushed any liberal tendencies and imposed an “ultramontane nationalism.” It had a tacit agreement with the colonial rulers to whom it delivered the political submissiveness of the French Canadians in return for some religious and linguistic concessions. In other words, until recently, Quebec had an ossified ancien régime society. But the nationalism now being experienced in Quebec is becoming more and more secular, and is often moving to the left politically; sometimes even very far to the left. The Church, in the expert view of Louis Balthazar, “is not going to give any further direction in the realm of the French-Canadian nationalism.”16

Under these circumstances, many Jews sincerely feel, the Jews should actively seek to become a bridge group, the interpreter and unifier of a divided community.

16 Quebec: Year Eight, op. cit., pp. 82–85.
Francophone Jews

"Francophone Jews in Québec are not ghettoizing themselves. They are trying to live together and achieve understanding with the English-speaking Jewish community, at the same time retaining their identity." This was the official view of Elias Malka, president of Association Sépharade Francophone, a relatively new umbrella organization of French-speaking chapters of B'nai B'rith, Hadassah, and other Jewish agencies, fostering French and Jewish culture. Indeed, since 1948, the Canadian Jewish Congress has been publishing *Bulletin du Circle Juif de Langue Française*, edited for some years by the well-known Baghdad-born Nairn Kattan (now the literary officer of the prestigious Canada Council in Ottawa, a governmental body dealing with the fostering of Canadian culture). He had also served as secretary of "Circle Juif de Langue Française de Montréal."

However, despite Malka's apparent optimism, the Francophone Jew in Montreal has little opportunity to retain his identity, and, as a result, is very close to cultural and religious assimilation. He has a choice of identifying either with the existing Anglophone Jewish community and probably losing his language and his unique French-Sephardi cultural heritage, or with a non-Jewish Francophone community and thus probably losing his Jewish religious connections.

It is claimed by many that studies will reveal a very high rate of intermarriage between young Sephardi Francophone Jews and French non-Jews. To be sure, groups like the Association Sépharade Francophone are concerned with this question. But the shortage of French-language facilities for the socialization of young, unmarried immigrants necessarily leads many to pursue their social life outside the Jewish community.

Another problem is the traditional Quebec educational structure. Almost all Sephardi Jews must still go to English-speaking schools: either to the Protestant schools (which, in Quebec, are equivalent to the public schools of other provinces), or to Jewish day schools, all of which use English, not French, as the language of instruction. All French-language lower schools are Catholic. Three small Jewish schools are the only exceptions: the Ecole Sépharade in Cartierville, with 100 pupils; the donation-supported Ecole Beth Rifka, with 200 pupils, and Ecole Maimonide, housed in a Catholic church (to the consternation of many traditional Jews), which, in 1970, had only one class of 20 pupils. French courses are offered at Montreal High School and a few other nondenominational secondary schools. Universities, on the other hand, pose no confessional or cultural problems, since there are French-language secular colleges and universities throughout the province.

The serious problem exists at the elementary-school level: Francophone children, most of whom go to English-language schools, are often placed two or three years behind English-speaking children of the same age because of the language difficulties. In time, these difficulties are overcome and Franco-
phone children adopt English as the language of their peers, while French remains the language in the home. Thus, the special educational problems in Quebec create almost insuperable difficulties in bridging the gaps between the Francophone Jews and the French-Canadian groups, despite good intentions and despite the efforts of Jewish organizations to help the Sephardi Jews serve as a major contributor to Quebec's French culture.17

**Anglophone Jewish Institutions and the New Quebec**

The Canadian Jewish Congress (CJC), YM-YWHA, and particularly, Montreal's Allied Jewish Community Services representing some 20 Jewish institutions and social agencies in the area are making efforts to deal with the "French Fact." CJC's Eastern Region, which includes Montreal, established a Standing Committee on the French Fact. In March 1970, the large and important YM-YWHA of Montreal embarked on a new program which was defined in a basic working paper:

The Committee [studying the French Fact] accepts the movement to a French cultural milieu as a reality. . . . The Programme Committee intends to define how the "Y" can help the Jewish Community to accommodate to this change through programme. . . . The "Y" must begin to reflect change within the community by becoming a fully bi-lingual institution, rather than remain an enclave of the English speaking community . . . So that the Association [the "Y"] does not become insular it will be necessary to aggressively move out into the French community to establish contact with other recognized associations, professional groups, and individuals. . . . This moving out process should also enhance one's own Jewish identity. This movement must not be of a "token" nature, and it is recognized that initially it may be difficult to get some French Canadian groups to accept this movement. These programmes should not only include visits involving children, teens, and adults as spectators or observers, but should provide opportunities to involve the "Y" membership as an integral part of the total Quebec community. . . .

Our involvement in the "French Fact" does not, and should not be regarded in any way as an abdication of our concerns in the enrichment of Jewish identification, its values and traditions. The strength of the Jewish community is also determined by the way it relates to the total community of which it is an integral part. Equal to the threat of assimilation and self-denial is that of the self-imposed isolation and "ghettoization" and its unhappy consequences. The problems are by no means minimal, but all the more reason for the "Y," as a responsible Jewish communal organization, to play a positive and effective role in this developing situation.

Similarly, after the FLQ crisis, and the imposition by Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau of the War Measures Act, the Allied Jewish Community Services sponsored a community conference, "Jews in the Quebec of the Future—Réalité, 1970" (AJYB, 1971 [Vol. 72], pp. 273-76). It was

followed with a major conference, *Recontre 1971*, sponsored by its now permanent Comité Sur Le Fait Français (Committee on the French Fact). In the invitation to attend the conference in November, the committee chairman wrote: "Let us not forget that the Province of Quebec is *our* Quebec—we love it and are deeply rooted in our loyalty to it."

Despite such romantic rhetoric—real and deeply felt, no doubt—by official spokesmen of the community, a deep malaise continues to pervade Quebec's Jews. Indeed, even Prime Minister Trudeau, who is a French-Canadian, discussed the problem quite openly and realistically at a major meeting of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in Montreal, in February 1970. After reviewing Jewish history, and labeling the Jews a chosen people who represented for him the "quintessence of a minority," he addressed himself directly to the omnipresent, but often publicly unvoiced, fact of Jewish uneasiness in the new Quebec. Said Trudeau:

I am aware that we are passing through a troubled period in this Province and being a member of a minority in these circumstances can be a cause for apprehension. I know that many members of the Jewish community share this feeling and have doubts about their future in Quebec. If I can speak as a member of one minority to another—stick with it! With all your energies and abilities, play your full part in this society which you have helped to build and insist on your rights as members of it.\footnote{Stuart E. Rosenberg, *The Jewish Community in Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971), Vol. 2, pp. 205–6.}

**Official Jewish Positions on Language Rights**

In 1969, the Quebec government passed Bill 63, which, when originally introduced in the National Assembly, was labeled an act to promote the teaching of the French language in Quebec "to insure that the English-speaking children of Quebec acquire a working knowledge of the French language and that persons who locate in Quebec acquire the knowledge of the French language upon arrival." At the same time, it also confirmed "the parents' option to choose between French and English as the language in which courses will be given their children."

In its final form, the bill included sections dealing with the promotion of French as the working language in Quebec. Even its title was changed, not without reason, so that it was known as an "Act to promote the French language in Quebec." The final version also contained a provision for educating children of persons moving to Quebec in French schools. This section reads in French, "*qu'elles fassent instruire leurs enfants,*" which *could* be translated "that they have their children educated," in French schools. But the official English translation prepared by the government reads: "and *may have* their children educated" in French schools. Jewish leaders repeatedly
have pointed out the significant difference between "assent" and "may have."19

The act also created an Office de la Langue Française (French Language Bureau), to act as a "watchdog" over French-language rights in the province. The bureau was empowered to hear complaints from workers, whose employers would not let them use French in their every-day work, and to take other action, all in the interest of protecting the French language in the province.

To be sure, the Canadian Jewish Congress has had to tread a very narrow path in this matter. Here is the way it describes its own difficult position:

The Canadian Jewish Congress has maintained throughout, in its submissions to Government and several Royal Commissions, that parental choice of language of education is a basic right which ought not to be denied to anyone regardless of origin. Canadian Jewish Congress is also on record as favouring the strengthening of the French language in the Province of Quebec and for making facilities for acquiring of French available to all.

At the same time, there was need to protect the "independent sector", as CJC euphemistically called the Jewish day school. A brief on the reorganization of the school boards on the island of Montreal, submitted by CJC to the Standing Parliamentary Committee on Education of the Quebec National Assembly, in September 1971, made the following recommendations concerning Bill 28:

1. The ultimate goal of the Education Act amendments should be the establishment of a unified school administration, democratically elected with adequate safeguards written into law to assure equality of educational opportunity and the necessary conditions to provide courses of study of the highest quality in the language chosen by the parents.

2. The evolvement of the suggested educational school system should include full recognition by the Government of Quebec of the independent school sector, supported by government aid to the fullest extent in which every group may, if it so wishes, assume additional responsibility on its own to develop its own cultural or religious heritage consonant with the democratic ideals of Quebec and Canada.

3. Close to 5,000 Jewish children, representing 25–30% of the total Jewish child population, attend Jewish Day Schools in Montreal, in which they receive their general education in addition to courses of study in Jewish religion and culture.

4. In a multicultural society such as ours there can be no doubt that special stress is needed on that aspect of public mutual understanding of the various religious differences and the maintenance of linguistic duality. We are all dedicated to this goal.

Of course, underlying these arguments was the growing fear on the part of many Anglophone Quebeckers, many of them Jews, that Quebec nationalism was really moving away from bilingualism toward unilingualism—French. Proponents of unilingualism, largely separatist-oriented groups, maintain that, historically, bilingualism in Quebec has always been identified with colonialism. In their view, too, bilingualism inexorably has led to a state of economic subservience because "as long as a French-Canadian seeking a job with an English-speaking company must know English, he will be in an inferior position." Consequently, French-Canadians can enjoy economic equality only if a form of unilingualism, however adroitly skirted by legalistic terminologies, is imposed.

This view was strongly protested in 1969 by Jacob Ziegel, a Jewish professor of law in Quebec, who, significantly, left Quebec to teach law in Toronto since voicing his disagreement. He rejected unilingualism for Quebec in any shape or form. Speaking as a Jew, he said: "I think it . . . clear that we must reject unilingualism in any form or guise, not only because it would spell the end of our own cultural and linguistic status in this province, but also because unilingualism as a concept seems to me invalid and dangerous." He maintained that there is "economic discrimination on the part of French Canadians against those of us who are not French Canadians" and that this "should not grow and develop."

And while he was optimistic about the ultimate solution of the problem, he felt that the one important condition for Jews was that "we don't stand back waiting to be kicked. I don't think the French Canadian appreciates a softy anymore than people in other parts of the world do. I think that as a minority we ought to speak up about it." 20

The seriousness of the problem became more apparent in December 1971, when the Parti Québécois proposed the insertion in the projected Education Bill 28 of a clause to the effect that courses in English be given in Montreal public schools only to children having already had such courses in Quebec, or whose mother tongue was English. The amendment received solid support from most labor leaders and French-speaking intellectuals, and especially from Claude Ryan.

The great threat to the French language in Montreal was not the growing number of Anglophones, but the new Canadians. Indeed, Bill 63 passed by the Union Nationale party as recently as 1969 was already being seen as a major stumbling block to a French-language Quebec; and this made more and more French-Canadian leaders receptive to unilingualism (French only) in theory, if not yet openly in practice. In the fall of 1971, the Quebec department of education produced statistics showing that children of parents, who were neither Anglophones nor Francophones, were then opting for

English-language schools at the stupendous rate of nine to one. And all sorts of demographers were pouring forth predictions that Montreal could indeed become a predominantly English-speaking city by the end of the century.21

The language problem, as it was perceived only a few years ago and as the Royal Commissioners on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, rationally and dispassionately discussed for the past four years, was moving to center stage, perhaps to become Quebec's most explosive issue today. The drive for a form of unilingualism would have to be stepped up in the face of the realities of Montreal and the continuing French-Canadian problem of remaining a cultural, if not a political, minority in their own province. All signs pointed to the fact that in Montreal, the center of most new immigration to Quebec, the children of the newcomers were assimilating with the English-speaking minority of one million, and that the five million French-speaking Quebeckers perhaps would be engulfed before too long, even in their own home.

All these questions, of course, leave the Montreal Jews in a most vulnerable position, despite their serious attempts to identify with the "French Fact"; despite their high rating as French-speaking members of a minority; despite their willingness to work within "our Quebec culture which we love." Culturally, religiously, and even politically, they score very low in the eyes of Quebec nationalists.

The Future

What then lies ahead for the Jews of Quebec? One thing seems clear: in political matters Jews will have to rely only on themselves. Only one Jew holds the post of provincial cabinet minister: (Liberal) Victor Goldbloom, currently minister of state responsible for the quality of the environment. And over the years, since 1832 when the Quebec (Lower Canada, as it was then known) legislature first allowed Jews to serve in that body, if elected, very few have been elected; a few found their way to the federal House of Commons, and, recently, two Quebec Jews have been appointed to the federal Senate.

It is necessary to state these facts of Jewish political scarcity in Quebec, because Quebec lives by the basic axiom of étatism—the centralization of total power in the state and the recognition of this political power as the basis of all life. It is a fundamental French-Canadian philosophy that the government takes care of everything. Accordingly, prosperity is the time when one's political party is in office; depression, when it is in opposition.

Philip Vineberg, Q.C., a leading Montreal Jewish lawyer and batonnier (head of the city's bar association), pinpointed these problems in 1970, in a succinct manner:

In the heyday of Quebec corruption, literally tens of thousands of people were put on the public corruption payroll in token recognition of the fact that the government provides all . . . The government gives all . . . This notion was even carried forward into the provincial election of 1970. Read the political platform campaigns of all parties. Robert Bourassa of the Liberals (and now the Premier) said the Government was going to “give” one hundred thousand jobs . . . All the arguments are on the basis of what the government will do. There is very little reliance upon, until very recently, the individual, the struggling businessman.

Do not misunderstand. I have found French Canadian businessmen as able and as competent, and sometimes much more so, than any other kind of businessman, and just as anxious to make money and activated by exactly the same economic motives as anyone else. But they are not as numerous; and they are not as respected. The younger people were not trained to look to the solution of economic problems by economic methods.

We Jews have had no brera [alternative]. If we want to get ahead in the world, we get ahead by economic means. It is not that we made a great discovery. We had no choice in the matter. Until recently it was an article of faith in French Canada and a persistent struggle of its political parties that you don’t get ahead in this world by economic methods; you get ahead by political methods. And of course, at the same time, paradoxically the great complaint of the French Canadian is that the French Canadian is underrepresented economically. Of course he is; he is overrepresented politically. He had enormous political influence. Who runs Quebec politically? Surely, the French Canadians. And even beyond the horizons of Quebec; who runs Canada? Who are the people in control in Ottawa? You would have to answer—and I’m not a western province style separatist—the French Canadians, as well.

New moods are now in vogue. A whole generation is being transformed. But in the process of the transformation they are subjected to teachers, professors, a high proportion of whom are anti-business, and in some cases anti-English. And so you find a disproportionate amount of propaganda in favour of separatism, in favour of rather extreme nationalism in the schools and universities which are attracting so many French Canadians.22 (Emphasis throughout added.)

If history teaches us anything at all, étatism is a very poor portent of Jewish survival. Uriel Tal23 has shown, for example, that, at first, the Jews in late 19th-century Germany actively supported the Kulturkampf to help separate church and state. Before too long, however, the Kulturkampf merely substituted the powers of the central state for the powers of the central Church.

Whether a valid analogy can be made between the Kulturkampf of 19th-century Germany, which was at first supported but later spurned by Jews, ———

22 Speech at a community conference sponsored by the Montreal Allied Jewish Community Services, 1970.
and the present drive toward French-Canadian nationalism or even separatism, is difficult to establish. However, they have much in common: both are secularizing movements aimed at modernizing the nation-state by means of étatism, by centralizing political power in government; both inexorably lead to the stifling of minorities (unilingualism in Quebec) and the homogenizing of society. The result can only be that ethnic groups other than the majority lose their distinctive cultural characteristics, and, unhappily, both can lead to a form of totalitarianism, which often starts out as a liberating force, but ends up with intolerant, irresponsible government relying on violence as a means and an end.

No one can foretell the precise future of Quebec. How then can one detail the future of its Jews? One thing is certain: the road ahead is uncertain, fearful, even fraught with unknowable dangers. But Jews have learned to accommodate to a variety of societies. If Quebec remains democratic, as most observers deeply believe it will, then, despite the problems, the Jews must have a future in the province.

STUART E. ROSENBERG